Article:
South, J., Barbulescu, R., Macêdo, R.L. et al. (2025) Parallels between biological invasions and human migration are flawed and undermine both disciplines. Response to Ahmed et al. BioScience. ISSN: 0006-3568

https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biaf073

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS | BioScience

Parallels between biological invasions and human migration are flawed and undermine both disciplines. Response to Ahmed et al.

Journal:	*BioScience*
Manuscript ID	BIOS-25-0144.R1
Manuscript Type:	Viewpoint
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-May-2025

Complete List of Authors:	South, Josie; University of Leeds, Faculty of Biological Sciences Barbulescu, Roxana; University of Leeds, Sociology and Social Policy, Faculty of Social Sciences Macêdo, Rafael ; Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries in the Forschungsverbund Berlin eV; Freie Universität Berlin, Institute of Biology Musseau, Camille; Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries in the Forschungsverbund Berlin eV; Freie Universität Berlin, Guareschi, Simone; Rey Juan Carlos University Alamenciak, Tim; Carleton University, Institute of Environmental and Interdisciplinary Science Alberti, Gabriella; University of Leeds, Leeds University Business School Allen, Sylvie; University of Leeds, School of Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences Bacher, Sven; University of Fribourg, Department of Biology Baker, Emma; University of Leeds, School of Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences Benson, Michaela; Lancaster University, Department of Sociology Bernard-Verdier, Maud; Sorbonne Université, 10Centre d'Écologie et des Sciences de la Conservation (CESCO) Bibi, Rashida; University of Sheffield, School of Sociological Studies, Politics and International Relations Boatcă, Manuela; Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Institut für Soziologie Bolpagni, Rossano; University of Parma, Department of Chemistry, Life Sciences and Environmental Sustainability Brown, Timothy M.; University of Leeds, School of Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences; University of Leeds, School of Philosophy, Religion and History of Science, Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Cultures Byrne, Bridget; University of Manchester, Department of Sociology Canavan, Susan; Ollscoil na Gaillimhe – University of Galway, School of Natural Sciences Castro, Esther Neira; Queen's University Belfast, School of History, Anthropology, Philosophy and Politics Conlon, Deirdre; University of Leeds, School of Geography Demoule, Jean-Paul; Université de Paris I Panthéon Dunn, Allison; University of Leeds, School of Biology, Faculty of Biological

	Sciences Faist, Thomas; Bielefeld University, Faculty of Sociology Garelli, Glenda; University of Leeds, School of Geography Gervazoni, Paula; Estación Experimental de Zonas Áridas Gidley, Ben; Birkbeck University of London, School of Social Sciences Gippet, Jérôme M. W.; University of Fribourg, Department of Biology Harwood, Matthew; University of Leeds, School of Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences Heger, Tina; Leibniz Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB); Freie Universität Berlin, Institute of Biology; Technical University of Munich, School of Life Sciences Henke, Theresa; Estación Experimental de Zonas Áridas Hill, Sara; University of Sheffield, School of Sociological Studies, Politics and International Relations Hobbs, Joshua; PRHS University of Leeds, IDEA, The Ethics Centre Hodson, James; University of Leeds, School of Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences Holmes, George; University of Leeds, School of Earth and Environment, Faculty of Environment Hulme, Phil; Lincoln University, Bioprotection Aotearoa, Department of Pest-Management and Conservation Jones, Hannah; University of Warwick, Department of Sociology Khosa, Dumisani; South African National Parks, Scientific Services Kilkey, Majella; University of Sheffield, School of Sociological Studies, Politics and International Relations Kontou, Danai; University of Leeds, School of Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences Lavanchy, Anne; University of Applied Sciences and Arts, Department of Social Work Lewis, Hannah; University of Sheffield, School of Sociological Studies, Politics and International Relations Giralt, Rosa Mas; University of Leeds, School of Geography; University of Leeds, Lifelong Learning Centre Meyerson, Laura; University of Rhode Island, Deptartment of Natural Resources Science Novoa, Ana; Estación Experimental de Zonas Áridas; Institute of Botany Czech Academy of Sciences Pattison, Zarah; University of Stirling, School of Biological and Environmental Science Pipek, Pavel; Institute of Botany Czech Academy of Sciences; Charles University, Department of Ecology, Faculty of Science Probert, Anna F.; University of New England, Zoology Discipline, School of Environmental and Rural Science Pyšek, Petr; Institute of Botany Czech Academy of Sciences; Charles University, Department of Ecology, Faculty of Science Ricciardi, Anthony; McGill University, Department of Biology Roberts, Jonathan David; University of Leeds, School of Biology and School of History Ruland, Florian; Leibniz Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB); Freie Universität Berlin, Institute of Biology; Náttúrustofa Vesturlands Saul, Wolf-Christian; Leibniz Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB) ; Freie Universität Berlin, Institute of Biology Shackleton, Ross; Swiss Federal Institute for Forest Snow and Landscape Research WSL Sigona, Nando; University of Birmingham, Department of Social Policy, Sociology and Criminology Simberloff, Daniel; University of Tennessee, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Solomos, John; University of Warwick, Department of Sociology Sun, Li; University of Leeds, Sociology and Social Policy, Faculty of Social

	Sciences Waite, Louise; University of Leeds, School of Geography Wilson, Pip; University of Leeds, School of Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences; University of Leeds, School of Earth and Environment, Faculty of Environment Yannelli, Florencia A.; Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentine Institute for Dryland Research, CONICET Vathi, Zana; Edge Hill University, Department of History, Geography and Social Sciences Yemane, Tesfalem; University of Liverpool, Department of Geography and Planning Vieten, Ulrike M; Queen's University Belfast, School of Social Sciences, Education and Social Work Vimercati, Giovanni; University of Fribourg, Department of Biology Zambelli, Elena; Maynooth University, Department of Sociology Lieurance, Deah; Penn State University, Department of Ecosystem Science and Management
Abstract:	n/a

Parallels between biological invasions and human migration are flawed and undermine both disciplines. Response to Ahmed et al.

Josie South[1], Roxana Barbulescu[2], Rafael L. Macêdo[3,4], Camille L. Musseau[3], Simone Guareschi[5], Tim Alamenciak [6], Gabriella Alberti[7], Sylvie Allen[1], Sven Bacher[8], Emma Baker[1], Michaela Benson[9], Maud Bernard-Verdier[10], Rashida Bibi[11], Manuela Boatcă[12], Rossano Bolpagni[13], Timothy M. Brown[1,14], Bridget Byrne[15], Susan Canavan[16], Esther Neira Castro[17], Deirdre Conlon[18], Jean-Paul Demoule[19], Alison M. Dunn[1], Thomas Faist[20], Glenda Garelli[18], Paula Gervazoni[21], Ben Gidley[22], Jérôme M. W. Gippet[8], Matthew Harwood[1], Tina Heger [3,4,23], Theresa Henke[21], Sara Hill[11], Joshua Hobbs[24], James Hodson[1], George Holmes[25], Phillip E. Hulme[26], Hannah Jones[27], Dumisani Khosa[28], Majella Kilkey[11], Danai Kontou[1], Anne Lavanchy[29], Hannah Lewis[11], Rosa Mas Giralt[18,30] Laura A. Meyerson[31], Ana Novoa[21,32], Zarah Pattison[33], Pavel Pipek[32,34], Anna F. Probert[35], Petr Pyšek[32,34], Anthony Ricciardi[36], Jonathan David Roberts[37], Florian Ruland[3,4,38], Wolf-Christian Saul[3,4], Ross Shackleton[39], Nando Sigona[40], Daniel Simberloff[41], John Solomos[27], Li Sun[2], Louise Waite[18], Pip Wilson[1,25], Florencia A. Yannelli[42], Zana Vathi[43], Tesfalem Yemane[44], Ulrike M Vieten[45], Giovanni Vimercati[8], Elena Zambelli[46], Deah Lieurance[47*]

[1]School of Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences, University of Leeds, United Kingdom
[2]Sociology and Social Policy, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Leeds, United Kingdom
[3]Leibniz Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB), Germany
[4]Institute of Biology, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany
[5]Rey Juan Carlos University (URJC), Madrid, Spain
[6]Institute of Environmental and Interdisciplinary Science, Carleton University, Canada
[7]Leeds University Business School, University of Leeds, United Kingdom
[8]Department of Biology, University of Fribourg, Switzerland
[9]Department of Sociology, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
[10]Centre d'Écologie et des Sciences de la Conservation (CESCO), Sorbonne Université – Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle – CNRS, Paris, France
[11]School of Sociological Studies, Politics and International Relations, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom
[12]Institut für Soziologie, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Germany
[13]Department of Chemistry, Life Sciences and Environmental Sustainability, University of Parma, Parma, Italy
[14]School of Philosophy, Religion and History of Science, Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Cultures, University of Leeds, United Kingdom
[15]Department of Sociology, University of Manchester, United Kingdom
[16] School of Natural Sciences, Ollscoil na Gaillimhe – University of Galway, Ireland
[17]School of History, Anthropology, Philosophy and Politics, Queen's University Belfast, United Kingdom
[18]School of Geography, University of Leeds, United Kingdom
[19]Université de Paris I Panthéon – Sorbonne, France
[20]Faculty of Sociology, Bielefeld University, Germany
[21]Estación Experimental de Zonas Áridas (EEZA-CSIC), Spain
[22]School of Social Sciences, Birkbeck University of London, United Kingdom
[23]Technical University of Munich, School of Life Sciences, Germany
[24]IDEA, The Ethics Centre, PRHS University of Leeds, United Kingdom

[25]*School of Earth and Environment, Faculty of Environment, University of Leeds, United Kingdom*
[26]*Bioprotection Aotearoa, Department of Pest-Management and Conservation, Lincoln University, New Zealand*
[27]*Department of Sociology, University of Warwick, United Kingdom*
[28]*Scientific Services, South African National Parks, South Africa*
[29]*Department of Social Work, University of Applied Sciences and Arts, Western Switzerland*
[30] *Lifelong Learning Centre, University of Leeds, United Kingdom*
[31]*Department of Natural Resources Science, University of Rhode Island, USA*
[32]*Institute of Botany, Czech Academy of Sciences, Czech Republic*
[33]*School of Biological and Environmental Science, University of Stirling, Scotland* [34] *Department of Ecology, Faculty of Science, Charles University, Czech Republic*
[35]*Zoology Discipline, School of Environmental and Rural Science, University of New England, Armidale, Australia*
[36] *Department of Biology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada*
[37]*School of Biology and School of History, University of Leeds, United Kingdom*
[38]*Náttúrustofa Vesturlands, Stykkishólmur, Iceland*
[39]*Swiss Federal Research Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research WSL, Switzerland*
[40] *Department of Social Policy, Sociology and Criminology University of Birmingham, United Kingdom*
[41]*Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Tennessee, United States*
[42]*Argentine Institute for Dryland Research, CONICET and Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina*
[43]*Department of History, Geography and Social Sciences, Edge Hill University, United Kingdom*
[44]*Department of Geography and Planning, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom*
[45]*School of Social Sciences, Education and Social Work, Queen's University Belfast, United Kingdom*
[46]*Department of Sociology, Maynooth University, Ireland*
[47]*Department of Ecosystem Science and Management, Penn State University, United States*

**Corresponding author information dzl5661@psu.edu*
The authors wish to be considered equally as a consortium

A recent article by Ahmed et al. (2025) attempts to draw parallels and assess distinctions between biological invasions and the human migration. This comparison conflates two globally occurring phenomena in a scientifically flawed way and risks the misappropriation of scientific concepts for ideological and political agendas. The repeated use of '*similarity*' and '*parallels*' throughout the text, including in the title, could easily lead to misconceptions among broader audiences, such as educators and policymakers, who can help shape public discourse. Despite their acknowledgement that comparing introductions of non-native species to human migration "*may be inappropriate and cause confusion,"* Ahmed et al. argue that it reveals "*complex parallels that are potentially fruitful to explore.*" However, they fail to make their case.

While interdisciplinary analogies can sometimes yield fresh insights, applying concepts of biological invasions to human migration is both conceptually flawed and ethically problematic. Invasion science examines ecological processes and the subsequent environmental, economic, and public health impacts. In contrast, migration studies explore the drivers of human movement and their effects on individuals, communities, and countries, emphasizing that

human migration—unlike biological invasions—is a single-species phenomenon in which individuals are not passive agents. Although external forces like war or famine can drive their movement, humans actively make decisions and respond to these pressures. This distinction is overlooked by Ahmed et al., when they wrongly compare human migration to interspecific invasional meltdown—a process involving the accumulation of multiple non-native species and their compounded ecological impacts, not merely a group of conspecifics (Simberloff and Von Holle 1999).

Such analogies are not only scientifically inaccurate but also carry serious ethical implications. In framing human migration through the lens of biological invasions, Ahmed et al. falsely portray migrants as threats. For example, they misapply the concept of *establishment*, which in invasion biology refers to the formation of self-sustaining populations of a species outside its historical range, often as a precursor toward spread and negative impacts. When this logic is extended to human migrants, it risks implying that their integration or success is inherently problematic, potentially reinforcing anti-immigration sentiments. This error is compounded by their application of frameworks designed to categorize the impacts of non-native species on human society [e.g., Socio-economic Impact Classification of Alien Taxa (SEICAT; Bacher *et al*., 2018)] in evaluating human migrants. This is incompatible and inappropriate for human-to-human interactions.

Similarly, by forcing comparisons between the standard framework describing pathways of non-native species introductions (Hulme et al. 2008) and to human migrants, the authors frame migration as a process largely controlled by the recipient country, equating deprecatory terms including ‘contaminant’, ‘stowaway’, and ‘escape’ with the deeply complex socio-cultural phenomenon of immigration. Likewise, Ahmed et al. equate language used for neutral classification in medicine and invasion science with human migration, resulting in unacceptable comparisons that liken refugees to at-risk species or harmful diseases, depict successful migrants as filling ecological niches, and equate the containment of migrants with the containment of infectious disease, harmful contaminants, or invasive species. This approach dehumanizes these groups by reinforcing the comparisons Ahmed et al. themselves cautioned against and prevents scientific interdisciplinary progress.

In contrast, robust interdisciplinarity, such as the use of welfare economics by invasion scientists to develop the SEICAT (Bacher et al. 2018), or the integration of sociological analysis to incorporate context-sensitive Indigenous knowledge (Brondízio et al. 2021), prioritises conceptual rigor and fosters genuine dialogue between disciplines to avoid misconceptions. Ahmed et al., by contrast, neglect the scientific collaboration needed to bring social sciences and invasion ecology together for effective interdisciplinary work in invasion science (Guareschi et al. 2024). As a result, they neither advance invasion science nor provide meaningful insights into human migration. For social scientists in migration studies, drawing parallels between biological invasions crossing biogeographic or jurisdictional boundaries and human migration occurring within or across jurisdictional boundaries reflects a conceptual mismatch rather than a scientifically sound comparison. Such comparisons fail to apply key distinctions, particularly the role of agency and intentionality in human migration, and risk oversimplifying or misrepresenting the complex social, political, and economic drivers that shape human migration.

Apart from failing to demonstrate heuristic value, Ahmed et al.’s misguided comparison of humans to non-native species, even as an academic exercise, is needlessly provocative, especially at a time when scientific concepts and associated data are increasingly misused for ideological and political purposes that disproportionately harm marginalized groups. This also highlights the responsibility of scientific journals and editors in this regard. Even if studies

such as Ahmed et al.'s review were scientifically sound, those with strong ethical implications and high potential to impact marginalized groups should be scrutinized more carefully for their ethical implications during decision for publication. This is especially relevant as ecologists increasingly engage with their peers in the social sciences. We urge that future research and publication practices should prioritize ethical integrity, especially when addressing topics with significant social impacts.

In summary, by drawing untenable equivalencies between biological invasions and human migration, Ahmed et al. open the door for both intentional and unintentional misuse instead of preventing it. Their stated caveats in the review are undermined by the fact that the authors themselves disregard them in their own synthesis. We strongly recommend such comparisons should be avoided altogether and reiterate Ahmed et al.'s own warning that this analogy is "*fundamentally flawed and dangerous and so these two phenomena should not be directly compared*".

References

Ahmed DA, Sousa R, Bortolus A, Aldemir C, Angeli NF, Błońska D, ... Haubrock PJ. 2025. Parallels and discrepancies between non-native species introductions and human migration. *Biological Reviews*. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.70004

Bacher S, Blackburn TM, Essl F, Genovesi P, Heikkilä J, Jeschke JM, ... Kumschick S. 2018. Socio-economic impact classification of alien taxa (SEICAT). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 9: 159–168. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12844

Brondízio ES, Aumeeruddy-Thomas Y, Bates P, Carino J, Fernández-Llamazares Á, Ferrari MF, ... Samakov A. 2021. Locally based, regionally manifested, and globally relevant: Indigenous and local knowledge, values, and practices for nature. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 46: 481–509.

Guareschi S, Mathers KL, South J, Navarro LM, Renals T, Hiley A, ... Wood PJ. 2024. Framing challenges and polarized issues in invasion science: toward an interdisciplinary agenda. *BioScience* 74: 825–839. https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biae084

Hulme, P. E., Bacher, S., Kenis, M., Klotz, S., Kühn, I., Minchin, D., ... Vilà, M. 2008. Grasping at the routes of biological invasions: a framework for integrating pathways into policy. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 45: 403-414.

Simberloff, D., Von Holle, B. 1999. Positive interactions of nonindigenous species: invasional meltdown?. *Biological invasions* 1: 21-32.