



**HAL**  
open science

## **From the backyard to the backcountry: how ecological and biological traits explain the escape of garden plants into Mediterranean old fields**

Audrey Marco, Sébastien Lavergne, Thierry Dutoit, Valérie Bertaudiere-Montes

### ► **To cite this version:**

Audrey Marco, Sébastien Lavergne, Thierry Dutoit, Valérie Bertaudiere-Montes. From the backyard to the backcountry: how ecological and biological traits explain the escape of garden plants into Mediterranean old fields. *Biological Invasions*, 2009, 12, pp.761 - 779. <10.1007/s10530-009-9479-3>. <hal-05552136>

**HAL Id: hal-05552136**

**<https://hal.science/hal-05552136v1>**

Submitted on 13 Mar 2026

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 - Attribution - International License

# From the backyard to the backcountry: how ecological and biological traits explain the escape of garden plants into Mediterranean old fields

Audrey Marco · Sébastien Lavergne ·  
Thierry Dutoit · Valérie Bertaudiere-Montes

**Abstract** To explain current ornamental plant invasions, or predict future ones, it is necessary to determine which factors increase the probability of an alien species becoming invasive. Here, we focused on the early phases of ornamental plant invasion in order to identify which plant features and cultivation practices may favor the escape of ornamental plants from domestic gardens to abandoned agricultural land sites in the Mediterranean Region. We used an original approach which consisted in visiting 120 private gardens in an urbanizing rural area of the French Mediterranean backcountry, and then visited surrounding old fields to determine which planted species had escaped out of the gardens. We built a database of 407 perennial ornamental alien species (most of which were animal-dispersed), and determined nineteen features that depicted the strength

of species' propagule pressure within gardens, the match between species requirements and local physical environment, and each species' reproductive characteristics. Using standard and phylogenetic logistic regression, we found that ornamental alien plants were more likely to have escaped if they were planted in gardens' margins, if they had a preference for dry soil, were tolerant to high-pH or pH-indifferent, and if they showed a capacity for clonal growth. Focusing only on animal-dispersed plants, we found that alien plants were more likely to have escaped if they were abundant in gardens and showed preference for dry soil. This suggests that gardening practices have a primary impact on the probability of a species to escape from cultivation, along with species pre-adaptation to local soil conditions, and capacity of asexual reproduction. Our results may have important implications for the implementation of management practices and awareness campaigns in order to limit ornamental plants to becoming invasive species in Mediterranean landscapes.

---

A. Marco (✉) · V. Bertaudiere-Montes  
UMR 151 UP/IRD, Laboratoire Population-  
Environnement-Développement, Université de Provence  
Centre Saint-Charles Case 10, 3 place Victor Hugo,  
13331 Marseille Cedex 3, France  
e-mail: audrey.marco@laposte.net;  
audrey.marco@etu.univ-provence.fr

S. Lavergne  
UMR CNRS 5553 Laboratoire d'Ecologie Alpine,  
Université Joseph Fourier, BP 53, 38041 Grenoble  
Cedex 9, France

T. Dutoit  
UMR-CNRS-IRD 6116 IMEP, Université d'Avignon,  
IUT, Site Agroparc, BP 1207, 84911 Avignon Cedex 9,  
France

**Keywords** Biological invasions ·  
Ornamental plants · Propagule pressure ·  
Pre-adaptation · Phylogenetic regression

## Introduction

Many invasive plant species have been accidentally transported by humans or deliberately introduced for ornamental, forestry or agricultural purposes (Mack

and Lonsdale 2001). Horticulture is now recognized as a major pathway for the introduction of alien terrestrial plants (Hodkinson and Thompson 1997; Reichard and White 2001; Dehnen-Schmutz et al. 2007a, b; Foxcroft et al. 2008; Křivánek and Pyšek 2008; Lambdon et al. 2008a). Although the majority of plants imported for horticulture will never become invasive (Williamson and Fitter 1996; Burt et al. 2007), many successful horticultural escapees have caused severe economic (McNeely 2001; Pimentel et al. 2005) and ecological damages (Vitousek et al. 1997; Whelan et al. 2006). Thus, disentangling the sociological, ecological and biological factors that allow introduced ornamental plants to become harmful invaders is of major importance.

From a theoretical perspective, an introduced species will succeed in a new region if it overcomes the following stages: introduction of alien propagules, existence as casual alien, naturalization, and spread (Richardson et al. 2000a). However, a number of geographical, abiotic and biotic barriers may prevent the introduced plant from becoming invasive (Richardson et al. 2000a), and it is crucial to understand which factors may allow alien plants to overcome these barriers and favor the transition from one stage of invasion to another (Milbau and Stout 2008). To do so, comparing species of varying invasive potential (i.e., cultivated, casual, naturalized, and invasive) may be the most promising way to identify factors that promote invasiveness in introduced plants (Nijs et al. 2004; Milbau and Stout 2008). Although some studies have focused on the early stages by a “source-area” approach (Goodwin et al. 1999; Prinzing et al. 2002), there is still a lack of information about the transition between plant cultivation and plant naturalization outside of cultivation. Given the constant rise of gardening practices and the increasing urbanization which favors managed parks and residential areas with gardens, the risks of escape of ornamental plant species to natural communities is constantly increasing. Thus, identifying the factors which allow horticultural plants to become invasive would be an important step in assessing the risks associated with different ornamental plant species and preserving biodiversity in natural habitats.

First of all, propagule pressure may strongly influence a species’ colonization success (Lockwood et al. 2005), in particular for ornamental plants (Dehnen-Schmutz et al. 2007a). Species introduced

for horticultural purposes may have an advantage over accidentally introduced species because they may suffer less from demographic stochasticity due to small founding populations (Mack 1995, 2000). If ornamental plants are planted in high local abundance, introduced populations of ornamental plants may become demographic sources that will send a number of immigrants to surrounding landscapes (Maron 2006). High propagule pressure may also have evolutionary consequences: recent experimental results proved that multiple introductions of ornamental or agronomic species may increase their evolutionary potential in their introduced populations by favoring genetic admixture and emergence of novel genotypes with higher invasive potential (Lavergne and Molofsky 2007).

Second, ornamental species that have gone through the dispersal phase do not necessarily colonize habitats outside cultivation since their environmental requirements (e.g., soil type and climatic conditions) will also determine their probability of naturalization (Theoharides and Dukes 2007). Many alien species introduced to a new region do not survive because they are generally not adapted to the abiotic conditions of their new environment. This may be particularly true in harsh environments (Prinzing et al. 2002). After passing through a climate-matching filter, ornamental species can form stable source populations that may eventually spread into natural areas (Mack and Lonsdale 2001; Theoharides and Dukes 2007). It has been shown that species intentionally or accidentally transferred into a new region are more likely to become invasive if the climate of their donor region is at least partly overlapping with the one of its alien range (Thuiller et al. 2005). This has often been termed pre-adaptation of introduced species to their region of introduction, and may strongly contribute to the naturalization and further spread of introduced species. This pre-adaptation may concern a number of edaphic (soil type, fertility, humidity, pH) (Prinzing et al. 2002) and climatic conditions (cold tolerance and drought resistance) (Prinzing et al. 2002; Maron 2006).

Third, the spread of ornamental plants out of gardens is also determined by their capacity of dispersing reproductive or vegetative propagules across the landscape (Myers and Bazely 2003). Mode of seeds or fruits dispersal may play a primary role, since wind, water and animal-mediated dispersal are

known to be efficient dispersal mechanisms (Lloret et al. 2005). Also, asexual reproduction is another potentially efficient mechanism of local spread for invasive plants (Pauchard and Shea 2006). Many ornamental plants will have ‘showy’ fruit displays, attracting generalist seed dispersers; such species, grown by gardeners at numerous foci near the urban/wildland interface, are well placed to spread into natural areas (Alston and Richardson 2006). Thus, dispersal of these species depends on the presence of birds (Richardson et al. 2000b), which may also be affected by the landscape structure (Gosper et al. 2005; Buckley et al. 2006). Fruit traits may also be important for the spread of ornamental plants, such as fruit morphology, colour and display, nutritional quality, accessibility and phenology, because these traits may affect frugivory and thus seed dispersal (Gosper et al. 2005).

The Mediterranean Region is particularly appropriate for the study of ornamental plant invasions. The Region has experienced a long history of species introduction (Hulme 2004) which continue to increase (Lambdon et al. 2008b) with the development of residential areas in semi-natural and natural areas (Julien 1999; European Environment Agency Report 2006), thus contributing to a high diversity of introduced alien taxa. The increase of garden/fallow land interfaces particularly in urbanizing rural areas constitutes suitable ecotones that may favor the escape of alien plants. These interfaces are vulnerable to invasion since they are subject to edge effects due to fragmentation and high propagule transport resulting from their proximity to urban environments (Alston and Richardson 2006). Also, the mediterranean context where alien zoochorous species can be dispersed by generalist animals (Debussche and Isenmann 1990; Debussche and Lepart 1992; Debussche and Isenmann 1994; Ne’eman and Izhaki 1996) may cause introduced zoochorous species to become more likely invasive because natural vectors are already present for their dispersion. Finally, many Mediterranean-climate regions of the world, such as South Africa, California, Central Chile and Western Australia are important donor regions of alien ornamental plants (e.g., Thuiller et al. 2005), so that many introduced ornamentals are potentially pre-adapted to the environmental conditions of the Mediterranean Basin (arid climate, strong summer drought, calcareous soil, nutrient poor soils).

In this study, we aim at identifying which ornamental plant features and cultivation habits favor the escape of ornamental plants into mediterranean old fields according to the three hypotheses detailed above, namely ‘propagule pressure’, ‘climate matching’ and ‘reproductive characteristics’ hypotheses (see Table 1). In an urbanizing rural area of the French Mediterranean backcountry, we visited 120 private gardens to estimate the pool of perennial ornamental cultivated species (Marco et al. 2008a) and then visited surrounding old fields to determine which species had successfully escaped outside of cultivation. We previously analyzed local and landscape factors that enhanced richness of escaped garden plants in old fields in the same study area (Marco et al. 2008b). The situation of study gardens near semi-natural and natural areas gives us the opportunity to focus on the early transition phases of the process of ornamental plant invasions. We used standard and phylogenetic logistic regression to test whether perennial garden species were more likely to escape to surrounding old fields, (1) when they were abundant and planted near the margins of gardens (‘propagule pressure’), (2) when their edaphic and climatic tolerance match local ones in natural habitats (‘climate matching’), (3) their flowering period was longer and extended through the summer, and when they were dispersed by birds (‘reproductive characteristics’). We also specifically focused on zoochorous species to test whether zoochorous species were more likely to escape when (1) their fruit size ranged between 6 and 10 mm, the most common sizes for bird-dispersed fruits (Gosper et al. 2005), (2) their fruits were of a ‘showy’ colour and (3) their fruiting period was longer and matched with major bird migration periods.

## Methods

### Species list, data, and phylogeny

Our study was performed in the Lauris neighborhood, an urbanizing rural area of the French Mediterranean backcountry (2,181 ha), located 70 km north-west of Marseille. To estimate the pool of ornamental cultivated species we visited 120 private gardens owing three housing density type (Marco et al. 2008a). In order to provide a homogeneous distribution of gardens, houses from five main streets within

**Table 1** Description of the variables used to predict species' probability of escaping out of cultivation

Hypotheses	Variables	Abbreviation	Type	Data sources	Levels
Propagule pressure	Garden position	GARL	Continuous	a	1,2,3,4 from house to garden margins
	Abundance in gardens	ABUN	Continuous	a	Very low (<50), low (50–100), medium (10–500), strong (>500)
Climate-matching	Hardiness	HARD	Continuous	c, d, f, i, j	Frost intolerant ( $T^{\circ} > 5^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), semi-hardy ( $T^{\circ} > 0^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), hardy and very hardy ( $T^{\circ} > -5^{\circ}\text{C}$ ).
	Drought resistance	RESI	Continuous	c, d, f, i, j	Very low, low, medium, strong, very strong
	pH	pH	Categorical	c, d, f, i, j	$\text{pH} \leq 7$ , $\text{pH} = 7$ , $\text{pH} \geq 7$ , indifferent
	Soil moisture	HUMI	Continuous	c, d, f, i, j	Dry, normal, fresh soil
	Soil type	TYPE	Categorical	c, d, f, i, j	Clayey-humid, normal, sandy-calcareous-indifferent
	Soil fertility	FERT	Continuous	c, d, f, i, j	Poor, normal, rich
Reproductive characteristics	Flowering phenology	FLOP	Categorical	b, g, k, l, m, n, o, p	None, autumn–winter, spring, summer
	Length of flowering period	FLOS	Continuous	b, g, k, l, m, n, o, p	None, short (1–3 months), medium (4–6 months), long (>6 months)
	Pollination vector	POLL	Categorical	b, g, k, l, m, n, o, p	None, abiotic, biotic, autogamous, mixed
	Sex repartition	SREP	Categorical	g, k, l, m, n, o, p	Diocious, monoecious
	Mating system	REPT	Categorical	g, h, k, l, m, n, o, p	None, allogamous, autogamous, mixed
	Fruiting phenology	FRUP	Categorical	e, j	None, not indicated, spring–summer, autumn–winter
	Length of fruiting period	FRUS	Continuous	e, j	None, not indicated, short (<1 month), medium (1–3 months), long (>3 months)
	Dispersal mode	DISM	Categorical	b, g, h, k	None, zoochory, anemochory, myrmecochory-barochory-autochory
	Vegetative reproduction	VEGR	Categorical	g, h, k	Yes, no
	Seed size	SEES	Categorical	g, k	Unknown, indicated, medium (<5 mm $\Phi$ ), large (5–10 mm $\Phi$ ), very large (>10 mm $\Phi$ )
	Seed colour	SEEC	Categorical	a, b, e	Dark, red–orange, yellow, others, not indicated

Variables are organized relative to our different working hypotheses, being 'climate matching', 'propagule pressure' and 'reproductive characteristics'. For each variable, we give the abbreviation used in the results description (Abbreviation), its variable type (Type), i.e., being continuous or categorical, and its respective categories (Levels). Data were drawn from field observations, from horticultural literature and from species traits databases (Data sources)

The main sources of information used to complete the database of species traits were a: field observations; b: Fournier (1947); c: Collectif (1990); d: Huxley (1992); e: De Belder and Misonne (1997); f: Bärtels (1998); g: Julve (1998); h: Gachet et al. (2004); i: Brickell and Mioulane (2004); j: Burnie et al. (2006); k: The Flora of China (<http://hua.huh.harvard.edu/china/>); l: The Ecological Flora of the British Isles (<http://www.york.ac.uk/res/ecoflora/cfm/ecofl/index.cfm>); m: Interactive Flora of NW Europe (<http://ip30.eti.uva.nl/bis/flora.php>); n: FloraBase the Western Australian Flora (<http://florabase.calm.wa.gov.au/>); o: Plants for a Future database (<http://www.pfaf.org>); p: Swaziland's Flora Database (<http://www.sntc.org.sz/flora/>)

each housing density type were chosen for survey. Each street was then exhaustively visited so that the entire length and both sides of each street were examined and each house visited. After requesting

permission to undertake the survey on the resident's property, native and alien cultivated plants were recorded during an exhaustive survey of the garden. The garden size of these dwellings ranged from 2 to

10,000 m<sup>2</sup> and the combined area of all the gardens sampled was 21.5 ha. Given that 92% of ornamental species cultivated in the study neighborhood were perennials, we focused our study only on perennial species. Perennial species are also the major group of invasive plant species in the world (Weber 2003).

Then we recorded all perennial alien cultivated plants that had escaped in 180 abandoned agricultural land sites of the same study area. This habitat represents 10% of the entire of study area, and was chosen because ruderal, early successional habitats are the ones that receive the most invasive species in Mediterranean regions (Le Floc'h 1991; Meiners et al. 2002). Abandoned agricultural land site areas ranged from 0.056 to 44.8 ha and the total area of all the sampled abandoned agricultural land sites was 101 ha. In each abandoned agricultural land site, all the alien perennial escaped plants from gardens were recorded by walking all over the site using a reasonably consistent search effort (e.g., 60 min ha<sup>-1</sup>).

Each species was assigned to its proper systematic family, order and class according to the Angiosperm Phylogeny Group (2003). For each species, we also gathered nineteen traits in order to test working hypotheses (Table 1). Data were drawn from our own field observations, from horticultural literature and from species traits databases. Refer to Table 1 for a full description of the study species characteristics and the data sources used to complete the database. Finally, each species was coded as 1 if it was escaped (either casual, established, or invasive species) or as 0 if it was not escaped.

Phylogenetically related species may have similar traits and tend to occupy similar niches because of their shared evolutionary history (Harvey and Pagel 1991). Hence, relationships between species traits and likelihood of escape from gardens could reflect phylogenetic effects unrelated to the traits used in this study. By including phylogenetic information in the analyses, it is possible to determine to what extent escaped status of introduced species may be correlated with certain traits throughout a particular phylogeny. To obtain a conservative phylogenetic hypothesis, we used the web-tool Phylomatic (Webb and Donoghue 2005). Phylomatic takes as input a list of taxa, matches the taxa to the most resolved position possible in any of a set of master trees, and returns the phylogeny in a newick format. We arbitrarily set all branch lengths equals to unity, as advised in the absence of molecular

**Fig. 1** Phylogenetic supertree of the 116 families that included the 407 species. Branch lengths are arbitrary. The two numbers following family names depicts the number of escaped species and the total species number of this family recorded in the study area, respectively

data (Martins and Garland 1991; Fig. 1). This approach is sometimes considered to assume a speciation mode of trait evolution (where phenotypic change occurs only at speciation, independently of branch lengths).


A potential bias could arise from the occurrence of hybrid taxa in our data set. We believe this has caused only a very small bias in our study, if any; since species numbers per study genus were always very small and some hybrid taxa were generally the only representatives of their genus in our data set.

### Statistical analyses

We analysed the relationship between the probability of species escape of and their phylogenetic groups (Family, Class, Order) by performing Chi-square contingency tests. This was done for all species and also for focusing only on zoochorous species.

Before analysing the effect of species characteristics (Table 1) on probability of escaping, we looked for statistical associations between characteristics in order to prevent collinearity in our analysis. One way ANOVA was used to determine relationships between categorical and continuous variables (homogeneity of variance checked with Levene's Test), chi-square contingency tests were performed to detect association between categorical variables, and Pearson correlations tests were computed to test for relationships between continuous variables.

Probability of species' escape was modeled as a binomial process (0 = not escaped; 1 = escaped), using logistic regressions with species characteristics listed in Table 1 as explanatory variables. To do so, we used standard generalized linear models (GLM) with a uniform correlation structure (non-phylogenetic model) and generalized estimating equations (GEE) with a phylogenetic correlation structure. Test for the significance of each explanatory variable was performed using a Fischer test. Since the set of explanatory variables was quite large, we used a stepwise selection procedure based on Akaike's information criterion (AIC) to determine the minimum adequate GLM model. Then the same minimum



adequate model was fitted using GEE to test whether the integration of phylogenetic correlation structure into the model affected the significance of independent variables selected in the minimum adequate model. Note that there exists no information criterion allowing the comparison of GLM and GEE models with same fixed effects. The same procedure was employed for all species, but also focusing only on zoochorous species. All statistical analyses were performed using R (Ihaca and Gentleman 1996) using MASS package (Venables and Ripley 2002) and APE library (Paradis and Claude 2002).

## Results

Around 88% of ornamental species planted in the study gardens were alien species. The inventories of perennial alien plant species, respectively in gardens and abandoned agricultural land sites, yielded a final list of 407 perennial alien plant species among which 20 were observed to have escaped into adjacent abandoned agricultural land sites (Appendix). Study species represented 116 different angiosperm families (Fig. 1). Only 119 species were zoochorous, among which 11 species had escaped. Out of the 407 cultivated perennial alien plants species collected in the combined area of all gardens the most frequent species was *Rosa* sp. (86%). The most abundant planted species were *x Cupressocyparis leylandii*, *Cupressus arizonica*, *Pyracantha* sp., *Prunus lauro-cerasus*, which were all planted in garden hedges (Marco et al. 2008a). Out of the 407 species, 20 were observed to have escaped into abandoned agricultural land sites. These had highly variable abundances ranging from one to >1,000 individuals. The most abundant escaped garden plant was *Pyracantha* sp.

with 1,653 individuals in the combined area of all abandoned agricultural land sites (101 ha). Among the most abundant escaped aliens, six species, namely *Acer negundo*, *Buddleia davidii*, *Ailanthus altissima*, *Robinia pseudoacacia*, *Cortaderia selloana* and *Opuntia ficus-indica*, are recognized ‘harmful invasives’ in the French Mediterranean and beyond, and twelve other escaped aliens are listed as ‘potentially harmful invasives’ on the French territory (Müller 2004).

We found no significant association between phylogenetic groups (Family, Order and Class) and species’ escape probability for both all species and zoochorous species (Table 2), suggesting that phylogenetic effects on the probability species’ escape was quite low.

Analyses of associations between traits showed that the variable “soil Type” was strongly correlated with many other ecological traits; hence we excluded this variable from further analyses based on the whole set of species. We also excluded the variable “soil Type” and “soil pH” for analyses concerning the zoochorous species database due to a strong statistical association.

Single logistic models (listed in Table 3) showed that many ecological and biological traits had significant effects on the probability of species escape. All variables but “Flowering phenology” and “Reproduction type” had a significant effect on the probability of species escape. All traits concerning climate-matching process and propagule pressure were significant. However, after incorporating phylogenetic information, “Hardiness” and “Resistance to drought”, “Flowering span”, “Fruiting phenology”, “Fruiting span”, “Dispersal type” and “Seed colour” were no longer significant. Only four out of the 18 study characteristics were included in the minimum adequate

**Table 2** Results of contingency tests of association between species phylogenetic groups (Family, Order and Class) and species probability of escaping out of cultivation

Escape probability	Phylogenetic groups								
	Family			Order			Class		
	Chi <sup>2</sup>	df	P	Chi <sup>2</sup>	df	P	Chi <sup>2</sup>	df	P
All species	123.78	113	0.229	27.68	41	0.944	0.718	2	0.698
Zoochorous species	43.44	51	0.764	12.63	27	0.991	1.169	2	0.557

For each test, we give the computed chi-square statistics (Chi<sup>2</sup>), its degrees of freedom (df) and significance P-value (P). The same test was performed for the complete list (407 species) and also for the subset of 119 zoochorous species

**Table 3** Results of standard and phylogenetic logistic regressions (GLM and GEE, respectively) of species probability of escaping outside cultivation as a function of predictive variables (abbreviations given in Table 1)

	GLM			GEE		
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
<i>Single models</i>						
HARD	1	13.461	***	1	0.1286	NS
RESI	1	24.715	***	1	0.237	NS
PH	3	23.864	***	3	16.794	***
HUMI	1	31.106	***	1	13.397	***
FERT	1	6.5448	*	1	3.8943	*
VEGR	1	10.136	**	1	9.9513	**
FLOP	2	2.2968	NS	2	0.5155	NS
FLOS	1	6.9128	**	1	0.1304	NS
POLL	3	5.9884	***	1	6.2338	*
ABUN	1	10.327	**	1	12.238	***
SREP	1	12.851	***	1	8.3882	**
REPT	2	0.2899	NS	2	0.2244	NS
FRUP	3	7.1151	***	1	0.9644	NS
FRUS	1	11.264	***	1	2.8524	NS
DISM	3	6.8174	***	1	3.3348	NS
GARL	1	58.491	***	1	14.768	***
SEES	3	6.958	***	3	8.3381	***
SEEC	4	8.2664	***	1	1.8624	NS
<i>Stepwise selection</i>						
HUMI	1	47.420	***	1	14.7018	***
pH	3	21.710	***	3	13.8428	***
VEGR	1	12.003	***	1	4.9041	*
GARL	1	42.803	***	1	11.4633	***

Analyses done with the entire sample of study species. Results concern single-variable models and results of stepwise selection in order to reduce the entire set of predictive variables to the minimum adequate model. Significance of variables was assessed with a Fisher test


Degrees of freedom (*df*), Fisher test statistics (*F*) and associated *P*-value are given. *P*-values indicated as follows: NS no significant, \*  $P < 0.05$ , \*\*  $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $P < 0.001$

model following the stepwise selection procedure (Table 3): alien introduced plants were more likely to be escaped if they had a preference for dry soil, if they were planted in gardens' margins, were high-pH or pH-indifferent species for soil conditions; and showed capacity for clonal growth (Fig. 2). The effects of independent variables were equally significant in the GLM and GEE minimum adequate models, suggesting that incorporating phylogenetic information into the model did not change model's fit (Table 3).

Concerning the subset of zoochorous species; single binomial models showed that all traits related to propagule pressure had a significant effect on the probability of species escaping out of gardens (Table 4). "Resistance to drought", "Humidity" and "Fertility" also had a significant effect. About reproductive traits, only "Vegetative reproduction" and "Seed colour" were correlated to the escape probability but had no significant effects after incorporating phylogenetic information. Only two out of the 16 traits tested were included in the minimum adequate model (Table 4). We found that zoochorous alien plants were more likely to have escaped if they were abundant in gardens and showed a preference for dry soils (Fig. 3). All species characteristics retained in the minimum adequate model remained significant after incorporating phylogenetic information (Table 4).

## Discussion

Our work provides an original and interesting account of the factors that favour the escape of ornamental plants into abandoned agricultural lands in the Mediterranean backcountry. A primary result of our study was that almost 90% of ornamental species planted in private gardens have an alien origin, and that these planted alien species come from extraordinarily diverse phylogenetic origins. These two factors dramatically increase the probability that among the alien species planted in private gardens, a few will be 'pre-adapted' to regional environmental conditions and able to escape and colonize surrounding natural or semi-natural habitats. Indeed, most species escaped out of gardens in our study area are listed as harmful or potentially harmful invasives on the French territory. Our results are consistent with previous studies on ornamental plant invasiveness where species pre-adaptation to local abiotic conditions and ability for vegetative reproduction were found to have primary effects. The explanatory power of our models (34% for all ornamental species and 42% for zoochorous species) was inferior to the ones of previous studies (Dehnen-Schmutz et al. 2007a, b). This may be due to the lower number of escaped species in our study system and to the lack of available data on the history of species introductions. Data about species use in horticultural trade (Dehnen-Schmutz et al. 2007a, b) and species residence time



**Fig. 2** Histogram depicting the estimated effects and their standard errors (*error bars*) of each class of ecological and biological traits on the probability of alien cultivated species escaping out of gardens into post-cultural fallows. Effect estimates were extracted from GLM models. Ecological and

biological traits were species location in gardens (a), vegetative reproduction (b), tolerance to humidity (c), and soil pH preferences (d). *P*-values are indicated as follows: *ns* no significant, \*  $P < 0.05$ , \*\*  $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $P < 0.001$

(Milbau and Stout 2008) would be particularly interesting here as this may also strongly influence the species probability of escaping. However, our study provides new insights into the key mechanisms that may allow ornamental plants to escape out of cultivation: we found that planting practices have a strong impact on species probability of escaping, probably because they may cause propagules pressure to increase at the landscape level.

Our results confirm that the ornamental alien species pre-adapted to the abiotic conditions prevailing in habitats surrounding their introduction zone have a better chance of escaping than other planted alien species (Richardson et al. 2000a; Prinzing et al. 2002). Most plant species are adapted to restricted soil conditions and may be unlikely to overcome barriers of unsuitable soils. Here we found that the probability of species escape was higher when their edaphic tolerance matched soil conditions of surrounding natural habitats, here Mediterranean old fields. In the Mediterranean region, predominantly calcareous, but also shallow and dry soils can be considered limiting factors for numerous plant species (Debussche and Isenmann 1990). Alien introduced plants were more likely to have escaped if they had a preference for dry soils and were high-pH or pH-indifferent. These findings show that the establishment processes of ornamental alien species in abandoned agricultural land sites strongly depend on their edaphic requirements. This is consistent with Cadotte et al. 2006a who found that successful

invaders in the flora of Ontario were tolerant to a larger range of soil moistures relative to non invasive species. Besides, although we analysed the influence of hardiness and drought tolerance on probability of species' escape, we found no significant correlation. This contrasts with previous studies that showed an effect of species pre-adaptation to local climatic conditions on their colonization success. For instance, Hanspach et al. 2008 show that introduced species tolerances to low temperature improved their chance of becoming naturalized in Germany and increased their area of occupancy. Our results thus suggest that the main environmental features that determine the escape of ornamental species to old fields are edaphic factors (moisture, pH) in Mediterranean regions.

Propagule pressure has been proposed to have major impacts on the success of species colonizations (Mulvaney 2001; Lockwood et al. 2005; Dehnen-Schmutz et al. 2007a, b; Hanspach et al. 2008). We found that the more often an ornamental plant was grown and the closer it was planted to garden margins, the more likely the species had expanded to surrounding landscapes. Since, propagule pressure is difficult to measure and express quantitatively, several proxies of propagule pressure have been used in the literature, such as the number of visitors to nature reserves (Lonsdale 1999), economic activity (Taylor and Irwin 2004), the number of administrative units in which a species is planted and total planting area (Krivánek and Pyšek 2008), availability and prices in horticultural trade (Dehnen-Schmutz

**Table 4** Results of standard and phylogenetic logistic regressions (GLM and GEE, respectively) of species probability of escaping outside cultivation as a function of predictive variables (abbreviations given in Table 1)

	GLM			GEE		
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
<i>Single models</i>						
HARD	1	1.0973	NS	1	0.2499	NS
RESI	1	8.8546	**	1	2.2257	NS
HUMI	1	30.201	***	1	14.552	***
FERT	1	11.638	***	1	5.6914	*
VEGR	1	4.172	*	1	3.215	NS
FLOP	2	0.0239	NS	2	0.7231	NS
FLOS	1	3.0136	NS	1	0.7827	NS
POLL	3	0.9466	NS	1	0.6882	NS
ABUN	1	13.422	***	1	10.918	**
SREP	1	0.0192	NS	1	0.8208	NS
REPT	2	0.9775	NS	1	0.0282	NS
FRUP	2	1.503	NS	1	0.2788	NS
FRUS	1	0.0301	NS	1	1.2554	NS
GARL	1	4.3659	*	3	12.456	***
SEES	3	1.7128	NS	1	1.0497	NS
SEEC	4	3.273	*	1	0.3761	NS
<i>Stepwise selection</i>						
HUMI	1	32.857	***	1	14.0575	***
ABUN	1	15.903	***	1	8.5154	**


Analyses done with the sample of zoochorous study species. Results concern single-variable models and results of stepwise selection in order to reduce the entire set of predictive variables to the minimum adequate model for zoochorous species. Significance of variables was assessed with a Fisher test

Degrees of freedom (*df*), Fisher test statistics (*F*) and associated *P*-value are given. *P*-values indicated as follows: NS no significant, \*  $P < 0.05$ , \*\*  $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $P < 0.001$

et al. 2007a) or the number of botanical gardens in which a species is cultivated (Hanspach et al. 2008). What distinguishes our study from these other multispecies comparative studies is the inclusion of variables on propagule pressure as measured by the abundance of species in private domestic gardens, and the location of alien species in gardens. Our results revealed that the abundance of ornamentals species in gardens predict the probability of escaping out of cultivation and establishing in surrounding old fields, particularly for zoochorous species. Zoochorous species planted in high abundance provide a high fruit density which affects bird fruit choices (Denslow

1986; Sargent 1990; Stanley and Lill 2001). Garden shrubs (*Pyracantha* sp., *Cotoneaster* sp.) which are frequently planted in hedges of the gardens (Marco et al. 2008a) are particularly attractive for generalist frugivorous birds. *Pyracantha* offers a great density of fruits (several millions per ha) and the seeds are dispersed by vertebrates, especially birds which can occur in very high numbers during migration periods (Debussche and Isenmann 1990). Moreover, the location of cultivated alien plants in gardens also appears critical for their probability of dispersing out of cultivation. Species planted in margins of gardens (lawns or hedges) were more likely to escape outside cultivation likely because growing near abandoned agricultural land sites reduces dispersal distance between introduction and potential establishment sites. This may increase the risk of alien species spread in the Mediterranean countryside by helping them to overcome dispersal barriers. Thus, the planting practices of gardeners may strongly influence the success of alien species outside cultivation and could be modified to reduce the risk of invasion by ornamental plants. An important factor which can also influence garden plant dispersal is the dumping of garden waste (Sullivan et al. 2005; Foxcroft et al. 2008). Garden refuse can effectively form important sites from which plants may spread. Here, we found no dumping in adjacent old fields studied. Seed of exotic plants are also likely to be inadvertently carried into old fields by human or animals (Mack and Lonsdale 2001). However, abandoned agricultural land sites in rural areas are not visited unlike forest fragments and reserves, which are more popular recreational areas where the visitors create disturbance and facilitate dispersal of alien plant species.

When local conditions do not allow species to produce seeds, the ability to spread vegetatively may be of major importance. Among the reproductive characteristics tested in our study, vegetative reproduction best enhanced species ability to escape out of gardens. This is in accordance with previous studies which showed that invasion success heavily depends on vegetative propagation (Reichard and Hamilton 1997; Lloret et al. 2005). Indeed, vegetative spread will facilitate establishment, rapid expansion and persistence within suitable habitats, and enhance competitive ability and resource-use efficiency (Pyšek et al. 1995). For species invading semi-natural areas, vertebrate and wind dispersal could also be important (Lloret et al. 2005) but we found no



**Fig. 3** Histogram depicting the estimated effects and their standard errors (*error bars*) of each class of ecological and biological traits on the probability of alien zoochorous cultivated species escaping out of gardens into post-cultural fallows. Effect estimates were extracted from GLM models.

Ecological and biological traits were species abundance in garden (a) and soil moisture preference (b). *P*-values are indicated as follows: *ns* no significant, \*  $P < 0.05$ , \*\*  $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $P < 0.001$

significant effect of dispersal-related traits. A possible reason for this is that in our study, the close contact between gardens and abandoned agricultural land sites will only require short dispersal distances in order to escape from cultivation (Marco et al. 2008b); thus bird or wind dispersal only give a limited advantage for the probability of species escaping out of cultivation, and both local and long distance dispersal determine spatial patterns of garden escapees (Pyšek and Hulme 2005). For other reproductive traits, period and duration of flowering were surprisingly not significant variables for species ability to escape to abandoned agricultural lands. These findings are consistent with Milbau and Stout (2008) who used an approach similar to ours, but contrast with other studies which identified these traits as important for the invasion process (Lloret et al. 2005; Goodwin et al. 1999; Cadotte and Lovett-Doust 2001; Lake and Leishman 2004; Cadotte et al. 2006a). We also identified no fruit traits that could explain escape probability of zoochorous species', which may be due to the low number of zoochorous escaped plants in our sample which reduced our statistical power. This result highlights the conceptual limitations of comparative approaches based on a limited subset of species, sampled from a particular habitat type (Cadotte et al. 2006b).

## Conclusion

Our study provides interesting insights into the factors that may allow ornamental plants to escape out of

cultivation and potentially become invaders. Alien species cultivated in gardens which exhibit pre-adaptation to local environmental constraints, especially edaphic ones, and potential for vegetative reproduction have more chance to escape out of the gardens. We also demonstrated that species abundance within gardens, especially for zoochorous species, and species occurrence towards gardens margins increased their probability of escaping to surrounding landscapes. This highlights the importance of gardening practices regarding both pre-selection and propagule pressure on the establishment success of ornamental plants. Therefore, it may be possible to mitigate risks of establishment of ornamental plants in abandoned agricultural land sites by modifying gardening practices, at least in Mediterranean regions. It is important to encourage gardeners to plant native species as these species are also naturally adapted to local environmental constraints. Planting of pre-adapted aliens should be reduced to be occasional and or far from garden margins. Furthermore, local ornamental nurseries and the ornamental market should develop the cultivation and trade of native species. Gardeners should also avoid planting zoochorous monospecies hedges, which are an important source of escaped zoochorous alien species in abandoned agricultural land sites. Special attention must be given to the positioning of these species in gardens because this may affect the chance of species dispersal outside of gardens. Our study thus shows that it is important to conduct research on the transition phase from plant cultivation to plant naturalization outside of

cultivation because this may produce useful data for the implementation of adequate management policies. We also encourage the development of large databases probing characteristics of ornamental species as well as the cooperation with horticulture companies which may provide useful biological information on the ecological and biological features of ornamental plants. This will allow us to better understand the processes by which ornamentals become invaders and affect natural biodiversity, as this phenomenon is expected to increase in the years to come.

**Acknowledgments** We are grateful to the municipality of Lauris for its contribution to this work and to Lauris' inhabitants for allowing us to visit and study their properties. The authors also thank Jane Molofsky for language edition of the manuscript, as well as Marc Cadotte and two anonymous reviewers for proposing significant improvements to our manuscript. This work was supported by the Association for Development of Teaching and Research in the Provence Alpes Côte-d'Azur region.

## Appendix

See Table 5.

**Table 5** List of the perennial alien plant species escaped (=1) and not escaped (=0) in abandoned agricultural lands of Lauris village

Species	Family	Not escaped/ escaped
<i>x Cupressocyparis leylandii</i>	Cupressaceae	0
<i>Abelia schumannii</i>	Linnaeaceae	0
<i>Abelia x grandiflora</i>	Linnaeaceae	0
<i>Abies nordmanniana</i>	Pinaceae	0
<i>Abies</i> sp.	Pinaceae	0
<i>Abutilon</i> sp.	Malvaceae	0
<i>Acacia dealbata</i>	Fabaceae	0
<i>Acanthus mollis</i>	Acanthaceae	0
<i>Acca sellowiana</i>	Myrtaceae	0
<i>Acer campestre</i>	Sapindaceae	0
<i>Acer negundo</i>	Sapindaceae	1
<i>Acer palmatum</i>	Sapindaceae	0
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	Sapindaceae	0
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Sapindaceae	0
<i>Achillea</i> sp.	Asteraceae	0
<i>Acorus gramineus</i>	Acoraceae	0
<i>Actinidia chinensis</i>	Actinidiaceae	0

**Table 5** continued

Species	Family	Not escaped/ escaped
<i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	Sapindaceae	0
<i>Agapanthus</i> sp.	Agapanthaceae	0
<i>Agave americana</i>	Agavaceae	0
<i>Ailanthus altissima</i>	Simaroubaceae	1
<i>Akebia</i> sp.	Lardizabalaceae	0
<i>Albizia julibrissin</i>	Fabaceae	0
<i>Albizia ombrella</i>	Fabaceae	0
<i>Alcea rosea</i>	Malvaceae	0
<i>Allium ascalonicum</i>	Alliaceae	0
<i>Allium cepa</i>	Alliaceae	0
<i>Allium sativum</i>	Alliaceae	0
<i>Allium schoenoprasum</i>	Alliaceae	0
<i>Alocasia macrorrhiza</i>	Araceae	0
<i>Aloe arborescens</i>	Asphodelaceae	0
<i>Aloe grandidentata</i>	Asphodelaceae	0
<i>Aloe</i> sp.	Asphodelaceae	0
<i>Aloysia triphylla</i>	Verbenaceae	0
<i>Althaea</i> sp.	Malvaceae	0
<i>Amaranthus caudatus</i>	Amaranthaceae	0
<i>Amaryllis belladonna</i>	Amaryllidaceae	0
<i>Ampelopsis robusta</i>	Vitaceae	0
<i>Anthemis</i> sp.	Asteraceae	0
<i>Aporocactus flagelliformis</i>	Cactaceae	0
<i>Aptenia cordifolia</i>	Aizoaceae	0
<i>Aquilegia alpina</i>	Ranunculaceae	0
<i>Arabis caucasica</i>	Brassicaceae	0
<i>Arbutus unedo</i>	Ericaceae	0
<i>Armeria</i> sp.	Plumbaginaceae	0
<i>Artemisia</i> sp.	Asteraceae	0
<i>Artemisia dracunculus</i>	Asteraceae	0
<i>Arum</i> sp.	Araceae	0
<i>Asparagus densiflorus</i>	Asparagaceae	0
<i>Aspidistra elatior</i>	Ruscaceae	0
<i>Aster novi-belgii</i>	Asteraceae	0
<i>Aubrieta</i> sp.	Brassicaceae	0
<i>Aucuba japonica</i>	Garryaceae	0
<i>Aurinia saxatilis</i>	Brassicaceae	0
<i>Begonia</i> sp.	Begoniaceae	0
<i>Bellis perennis</i>	Asteraceae	0
<i>Berberis x ottawensis</i>	Berberidaceae	0
<i>Berberis thunbergii</i>	Berberidaceae	1
<i>Bergenia cordifolia</i>	Saxifragaceae	0
<i>Betula</i> sp.	Betulaceae	0

Table 5 continued

Species	Family	Not escaped/ escaped
<i>Bougainvillea</i> sp.	Nyctaginaceae	0
<i>Bracteantha bracteata</i>	Asteraceae	0
<i>Broussonetia papyrifera</i>	Moraceae	1
<i>Brugmansia</i> sp.	Solanaceae	0
<i>Buddleja davidii</i>	Scrophulariaceae	1
<i>Buxus sempervirens</i>	Buxaceae	0
<i>Caesalpinia gilliesii</i>	Fabaceae	0
<i>Callistemon citrinus</i>	Myrtaceae	0
<i>Callistemon</i> sp.	Myrtaceae	0
<i>Calluna vulgaris</i>	Ericaceae	0
<i>Calocedrus decurrens</i>	Cupressaceae	0
<i>Caltha palustris</i>	Ranunculaceae	0
<i>Camellia japonica</i>	Theaceae	0
<i>Campanula carpatica</i>	Campanulaceae	0
<i>Campsis grandiflora</i>	Bignoniaceae	0
<i>Carpobrotus acinaciformis</i>	Aizoaceae	0
<i>Caryopteris</i> sp.	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Caryopteris x clandonensis</i>	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Catalpa bignonioides</i>	Bignoniaceae	0
<i>Ceanothus</i> sp.	Rhamnaceae	0
<i>Ceanothus x delileanus</i>	Rhamnaceae	0
<i>Cedrus deodara</i>	Pinaceae	0
<i>Centaurea montana</i>	Asteraceae	0
<i>Cerastium tomentosum</i>	Caryophyllaceae	0
<i>Ceratostigma plumbaginoides</i>	Plumbaginaceae	0
<i>Cercis siliquastrum</i>	Fabaceae	0
<i>Chaenomeles x superba</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana</i>	Cupressaceae	0
<i>Chamerion fleischeri</i>	Onagraceae	0
<i>Chlorophytum comosum</i>	Agavaceae	0
<i>Choisya ternata</i>	Rutaceae	0
<i>Chrysanthemum</i> sp.	Asteraceae	0
<i>Cistus salviifolius</i>	Cistaceae	0
<i>Cistus</i> sp.	Cistaceae	0
<i>Cistus x purpureus</i>	Cistaceae	0
<i>Citrus aurantium</i>	Rutaceae	0
<i>Citrus clementina</i>	Rutaceae	0
<i>Citrus limon</i>	Rutaceae	0
<i>Citrus mitis</i>	Rutaceae	0
<i>Citrus paradisi</i>	Rutaceae	0
<i>Citrus</i> sp.	Rutaceae	0
<i>Clematis</i> sp.	Ranunculaceae	0

Table 5 continued

Species	Family	Not escaped/ escaped
<i>Clivia miniata</i>	Amaryllidaceae	0
<i>Commelina coelestis</i>	Commelinaceae	0
<i>Convallaria majalis</i>	Ruscaceae	0
<i>Cordyline australis</i>	Laxmanniaceae	0
<i>Coreopsis</i> sp.	Asteraceae	0
<i>Cornus alba</i>	Cornaceae	0
<i>Cornus sanguinea</i>	Cornaceae	0
<i>Coronilla glauca</i>	Fabaceae	0
<i>Cortaderia selloana</i>	Poaceae	1
<i>Corylus avellana</i>	Betulaceae	0
<i>Corylus maxima</i>	Betulaceae	0
<i>Cotinus</i> sp.	Anacardiaceae	0
<i>Cotoneaster franchetii</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Cotoneaster horizontalis</i>	Rosaceae	1
<i>Cotoneaster lacteus</i>	Rosaceae	1
<i>Cotoneaster microphyllus</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Cotoneaster salicifolius</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Cotoneaster</i> sp.	Rosaceae	0
<i>Crambe maritima</i>	Brassicaceae	0
<i>Crassula ovata</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Crassula perforata</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Crocus</i> sp.	Iridaceae	0
<i>Cucurbita pepo</i>	Cucurbitaceae	0
<i>Cupressus arizonica</i>	Cupressaceae	0
<i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>	Cupressaceae	0
<i>Cycas revoluta</i>	Cycadaceae	0
<i>Cyclamen</i> sp.	Myrsinaceae	0
<i>Cydonia oblonga</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Cymbidium</i> sp.	Orchidaceae	0
<i>Cyperus longus</i>	Cyperaceae	0
<i>Cyperus papyrus</i>	Cyperaceae	0
<i>Cytisus nigricans</i>	Fabaceae	0
<i>Dahlia</i> sp.	Asteraceae	0
<i>Delosperma cooperi</i>	Aizoaceae	0
<i>Deutzia</i> sp.	Hydrangeaceae	0
<i>Dianthus barbatus</i>	Caryophyllaceae	0
<i>Dianthus plumarius</i>	Caryophyllaceae	0
<i>Dianthus</i> sp.	Caryophyllaceae	0
<i>Dicentra spectabilis</i>	Papaveraceae	0
<i>Diospyros kaki</i>	Ebenaceae	0
<i>Echeveria elegans</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Echinocereus</i> sp.	Cactaceae	0

Table 5 continued

Species	Family	Not escaped/ escaped
<i>Echinopsis</i> sp.	Cactaceae	0
<i>Eichhornia crassipes</i>	Pontederiaceae	0
<i>Elaeagnus angustifolia</i>	Elaeagnaceae	0
<i>Elaeagnus x ebbingei</i>	Elaeagnaceae	1
<i>Epiphyllum</i> sp.	Cactaceae	0
<i>Erigeron karvinskianus</i>	Asteraceae	0
<i>Erysimum cheiri</i>	Brassicaceae	0
<i>Escallonia</i> sp.	Escalloniaceae	0
<i>Eucalyptus gunnii</i>	Myrtaceae	0
<i>Eucalyptus</i> sp.	Myrtaceae	0
<i>Euonymus fortunei</i>	Celastraceae	0
<i>Euonymus japonicus</i>	Celastraceae	0
<i>Euphorbia candelabrum</i>	Euphorbiaceae	0
<i>Euphorbia myrsinites</i>	Euphorbiaceae	0
<i>Euphorbia</i> sp.	Euphorbiaceae	0
<i>Euryops chrysanthemoides</i>	Asteraceae	0
<i>Fagus</i> sp.	Fagaceae	0
<i>Felicia amelloides</i>	Asteraceae	0
<i>Festuca glauca</i>	Poaceae	0
<i>Ficus benjamina</i>	Moraceae	0
<i>Ficus carica</i>	Moraceae	0
<i>Ficus elastica</i>	Moraceae	0
<i>Foeniculum vulgare</i>	Apiaceae	0
<i>Forsythia x intermedia</i>	Oleaceae	0
<i>Fortunella japonica</i>	Rutaceae	0
<i>Fragaria vesca</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	Oleaceae	0
<i>Fuchsia</i> sp.	Onagraceae	0
<i>Gaillardia</i> sp.	Asteraceae	0
<i>Gaura lindheimeri</i>	Onagraceae	0
<i>Gazania</i> sp.	Asteraceae	0
<i>Geranium maculatum</i>	Geraniaceae	0
<i>Geranium sanguineum</i>	Geraniaceae	0
<i>Geranium</i> sp.	Geraniaceae	0
<i>Ginkgo biloba</i>	Ginkgoaceae	0
<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>	Fabaceae	0
<i>Graptopetalum bellum</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Graptopetalum paraguayense</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Grevillea</i> sp.	Proteaceae	0
<i>Haworthia</i> sp.	Asphodelaceae	0
<i>Hebe</i> sp.	Plantaginaceae	0
<i>Hebe x franciscana</i>	Plantaginaceae	0

Table 5 continued

Species	Family	Not escaped/ escaped
<i>Hedera colchica</i>	Araliaceae	0
<i>Hedera helix</i>	Araliaceae	0
<i>Heliotropium arborescens</i>	Boraginaceae	0
<i>Helleborus niger</i>	Ranunculaceae	0
<i>Hemerocallis</i> sp.	Hemerocallidaceae	0
<i>Heuchera</i> sp.	Saxifragaceae	0
<i>Hibiscus</i> sp.	Malvaceae	0
<i>Hippuris vulgaris</i>	Plantaginaceae	0
<i>Hosta</i> sp.	Agavaceae	0
<i>Hyacinthus orientalis</i>	Hyacinthaceae	0
<i>Hydrangea macrophylla</i>	Hydrangeaceae	0
<i>Hydrangea quercifolia</i>	Hydrangeaceae	0
<i>Hypericum</i> sp.	Hypericaceae	0
<i>Hypoestes phyllostachya</i>	Acanthaceae	0
<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	Aquifoliaceae	0
<i>Impatiens balfourii</i>	Balsaminaceae	0
<i>Incarvillea</i> sp.	Bignoniaceae	0
<i>Ipomoea</i> sp.	Convolvulaceae	0
<i>Iris</i> sp.	Iridaceae	1
<i>Jasminum nudiflorum</i>	Oleaceae	0
<i>Jasminum officinale</i>	Oleaceae	0
<i>Juglans regia</i>	Juglandaceae	1
<i>Juniperus chinensis</i>	Cupressaceae	0
<i>Juniperus communis</i>	Cupressaceae	0
<i>Juniperus horizontalis</i>	Cupressaceae	0
<i>Juniperus</i> sp.	Cupressaceae	0
<i>Juniperus squamata</i>	Cupressaceae	0
<i>Juniperus x media</i>	Cupressaceae	0
<i>Kalanchoe blossfeldiana</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Kalanchoe daigremontiana</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Kerria japonica</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Kniphofia</i> sp.	Asphodelaceae	0
<i>Kolkwitzia amabilis</i>	Linnaeaceae	0
<i>Lagerstroemia indica</i>	Lythraceae	0
<i>Lantana camara</i>	Verbenaceae	0
<i>Lathyrus</i> sp.	Fabaceae	0
<i>Lavandula x intermedia</i>	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Lavandula dentata</i>	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Lavatera</i> sp.	Malvaceae	0
<i>Lavatera thuringiaca</i>	Malvaceae	0
<i>Leontopodium alpinum</i>	Asteraceae	0
<i>Leucanthemum vulgare</i>	Asteraceae	0

Table 5 continued

Species	Family	Not escaped/ escaped
<i>Ligustrum jonandrum</i>	Oleaceae	0
<i>Ligustrum ovalifolium</i>	Oleaceae	1
<i>Ligustrum sinense</i>	Oleaceae	0
<i>Lilium</i> sp.	Liliaceae	0
<i>Linum perenne</i>	Linaceae	0
<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	Altingiaceae	0
<i>Lobelia splendens</i>	Campanulaceae	0
<i>Lonicera japonica</i>	Caprifoliaceae	0
<i>Lonicera nitida</i>	Caprifoliaceae	0
<i>Lonicera pileata</i>	Caprifoliaceae	0
<i>Lonicera</i> sp.	Caprifoliaceae	0
<i>Lonicera x heckrottii</i>	Caprifoliaceae	0
<i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>	Magnoliaceae	0
<i>Magnolia x soulangeana</i>	Magnoliaceae	0
<i>Mahonia aquifolium</i>	Berberidaceae	0
<i>Malus domestica</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Mandevilla</i> sp.	Apocynaceae	0
<i>Melia azedarach</i>	Meliaceae	0
<i>Melissa officinalis</i>	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Mentha viridis</i>	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Mespilus germanica</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Mirabilis jalapa</i>	Nyctaginaceae	0
<i>Miscanthus sinensis</i>	Poaceae	0
<i>Monstera deliciosa</i>	Araceae	0
<i>Morus kagayamae</i>	Moraceae	0
<i>Musa basjoo</i>	Musaceae	0
<i>Myosotis</i> sp.	Boraginaceae	0
<i>Nandina domestica</i>	Berberidaceae	0
<i>Narcissus</i> sp.	Amaryllidaceae	0
<i>Nicotiana</i> sp.	Solanaceae	0
<i>Opuntia microdasys</i>	Cactaceae	0
<i>Opuntia</i> sp.	Cactaceae	1
<i>Opuntia spinosior</i>	Cactaceae	0
<i>Osteospermum</i> sp.	Asteraceae	0
<i>Oxalis articulata</i>	Oxalidaceae	0
<i>Paeonia</i> sp.	Paeoniaceae	0
<i>Paeonia suffruticosa</i>	Paeoniaceae	0
<i>Paliurus spina-christi</i>	Rhamnaceae	0
<i>Papaver croceum</i>	Papaveraceae	0
<i>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</i>	Vitaceae	1
<i>Parthenocissus tricuspidata</i>	Vitaceae	0
<i>Passiflora caerulea</i>	Passifloraceae	0

Table 5 continued

Species	Family	Not escaped/ escaped
<i>Passiflora violacea</i>	Passifloraceae	0
<i>Paulownia tomentosa</i>	Paulowniaceae	0
<i>Pelargonium lierre</i>	Geraniaceae	0
<i>Pelargonium zonale</i>	Geraniaceae	0
<i>Pennisetum villosum</i>	Poaceae	0
<i>Perovskia</i> sp.	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Petunia</i> sp.	Solanaceae	0
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	Poaceae	0
<i>Philadelphus coronarius</i>	Hydrangeaceae	0
<i>Phlox subulata</i>	Polemoniaceae	0
<i>Phormium tenax</i>	Hemerocallidaceae	0
<i>Photinia serratifolia</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Photinia x fraseri</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Phyllostachys aurea</i>	Poaceae	1
<i>Physocarpus opulifolius</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Picea abies</i>	Pinaceae	0
<i>Picea glauca</i>	Pinaceae	0
<i>Picea pungens</i>	Pinaceae	0
<i>Pieris</i> sp.	Ericaceae	0
<i>Pinus mugo</i>	Pinaceae	0
<i>Pinus nigra</i>	Pinaceae	1
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	Pinaceae	0
<i>Pittosporum tenuifolium</i>	Pittosporaceae	0
<i>Pittosporum tobira</i>	Pittosporaceae	0
<i>Platanus x hispanica</i>	Platanaceae	0
<i>Plectranthus coleoides</i>	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Plumbago auriculata</i>	Plumbaginaceae	0
<i>Polygala myrtifolia</i>	Polygonaceae	0
<i>Polygonatum</i> sp.	Ruscaceae	0
<i>Populus nigra</i>	Salicaceae	0
<i>Portulaca grandiflora</i>	Portulacaceae	0
<i>Portulaca umbraticola</i>	Portulacaceae	0
<i>Potentilla fruticosa</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Primula auricula</i>	Primulaceae	0
<i>Primula groupe</i> <i>Polyanthus</i>	Primulaceae	0
<i>Prunus armeniaca</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Prunus avium</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Prunus cerasifera</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Prunus domestica</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Prunus dulcis</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>	Rosaceae	0

Table 5 continued

Species	Family	Not escaped/ escaped
<i>Prunus persica</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Prunus</i> sp.	Rosaceae	0
<i>Ptelea trifoliata</i>	Rutaceae	0
<i>Punica granatum</i>	Lythraceae	0
<i>Pyracantha</i> sp.	Rosaceae	1
<i>Pyrus communis</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Quercus ilex</i>	Fagaceae	0
<i>Quercus pubescens</i>	Fagaceae	0
<i>Ranunculus flammula</i>	Ranunculaceae	0
<i>Rheum rhaponticum</i>	Polygonaceae	0
<i>Rhododendron</i> sp.	Ericaceae	0
<i>Rhus typhina</i>	Anacardiaceae	0
<i>Ribes nigrum</i>	Grossulariaceae	0
<i>Ribes</i> sp.	Grossulariaceae	0
<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	Fabaceae	1
<i>Rosa</i> sp.	Rosaceae	0
<i>Rubus idaeus</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Rudbeckia</i> sp.	Asteraceae	0
<i>Rumex acetosa</i>	Polygonaceae	0
<i>Rumex arifolius</i>	Polygonaceae	0
<i>Ruscus aculeatus</i>	Ruscaceae	0
<i>Russelia equisetiformis</i>	Plantaginaceae	0
<i>Salix</i> sp.	Salicaceae	0
<i>Salvia microphylla</i>	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Salvia nemorosa</i>	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Sambucus nigra</i>	Adoxaceae	0
<i>Sanvitalia procumbens</i>	Asteraceae	0
<i>Saponaria officinalis</i>	Caryophyllaceae	0
<i>Saponaria</i> sp.	Caryophyllaceae	0
<i>Sarcococca confusa</i>	Buxaceae	0
<i>Satureja montana</i>	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Scaevola aemula</i>	Goodeniaceae	0
<i>Schefflera actinophylla</i>	Araliaceae	0
<i>Schlumbergera truncata</i>	Cactaceae	0
<i>Sedum acre</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sedum aizoon</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sedum album</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sedum oreganum</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sedum palmeri</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sedum reflexum</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sedum sieboldii</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sedum</i> sp.	Crassulaceae	0

Table 5 continued

Species	Family	Not escaped/ escaped
<i>Sedum spathulifolium</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sedum spectabile</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sedum spurium</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sedum telephium</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sempervivum arachnoideum</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sempervivum montanum</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sempervivum</i> sp.	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Sempervivum tectorum</i>	Crassulaceae	0
<i>Skimmia japonica</i>	Rutaceae	0
<i>Solanum pseudocapsicum</i>	Solanaceae	0
<i>Solanum rantonnetii</i>	Solanaceae	0
<i>Solanum tuberosum</i>	Solanaceae	0
<i>Sophora japonica</i>	Fabaceae	0
<i>Spathiphyllum wallisii</i>	Araceae	0
<i>Spiraea japonica</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Spiraea</i> sp.	Rosaceae	0
<i>Spiraea x vanhouttei</i>	Rosaceae	0
<i>Stachys byzantina</i>	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Stipa tenuissima</i>	Poaceae	0
<i>Strelitzia reginae</i>	Strelitziaceae	0
<i>Symphoricarpos</i> sp.	Caprifoliaceae	0
<i>Syringa vulgaris</i>	Oleaceae	1
<i>Tamarix ramosissima</i>	Tamaricaceae	0
<i>Tamarix tetrandra</i>	Tamaricaceae	0
<i>Taxus baccata</i>	Taxaceae	0
<i>Teucrium chamaedrys</i>	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	Cupressaceae	0
<i>Thuja orientalis</i>	Cupressaceae	1
<i>Thymus x citriodorus</i>	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Tilia cordata</i>	Malvaceae	0
<i>Tilia tomentosa</i>	Malvaceae	0
<i>Trachelospermum jasminoides</i>	Apocynaceae	0
<i>Trachycarpus fortunei</i>	Arecaceae	0
<i>Tradescantia pallida</i>	Commelinaceae	0
<i>Tropaeolum</i> sp.	Tropaeolaceae	0
<i>Tulbaghia violacea</i>	Alliaceae	0
<i>Tulipa</i> sp.	Liliaceae	0
<i>Vaccinium myrtillus</i>	Ericaceae	0
<i>Verbena bonariensis</i>	Verbenaceae	0
<i>Verbena x hybrida</i>	Verbenaceae	0
<i>Viburnum carlesii</i>	Adoxaceae	0

**Table 5** continued

Species	Family	Not escaped/ escaped
<i>Viburnum opulus</i>	Adoxaceae	0
<i>Viburnum rhytidophyllum</i>	Adoxaceae	0
<i>Viburnum</i> sp.	Adoxaceae	0
<i>Viburnum x bodnantense</i>	Adoxaceae	0
<i>Viola tricolor</i>	Violaceae	0
<i>Weigela</i> sp.	Diervillaceae	0
<i>Westringia fruticosa</i>	Lamiaceae	0
<i>Wisteria sinensis</i>	Fabaceae	0
<i>Yucca aloifolia</i>	Agavaceae	0
<i>Yucca elephantipes</i>	Agavaceae	0
<i>Yucca filamentosa</i>	Agavaceae	0
<i>Yucca</i> sp.	Agavaceae	0

Each species was assigned to its proper systematic family according to the Angiosperm Phylogeny Group (2003)

## References

- Alston KP, Richardson DM (2006) The roles of habitat features, disturbance, and distance from putative source populations in structuring alien plant invasions at the urban/wildland interface on the Cape Peninsula, South Africa. *Biol Conserv* 132:183–198. doi:[10.1016/j.biocon.2006.03.023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2006.03.023)
- Angiosperm Phylogeny Group (2003) An update of the Angiosperm Phylogeny Group classification for the orders and families of flowering plants: APG II. *Bot J Linn Soc* 141:399–436. doi:[10.1046/j.1095-8339.2003.t01-1-00158.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1095-8339.2003.t01-1-00158.x)
- Bärtels A (1998) *Le livre des arbres et arbustes*. E. Ulmer, 320 pp
- Brickell C, Mioulane P (2004) *Encyclopédie des 15000 plantes et fleurs de jardin*. Larousse, 1080 pp
- Buckley YM, Anderson S, Cattarall CP, Corlett RT, Engel T, Gosper CR, Nathan R, Richardson DM, Setter M, Spiegel O, Vivian-Smith G, Voigt FA, Weir JES, Westcott DA (2006) Management of plant invasions mediated by frugivore interactions. *J Appl Ecol* 43:848–857. doi:[10.1111/j.1365-2664.2006.01210.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2006.01210.x)
- Burnie G, Forrester S, Greig D, Guest S (2006) *Botanica: Encyclopédie de botanique et d'horticulture*. Mengès, Paris 970 pp
- Burt JW, Muir AA, Piovra-Scott J, Veblen KE, Chang AL, Grossman JD, Weiskel WH (2007) Preventing horticultural introductions of invasive plants: potential efficacy of voluntary initiatives. *Biol Invasions* 9:909–923. doi:[10.1007/s10530-007-9090-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-007-9090-4)
- Cadotte MW, Lovett-Doust J (2001) Ecological and taxonomic differences between native and introduced plants of southwestern Ontario. *Ecoscience* 8:230–238
- Cadotte MW, Murray BR, Lovett-Doust J (2006a) Evolutionary and ecological influences of plant invader success in the flora of Ontario. *Ecoscience* 13:388–395. doi:[10.2980/11195-6860-13-3-388.1](https://doi.org/10.2980/11195-6860-13-3-388.1)
- Cadotte MW, Murray BR, Lovett-Doust J (2006b) Ecological patterns and biological invasions: using regional species inventories in macroecology. *Biol Invasions* 8:809–821. doi:[10.1007/s10530-005-3839-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-005-3839-4)
- Collectif (1990) *Grande encyclopédie des plantes & fleurs de jardin*. Reader's Digest, 608 pp
- De Belder J, Misonne X (1997) *Le livre des baies, fruits sauvages pour parc et jardins*. Racine, 192 pp
- Debussche M, Isenmann P (1990) Introduced and cultivated fleshy-fruited plants: consequences for a mutualistic Mediterranean plant-bird system. In: Di Castri F, Hansen AJ, Debussche M (eds) *Biological invasions in Europe and the Mediterranean Basin*. Kluwer Academic Pub, Dordrecht
- Debussche M, Isenmann P (1994) Bird-dispersed seed rain and seedling establishment in patchy Mediterranean vegetation. *Oikos* 69:414–426. doi:[10.2307/3545854](https://doi.org/10.2307/3545854)
- Debussche M, Lepart J (1992) Establishment of woody plants in mediterranean old fields: opportunity in space and time. *Landscape Ecol* 6:133–145. doi:[10.1007/BF00130026](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00130026)
- Dehnen-Schmutz K, Touza J, Perrings C, Williamson M (2007a) A century of the ornamental plant trade and its impact on invasion success. *Divers Distrib* 13:527–534. doi:[10.1111/j.1472-4642.2007.00359.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2007.00359.x)
- Dehnen-Schmutz K, Touza J, Perrings C, Williamson M (2007b) The horticultural trade and ornamental plant invasions in Britain. *Conserv Biol* 21:224–231. doi:[10.1111/j.1523-1739.2006.00538.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2006.00538.x)
- Denslow JS (1986) Fruit removal rates from aggregated and isolated bushes of the red elderberry *Sambucus pubens*. *Can J Bot* 65:1229–1235. doi:[10.1139/b87-170](https://doi.org/10.1139/b87-170)
- European Environment Agency Report (2006) *Urban sprawl in Europe, the ignored challenge*
- Fournier P (1947) *Les quatre flores de France, Corse comprise: Générale, Alpine, Méditerranéenne, Littorale*. LeChevalier, Paris, 1103 pp
- Foxcroft LC, Richardson DM, Wilson JR (2008) Ornamental plants as invasive aliens: problems and solutions in Kruger National Park, South Africa. *Environ Manage* 41:32–51. doi:[10.1007/s00267-007-9027-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-007-9027-9)
- Gachet S, Vela E, Taton T (2004) BASECO: a floristic and ecological database of Mediterranean French flora. *Biodivers Conserv* 14:1023–1034. doi:[10.1007/s10531-004-8411-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-004-8411-5)
- Goodwin BJ, McAllister AJ, Fahrig J (1999) Predicting invasiveness of plant species based on biological information. *Conserv Biol* 13:422–426. doi:[10.1046/j.1523-1739.1999.013002422.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.1999.013002422.x)
- Gosper CR, Stansbury CD, Vivian-Smith G (2005) Seed dispersal of fleshy-fruited invasive plants by birds: contributing factors and management options. *Divers Distrib* 11:549–558. doi:[10.1111/j.1366-9516.2005.00195.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1366-9516.2005.00195.x)
- Hanspach J, Kühn I, Pyšek P, Boos E, Klotz S (2008) Correlates of naturalization and occupancy of introduced ornamentals in Germany. *Perspect Plant Ecol Evol Syst* 10:241–250. doi:[10.1016/j.ppees.2008.05.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ppees.2008.05.001)

- Harvey PH, Pagel MD (1991) *The comparative method in evolutionary biology*. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Hodkinson D, Thompson K (1997) Plant dispersal: the role of man. *J Appl Ecol* 34:1484–1496. doi:[10.2307/2405264](https://doi.org/10.2307/2405264)
- Hulme PE (2004) Invasions, islands and impacts: a Mediterranean perspective. In: Palacios F (ed) *Island ecology*. Asociación Española de Ecología Terrestre, La Laguna, pp 337–361
- Huxley A (ed) (1992) *The new royal horticultural society dictionary of gardening*, vols 1–4. Macmillan, London 3353 pp
- Itaca R, Gentleman R (1996) R: a language for data analysis and graphics. *J Comput Graph Statist* 5:299–314. doi:[10.2307/1390807](https://doi.org/10.2307/1390807)
- Julien P (1999) Au-delà de l'urbanisation, l'étalement urbain caractérise la région. *SUD INSEE l'essentiel* 23:1–4
- Julve P (1998) *Baseflor*. Index botanique, écologique et chorologique de la flore de France. <http://perso.wanadoo.fr/philippe.julve/catminat.htm>
- Křivánek M, Pyšek P (2008) Forestry and horticulture as pathways of plant invasions: a database of alien woody plants in the Czech Republic. In: Tokarska-Guzik B, Brock JH, Brundu G, Child LE, Daehler CC, Pyšek P (eds) *Plant invasions: human perception, ecological impacts and management*. Backhuys Publisher, Leiden, pp 21–38
- Lake J, Leishman MR (2004) Invasion success of exotic plants in natural ecosystems: the role of disturbance, plant attributes and freedom from herbivores. *Biol Conserv* 117:215–226. doi:[10.1016/S0006-3207\(03\)00294-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(03)00294-5)
- Lambdon PW, Pyšek P, Basnou C, Hejda M, Arianoutsou M, Ess F, Jarošík V, Pergl J, Winter M, Anastasiu P, Andriopoulos P, Bazos I, Brundu G, Celesti-Grapow L, Chassot P, Delipetrou P, Josefsson M, Kark S, Klotz S, Kokkoris Y, Kühn I, Marchante H, Perglova I, Pino J, Vilà M, Zikos A, Roy D, Hulme PH (2008a) Alien flora of Europe: species diversity, temporal trends, geographical patterns and research needs. *Preslia* 80:101–149
- Lambdon PW, Lloret F, Hulme PE (2008b) How do introduction characteristics influence the invasion success of Mediterranean alien plants? *Perspect Plant Ecol Evol Syst* 10:143–159. doi:[10.1016/j.ppees.2007.12.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ppees.2007.12.004)
- Lavergne S, Molofsky J (2007) Increased genetic variation and evolutionary potential drive the success of an invasive grass. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 104:3883–3888. doi:[10.1073/pnas.0607324104](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0607324104)
- Le Floch E (1991) Invasive plants of the Mediterranean Basin. In: Groves RH, DiCasta F (eds) *Biogeography of Mediterranean invasions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 67–80
- Lloret F, Médail F, Brundu G, Camarda I, Moragues E, Rita J, Lambdon P, Hulme PE (2005) Species attributes and invasion success by alien plants on Mediterranean islands. *Ecology* 93:512–520. doi:[10.1111/j.1365-2745.2005.00979](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2005.00979)
- Lockwood JL, Cassey P, Blackburn T (2005) The role of propagule pressure in explaining species invasions. *Trends Ecol Evol* 20:223–228. doi:[10.1016/j.tree.2005.02.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2005.02.004)
- Lonsdale WM (1999) Global patterns of plant invasions and the concept of invasibility. *Ecology* 80:1522–1536
- Mack RN (1995) Understanding the processes of weed invasions: the influence of environmental stochasticity. In Stirton C (ed) *Weeds in a changing world*. British Crop Protection Council, Symposium Proceedings Number 64. Brighton, UK, pp 65–74
- Mack RN (2000) Cultivation fosters plant naturalization by reducing environmental stochasticity. *Biol Invasions* 2:111–122. doi:[10.1023/A:1010088422771](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010088422771)
- Mack RN, Lonsdale WM (2001) Humans as global plant dispersers: getting more than we bargained for. *Bioscience* 51:95–102. doi:[10.1641/0006-3568\(2001\)051\[0095:HAGPDG\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2001)051[0095:HAGPDG]2.0.CO;2)
- Marco A, Dutoit T, Deschamps-Cottin M, Mauffrey J-F, Venetier M, Bertaudière-Montes V (2008a) Gardens in urbanizing rural areas reveal an unexpected floral diversity related to housing density. *C R Biol* 331:452–465. doi:[10.1016/j.crv.2008.03.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crv.2008.03.007)
- Marco A, Oliveau S, Pech N, Dutoit T, Bertaudière-Montes V (2008b) Garden plants dynamics at urban/fallow land interfaces: influence of local versus landscape factors. *Salzburger Geogr Arbeiten* 42:25–41
- Maron JM (2006) The relative importance of latitude matching and propagule pressure in the colonization success of an invasive forb. *Ecography* 29:819–826. doi:[10.1111/j.2006.0906-7590.04716.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2006.0906-7590.04716.x)
- Martins EP, Garland TJ (1991) Phylogenetic analyses of the correlated evolution of continuous characters: a simulation study. *Evolution Int J Org Evolution* 45:534–557. doi:[10.2307/2409910](https://doi.org/10.2307/2409910)
- McNeely J (2001) Invasive species: a costly catastrophe for native biodiversity. *Land Use Water Resour* 1:1–10
- Meiners SJ, Pickett STA, Cadenasso ML (2002) Exotic plant invasions over 40 years of old field successions: community patterns and associations. *Ecography* 25:215–223. doi:[10.1034/j.1600-0587.2002.250209.x](https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0587.2002.250209.x)
- Milbau A, Stout J (2008) Factors associated with alien plants transitioning from casual, to naturalized, to invasive. *Conserv Biol* 22:308–317. doi:[10.1111/j.1523-1739.2007.00877.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2007.00877.x)
- Müller S (coord.) (2004) *Plantes invasives en France*. Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Patrimoines naturels 62, Paris, 168 pp
- Mulvaney M (2001) The effect of introduction pressure on the naturalization of ornamental woody plants in south-eastern Australia. In: Groves RH, Panetta FD, Virtue JG (eds) *Weed risk assessment*. CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood, pp 186–193
- Myers J, Bazely DR (2003) *Ecology and control of introduced plants: evaluating and responding to invasive plants*. Ecology, biodiversity and conservation series. Cambridge University Press, 313 p
- Ne'eman G, Izhaki I (1996) Colonization in an abandoned East-Mediterranean vineyard. *J Veg Sci* 7:465–472. doi:[10.2307/3236294](https://doi.org/10.2307/3236294)
- Nijs I, Milbau A, Seidlová L (2004) New methodologies for analyzing and predicting alien plant invasions from species and ecosystem traits. *Weed Technol* 18:1240–1245. doi:[10.1614/0890-037X\(2004\)018\[1240:NMFAAP\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1614/0890-037X(2004)018[1240:NMFAAP]2.0.CO;2)
- Paradis E, Claude J (2002) Analysis of comparative data using generalized estimating equations. *J Theor Biol* 218:175–185. doi:[10.1006/jtbi.2002.3066](https://doi.org/10.1006/jtbi.2002.3066)

- Raichard A, Shea K (2000) Integrating the study of non-native plant invasions across spatial scales. *Biol Invasions* 8:399–413. doi:[10.1007/s10530-005-6419-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-005-6419-8)
- Pimentel D, Zuniga R, Morrison D (2005) Update on the environmental and economic costs associated with alien-invasive species in the United States. *Ecol Econ* 52:273–288. doi:[10.1016/j.ecolecon.2004.07.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2004.07.013)
- Prinzinger A, Durka W, Klotz S, Brandl R (2002) Which species become aliens? *Evol Ecol Res* 4:385–405
- Pyšek P, Hulme PE (2005) Spatio-temporal dynamics of plant invasions: linking pattern to process. *Ecoscience* 12:302–315. doi:[10.2980/i1195-6860-12-3-302.1](https://doi.org/10.2980/i1195-6860-12-3-302.1)
- Pyšek P, Prach K, Šmilauer P (1995) Invasion success related to plant traits: an analysis of Czech alien flora. In: Pyšek P, Prach K, Rejmánek M, Wade M (eds) *Plant invasions—general aspects and special problems*. SPB Academic Publ, Amsterdam, pp 39–60
- Reichard SH, Hamilton CW (1997) Predicting invasions of woody plants introduced into North America. *Conserv Biol* 11:193–203. doi:[10.1046/j.1523-1739.1997.95473.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.1997.95473.x)
- Reichard SH, White P (2001) Horticulture as a pathway of invasive plant introductions in the United States. *Bioscience* 51:103–113. doi:[10.1641/0006-3568\(2001\)051\[0103:HAAPOI\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2001)051[0103:HAAPOI]2.0.CO;2)
- Richardson DM, Pyšek P, Rejmanek M, Barbour MG, Panetta FD, West CJ (2000a) Naturalization and invasion of alien plants: concepts and definitions. *Divers Distrib* 6:93–107. doi:[10.1046/j.1472-4642.2000.00083.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1472-4642.2000.00083.x)
- Richardson DM, Allsopp N, D'Antonio CM, Milton SJ, Rejmanek M (2000b) Plant invasions—the role of mutualisms. *Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc* 75:65–93. doi:[10.1017/S0006323199005435](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0006323199005435)
- Sargent S (1990) Neighbourhood effects on fruit removal by birds: a field experiment with *Viburnum dentatum* (Caprifoliaceae). *Ecology* 71:1289–1298. doi:[10.2307/1938266](https://doi.org/10.2307/1938266)
- Stanley MC, Lill A (2001) Accessibility as a factor influencing frugivory by silvereyes (*Zosterops lateralis*): field comparisons with aviary experiments. *Aust J Zool* 49:171–182. doi:[10.1071/ZO00085](https://doi.org/10.1071/ZO00085)
- Sullivan J, Timmins S, Williams P (2005) Movement of exotic plants into coastal native forests from gardens in northern New Zealand. *N Z J Ecol* 29:1–10
- Taylor BW, Irwin RE (2004) Linking economic activities to the distribution of exotic plants. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 101:17725–17730. doi:[10.1073/pnas.0405176101](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0405176101)
- Theoharides KA, Dukes JS (2007) Plant invasion across space and time: factors affecting non indigenous species success during four stages of invasion. *New Phytol* 176:256–273. doi:[10.1111/j.1469-8137.2007.02207.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2007.02207.x)
- Thuiller W, Richardson DM, Pyšek P, Midgley GF, Hughes GO, Rouget M (2005) Niche-based modelling as a tool for predicting the risk of alien plant invasions at a global scale. *Glob Change Biol* 11:2234–2250. doi:[10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.001018.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.001018.x)
- Venables WN, Ripley BD (2002) *Modern applied statistics with S*. Springer, Berlin
- Vitousek PM, D'Antonio CM, Loope LL, Rejmanek M, Westbrooks R (1997) Introduced species: a significant component of human caused global change. *N Z J Ecol* 21:1–16
- Webb CO, Donoghue MJ (2005) Phylomatic: tree assembly for applied phylogenetics. *Mol Ecol Notes* 5:181–183. doi:[10.1111/j.1471-8286.2004.00829.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-8286.2004.00829.x)
- Weber E (2003) *Invasive plant species of the world. A reference guide to environmental weeds*. CABI Publishing, Wallingford
- Whelan J, Roberts DG, England PR, Ayre DA (2006) The potential for genetic contamination versus augmentation by native plants in urban gardens. *Biol Conserv* 128:493–500. doi:[10.1016/j.biocon.2005.10.016](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2005.10.016)
- Williamson M, Fitter A (1996) The characters of successful invaders. *Biol Conserv* 78:163–170. doi:[10.1016/0006-3207\(96\)00025-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(96)00025-0)