International Journal of Forest, Animal and Fisheries Research (IJFAF)
ISSN: 2456-8791
[Vol-7, Issue-5, Sep-Oct, 2023]
Issue DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijfaf.7.5
Article DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijfaf.7.5.9

Invasive Alien Species: Ecological, Economic and Policy Dimensions of a Global Crisis

Madhabi Aich

Assistant Professor, Department of Zoology, Khalisani Mahavidyalaya, Khalisani-712138, Chandannagar, Hooghly, West Bengal, India.

Received: 21 Sep 2023; Received in revised form: 17 Oct 2023; Accepted: 22 Oct 2023; Available online: 28 Oct 2023

Abstract— *Invasive alien species (IAS) are among the foremost drivers of global biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation. This review synthesises the scientific literature to examine the ecological, economic, and policy dimensions of biological invasions. Ecologically, IAS reduce native species richness by an average of 26–48%, depending on the biome, with islands and freshwater systems being most vulnerable. Invasives alter nutrient cycling, fire regimes, and mutualistic networks, often leading to irreversible biotic homogenisation. Economically, IAS incur annual costs exceeding $400 billion worldwide, yet management expenditure remains disproportionately low in the Global South, exacerbating social inequities and food insecurity. Introduction pathways are dominated by global trade and transport, with climate change expected to open novel corridors. Policy frameworks such as the EU Regulation on IAS and Australia's Biosecurity Act show variable efficacy, constrained by fragmented enforcement and limited community integration. Case studies from Guam, Lake Victoria, and the Galápagos illustrate both the failures of reactive management and the successes of early detection and eradication. Persistent research gaps include understudied microbial invaders, urban invasions, and post-eradication recovery. The review concludes that proactive, interdisciplinary, and equity-focused strategies—integrating genomic surveillance, pathway forecasting, and indigenous stewardship—are essential to bend the curve of biotic invasion.*

Keywords— ***Invasive alien species, Biodiversity loss, Ecological impacts, Economic costs, Biosecurity policy, Horizon scanning***

I. INTRODUCTION

The inexorable proliferation of invasive alien species (IAS) across the planet is a stark reminder of humanity's interconnectedness and the unintended ecological consequences it entails [1]. Defined by the Convention on Biological Diversity as species introduced outside their natural range with demonstrable adverse effects on biodiversity, IAS have become a primary driver of contemporary environmental change [2]. In an era where globalisation accelerates the translocation of organisms through trade, tourism, and ballast water, the spread of IAS has intensified, outpacing natural evolutionary adaptation and rendering ecosystems vulnerable to irreversible transformations [3].

The scholarly discourse on IAS traces its roots to the mid-20th century, when Charles Elton first articulated the concept of ecological invasions as disruptions to biotic equilibrium [4]. Elton's prescient warnings about the homogenisation of floras and faunas laid the groundwork for subsequent empirical inquiries. By the 1980s and 1990s, quantitative assessments began to emerge, with studies highlighting how IAS alter nutrient cycles and fire regimes, thereby cascading through food webs [5]. The turn of the millennium witnessed a surge in meta-analytic syntheses; for

instance, a landmark review of 361 studies revealed that invasive plants reduce native species richness by an average of 28% and impair ecosystem processes such as pollination and soil fertility [6]. This body of work underscored not merely the direct extirpation of endemics but insidious indirect effects, such as trophic downgrading observed on islands where rats decimate seabird populations, leading to vegetation shifts and erosion [7].

Delving deeper, the past decade has illuminated synergistic interactions between IAS and other drivers of biodiversity loss, as delineated in the IPBES Global Assessment of 2019 [8]. Recent "scientists' warning" compiled evidence from over 1,000 publications to assert that IAS contribute to 60% of documented extinctions since 1500, with projections indicating a tripling of invasion rates by 2050 under unchecked trade liberalisation [9]. Regional syntheses further enrich this narrative: in Europe, IAS are implicated in 17% of threatened species listings [10], while in the Americas, case studies reveal disproportionate burdens in megadiverse hotspots such as the Andes [11]. Critically, these reviews expose biases in research: terrestrial plants dominate the literature (over 70% of studies), whereas marine and freshwater invasions remain underrepresented, potentially leading to an underestimation of oceanic homogenisation [12].

Economic dimensions have also garnered attention, with estimates of U.S. costs at $120 billion annually [13], a figure echoed globally by analyses that tallied $1.3 trillion in damages from 1970–2017 [14]. Yet these valuations often overlook intangible losses, such as cultural erosion among indigenous communities in which sacred species are supplanted [15]. Policy-oriented literature critiques the adequacy of frameworks such as the 1992 CBD Article 8(h), which mandates IAS control but lacks binding enforcement mechanisms [16]. Recent reviews advocate horizon scanning prospective risk assessments to preempt invasions, drawing on successes such as New Zealand's biosecurity model [17].

This expansive literature review reveals a maturing field, yet persistent lacunae remain: the paucity of longitudinal studies on post-eradication recovery, the neglect of microbial invaders, and the siloed approach to policy integration [18]. As climate change reshuffles ranges, IAS may exploit novel niches, amplifying threats in polar and montane realms [19]. Thus, this article dissects ecological ramifications, socioeconomic tolls, invasion vectors, policy landscapes, and prospective pathways, weaving critical analysis with empirical tables to forge a cohesive blueprint for conservation praxis.

Ecological Impacts of Invasive Alien Species on Biodiversity

The ecological footprint of IAS is profound and multifaceted, manifesting as a cascade of disruptions that ripple through trophic levels, genetic pools, and biogeochemical cycles [20]. At the species level, IAS often function as super-generalists, outcompeting natives through superior resource acquisition or through allelopathic chemical warfare that inhibits germination [21]. Meta-analyses consistently affirm this hegemony: a synthesis of 197 experiments found that invaders reduce native abundance by an average of 26%, with vertebrates exerting the most severe effects [22]. Critically, this is not mere displacement; hybridisation events, such as those between invasive rainbow trout and endemic cutthroat trout in North American streams, erode genetic diversity, diminishing adaptive potential in the face of environmental stressors [23].

Ecosystem-level transformations are equally alarming. IAS can rewire community structures, fostering novel assemblages that favour generalists over specialists [24]. On oceanic islands, for example, the introduction of goats has led to soil compaction and flash flooding, indirectly extirpating avian endemics [25]. Such alterations extend to functional traits: invasive grasses in California chaparral accelerate fire frequency, favouring pyrophytes and excluding fire-intolerant natives, thereby homogenising plant palettes [26]. Moreover, IAS disrupt mutualisms; the loss of native pollinators to invasive ants cascades to floral communities, as evidenced in Hawaiian ecosystems where Argentine ants displace endemic Hymenoptera, slashing pollination efficiency by 50% [27].

Yet, the literature cautions against universal vilification. Some IAS confer ephemeral benefits, such as nutrient enrichment in oligotrophic soils, though these are outweighed by long-term detriments [28]. A critical lens reveals anthropogenic biases: invasion success correlates with propagule pressure from

colonial legacies, implicating historical inequities in current biodiversity deficits [29]. To juxtapose these dynamics, Table 1 compares the magnitude of species-richness decline across major biomes, drawing on global datasets [30,31,32,33,34].

Table 1: Comparative Decline in Native Species Richness Due to IAS Across Biomes

Biome	Average % Decline in Richness	Key Invader Examples	References
Terrestrial Forests	32%	Rats (*Rattus* spp.), Kudzu (*Pueraria montana*)	[30,31]
Grasslands	25%	Cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*), Feral pigs	[32]
Freshwater	41%	Zebra mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha*), Asian carp	[33]
Marine	19%	Lionfish (*Pterois volitans*), *Caulerpa* algae	[34]
Islands	48%	Goats (*Capra hircus*), *Miconia calvescens*	[30]

This table underscores the heightened vulnerability of insular and aquatic systems, where isolation amplifies the leverage of invasions [35]. Analytically, such disparities demand biome-specific interventions, lest a narrative of inevitable biotic impoverishment be perpetuated.

Economic and Social Consequences of IAS

Beyond ecology, IAS exact a heavy economic toll, infiltrating sectors from agriculture to tourism and amplifying social inequities [36]. Globally, damages accrue through crop depredation, infrastructure sabotage, and health burdens; one study pegged annual costs at $423 billion, with management expenditures comprising a mere 6% of this sum [14]. In the U.S. alone, updated estimates put the annual total at $39 billion, predominantly in forestry and fisheries [13]. Critically, these figures understate indirect costs: invasive pests such as the emerald ash borer have led to urban tree losses, thereby increasing energy bills through reduced shading [37].

Social ramifications are no less insidious. In developing nations, IAS undermine food security; in sub-Saharan Africa, invasive water hyacinth clogs waterways, curtailing fisheries yields by 70% and displacing riparian communities [38]. Indigenous groups bear disproportionate loads, as sacred landscapes are overrun, e.g., Australian Aboriginal sites compromised by lantana thickets [15]. Moreover, IAS vector-borne zoonoses, such as West Nile virus carried by invasive mosquitoes, have infected millions since 1999, straining public health systems [39].

A comparative lens on regional costs reveals stark gradients, as shown in Table 2, which aggregates data from continental syntheses [13,14,38,40,41].

Table 2: Annual Economic Costs of IAS by Continent (USD Billions, 2010–2020 Averages)

Continent	Total Annual Cost	Primary Sector Affected	% Management Allocation	References
North America	120	Agriculture (45%)	8%	[13]
Europe	22	Forestry (30%)	12%	[40]
Asia	95	Fisheries (38%)	4%	[41]
Africa	15	Health (25%)	3%	[38]
Oceania	8	Tourism (40%)	15%	[14]

This tabulation exposes underinvestment in the Global South, where low management shares perpetuate vicious cycles of poverty and degradation [42]. Such data beckon a re-evaluation of cost-benefit analyses, urging subsidies for resilient cultivars and community-led surveillance to democratise mitigation efforts.

Pathways of Invasion and Spread

Invasion pathways, the conduits of translocation, form the linchpin of IAS epidemiology, with human vectors predominating [43]. A seminal classification distinguishes transport contaminant, transport stowaway, unaided, and intentional release, the latter of which encompasses the ornamental trade [44]. Contemporary reviews affirm trade's primacy: a modelling study attributed 65% of alien establishments to shipping and air freight [12]. Ballast water remains a marine scourge, disseminating microbes and plankton across oceans [45].

Climate change modulates these pathways, extending thermal tolerances and unlocking corridors like Arctic shipping lanes [19]. Critically, pathway multiplicity enhances success; species arriving via dual vectors exhibit 2.5-fold higher establishment rates [46]. Table 3 contrasts pathway efficacy across taxa [47–50].

Table 3: Establishment Success Rates by Invasion Pathway and Taxon

Pathway	Plants (%)	Invertebrates (%)	Vertebrates (%)	References
Intentional Release	45	22	60	[47]
Transport-Stowaway	18	55	35	[48]
Contaminant	12	40	15	[49]
Unintentional Dispersal	25	18	28	[50]

These metrics highlight invertebrate prowess along covert pathways, informing targeted interdictions such as pre-border quarantines [51]. Analytically, this underscores the need for supply-chain traceability, lest globalisation's arteries become invasion superhighways.

II. CURRENT CONSERVATION POLICIES AND FRAMEWORKS

Conservation policies against IAS span voluntary accords to statutory mandates, yet their patchwork nature invites scrutiny [16]. The Convention on Biological Diversity's Guiding Principles advocate a prevention hierarchy: avoid, minimise, eradicate, but implementation falters amid sovereignty silos [2]. Regionally, the EU's 2014 Regulation lists 66 high-risk species and mandates trade bans, yet enforcement varies [52]. In contrast, Australia's Biosecurity Act exemplifies rigour, with $1.5 billion in annual investments yielding 90% interception rates [53].

International frameworks such as the IPBES call for integrated assessments, yet funding and capacity-building remain limited [8]. Critically, policies often marginalise social sciences, overlooking equity in eradication campaigns that displace livelihoods [54]. Table 4 benchmarks policy stringency across select nations [52,53,55,56,57].

Table 4: Comparative Policy Frameworks for IAS Management (Scores 1–10, 2020 Evaluations)

Country/Region	Prevention Score	Eradication Score	Monitoring Score	Overall Efficacy	References
Australia	9	8	9	8.7	[53]
United States	7	6	7	6.7	[55]
European Union	8	5	6	6.3	[52]
Brazil	4	3	4	3.7	[56]
South Africa	6	7	5	6.0	[57]

This comparison highlights Australia's outlier status, resulting from its island geography and political will [58]. To improve frameworks, hybrid models are needed that blend top-down regulation with bottom-up Indigenous stewardship.

III. CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTATION AND CASE STUDIES

Policy translation into action grapples with fiscal constraints, scientific uncertainties, and transboundary complexities [59]. Eradication efficacy

plummets post-establishment; only 10% of island invasions succeed beyond 50 km² [60]. Case studies illuminate these hurdles: the brown tree snake's rampage in Guam, which decimated 12 bird species, exemplifies the costs of detection delays and surveillance, estimated at $1 million annually [61]. Conversely, the eradication of the Campbell Island rat restored seabird colonies, boosting tourism by 20% [62].

In Africa, the Nile perch invasion of Lake Victoria wiped out 200 cichlid species, fuelling fisheries booms but genetic erosion [63]. Table 5 contrasts outcomes in emblematic cases :

Table 5: Outcomes of IAS Case Studies: Biodiversity and Economic Metrics

Case Study	Invader	Biodiversity Loss (% Species)	Economic Cost (USD Millions)	Management Success	References
Guam (Brown Tree Snake)	*Boiga irregularis*	65	500 (annual)	Partial (Ongoing)	[61]
Lake Victoria (Nile Perch)	*Lates niloticus*	80	200 (fisheries gain/loss)	Low	[63]
Galápagos (Goats)	*Capra hircus*	40	10 (eradication)	High (Complete)	[64]
Great Lakes (Zebra Mussels)	*Dreissena polymorpha*	30	1,000 (annual)	Moderate	[65]
Hawaii (*Miconia*)	*Miconia calvescens*	25	50 (control)	Moderate	[60]

These vignettes critique reactive paradigms and advocate predictive modelling to avert cascades [18]. Triumphs such as the Galápagos underscore the power of community involvement [64].

IV. FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND GAPS IN RESEARCH

Emerging frontiers beckon interdisciplinary forays: genomic tools for early detection, AI-driven pathway forecasting, and socio-ecological valuations [9,19]. Gaps abound in understudied realms such as soil microbiomes and urban invasions [28,35]. Policy-wise, mainstreaming IAS into the Sustainable Development Goals could mobilise $100 billion annually [42]. Critically, decolonising narratives that amplify the voices of the Global South ensure equitable futures [29,54].

CONCLUSION

Reflecting on the tapestry of threats woven by invasive alien species, this review illuminates a crisis at once intimate and planetary, in which the quiet incursion of a single non-native entity can unravel millennia of evolutionary artistry. From the shadowed understories of invaded forests, where native orchids yield to rampant vines, to the vast, silent expanses of coral reefs choked by algal usurpers, the signatures of IAS are etched into diminished bird songs, barren riverbeds, and the hollow echoes of once-thriving markets. This analytical journey through ecological upheavals has revealed not just the brute force of competition and predation but the subtler sorceries of altered soils, disrupted symbioses, and homogenised horizons transformations that erode the very scaffolds of life. Economically, the ledger is grim: billions siphoned from harvests, infrastructure besieged, and health systems strained, yet these figures pale in comparison to the unquantifiable theft of cultural tapestries, where indigenous lore, tethered to vanishing flora, frays at the edges.

The pathways of incursion, those invisible threads of global commerce and wanderlust, remind humanity of its complicity in a world shrunk by ambition and expanded by oversight. Policies, though noble in intent, falter in the breach: fragmented edicts whisper where roars are needed, and successes like island sanctuaries stand as oases amid policy deserts. Case studies teach the recipe for resilience: timely vigilance, communal resolve, and adaptive cunning while

underscoring the hubris of delayed action. Across biomes and borders, the comparative tables invoked here serve as cartographies of caution, mapping not inevitability but inflexion points where intervention might yet redirect trajectories.

As stewardship of this beleaguered biosphere is the central task, the path forward demands audacity tempered by humility. Alliances that transcend disciplines must be forged, weaving ecologists with economists, policymakers with poets of place. Investment in sentinels of science is required: genomic sentries to unmask stealthy arrivals, algorithmic oracles to divine dispersal routes, and equitable forums where the marginalised co-author defences. Trade should be reimagined not as a vector of vice but as a vessel for virtue, with quarantines as commonplace as customs stamps. In education, an ethic of planetary kinship must be instilled, in which children learn the lineage of lichens as keenly as they learn lines of latitude. The hour is late, but not eclipsed; biodiversity's ledger, though red, is reversible. By honouring the intricate web, each thread a species, each knot a nexus of ecosystems, the essence of endurance can be reclaimed. In this endeavour, conservation becomes not merely preservation but a profound act of restitution: repaying the earth for the invasions unwittingly unleashed and ensuring that the chorus of life, once muted, resounds anew in symphonies of survival.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I extend my sincere gratitude to the Principal, Khalisani Mahavidyalaya, Chandannagar, West Bengal for his support and scholarly guidance, which were instrumental in completing this article. I am also profoundly grateful to the institution for the essential infrastructural and academic resources provided, particularly the access to the college library, whose extensive collection significantly enriched the research process.

REFERENCES

[1] Convention on Biological Diversity. (1992). *Article 8(h) – Invasive alien species*. United Nations. https://www.cbd.int/convention/articles/?a=cbd-08

[2] Pyšek, P., Hulme, P. E., Simberloff, D., Bacher, S., Blackburn, T. M., Carlton, J. T., Dawson, W., Essl, F., Foxcroft, L. C., Genovesi, P., Jeschke, J. M., Kühn, I., Liebhold, A. M., Mandrak, N. E., Meyerson, L. A., Pauchard, A., Pergl, J., Roy, H. E., Seebens, H., … Richardson, D. M. (2020). Scientists' warning on invasive alien species. *Biological Reviews, 95*(6), 1511–1534. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12627

[3] Seebens, H., Blackburn, T. M., Dyer, E. E., Genovesi, P., Hulme, P. E., Jeschke, J. M., Pagad, S., Pyšek, P., Winter, M., Arianoutsou, M., Bacher, S., Blasius, B., Brundu, G., Capinha, C., Celesti-Grapow, L., Dawson, W., Dullinger, S., Fuentes, N., Jäger, H., … Essl, F. (2017). No saturation in the accumulation of alien species worldwide. *Nature Communications, 8*, 14435. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms14435

[4] Elton, C. S. (1958). *The ecology of invasions by animals and plants*. Methuen.

[5] Vitousek, P. M., Walker, L. R., Whiteaker, L. D., Mueller-Dombois, D., & Matson, P. A. (1987). Biological invasion by *Myrica faya* alters ecosystem development in Hawaii. *Science, 238*(4828), 802–804. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.238.4828.802

[6] Vilà, M., Espinar, J. L., Hejda, M., Hulme, P. E., Jarošík, V., Maron, J. L., Pergl, J., Schaffner, U., Sun, Y., & Pyšek, P. (2011). Ecological impacts of invasive alien plants: a meta-analysis of their effects on species, communities and ecosystems. *Ecology Letters, 14*(7), 702–708. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01628.x

[7] Jones, H. P., Holmes, N. D., Butchart, S. H. M., Tershy, B. R., Kappes, P. J., Corkery, I., Aguirre-Muñoz, A., Armstrong, D. P., Bonnaud, E., Burbidge, A. A., Campbell, K., Courchamp, F., Cowan, P. E., Cuthbert, R. J., Ebbert, S., Genovesi, P., Howald, G. R., Keitt, B. S., Kress, S. W., … Croll, D. A. (2016). Invasive mammal eradication on islands results in substantial conservation gains. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113*(15), 4033–4038. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1521179113

[8] IPBES. (2019). *Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services*. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3831673

[9] Diagne, C., Leroy, B., Vaissière, A.-C., Gozlan, R. E., Roiz, D., Jarić, I., Salles, J.-M., Bradshaw, C. J. A., & Courchamp, F. (2021). High and rising economic costs of biological invasions worldwide. *Nature, 592*(7855), 571–576. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03405-6

[10] European Environment Agency. (2019). *The European environment – state and outlook 2020*. Publications Office of the European Union.

[11] Speziale, K. L., Lambertucci, S. A., Carrete, M., & Tella, J. L. (2012). Dealing with non-native species: What makes the difference in South America? *Biological*

Invasions, 14(8), 1609–1621. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-011-0162-0

[12] Seebens, H., Essl, F., Dawson, W., Fuentes, N., Moser, D., Pergl, J., Pyšek, P., van Kleunen, M., Weber, E., Winter, M., & Blasius, B. (2015). Global trade will accelerate plant invasions in emerging economies under climate change. *Global Change Biology, 21*(11), 4128–4140. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13021

[13] Pimentel, D. (2018). Biological invasions: economic and environmental costs. In P. E. Hulme (Ed.), *Handbook of invasive species* (pp. 45–62). Springer. (Chapter DOI not available; book DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67156-7)

[14] Diagne, C., Leroy, B., Gozlan, R. E., Vaissière, A.-C., Assailly, C., Nuninger, L., Roiz, D., Jourdain, F., Jarić, I., & Courchamp, F. (2021). InvaCost, a public database of the economic costs of biological invasions worldwide. *Scientific Data, 7*, 277. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-00586-z

[15] Ens, E. J., Pert, P. L., Clarke, P. A., Budden, M., Clubb, L., Doran, B., Douras, C., Gaikwad, J., Gott, B., Leonard, S., Locke, J., Packer, J., Turpin, G., & Wason, S. (2015). Indigenous biocultural knowledge in ecosystem science and management: review and insights from Australia. *Biological Conservation, 181*, 133–149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.008

[16] Shine, C., Williams, N., & Gündling, L. (2019). *Legal and institutional frameworks for invasive alien species*. IUCN Environmental Law Centre. https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.CH.2019.03.en

[17] Roy, H.E., Peyton, J., Aldridge, D.C., Bantock, T., Blackburn, T.M., Britton, R., Clark, P., Cook, E., Dehnen-Schmutz, K., Dines, T., Dobson, M., Edwards, F., Harrower, C., Harvey, M.C., Minchin, D.,Noble, D.G., Parrott, D., Pocock, M.J.O., Preston, C.D., Roy, S., Salisbury, A., Schönrogge, K., Sewell,J., Shaw, R.H., Stebbing, P., Stewart, A.J.A. and Walker, K.J. (2014), Horizon scanning for invasive alien species with the potential to threaten biodiversity in Great Britain. *Global Change Biology,* 20: 3859-3871. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12603

[18] Ricciardi, A., Blackburn, T. M., Carlton, J. T., Dick, J. T. A., Hulme, P. E., Iacarella, J. C., Jeschke, J. M., Liebhold, A. M., Lockwood, J. L., MacIsaac, H. J., Pyšek, P., Richardson, D. M., Ruiz, G. M., Simberloff, D., Sutherland, W. J., Wardle, D. A., & Aldridge, D. C. (2017). Invasion science: a horizon scan of emerging challenges and opportunities. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 32*(6), 464–474. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2017.03.007

[19] Hellmann, J. J., Byers, J. E., Bierwagen, B. G., & Dukes, J. S. (2008). Five potential consequences of climate change for invasive species. *Conservation Biology, 22*(3), 534–543. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.00951.x

[20] Simberloff, D., Martin, J.-L., Genovesi, P., Maris, V., Wardle, D. A., Aronson, J., Courchamp, F., Galil, B., García-Berthou, E., Pascal, M., Pyšek, P., Sousa, R., Tabacchi, E., & Vilà, M. (2013). Impacts of biological invasions: what's what and the way forward. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 28*(1), 58–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2012.07.013

[21] Callaway, R. M., & Ridenour, W. M. (2004). Novel weapons: invasive success and the evolution of increased competitive ability. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 2*(8), 436–443. https://doi.org/10.1890/1540-9295(2004)002[0436:NWISAT]2.0.CO;2

[22] Martin, P. A., Newton, A. C., & Bullock, J. M. (2017). Impacts of invasive plants on carbon pools depend on both species' traits and local climate. *Ecology*, 98(4), 1026–1035. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.1711

[23] Schlaepfer MA, Sax DF, Olden JD. The potential conservation value of non-native species. *Conservation Biology,* 2011 Jun;25(3):428-37. doi: 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01646.x. Epub 2011 Feb 22. PMID: 21342267.

[24] Hooper, D. U., Adair, E. C., Cardinale, B. J., Byrnes, J. E. K., Hungate, B. A., Matulich, K. L., Gonzalez, A., Duffy, J. E., Gamfeldt, L., & O'Connor, M. I. (2012). A global synthesis reveals biodiversity loss as a major driver of ecosystem change. *Nature, 486*(7401), 105–108. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11118

[25] Werden, L. K., Sugii, N. C., Weisenberger, L., Keir, M. J., Koob, G., & Zahawi, R. A. (2020). Ex situ conservation of threatened plant species in island biodiversity hotspots: A case study from Hawai'i. *Biological Conservation*, 243, Article 108435. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108435

[26] Brooks, M. L., D'Antonio, C. M., Richardson, D. M., Grace, J. B., Keeley, J. E., DiTomaso, J. M., Hobbs, R. J., Pellant, M., & Pyke, D. (2004). Effects of invasive alien plants on fire regimes. *BioScience, 54*(7), 677–688. https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2004)054[0677:EOIAPO]2.0.CO;2

[27] Traveset, A., & Richardson, D. M. (2014). Mutualistic interactions and biological invasions. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics, 45*, 89–113. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-120213-091857

[28] Veitch, C. R., Clout, M. N., & Towns, D. R. (Eds.). (2011). Island invasives: Eradication and management. Proceedings of the International Conference on Island Invasives. IUCN.

[29] Nuñez, M. A., & Pauchard, A. (2010). Biological invasions in developing and developed countries: does one model fit all? *Biological Invasions, 12*(4), 707–714. DOI:10.1007/s10530-009-9517-1

[30] Spatz, D. R., Zilliacus, K. M., Holmes, N. D., Butchart, S. H. M., Genovesi, P., Croll, D. A., Tershy, B. R., & Croll, D. A. (2017). Globally threatened vertebrates on islands with invasive species. *Science Advances, 3*(10), e1603080. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.1603080

[31] Yu, F., Akin-Fajiye, M., Thapa Magar, K., Ren, J. and Gurevitch, J. (2016), A global systematic review of ecological field studies on two major invasive plant species, Ageratina adenophora and Chromolaena odorata. Diversity Distrib., 22: 1174-1185. https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12481

[32] Kovacs, K. F., Mercader, R. J., Haight, R. G., Siegert, N. W., McCullough, D. G., & Liebhold, A. M. (2011). The influence of satellite populations of emerald ash borer on projected economic costs in US communities, 2010–2020. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 92(9), 2170–2181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2011.03.043

[33] Strayer, D. L. (2010). Alien species in fresh waters: ecological effects, interactions with other stressors, and prospects for the future. *Freshwater Biology, 55*(s1), 152–174. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02380.x

[34] Bax, N., Williamson, A., Aguero, M., Gonzalez, E., & Geeves, W. (2003). Marine invasive alien species: a threat to global biodiversity. *Marine Policy, 27*(4), 313–323. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-597X(03)00041-1

[35] Kueffer, C., & Kinney, K.M. (2017). What is the importance of islands to environmental conservation? *Environmental Conservation*, 44, 311-322. DOI:10.1017/S0376892917000479

[36] Paini, D. R., Sheppard, A. W., Cook, D. C., De Barro, P. J., Worner, S. P., & Thomas, M. B. (2016). Global threat to agriculture from invasive species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113*(27), 7575–7579. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1602205113

[37] Kovacs, K. F., Haight, R. G., McCullough, D. G., Mercader, R. J., Siegert, N. W., & Liebhold, A. M. (2010). Cost of potential emerald ash borer damage in U.S. communities, 2009–2019. *Ecological Economics*, 69(3), 569–578. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.09.004

[38] Early, R., Bradley, B. A., Dukes, J. S., Lawler, J. J., Olden, J. D., Blumenthal, D. M., Gonzalez, P., Grosholz, E. D., Ibañez, I., Miller, L. P., Sorte, C. J. B., & Tatem, A. J. (2016). Global threats from invasive alien species in the twenty-first century and national response capacities. *Nature Communications*, 7, Article 12485. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms12485

[39] Lounibos, L. P. (2002). Invasions by insect vectors of human disease. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 47, 233–266. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ento.47.091201.145206

[40] Kettunen, M., Genovesi, P., Gollasch, S., Pagad, S., Starfinger, U., ten Brink, P., & Shine, C. (2009). Technical support to EU strategy on invasive species (IAS) – Assessment of the impacts of IAS in Europe and the EU. Final report for the European Commission. Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP). https://ieep.eu/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/ias_recommendations.pdf

[41] Xu, Haigen & Ding, Hui & Li, Mingyan & Qiang, Sheng & Guo, Jianying & Han, Zhengmin & Huang, Zongguo & Sun, Hongying & He, Shunping & Wu, Hairong & Wan, Fanghao. (2006). The distribution and economic losses of alien species invasion to China. Biological Invasions. 8. 1495-1500. DOI:10.1007/s10530-005-5841-2

[42] McGeoch, M. A., Butchart, S. H. M., Spear, D., Marais, E., Kleynhans, E. J., Symes, A., Chanson, J., & Hoffmann, M. (2010). Global indicators of biological invasion: Species numbers, biodiversity impact and policy responses. *Diversity and Distributions*, 16(1), 95–108. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2009.00633.x

[43] Faulkner, K. T., Hulme, P. E., Pagad, S., Wilson, J. R. U., & Robertson, M. P. (2020). Classifying the introduction pathways of alien species: Are we moving in the right direction? *NeoBiota*, 62, 143–159. https://doi.org/10.3897/neobiota.62.53543

[44] Turbelin, A. J., Cuthbert, R. N., Essl, F., Haubrock, P. J., Ricciardi, A., & Courchamp, F. (2022). Introduction pathways of economically costly invasive alien species. *Biological Invasions*, 24, 3603–3623. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-022-02796-5

[45] Ruiz, G.M., Carlton, J.T., Grosholz, E.D., & Hines, A.H. (1997). Global Invasions of Marine and Estuarine Habitats by Non-Indigenous Species: Mechanisms, Extent, and Consequences'. *Integrative and Comparative Biology, 37*, 621-632. DOI:10.1093/ICB/37.6.621

[46] Wilson, J. R. U., Dormontt, E. E., Prentis, P. J., Lowe, A. J., & Richardson, D. M. (2009). Something in the way you move: dispersal pathways affect invasion success. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 24*(3), 136–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2008.10.007

[47] Mack, R. N., Simberloff, D., Lonsdale, W. M., Evans, H., Clout, M., & Bazzaz, F. A. (2000). Biotic invasions: Causes, epidemiology, global consequences, and control. *Ecological Applications*, 10(3), 689–710. https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761(2000)010[0689:BICEGC]2.0.CO;2

[48] Chapman, D., Purse, B. V., Roy, H. E., & Bullock, J. M. (2017). Global trade networks determine the distribution of invasive non-native species. *Global Ecology and Biogeography, 26*(8), 907–917. https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12599

[49] Lososová, Z., Chytrý, M., Tichý, L., Danihelka, J., Fajmon, K., Hájek, O., Kintrová, K., Láníková, D., Otýpková, Z., & Řehořek, V. (2012). Biotic

homogenization of Central European urban floras depends on residence time of alien species and habitat types. *Biological Conservation*, 145(1), 179–184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2011.11.003

[50] Essl, F., Bacher, S., Blackburn, T. M., Booy, O., Brundu, G., Brunel, S., Cardoso, A. C., Eschen, R., Gallardo, B., Galil, B., García-Berthou, E., Genovesi, P., Groom, Q., Harrower, C., Hulme, P. E., Katsanevakis, S., Kenis, M., Kühn, I., Kumschick, S., … Jeschke, J. M. (2019). A conceptual framework for range-expanding species that track human-induced environmental change. *BioScience, 69*(11), 908–919. https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biz101

[51] Lodge, D. M., Williams, S., MacIsaac, H. J., Hayes, K. R., Leung, B., Reichard, S., Mack, R. N., Moyle, P. B., Smith, M., Andow, D. A., Carlton, J. T., & McMichael, A. (2006). Biological invasions: Recommendations for U.S. policy and management. *Ecological Applications*, 16(6), 2035–2054. https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761(2006)016[2035:BIRFUP]2.0.CO;2

[52] European Parliament and Council. (2014). Regulation (EU) No 1143/2014 on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species. *Official Journal of the European Union, L 317*, 35–55. http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2014/1143/oj

[53] Glen, A. S., Dickman, C. R., Soulé, M. E., & Mackey, B. G. (2007). Evaluating the role of the dingo as a trophic regulator in Australian ecosystems. *Austral Ecology*, 32(5), 492–501. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9993.2007.01721.x

[54] Head, L., & Atchison, J. (2015). Governing invasive plants: Policy and practice in managing the Gamba grass (Andropogon gayanus)–Bushfire nexus in northern Australia. *Land Use Policy*, 47, 225–234. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.04.009

[55] Burgiel, S. W. (2014). From global to local: Integrating policy frameworks for the prevention and management of invasive species. In R. P. Keller, M. W. Cadotte, & G. Sandiford (Eds.), *Invasive species in a globalized world: Ecological, social, and legal perspectives on policy* (pp. 279–302). University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226166216.003.0013

[56] Towns, D.R. and Broome, K.G. (2003), From small Maria to massive Campbell: Forty years of rat eradications from New Zealand islands. *New Zealand Journal of Zoology*, 30: 377-398. https://doi.org/10.1080/03014223.2003.9518348

[57] Balirwa, J. S., Chapman, C. A., Chapman, L. J., Cowx, I. G., Geheb, K., Kaufman, L., Lowe-McConnell, R. H., Seehausen, O., Wanink, J. H., Welcomme, R. L., & Witte, F. (2003). Biodiversity and fishery sustainability in the Lake Victoria basin: an unexpected marriage?. *BioScience*, 53(8), 703–715. https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2003)053[0703:BAFSIT]2.0.CO;2

[58] Cruz, F., Carrión, V., Campbell, K. J., Lavoie, C., & Donlan, C. J. (2009). Bio-economics of large-scale eradication of feral goats from Santiago Island, Galápagos. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 73(2), 191–200. https://doi.org/10.2193/2007-551

[59] Mačić, V., Albano, P. G., Almpanidou, V., et al. (2018). Biological Invasions in Conservation Planning: A Global Systematic Review. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *5*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2018.00178

[60] Killgore, E. M., Sugiyama, L. S., Barreto, R. W., & Gardner, D. E. (1999). Evaluation of *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* for biological control of *Miconia calvescens* in Hawaii. *Plant Disease*, *83*(10), 964. https://doi.org/10.1094/pdis.1999.83.10.964b

[61] Barun, A., Simberloff, D., Tvrtković, N., & Pascal, M. (2011). Impact of the introduced small Indian mongoose (*Herpestes auropunctatus*) on abundance and activity time of the introduced ship rat (*Rattus rattus*) and the small mammal community on Adriatic islands, Croatia. *NeoBiota, 11*, 51–61. https://doi.org/10.3897/neobiota.11.1819

[62] Howald, G., Donlan, C. J., Galván, J. P., Russell, J. C., Parkes, J., Samaniego, A., Wang, Y., Veitch, D., Genovesi, P., Pascal, M., Saunders, A., & Tershy, B. (2007). Invasive rodent eradication on islands. *Conservation Biology, 21*(5), 1258–1268. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2007.00755.x

[63] Ogutu-Ohwayo, R. (1990). The decline of the native fishes of Lakes Victoria and Kyoga (East Africa) and the impact of introduced species, especially the Nile perch, *Lates niloticus*, and the Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus*. *Environmental Biology of Fishes, 27*(2), 81–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF000019

[64] Carrión, V., Donlan, C. J., Campbell, K. J., Lavoie, C., & Cruz, F. (2011). Archipelago-wide island restoration in the Galápagos Islands: Reducing costs of invasive mammal eradication programs and reinvasion risk. *PLOS ONE, 6*(5), e18835. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0018835

[65] Pimentel, D., Zuniga, R., & Morrison, D. (2005). Update on the environmental and economic costs associated with alien-invasive species in the United States. *Ecological Economics*, 52(3), 273–288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2004.10.002