Do invasive alien plants benefit more from global environmental change than native plants?
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Abstract

Invasive alien plant species threaten native biodiversity, disrupt ecosystem functions and can cause large economic damage. Plant invasions have been predicted to further increase under ongoing global environmental change. Numerous case studies have compared the performance of invasive and native plant species in response to global environmental change components (i.e. changes in mean levels of precipitation, temperature, atmospheric CO2 concentration or nitrogen deposition). Individually, these studies usually involve low numbers of species and therefore the results cannot be generalized. Therefore, we performed a phylogenetically controlled meta-analysis to assess whether there is a general pattern of differences in invasive and native plant performance under each component of global environmental change. We compiled a database of studies that reported performance measures for 74 invasive alien plant species and 117 native plant species in response to one of the above-mentioned global environmental change components. We found that elevated temperature and CO2 enrichment increased the performance of invasive alien plants more strongly than was the case for native plants. Invasive alien plants tended to also have a slightly stronger positive response to increased N deposition and increased precipitation than native plants, but these differences were not significant (N deposition: $P = 0.051$; increased precipitation: $P = 0.679$). Invasive alien plants tended to have a slightly stronger negative response to decreased precipitation than native plants, although this difference was also not significant ($P = 0.060$). So while drought could potentially reduce plant invasion, increases in the four other components of global environmental change considered, particularly global warming and atmospheric CO2 enrichment, may further increase the spread of invasive plants in the future.

Introduction

Across the globe, thousands of plant species have been introduced to biogeographic regions where they are not native (van Kleunen et al., 2015). Some of these introduced plants have since become naturalized, and eventually invasive, whereby they displace native plants and hence threaten native diversity, disrupt ecosystem functions and services, and cause large economic damage (Pimentel et al., 2005; Vilà et al., 2011). Consequently, understanding the mechanisms by which invasive alien plant species outperform native plants in the recipient native communities has become a hot topic in ecology (Funk & Vitousek, 2007; van Kleunen et al., 2010; Leishman et al., 2010; Heberling & Fridley, 2013). With ongoing global environmental change, there is also increasing interest in how the spread of invasive plants may change in the future (Dukes & Mooney, 1999; Bradley et al., 2010a; Jia et al., 2016).

Biotic exchange is itself a major component of global environmental change, but it might be strongly affected by other global change components such as increasing atmospheric CO2 concentrations, increasing temperatures, increasing nitrogen (N) deposition, and increasing or decreasing precipitation. It is thought that these environmental changes are more likely to promote than to inhibit invasive plant performance compared to native plant performance. This is because invasive
plants often exhibit broad environmental tolerance and high phenotypic plasticity, which may confer the capacity to survive in altered environmental conditions (Richards et al., 2006; Davidson et al., 2011). Furthermore, the intrinsically high growth rate characteristic of many invasive plant species (Grotkopp et al., 2010; van Kleunen et al., 2010; Dawson et al., 2011) may enable them to respond more positively to environmental changes that result in increased resource availability (elevated levels of water supply, atmospheric CO₂ concentrations and N deposition) than native plants adapted to low resource conditions (Tilman, 2004). Thus, global environmental change could further promote invasiveness of invasive alien plant species.

The hypothesis that global environmental change may favour performance of invasive plant species more strongly than that of native plants has been subjected to numerous experimental tests. These are usually case studies involving local comparisons of a single pair or a few pairs of invasive and native plant species, and have produced mixed results (Dukes & Mooney, 1999; Bradley et al., 2010a). A few years ago, Sorte et al. (2013) did a meta-analysis on the responses of naturalized alien and native organisms to climate change. Across different types of organisms and ecosystems, naturalized alien species tended to show stronger responses than natives, but, among terrestrial plants, naturalized alien and native plants showed similar responses. That study, however, was not restricted to invasive alien plant species and did not correct for phylogenetic non-independence of the studied species. Although Sorte et al. (2013) did not consider responses to N deposition, which is another major component of global environmental change (Holland et al., 2005; Liu et al., 2013), successful plant species are often associated with a particular suite of traits that enable them to respond more positively to N deposition (Dawson et al., 2012).

Therefore, one could hypothesize that invasive plants are more successful in areas with high N deposition. Indeed, several studies found evidence in support of this hypothesis at a regional scale (Scherer-Lorenzen et al., 2000, 2007; Seabloom et al., 2015). Moreover, a previous meta-analysis also found evidence that in terrestrial plants, invasive species responded more strongly to N deposition than native species (Gonzalez et al., 2010). However, that meta-analysis did not correct for phylogenetic non-independence of the studied species either. Recent studies have shown that inclusion of phylogenetic information can significantly change the outcomes of a meta-analysis (Chamberlain et al., 2012), and hence correction for species relatedness should be an important component of any meta-analysis on variation among species.

Here, we established a database, restricted to plants, with responses of invasive alien and native species to environmental change. We used these data to do a phylogenetically controlled meta-analysis to address the question: (i) Do invasive alien plant species respond more positively (i.e. benefit more) to each component of global environmental change than native plant species? (ii) Which components of global environmental change are likely to favour or inhibit performance of invasive alien plants over native plants? Answering these questions will enable an assessment of whether global environmental change is likely to further increase invasiveness of invasive alien plants and thereby may exacerbate their impacts on native plants in the future.

Materials and methods

Data compilation

To identify studies on performance responses of both native and invasive alien plants to global change, we conducted a literature search for peer-reviewed publications in ISI Web of Science (http://apps.webofknowledge.com/) and Google Scholar using the following search string: ‘climate change’ OR ‘global change’ OR ‘warm*’ OR ‘temperature’ OR ‘nitrogen’ OR ‘nitrogen deposition’ OR ‘CO₂’ OR ‘carbon dioxide’ OR ‘precipitation’ OR ‘watering’ OR ‘drought’ OR ‘rainfall’ AND ‘invasive’ OR ‘alien’ OR ‘non-native’. All published records from 1980 to 30th June 2015 were included in the search. We found two pre-1980 studies on temperature responses of native and invasive species (i.e. Henry & William, 1958; Ashby & Hellmers, 1959), but, as these studies did not provide measures of variation (standard errors or standard deviations), they could not be used for the meta-analysis. We also included studies published in the Chinese language (www.cnki.net). Our searches were limited to studies on plants and resulted in 1036 publications.

We then individually assessed each publication and retained the ones that met each of the three criteria given below. (i) The publication reported effects of manipulating mean values of at least one of the five different components of global environmental change (i.e. increases in temperature, atmospheric CO₂ concentration, N deposition, increased precipitation or a decrease in precipitation) on performance of invasive alien and native plants. Although global environmental change also entails changes in variability, such as the increased frequency of extremes in temperature and precipitation, we focus on changes in means values because only few studies have manipulated variability in global change components. (ii) Publications included at least one invasive alien and one native plant species in the same experiment (origin and invasive status of each species was determined from the respective publications). (iii) Publications reported mean values, sample sizes and variances for performance-related traits of each species. The performance-related traits included in our meta-analysis were direct estimates of fitness (i.e. survival and reproduction), of growth (i.e. biomass and size) and
physiology (i.e. photosynthetic rate, which is likely to increase the performance of plants). In total, 56 publications met these criteria (see Materials and Methods S1), covering 74 invasive alien species and 117 native species. There were a few studies in which it was not clear whether the alien species studied was invasive or not. Such studies were excluded from the analysis presented in the main text. However, analysis with and without data from such studies gave similar results (Tables S1 and S2, Figs S1 and S2). We also considered whether seeds of invasive species were sourced from their native range or their invaded range, as this might influence the performance of plants. Although not all studies provided information on this, seeds of the invasive species appear to be generally sourced from the invaded range. Therefore, the effect of seeds source could not be tested.

We extracted mean values of the performance-related traits mentioned above and their corresponding variances (standard deviations, standard errors or 95%-confidenc intervals) and sample sizes directly from the text or tables, or from figures using the software IMAGE j 1.47v (Rasband, 2013). For all cases of temperature, atmospheric CO2 concentration and soil N, we considered the ambient level (i.e. no treatment level) of an environmental change factor as the ‘control’, and the elevated level of the same factor as the ‘treatment’. However, as precipitation is likely to decrease in some parts of the world and increase in other parts, some studies imposed a drought treatment, whereas others increased watering relative to ambient levels. We considered these as two different types of studies. For studies with decreased water availability relative to ambient, the drought treatment is considered the ‘treatment’, and for studies with increased water availability relative to ambient, the high water availability treatment is considered the ‘treatment’. When performance measures were reported for different time points from the same experiment, we only used the data from the last time point (i.e. we chose the longest duration of the study). When more than one environmental change factor was manipulated in an experiment, we used the performance measures corresponding to manipulation of a single focal global environmental change factor, as the ‘control’, and the elevated level of the same factor as the ‘treatment’. However, as precipitation is likely to decrease in some parts of the world and increase in other parts, some studies imposed a drought treatment, whereas others increased watering relative to ambient levels. We considered these as two different types of studies. For studies with decreased water availability relative to ambient, the drought treatment is considered the ‘treatment’, and for studies with increased water availability relative to ambient, the high water availability treatment is considered the ‘treatment’.

When performance measures were reported for different time points from the same experiment, we only used the data from the last time point (i.e. we chose the longest duration of the study). When more than one environmental change factor was manipulated in an experiment, we used the performance measures corresponding to manipulation of a single focal global environmental change factor, when the other factors were kept at their ambient levels. When the plants were grown under different levels of competition, we included data for all the competition levels (eight of 56 total publications in our meta-analysis manipulated competition).

**Effect size and variance computation**

To examine the effects of global environmental change on native and invasive alien plant performance, we calculated the log response ratio (In R) as the effect size of response variables for each individual performance-related traits of each species per study, following Hedges et al. (1999):

\[
\ln R = \ln \left( \frac{X_t}{X_c} \right) = \ln (X_t) - \ln (X_c).
\]

Here, \(X_t\) and \(X_c\) are the mean values of each individual trait measure in the treatment (t) and control (c), respectively. An ln R value < 0 indicates a decrease in plant performance in response to a change in the environmental change factor; a value >0 indicates an increase in plant performance. The variance of ln R was calculated, following Hedges et al. (1999) as

\[
\sigma^2_{ln R} = \frac{(SD_t)^2}{N_t(X_t)^2} + \frac{(SD_c)^2}{N_c(X_c)^2}
\]

Here, \(N_t\), \(N_c\), SD_o, SD_c, \(\bar{X}_t\), and \(\bar{X}_c\) are sample sizes, standard deviations and mean values for traits measured in the treatment and control, respectively. Because some studies reported different measures of performance-related traits for the same plant species, we pooled the multiple effect sizes (weighted by the inverse variance) and corresponding variances per study to avoid pseudoreplication (Leimu et al., 2006). Pooling was done using the fixed-effect model (using the rma function in R package METAFORE), because we assumed that there is a single, true underlying effect size per species in a study (Borestein et al., 2009). The resulting 252 effect sizes and corresponding mean variances were used in the analyses described below.

**Data analysis**

All meta-analytical calculations and statistical analyses were performed in R 3.1.3 (R Core Team, 2015) using the package METAFORE v1.9-7 (Viechtbauer, 2010). First, to test whether the plants, on average, exhibited significant positive or negative responses to environmental change regardless of their invasive status, we performed a general meta-analysis using a random-effects model (i.e. we assumed that there is true random variation among effect sizes, as is thought to be the case for ecological data; Gurvenich & Hedges, 2001). Then, to test whether native and invasive alien plants differed significantly in their performance responses to each of the different components of global environmental change (increases in mean levels of precipitation, temperature, atmospheric CO2 levels or N deposition, or a decrease in mean levels of precipitation) separately, we constructed mixed-effects multivariate models using the rma.mv function. In the models, plant invasive status was included as a fixed-effects moderator. Other fixed-effects moderators were also considered but either had insufficient data, no variance or did not affect the results and so were not presented in this study. Because some studies included multiple pairs of invasive alien and native plant species, yielding multiple effect sizes per study, and some plant species were used in multiple studies, we included study (i.e. publications from which we extracted the data) and species identity as random factors in the models above.

To control for possible nonindependence of effect sizes from species with shared evolutionary history, we also included phylogenetic relatedness among the study species in the models above by including the variance–covariance matrix of species relatedness as an additional random factor. To get the variance–covariance matrix, we first constructed a base tree using the online program PHYLOMATIC (Webb & Donoghue, 2005). Polytomies within this base tree were then resolved as far as possible using published molecular phylogenies (see Materials and Methods S2). The phylogenetic tree was then transformed to an ultrametric tree using the compute.brlen function in the package APE v 3.2 (Paradis et al., 2004). Finally, a variance–covariance matrix was calculated from the
ultrametric tree, representing phylogenetic relatedness among species, using the ultrametric function in the package ape v 3.2.

In each model, we computed weighted mean effect sizes and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the moderator levels (invasive, native). We considered a mean effect size estimate to be significantly different from zero if the 95% CI around the mean did not include zero. In these models, total heterogeneity ($Q_\text{H}$) in effect sizes can be partitioned into heterogeneity explained by the model structure ($Q_\text{M}$) and unexplained heterogeneity ($Q_\text{U}$). We used the $Q_\text{M}$ test (Koricheva et al., 2013) to test for a significant difference in the mean effect size between native and invasive alien plant species for the moderator.

**Publication bias**

In many research fields, there is a bias against publishing negative results (Rosenthal, 1979). Hence, to assess whether there is evidence for a publication bias in our meta-data set, we used a funnel plot and Egger’s regression. A funnel plot graphs effect sizes against standard errors and assumes that studies with the largest sample sizes will have lower standard errors, and hence will be near the average effect size, while studies with smaller sample sizes will show a larger spread on both sides of the average effect size (Koricheva et al., 2014). Deviations from this expected pattern can indicate publication bias (Koricheva et al., 2014). Positive asymmetry in a funnel plot is typically taken to indicate bias, in that studies with positive effects are published with a greater frequency than studies with negative effects (Koricheva et al., 2014). We first graphed the funnel plots using the funnel function and visually inspected funnel plots of standard errors or replicate numbers vs. standardized effect sizes for the presence of asymmetry (Egger et al., 1997; Sterne & Egger, 2001). We then formally tested the asymmetry of funnel plots using Egger’s test which is widely used for detecting publication bias (Sterne & Egger, 2006) using the regtest function.

**Results**

In the analysis that did not consider the invasive status of the species, increases in mean levels of atmospheric CO2 concentration and N deposition had significantly positive effects on average plant performance (Table S3, Fig. S3). Increased temperatures and increased precipitation also had net positive effects on average plant performance, but these effects were not significantly different from zero (Table S3, Fig. S3). On the other hand, a decrease in the mean level of precipitation had a significantly negative effect on average plant performance (Table S3, Fig. S3). In the separate analyses for each component of global environmental change in which we considered the invasive status (invasive vs. native) of the plant species, elevated temperature and elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations resulted in significantly larger increases in performance for invasive alien plants than for native plants (Table 1, Fig. 1). Invasive alien plants tended to have a slightly stronger positive response to increased N deposition and increased precipitation than native plants, but these differences were only marginally significant for N deposition and not significant for precipitation (Table 1, Fig. 1). On the other hand, invasive alien plants tended to have a slightly stronger negative response to decreased precipitation than native plants, and this difference was marginally significant (Table 1, Fig. 1).

**Table 1** Results of a phylogenetically informed meta-analysis comparing invasive alien and native plant species for differences in response to environmental change (i.e. increased and decreased precipitation, elevated temperature, elevated atmospheric CO2 levels and nitrogen deposition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator</th>
<th>Number of Effect sizes</th>
<th>Effect sizes Mean Lower 95% CI</th>
<th>Random effects (variance component)</th>
<th>$Q_\text{M}$ tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreased precipitation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-0.5852 -0.1884 -0.9820</td>
<td>Species: 0.0038 Phylogeny: 0.0505 Study: -0.2850</td>
<td>$Q_\text{M}$ 3.4857 df 1 $P_{0.0619}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.4619 -0.0711 -0.8526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased precipitation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3115 -0.2688 0.8917</td>
<td>Species: -0.1380 Phylogeny: 0.0968 Study: 0.0596</td>
<td>$Q_\text{M}$ 0.1716 df 1 $P_{0.6787}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.2213 -0.2704 0.7131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated temperature</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.3827 0.0250 0.7404</td>
<td>Species: 0.0438 Phylogeny: 0.0212 Study: 0.2359</td>
<td>$Q_\text{M}$ 9.4482 df 1 $P_{0.0021}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.0775 -0.2607 0.4157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated CO2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.2932 0.1688 0.4175</td>
<td>Species: 0.0343 Phylogeny: 0.0000 Study: 0.0314</td>
<td>$Q_\text{M}$ 6.1477 df 1 $P_{0.0132}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.1300 0.0055 0.2544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated nitrogen</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.6556 0.3696 0.9416</td>
<td>Species: 0.0573 Phylogeny: 0.0182 Study: 0.1390</td>
<td>$Q_\text{M}$ 3.8164 df 1 $P_{0.0508}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.4739 0.1931 0.7547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis was performed for each component of global change individually. In the analysis, the $Q_\text{M}$ statistic and associated $P$ value test for a difference between invasive alien plants and native plants. A significant (or marginally significant) difference between invasive and native plants is marked in bold font.
Our results thus suggest that particularly elevated temperature, elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations and N deposition may further promote invasiveness of the invasive alien plant species, while decreased precipitation (i.e. drought) might inhibit it.

Overall, invasive plants benefited more from increases in the global environmental change components than native plants did. This result is concordant with the finding of a meta-analysis by Davidson et al. (2011) that invasive plants are more phenotypically plastic than co-occurring noninvasive plants across several different types of environmental variations. A previous meta-analysis on trait differences between invasive and noninvasive (mostly native) plant species found that, on average, invasive plant species had significantly higher values than native plants for traits reflecting physiology, size and fitness (van Kleunen et al., 2010). Combined with our results, this suggests that invasive plants may even more strongly outperform native plants under increases in global environmental changes in the future.

Our findings contrast to some extent with results of a recent meta-analysis by Sorte et al. (2013) who evaluated the responses of alien and native organisms, including both plants and animals, to elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations, warming and changes in precipitation, in terrestrial, marine and freshwater ecosystems. They found that alien and native organisms, primarily plants, in terrestrial ecosystems did not significantly differ in their responses to environmental changes. Nevertheless, some of the patterns that we found are in line with the patterns that Sorte et al. (2013) found. The results of Sorte et al. (2013) indicate a slight tendency for stronger responses to increases in CO2 and precipitation among alien species than among native species. There are several possible explanations for why the results or the statistical significances deviate between two studies. First, we used the log response ratio (ln R) as effect size to quantify the different plastic responses to environmental changes between invasive and native plants, while Sorte et al. (2013) used the ratio of the difference between treatment and control responses to the average of responses across treatment and control conditions. Second, we only evaluated responses of plants to environmental change rather than combining plants and animals. Third, we focused on the comparison between natives and invasive aliens, while Sorte et al. (2013) compared natives with naturalized aliens, which are not necessarily invasive. Fourth, we included studies that were published after 2013 and thus were not included in Sorte et al. (2013) meta-analysis.

In all analyses, the variance components associated with phylogenetic history were low (Tables 1 and S1–S3), indicating that the effect sizes used were largely phylogenetically independent. Visual inspection of the funnel plot and Egger’s test for asymmetry of the funnel plot showed that the results were not significantly affected by a publication bias (z = -0.887, p = 0.375; Fig. S4).

**Discussion**

Many invasive alien plant species have a broader environmental tolerance and a higher phenotypic plasticity than native plants (Richards et al., 2006; Davidson et al., 2011). Hence invasive plants have been hypothesized to benefit more from global environmental change than native plants do (Dukes & Mooney, 1999; Davidson et al., 2011). The present synthesized results of a phylogenetically controlled meta-analysis partly support this hypothesis. The separate analyses of the individual global change components showed that elevated temperature, elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations and N deposition might favour performance of invasive plants relative to that of native plants. Decreased precipitation, on the other hand, might inhibit performance of invasive plants more relative to that of native plants.
et al. (2013). Whatever the exact reason for the discrepancies, in contrast to Sorte et al. (2013), who mainly found differences in the responses of alien and native organisms in aquatic systems, we now provide evidence that similar differences exist for terrestrial plants.

Invasive plants took significantly more advantage of CO2 enrichment than native plants did. Plants with the C3 photosynthetic pathway are thought to take more advantage of CO2 enrichment than plants with a C4 pathway (Pearcy & Ehleringer, 1984; Poorter, 1993). Thus, the present results could also reflect differences in photosynthetic pathways between invasive and native plants in our study. However, because invasive and native plants had similar numbers of species characterized by C3 (invasive: n = 35; native: n = 35) and C4 (invasive: n = 4; native: n = 7) photosynthetic pathways in our analysis, the photosynthetic pathway likely played little role in differences between invasive and native plant responses to CO2 enrichment. Therefore, increased CO2 concentration likely favoured performance of invasive plants over native plants through direct (enhanced growth rate) and indirect (enhanced resource capture) mechanisms regardless of photosynthetic pathway.

Increased elevated CO2 had stronger positive effects on performance of invasive plant species than of native plant species. Warming can directly affect photosynthesis and resource uptake (Llorens et al., 2004; Blumenthal et al., 2013), increase the duration of the growth period of a plant (Penuelas et al., 2002) and could also induce a higher soil nutrient availability through increased mineralization (Rustad et al., 2001). Generally, native plants have a long evolutionary history under ambient temperatures and thus are adapted to the ambient temperature, whereas they might not be optimally adapted to novel temperature conditions created by global warming. Although invasive plant species are locally adapted as frequently as native plants are (Oduor et al., 2016), invasive plants may naturally be pre-adapted to a wider range of temperatures (Bradley et al., 2015), and hence warming could enhance invasiveness of these alien plants.

Invasive plant species have often been introduced from more nitrogen-rich habitats and are thus more likely to be adapted to environments with high nitrogen levels (Dostál et al., 2013). A previous study also showed a positive correlation between N deposition and abundance of invasive plant species at a regional scale (Scherer-Lorenzen et al., 2007). This indicates that increased N deposition could promote plant invasion (Bradley et al., 2010a). Our meta-analysis tentatively supports this, because we found that the response of invasive plants to increased N deposition was marginally significantly higher than that of native plants. Our finding is in line with previous cross-species studies (Scherer-Lorenzen et al., 2000) and also with a previous meta-analysis showing that nitrogen enrichment favoured invasive terrestrial plant species over native terrestrial plants (Gonzalez et al., 2010). A recent study showed that in many grasslands, introduced plant species respond more strongly to nitrogen enrichment than native plant species do (Seabloom et al., 2015). Thus, the idea that invasive plants benefit more from increased nitrogen than native plants do seems to find general support, despite the marginal significance of this difference in our meta-analysis.

While atmospheric CO2 concentration, temperature and N deposition are likely to further increase in most parts of the world, precipitation is likely to increase in some regions and decrease in other regions (Naz et al., 2016). Moreover, there is a high uncertainty around the predictions of future precipitation levels, and it is likely that the frequency of extremely dry and wet years will increase (IPCC, 2013). Therefore, it is important to distinguish studies that increased from those that decreased the water availability relative to ambient levels (Sorte et al., 2013). Our meta-analysis indicated that invasive plant species tended to take more advantage of higher water availability, but that this difference was not significant. On the other hand, invasive plants tended to be slightly less drought tolerant than native plants, although this was only marginally significant. Sorte et al. (2013) found similar patterns for responses to changes in precipitation between alien and native organisms as we did, and the differences in their meta-analysis were also not statistical significant. The patterns revealed by both meta-analyses were quite similar due to the high degree of overlap in publications used for this global change component (13 out of 16 publications used in our study were also used in Sorte et al., 2013). Generally, invasive plant species tend to use more water than native plant species do (Cavaleri & Sack, 2010). Consequently, increases in precipitation may favour and, conversely, decreases in precipitation could inhibit invasive plant species more so than native plant species (Bradley et al., 2010b). Such patterns are also in line with the results of several field experiments (Levine et al., 2010; Ziska & Dukes, 2014). Our finding thus tentatively suggests that invasiveness of many currently invasive alien plants might decrease when the climate becomes drier.

The present meta-analysis has quantitatively summarized the patterns of invasive and native plant species’ responses to individual components of global environmental change. However, many of these components change simultaneously, and these changes may additively or interactively impact plant performance (Dukes et al., 2005; Bloor et al., 2010; Dieleman et al., 2012). For instance, elevated CO2 can enhance water-use efficiency.
and thereby increase plant productivity under drier conditions (Blumenthal et al., 2013). On the other hand, warming often reduces soil moisture and increases water use, thus negating the water-saving effects of elevated CO2 (Cantarel et al., 2013). So, while some of the effects of different individual global change components may act in the same direction (Zavaleta et al., 2003), others may act antagonistically (Williams et al., 2007). Despite the potential importance of co-occurring environmental changes, few studies to date (only eight out of the 56 publications included in our meta-analysis) have examined invasive and native species’ responses to more than one global change component at a time. Therefore, the question as to what is the relative significance as well as the interactive effects of environmental change components on performance of invasive and native plants remains largely unexplored empirically.

In a summary, our meta-analysis revealed that invasive alien plant species benefited from elevated mean temperature and atmospheric CO2 concentrations more so than native plants. There were similar patterns in response to increased N deposition and increases in precipitation (although the results were not significant). Among the native species, there was also wide variation in their responses, suggesting that some of them might benefit and expand their ranges. Similarly, among the invasive species, some species might benefit less than others under increased levels of the different global change components. Despite this variation within groups, overall, our findings suggest that global change drivers that create favourable environmental conditions, particularly elevated temperature and atmospheric CO2 concentrations, will further increase the invasiveness of invasive alien plants in the future.
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**Table S2.** Results of a phylogenetically informed meta-analysis comparing alien (included both invasive and non-invasive alien plants) and native plant species for differences in environmental change (i.e. increased and decreased precipitation, elevated temperature, elevated atmospheric CO2 levels, and nitrogen deposition).

**Table S3.** Results of a phylogenetically informed meta-analysis of plant species response to environmental change (i.e. increased and decreased precipitation, elevated temperature, elevated atmospheric CO2 levels, and nitrogen deposition) regardless of a plant invasive status (invasive alien or native).

**Figure S1.** Performance responses (indicated by log response ratio mean effect sizes) of plant species to drivers of global environmental change (increased and decreased precipitation, elevated temperature, elevated atmospheric CO2 levels, and nitrogen deposition) regardless of a plant origin (i.e. alien and native).

**Figure S2.** Performance responses (indicated by log response ratio mean effect sizes) of native (blue symbols) and alien (invasive and possibly non-invasive) plant species (red symbols) to drivers of global environmental change (increased and decreased precipitation, elevated temperature, elevated atmospheric CO2 levels, and nitrogen deposition).

**Figure S3.** Performance response (indicated by log response ratio mean effect sizes) of plant species to drivers of global environmental change (increased and decreased precipitation, elevated temperature, elevated atmospheric CO2 levels, and nitrogen deposition) regardless of a plant invasive status (i.e. invasive alien and native).

**Figure S4.** A funnel plot showing the relationship between effect size (ln R) and the inverse of the standard error (i.e. a test for publication bias).