ORIGINAL PAPER



Differences in interactions of aboveground and belowground herbivores on the invasive plant *Alternanthera philoxeroides* and native host *A. sessilis*

Hui Wei · Minyan He · Xinmin Lu · Jianqing Ding

Received: 29 January 2016/Accepted: 12 July 2016/Published online: 19 July 2016 © Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2016

Abstract Plant invasions may result in novel plantherbivore interactions. However, we know little about whether and how invasive plants can mediate native above- and belowground herbivore interactions. In this study, we conducted greenhouse experiments to examine the interaction between a native defoliating beetle, Cassida piperata, and a native root-knot nematode, Meloidogyne incognita, on the invasive alligator weed, Alternanthera philoxeroides. We also included their native host A. sessilis in the experiments to examine whether the patterns of above- and belowground herbivore interaction vary with host plants (invasive vs. native). We analyzed total carbon and nitrogen in leaves and roots attacked by M. incognita and C. piperata. M. incognita slightly negatively affected feeding by C. piperata on A. philoxeroides, and the leaf area damaged decreased as the number of *M. incognita* increased. *M. incognita* had a negative impact on total leaf nitrogen, but had no

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (doi:10.1007/s10530-016-1234-y) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

H. Wei \cdot M. He \cdot X. Lu \cdot J. Ding (\boxtimes) Key Laboratory of Aquatic Botany and Watershed Ecology, Wuhan Botanical Garden, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan 430074, Hubei, China e-mail: ding@wbgcas.cn

H. Wei University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China impact on total leaf carbon. *M. incognita* egg production on *A. philoxeroides* roots decreased as the amount of damage caused by *C. piperata* increased. Herbivory by *C. piperata* did not affect total root carbon or nitrogen. *M. incognita* and *C. piperata* did not affect each other on the native plant *A. sessilis*. These results suggest that invasive plants can mediate native aboveand belowground herbivore interactions. The knowledge of how invasive plants affect those interactions is crucial for better understanding the impacts of biological invasions on native above- and belowground organisms.

Keywords Above- and belowground interaction · Novel interactions · *Meloidogyne incognita* · *Cassida piperata* · Alligator weed

Introduction

Many studies have indicated that while invasive plants leave behind their co-evolved enemies, mutualists, and competitors from their native regions (Keane and Crawley 2002; Nuñez and Dickie 2014), they inevitably establish novel associations with herbivores from introduced regions (Colautti et al. 2004). Agrawal et al. (2005) suggested that invasive plants can be easily attacked by generalist herbivores as well as consumers of plants in exotic regions phylogenetically related to invasive plants, including aboveground herbivores and soil organisms. Although the effects of those generalists on invasive plants have received a lot of attentions (see Levine et al. 2004; Chun et al. 2010; Cushman et al. 2011), we have little knowledge about whether invasive plants can affect interactions between root and shoot herbivores from invaded ranges.

Plants can mediate above- and belowground herbivore interactions (Wardle et al. 2004; van der Putten et al. 2009; Johnson et al. 2012). Foliar herbivory may induce primary metabolites allocation to root for tissue re-growth or storage of substrates for biosynthesis of root defensive compounds (Schwachtje and Baldwin 2008; Orians et al. 2011), which may in turn affect root feeding herbivores. For example, foliar herbivory increased sugars allocating to root in Nicotiana attenuata L. (Solanaceae) (Schwachtje et al. 2006). Soler et al. (2007) reported shoot damage by *Pieris* brassicae L. (Pieridae) increased indole glucosinolates concentrations in root, resulting in a negative impact on root herbivores. On the other hand, damage caused by root-feeding organisms can lead to a similar response as drought stress (Masters et al. 1993), which causes an increase of soluble nitrogen and carbon in plant shoots, increasing plant nutritional quality for aboveground herbivore (Masters and Brown 1997). Also, root-feeding herbivores may disrupt synthesis of secondary metabolites that are transported between roots and leaves, leading to decreasing resistance to aboveground herbivores (Erb et al. 2009). Kaplan et al. (2008) demonstrated that a root-feeding nematode, Meloidogyne incognita (Kofoid and White 1919) Chitwood (1949) (Heteroderidae) inhibited foliar nicotine dynamics, resulting in positive effects on aboveground herbivores. Therefore, host plant traits which can be systematically induced by herbivores play an important role in the linkage of above- and belowground herbivores (Bezemer and van Dam 2005).

Plant chemistry is highly species-specific and diverse among species. Invasive plants may possess unique phytochemicals differing from native plants (Cappuccino and Arnason 2006), which can affect native above- and belowground herbivores, soil pathogens and decomposer organisms (Callaway et al. 2008; Schaffner et al. 2011). A recent study reported that a group of invasive Asteraceae plants had more species—unique metabolites and higher total number of metabolites than native congeners,

resulting in poor performance of the generalist herbivore [Mamestra brassicae L. (Noctuidae)] on most of invasive species (Senecio inaequidens D.C., Solidago gigantea Ait and Artemisia biennis Willd.) compared to their native congeners (Macel et al. 2014). Moreover, invasive plants may evolve and allocate resource from defense to growth due to enemy release (see Blossey and Notzold 1995; Siemann and Rogers 2003; Feng et al. 2009), which may affect both above- and belowground herbivores (Huang et al. 2012). Thus, above- and belowground interactions may vary between invasive and native hosts.

Native to South America, Alternanthera philoxeroides (Mart.) Griseb (Amaranthaceae) is a noxious weed that can now be found invasive in North America, Asia and Australia (Julien et al. 1995). A. sessilis (L.) R.Br. ex DC. (Amaranthaceae) is the only native congener of A. philoxeroides in China, and as such it has often been used for comparison with A. philoxeroides because they share the same phylogenetic history, and sympatrically distributed in terrestrial, semi-aquatic, and aquatic habitats (Li 1998; Geng et al. 2006; Pan et al. 2006). In China, several native generalist defoliators were found on A. philoxeroides, including Prodenia litura (Fabricius) (Noctuidae) and Spoladea recurvalis (Fabricius) (Crambidae) (Lin et al. 1990), as well as a native oligophagous beetle, Cassida piperata Hope (Chrysomelidae) which mainly occurs on the native species Chenopodium album L. (Chenopodiaceae) and A. sessilis (Lin et al. 1990). A recent study found that C. piperata has been expanding its host range to A. philoxeroides (Dai et al. 2014). A native root-knot nematode M. incognita was broadly found to cause damage to the roots of both A. philoxeroides and A. sessilis in China (Mao et al. 2011). Previous studies found that shoot removal increased soluble carbon concentration and decreased nitrogen concentration in roots of A. philoxeroides (Schooler et al. 2007). A. philoxeroides possessed higher leaf nitrogen, lignin and cellulose concentrations than A. sessilis, but cellulose and polyphenolic concentrations were higher in A. sessilis leaves than in A. philoxeroides leaves after defoliating by a native generalist herbivore (Fan et al. 2013).

In this study, we investigated whether *A. philoxeroides* could mediate the interaction between the native defoliator *C. piperata* and the root-knot nematode *M. incognita*. We predicted that nutrients allocated to *A. philoxeroides* root may decrease with increasing aboveground herbivory, resulting in negative impact on root-knot nematode, and vice versa. We also included the native congener *A. sessilis* to examine whether the patterns of above- and below-ground herbivores interaction vary with host plants (invasive vs. native).

Materials and methods

Study species

Alternanthera philoxeroides is a perennial and stoloniferous herbaceous plant. In its invaded region, A. philoxeroides can reproduce asexually, usually from apical stem buds and axillary stem or root buds, and can form dense monocultures in terrestrial, semiaquatic, and aquatic habitats (Julien et al. 1995). Its native range includes Brazil, Paraguay, and Argentina (Vogt et al. 1979). Alternanthera philoxeroides was first introduced into China as forage in the later 1930s, and then widely dispersed in southern and central China in the middle of 1970s (Fan et al. 2013). The invasion of A. philoxeroides always results in the loss of native species and large economic losses in agriculture and aquaculture (Pan et al. 2007). Cooccurring with A. philoxeroides in many habitats but native to China, A. sessilis is also a stoloniferous and amphibious perennial herbaceous plant with sexual or clonal growth (Li 1998).

Cassida piperata is an oligophagous defoliator that feeds on some plants in the Amaranthaceae and Chenopodiaceae (Lin et al. 1990). The beetle naturally occurs in Siberia, Korea, Japan, Vietnam, Philippines, as well as a large area of China (Tan 1994). *Cassida piperata* has two to four generations per year and overwinters as an adult (Lin et al. 1990). Both larvae and adults feed on leaves of *A. philoxeroides* and *A. sessilis*, leaving transparent membranes or large holes.

Meloidogyne incognita is a world-widely distributed root-knot nematode in agriculture and seminatural systems (Castagnone-Sereno et al. 2013). *Meloidogyne incognita* is capable of reproducing in >2000 species of plants (Sasser 1980). It needs 3–4 weeks to complete its life cycle at the optimum temperature range of 20–30 °C (Liu 2000). Infective second-stage juveniles can penetrate epidermis cells and migrate intracellularly toward the vascular cylinder (Wyss and Zunke 1986). Giant cells that are metabolically active are induced at the feeding sites, forming a strong nutrient sink with highly upregulated transport processes (McClure 1977).

For this study, *C. piperata* larvae were collected on *A. philoxeroides* in fields near the Wuhan Botanical Garden of the Chinese Academy of Sciences $(30^{\circ}32'44.5'' \text{ N}, 114^{\circ}24'45.6''\text{E})$ in Hubei Province, China. Larvae were reared on potted *A. philoxeroides* or *A. sessilis* in the laboratory, and the offspring of these colonies were used for tests on *A. philoxeroides* or *A. sessilis* in our experiments. Meanwhile, the eggs of *M. incognita* were collected from infected roots of native tomato plants [*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill. (Solanaceae)] from a farm in the suburban of Wuhan. They were extracted from the cyst using 0.5–1 % sodium hypochlorite solution which can destroy the cyst and allow obtaining eggs (Barker 1985).

Experimental design

Experiment 1. The impact of belowground herbivore on aboveground herbivore To assess the effects of root-knot nematode (M. incognita) on defoliator (C. piperata) with A. philoxeroides and A. sessilis as host plants, we conducted a greenhouse experiment at the Wuhan Botanical Garden from June to August in 2013, with the temperature around 26-28 °C. We changed the position of the pots every 15 days to minimize the impacts of light and temperature. In early June, stems of A. philoxeroides and A. sessilis collected near Wuhan Botanical Garden were cut to a similar size (4–5 cm lengths, each with one node) and planted in seedling trays with sterilized soil in a greenhouse. Three weeks later, when seedlings of A. philoxeroides and A. sessilis were 15 and 10 cm lengths respectively, we transplanted them singly into 500 ml pots containing a growing medium and all the pots were immediately covered with nylon cages (70 cm high). The growing medium was composed with 25 % sphagnum peat moss, as well as 75 % field soil collected from a wasteland in Wuhan Botanical Garden where A. philoxeroides and A. sessilis are common. Soils were sieved and large root fragments were removed. Soils were then homogenized and autoclaved at 0.15 m pa, 120 °C for 1.5 h to kill rootknot nematodes with an autoclave sterilizer (YXQ.WY21.600, Zhengzhou Nanbeiyi instrument and equipment Co. Ltd, China). Plants were

supplemented with nutrients weekly using Hoagland's nutrient solution (the proportion of nutrient: nitrogen: 117 mg/L and phosphorus: 24 mg/L). Seedlings of each species were randomly assigned to different nematode egg densities with c. 0, 2000, 5000, 10,000, or 20,000 eggs. Each treatment (species × nematode egg density) was repeated ten times and 50 seedlings were used for each Alternanthera species. The seedlings of each species that did not receive eggs served as controls.

Three weeks after M. incognita-inoculation, six newly hatched C. *piperata* larvae from a laboratory colony were applied to each control and M. incognita infested plant. We used similar-sized larvae (ANOVA, $F_{1, 40} = 0.63, P = 0.6438$), excluding any individuals that were unusually large or small. At the end of the experiment, when all the C. piperata larvae pupated 11 days after larval release, we estimated the amount of damage the plant experienced by scanning foliage on a piece of 10×10 grid graph paper with a flatbed scanner. We also measured the leaf area removed by C. piperata on each seedling using Adobe Photoshop CS 8.0.1 (Adobe System Incorporate, US). Percent of leaf damage was calculated as the ratio between leaf area consumed by larvae and total leaf area. In addition, to measure larval performance, we weighed (nearest 0.00001 g) and counted the number of the larvae and pupae, and then calculated the survival and pupation rates.

Plant leaves were collected individually, dried (5 days at 40 °C), weighed (nearest 0.0001 g) and ground up with a mortar for analyzing total carbon and nitrogen. To obtain sufficient samples for total carbon and nitrogen analysis, we mixed the powder from the same treatment (0.5-1 g for each sample). Then they were analyzed for total carbon and nitrogen in an elemental auto analyzer (Vario MAX CN, Elementar, GmbH, Hanau, Germany). Shoots were clipped, dried (48 h at 80 °C) and weighed. Roots were dug up and washed. All roots were stained and decolored individually with a modified sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl)-acid fuchsine-glycerin technique (Bybd Jr et al. 1983; Liu 2000). The number of nematodes were dissected and counted under an anatomical lens (adult nematodes were stained red) after removing the excessive solutions by rinsing in running water. We collected all dissected roots and nematodes individually, dried (48 h at 80 °C) and weighed.

Experiment 2. The impact of aboveground herbivore on belowground herbivore To investigate the impact of defoliation (C. piperata) on M. incognita on A. philoxeroides and A. sessilis, we conducted a greenhouse experiment from August to October in 2013. In mid-August, we prepared plant seedlings and soils as described in Experiment 1. Four weeks later, the roots of all plants were inoculated with c. 3500 M. incognita eggs obtained from a laboratory culture. This egg density is well within the range of infected-root of A. philoxeroides and A. sessilis observed in the field (Wei et al. unpublished data). At the same time, seedlings of each species used in treatments received 0, 1, 2, 3 or 5 newly hatched larvae of C. piperata, while seedlings of each species received no insects as controls. Each treatment (species \times larvae defoliation) was repeated ten times and 50 seedlings were used for each Alternathera species. After 2 weeks, we removed the C. piperata larvae because a previous study showed that the leaf nitrogen, lignin, cellulose and polyphenolic concentrations in both A. philoxeroides and A. sessilis were changed after 19 days of defoliation (Fan et al. 2013).

At the end of the experiment, when *M. incognita* completed one generation in two Alternanthera plants (30 days after nematode inoculation according to pilot study), we collected the damaged leaves of each species and scanned them on a piece of 10×10 grid graph paper with a flatbed scanner, measuring the leaf area on each plant that had been removed by C. piperata using Adobe Photoshop CS 8.0.1. The aboveground was clipped, dried and weighed. The roots were dug and washed. The number of root knots was counted firstly, then eggs were extracted from all roots and counted (as per Experiment 1). The roots were randomly divided into two subsamples for each Alternanthera species. One was used to count the number of nematodes using the method mentioned in Experiment 1. The roots were dried (48 h at 80 °C) and weighed. To exam the impact of C. piperata larval density on root nutrient concentrations, the other subsamples were rinsed to remove NaOCl solution, dried (5 days at 40 °C), weighed and ground up with a mortar for analyzing carbon and nitrogen (after Experiment 1). The number of nematode of the subsamples were estimated based on the relationship between the number of root knots (NNO) and nematodes(NNE) Alternathera for each species

Table 1Summary ofGLMs on the effect of hostplant species (Species), rootfeeding nematodeMeloidogyne incognita(Nematode) and theirinteraction on Cassidapiperata larvalperformances, as well asplant growth and nutrientconcentration at the end ofExperiment 1	Response variable	Source of variance	<i>d.f.</i>	F-value	Р
	Plant mass	Species (S)	1,86	45.75	<.0001***
		Nematode (N)	4,86	3.48	0.01**
		$S \times N$	4,86	1.75	0.15
	Root-to-shoot mass ratio	Species (S)	1,86	2	0.16
		Nematode (N)	4,86	10.51	<.0001***
		$S \times N$	4,86	8.28	<.0001***
	Leaf carbon	Species (S)	1,14	55.75	<.0001***
		Nematode (N)	4,14	0.32	0.86
		$S \times N$	4,14	0.79	0.55
	Leaf nitrogen	Species (S)	1,14	24.82	0.0002***
		Nematode (N)	4,14	1.44	0.27
		$S \times N$	4,14	4.22	0.02*
	Carbon-to-nitrogen ratio	Species (S)	1,13	33.91	<.0001***
		Nematode (N)	4,13	0.54	0.71
		$S \times N$	4,13	2.94	0.06
	Larval mass	Species (S)	1,90	27.69	<.0001***
		Nematode (N)	4,90	1.48	0.21
		$S \times N$	4,90	1.24	0.3
	Larvae survival	Species (S)	1,90	1.27	0.26
		Nematode (N)	4,90	1.11	0.35
		$S \times N$	4,90	0.87	0.48
	Pupation rate	Species (S)	1,90	3.28	0.07
		Nematode (N)	4,90	0.66	0.6
		$S \times N$	4,90	0.63	0.64
	No. adult nematode g^{-1} root	Species (S)	1,90	78.2	<.0001***
		Nematode (N)	4,90	48.4	<.0001***
*P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001		S × N	4,90	6.8	<.0001***

[A. philoxeroides: NNE = 1.641 + 1.106 NNO (r²) = 0.795, P < 0.0001), and A. sessilis: NNE = 1.610NNO-12.317 (r² = 0.801, P < 0.0001)].

Statistical analysis

In Experiment 1, we conducted General Linear Model (GLM) to test the impact of *M. incognita* egg density and host plant species on larval mass, larval survival and pupation rate and number of adult nematodes in roots. Larval mortality and pupation rate were arcsine transformed while the number of adult nematodes was square root transformed to meet the assumption of normality. We also employed GLM to exam the impact of *M. incognita* egg density and host plant species on plant mass and the ratio of root to shoot mass (RtoS) and leaf carbon, nitrogen and the ratio of carbon to nitrogen (C/N). Pearson product-moment correlation was used to determine the relationship between the final overall number of *M. incognita* in the roots and the percent of leaf damage from C. piperata for the two host species respectively, where the number of *M. incognita* were square root transformed to meet assumption of normality.

In Experiment 2, we ran GLM to test the impact of C. piperata larval density and host plant species on the number of adult M. incognita and M. incognita egg production. The data were squareroot transformed to improve normality. We also conducted GLM to test the impact of C. piperata larval density and host plant species on plant mass and RtoS, as well as total carbon, nitrogen and C/N



Fig. 1 The impact of native root feeding nematode *M. incognita* on plant nitrogen (**a**) and carbon (**b**) concentration of the invasive plant (*Alternanthera philoxeroides, black bar*) and native plant (*Alternanthera sessilis, grey bar*) at the end of Experiment 1. The values are means (\pm SE) of plant nitrogen and carbon concentrations. See Table 1 for the associated analysis of variances. Means sharing *same letters* indicate no significant difference (*P* < 0.05)

in root. In addition, we used Pearson productmoment correlation to test the relationship between overall damage area (mm² of leaf tissue removed) and the number of adult *M. incognita*, as well as its relationship with *M. incognita* egg production at the end of the experiment. Damaged area was square root transformed and the number of adult *M. incognita* and fecundity were \log_{10} transformed to meet the assumption of normality. We conducted adjusted means partial difference (P < 0.05) to examine the differences among treatments for significant interaction terms. All data analyses were performed using SAS 8.1 (SAS Institute Inc, NC, USA).



Fig. 2 Pearson's product correlation between number of native root feeding nematode (*Meloidogyne incognita*) and the percent of leaf damage from native leaf feeding larval beetle (*Cassida piperata*) on the invasive (*Alternanthera philoxeroides*, filled circle) and native (*Alternanthera sessilis, open circle*) host plants. Data were collected 32 days after *M. incognita* egg inoculation in Experiment 1. The *trend line* indicate a significantly negative relationship between *M. incognita* and *C. piperata* hosted on *A. philoxeroides*: y = -0.27x + 32.51, $r^2 = 0.1, P = 0.025$, where y is the percent of leaf damage from larval *C. piperata* and x is the number of adult *M. incognita*

Results

The impact of belowground herbivore on aboveground herbivore

Host plant species and *M. incognita* egg density significantly affected plant growth, but not their interaction (Table 1). *Meloidogyne incognita* egg density greatly increased RtoS, especially in *A. sessilis* (Table S 1). Additionally, *A. philoxeroides* leaf nitrogen concentration significantly decreased when the *M. incognita* egg densities were at *c.* 2000, 5000, 10,000 (but no change at the highest egg density), while *M. incognita* egg density did not affect leaf nitrogen in *A. sessilis* (Fig. 1a). Leaf nitrogen concentration was higher in *A. philoxeroides* than in *A. sessilis*, while *A. sessilis* had higher leaf carbon concentration than *A. philoxeroides* (Fig. 1b).

In this respect, the percent of leaf area consumed by larval *C. piperata* negatively correlated with final overall number of *M. incognita* eggs on *A. philoxeroides*, but not on *A. sessilis* ($r^2 = 0.007$, P = 0.56; Fig. 2). Host plant species significantly affected larval mass (Fig. 3a), as well as adult nematode number in roots (Fig. 3b), but not larval mortality and pupation



Fig. 3 Impact of native root feeding nematode (*Meloidogyne incognita*) density (c. 0, *unfilled bar*; c. 2000, *left diagonal filled*; c. 5000, *right diagonal filled*; c. 10,000, *cross filled*; c. 20,000, *line filled*) on native defoliator (*Cassida piperata*) (**a**) and nematode abundance in roots (**b**) hosted on *Alternanthera philoxeroides* and *Alternanthera sessilis* at the end of Experiment 1. Values are means (\pm SE) larval mass of *C. piperata* (**a**) and number of adult nematodes (**b**) hosted on two Alternanthera species. See Table 1 for the associated analysis of variances. Means sharing *same letters* indicate no significant difference (P < 0.05)

rate (Table 1). *Meloidogyne incognita* egg density had no significant impact on larval mass (Fig. 3a), larval mortality and pupation rate (Table 1), but significantly influenced adult nematode number in roots (Fig. 3b).

The impact of aboveground herbivore on belowground herbivore

Cassida piperata larval defoliation significantly decreased plant mass with the larval density increased (Table S 2). *Alternanthera sessilis* with no larval had higher RtoS compared to herbivory treatment (Table S 2).

Alternanthera philoxeroides had significantly higher root C/N than A. sessilis (mean \pm SE: 48.1 \pm 0.58 vs. 37.1 \pm 1.06). RtoS, root carbon and nitrogen were not affected by C. piperata larval density, host plant species and their interaction (Table 2). In this respect, M. incognita egg production decreased significantly as the amount of damage from larvae increased for A. philoxeroides, but not for A. sessilis (r² = 0.04, P = 0.16) (Fig. 4a), while there was no correlation between leaf damage area from the beetle and number of adult M. incognita, on A. philoxeroides (r² = 0.03, P = 0.24) and A. sessilis (r² = 0.02, P = 0.32) (Fig. 4b). Also, the number of adult M. incognita and egg production were significantly affected by host plant species, but not by C. piperata larval density (Table 2).

Discussion

Although the effects of invasive plants on insect herbivores have recently received much attention (Bezemer et al. 2014), there is little direct experimental evidence that invasive plants can affect the interaction of native aboveground and belowground herbivores. In this study, we found that the native rootknot nematode *M. incognita* decreased the damage level to the invasive plant *A. philoxeroides* caused by the native defoliator *C. piperata*, while *C. piperata* decreased *M. incognita* fecundity on *A. philoxeroides*. However, these above- and belowground herbivores did not affect each other in these ways on the native plant *A. sessilis*.

In response to herbivory by nematodes, plants can reduce the transport of nutrients from roots to shoots (Brueske and Bergeson 1972; Bird and Loveys 1975; Carneiro et al. 2002). In this case, nitrogen in *A. philoxeroide* leaves was significantly reduced when plants were attacked by *M. incognita* at low and medium densities. Nitrogen, being involved in fundamental plant physiological processes, may have a large impact on insect performance (Berenbaum 1995). A growing body of evidences suggests that aboveground herbivores preferentially consume species with high leaf nitrogen (Perez-Harguindeguy et al. 2003). Thus our finding that nitrogen decreased in leaves infected by *M. incognita* may explain the decrease in leaf damage by *C. piperata* on *M. incognita*-infected plants.

Table 2Summary ofGLMs on the impact of hostplant species (Species),larval of leaf feeding beetleCassida piperata (Beetle)and their interaction onplant and root feedingnematode Meloidogyneincognita performances atthe end of Experiment 2

Response variable	Source of variance	<i>d.f.</i>	F-value	Р
Plant mass	Species (S)	1,84	0.2	0.65
	Beetle (B)	4,84	3.94	0.006**
	$S \times B$	4,84	0.22	0.93
Root-to-shoot mass ratio	Species (S)	1,84	0.04	0.84
	Beetle (B)	4,84	0.52	0.72
	$S \times B$	4,84	2.5	0.05*
Root carbon	Species (S)	1,8	0.91	0.37
	Beetle (B)	4,8	0.63	0.65
	$S \times B$	3,8	0.72	0.57
Root nitrogen	Species (S)	1,8	2.48	0.15
	Beetle (B)	4,8	0.72	0.6
	$S \times B$	3,8	0.7	0.58
Carbon-to-nitrogen ratio	Species (S)	1,7	34.98	0.0006***
	Beetle (B)	4,7	0.85	0.53
	$S \times B$	3,7	0.51	0.69
Egg density	Species (S)	1,84	8.63	0.004**
	Beetle (B)	4,84	1	0.41
	$S \times B$	4,84	1.21	0.31
Nematode density	Species (S)	1,84	150.57	<.0001***
	Beetle (B)	4,84	0.81	0.52
	$S \times B$	4,84	0.76	0.55

P < 0.05, P < 0.01,P < 0.001

Insect defoliation can induce root resistance (Erb et al. 2011) or nutrient reallocation to different tissues (Orians and Jones 2001), resulting in an indirect impact of aboveground herbivores on belowground herbivores. In this case, we found that herbivory by C. piperata did negatively affect M. incognita egg production. This might be because nutrient concentrations decrease in the roots after herbivory by the foliar herbivore, resulting in poor growth and low fecundity of *M. incognita*. Mao et al. (2011) found that root water-soluble carbohydrate content decreased after herbivory by C. piperata. Carbohydrate is one of the key resources that affect nematode development (Spiegel and McClure 1995; Hofmann et al. 2008), while it is also the main composition of nematode oocysts (Bird 1956). Thus, low levels of water-soluble carbohydrate after herbivory by C. piperata may negatively affect M. incognita development, resulting in lower fecundity.

Several studies have demonstrated that invasive plants may have specific traits which did not historically co-occur with native herbivores, and may affect native above- and belowground herbivores (Schaffner et al. 2011; Pearse and Altermatt 2013; Macel et al. 2014). In this study, we found above- and belowground herbivores did not affect each other on the native species A. sessilis as they did on the invasive plant A. philoxeroides. However, we found M. incognita increased RtoS for A. sessilis, while C. piperata decreased RtoS of A. sessilis, but both of them had little impact on the growth of A. philoxeroides. The possible cause may be that nutrients or defensive chemicals elicited by *M. incognita* or *C. piperata* were different between the two plants, in turn resulting in altered native above- and belowground herbivores interaction. In this case, we found leaf nitrogen concentration had no change in A. sessilis after herbivory by M. incognita as A. philoxeroides did, which may be the cause that M. incognita did not affect C. piperata on A. sessilis. The possible reason is that there is a trade-off between tolerance (e.g. watersoluble carbohydrate concentration) and resistance (e.g. lignin and cellulose concentration) (Leimu and Koricheva 2006), while the total carbon or nitrogen concentration did not change after being fed upon herbivores. Mao et al. (2011) found that water-soluble carbohydrate concentration in A. sessilis root did not change after herbivory by C. piperata as they did on





Fig. 4 Effect of native leaf feeding beetle (*Cassida piperata*) on the population growth and fecundity of native root feeding nematode (*Meloidogyne incognita*) on invasive (*Alternanthera. philoxeroides, filled circle*) and native (*Alternanthera sessilis, open circle*) host plants at the end of Experiment 2 (30 days after nematode inoculation). **a** number of adult *M. incognita* and **b** number of *M. incognita* eggs. The *trend line* indicates negative impact of *C. piperata* of *M. incognita* hosted on *A. philoxeroides*: y = -0.02 x + 3.62, $r^2 = 0.1$, P = 0.025, where y is leaf damage area and x is number of *M. incognita* eggs

A. philoxeroides, which may explain why C. piperata had no impact on M. incognita.

In summary we found that native above- and belowground herbivores affected each other on the invasive plant host *A. philoxeroides*, but had no interactive effect on native host *A. sessilis*, suggesting that the invasive plant can mediate and alter the interactions of native above- and belowground herbivores. We predict that invasion by *A. philoxeroides* may affect both above- and belowground herbivore communities but further field investigations are needed. Because many invasive plants, such as *A. philoxeroides*, have close relatives in their new ranges, the altered interactions between native above- and belowground herbivores could affect both the native host plants and the novel invasive hosts. In this study, we only included one pair of invasive and native hosts, but future work needs to study multiple pairs to improve our understanding of how invasive plants, above- and belowground herbivores and native hosts interact with each other. This knowledge is crucial for better understanding the impacts of biological invasions on native above- and belowground organisms.

Acknowledgments We thank Evan Siemann for the suggestions on data analysis. We also thank Xu Shao and Jingzhong Lu for their field and laboratory assistance. We also appreciate Professor Roy van Driesche and Dr. Tilley Luke and for the language edits and anonymous reviewers' comments on the early version of this manuscript. This work was funded by the National Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 331100302).

References

- Agrawal AA, Kotanen PM, Mitchell CE, Power AG, Godsoe W, Klironomos J (2005) Enemy release? An experiment with congeneric plant pairs and diverse above- and belowground enemies. Ecology 86:2979–2989
- Barker KR (1985) Nematode extraction and bioassays. In: Barker KR, Carter CC, Sasser JN (eds) An advanced treatise on Meloidogyne, vol 2. North Carolina State University Graphics, Raleigh
- Berenbaum MR (1995) Turn about is fair play: secondary roles for primary compounds. J Chem Ecol 21:925–940
- Bezemer TM, Van Dam NM (2005) Linking aboveground and belowground interactions via induced plant defenses. Trends Ecol Evol 20:617–624
- Bezemer TM, Harvey JA, Cronin JT (2014) Response of native insect communities to invasive plants. Annu Rev Entomol 59:119–141
- Bird AF (1956) Chemical composition of the nematode cuticle; observations of the whole cuticle. Exp Parasitol 5:350–358
- Bird AF, Loveys BR (1975) Incorporation of photosynthates by Meloidogne javanica. J Nematol 7:111–113
- Blossey B, Notzold R (1995) Evolution of increased competitive ability in invasive nonindigenous plants—a hypothesis. J Ecol 83:887–889
- Brueske CH, Bergeson GB (1972) Investigation of growth hormones in xylem exudate and root tissue 1. J Exp Bot 23:14–22
- Bybd Jr DW, Kirkpatrick T, Barker KR (1983) An improved technique for clearing and staining plant tissues for detection of nematodes. J Nematol 15:142
- Callaway RM, Cipollini D, Barto K, Thelen GC, Hallett SG, Prati D, Stinson K, Klironomos J (2008) Novel weapons: invasive plant suppresses fungal mutualists in America but not in its native Europe. Ecology 89:1043–1055
- Cappuccino N, Arnason JT (2006) Novel chemistry of invasive exotic plants. Biol Lett 2:189–193
- Carneiro RG, Mazzafera P, Ferraz LCCB, Muraoka T, Trivelin PCO (2002) Uptake and translocation of nitrogen,

phosphorus and calcium in soybean infected with *Meloidogyne incognita* and *M. javanica*. Fitopatol Bras 27:141–150

- Castagnone-Sereno P, Danchin EGJ, Perfus-Barbeoch L, Abad P (2013) Diversity and evolution of root-knot nematodes, genus Meloidogyne: new insights from the genomic era. Annu Rev Phytopathol 51:203–220
- Chun YJ, van Kleunen M, Dawson W (2010) The role of enemy release, tolerance and resistance in plant invasions: linking damage to performance. Ecol Lett 13:937–946
- Colautti RI, Ricciardi A, Grigorovich IA, Macisaac HJ (2004) Is invasion success explained by the enemy release hypothesis? Ecol Lett 7:721–733
- Cushman JH, Lortie CJ, Christian CE (2011) Native herbivores and plant facilitation mediate the performance and distribution of an invasive exotic grass. J Ecol 99:524–531
- Dai H, Lu X, Zhang J, Ding J (2014) Responses of a native beetle to novel exotic plant species with varying invasion history. Ecol Entomol 39:118–124
- Erb M, Lenk C, Degenhardt J, Turlings TCJ (2009) The underestimated role of roots in defense against leaf attackers. Trends Plant Sci 14:653–659
- Erb M, Robert CAM, Turlings TCJ (2011) Induction of rootresistance by leaf-herbivory follows a vertical gradient. J Plant Interact 6:133–136
- Fan S, Yu D, Liu C (2013) The invasive plant *Alternanthera philoxeroides* was suppressed more intensively than its native congener by a native generalist: implications for the biotic resistance hypothesis. Plos One 8:1–8
- Feng Y, Lei Y, Wang R, Callaway RM, Valiente-Banuet AI, Li Y, Zheng Y (2009) Evolutionary tradeoffs for nitrogen allocation to photosynthesis versus cell walls in an invasive plant. P Natl Acad Sci USA 106:1853–1856
- Geng Y, Pan X, Xu C, Zhang W, Li B, Chen J (2006) Phenotypic plasticity of invasive Alternanthera philoxeroides in relation to different water availability, compared to its native congener. Acta Oecol 30:380–385
- Hofmann J, Szakasits D, Bloechl A, Sobczak M, Daxboeck-Horvath S, Golinowski W, Bohlmann H, Grundler FMW (2008) Starch serves as carbohydrate storage in nematodeinduced syncytia. Plant Physiol 146:228–235
- Huang W, Carrillo J, Ding J, Siemann E (2012) Invader partitions ecological and evolutionary responses to above-and belowground herbivory. Ecology 93:2343–2352
- Johnson SN, Clark KE, Hartley SE, Jones TH, McKenzie SW, Koricheva J (2012) Aboveground-belowground herbivore interactions: a meta-analysis. Ecology 93:2208–2215
- Julien MH, Skarratt B, Maywald GF (1995) Potential geographical-distribution of alligator weed and its biologicalcontrol by *Agasicles hygrophila*. J Aquat Plant Manag 33:55–60
- Kaplan I, Halitschke R, Kessler A, Rehill BJ, Sardanelli S, Denno RF (2008) Physiological integration of roots and shoots in plant defense strategies links above- and belowground herbivory. Ecol Lett 11:841–851
- Keane RM, Crawley MJ (2002) Exotic plant invasions and the enemy release hypothesis. Trends Ecol Evol 17:164–170
- Leimu R, Koricheva J (2006) A meta-analysis of tradeoffs between plant tolerance and resistance to herbivores: combining the evidence from ecological and agricultural studies. Oikos 112:1–9

- Levine JM, Adler PB, Yelenik SG (2004) A meta-analysis of biotic resistance to exotic plant invasions. Ecol Lett 7:975–989
- Li Y (1998) China flora of weeds (in Chinese). Chinese Agricultural Press, Beijing
- Lin G, Yang Y, Hu J (1990) Studies on biology and control of Alternanthera philoxeroiders. J Jiangsu Agric Coll 11:57–63
- Liu W (2000) Plant pathogenic nematology. China Agriculture Press, Beijing
- Macel M, Vos RC, Jansen JJ, Putten WH, Dam NM (2014) Novel chemistry of invasive plants: exotic species have more unique metabolomic profiles than native congeners. Ecol Evol 4:2777–2786
- Mao R, Lu X, Ding J (2011) Effects of a nematode Meloidogyne incognita and its interaction with above-ground herbivory on an invasive wetland plant, alligator weed (*Alternanthera philoxeroides*). Plant Spec Biol 26:73–83
- Masters GJ, Brown VK (1997) Host-plant mediated interactions between spatially separated herbivores: effects on community structure. In: Gange AC, Brown VK (eds) Multitrophic interactions in terrestrial systems. Blackwell Science, pp 217–237
- Masters GJ, Brown VK, Gange AC (1993) Plant mediated interactions between aboveground and belowground insect herbivores. Oikos 66:148–151
- McClure MA (1977) *Meloidogyne incognita*—metabolic sink. J Nematol 9:88–90
- Nuñez MA, Dickie IA (2014) Invasive belowground mutualists of woody plants. Biol Invasions 16:645–661
- Orians CM, Jones CG (2001) Plants as resource mosaics: a functional model for predicting patterns of within-plant resource heterogeneity to consumers based on vascular architecture and local environmental variability. Oikos 94:493–504
- Orians CM, Thorn A, Gomez S (2011) Herbivore-induced resource sequestration in plants: why bother? Oecologia 167:1–9
- Pan X, Geng Y, Zhang W, Li B, Chen J (2006) The influence of abiotic stress and phenotypic plasticity on the distribution of invasive *Alternanthera philoxeroides* along a riparian zone. Acta Oecol 30:333–341
- Pan X, Geng Y, Sosa A, Zhang W, Li B, Chen J (2007) Invasive Alternanthera philoxeroides: biology, ecology and management. Acta Phytotaxon Sin 45:884–900
- Pearse IS, Altermatt F (2013) Predicting novel trophic interactions in a non-native world. Ecol Lett 16:1088–1094
- Perez-Harguindeguy N, Diaz S, Vendramini F, Cornelissen JHC, Gurvich DE, Cabido M (2003) Leaf traits and herbivore selection in the field and in cafeteria experiments. Austral Ecol 28:642–650
- Sasser JN (1980) Root-knot nematodes—a global menace to crop production. Plant Dis 64:36–41
- Schaffner U, Ridenour WM, Wolf VC, Bassett T, Mueller C, Mueller-Schaerer H, Sutherland S, Lortie CJ, Callaway RM (2011) Plant invasions, generalist herbivores, and novel defense weapons. Ecology 92:829–835
- Schooler SS, Yeates AG, Wilson JRU, Julien MH (2007) Herbivory, mowing, and herbicides differently affect production and nutrient allocation of *Alternanthera philoxeroides*. Aquat Bot 86:62–68

- Schwachtje J, Baldwin IT (2008) Why does herbivore attack reconfigure primary metabolism? Plant Physiol 146:845–851
- Schwachtje J, Minchin PEH, Jahnke S, Van Dongen JT, Schittko U, Baldwin IT (2006) SNF1-related kinases allow plants to tolerate herbivory by allocating carbon to roots. P Natl Acad Sci USA 103:12935–12940
- Siemann E, Rogers WE (2003) Reduced resistance of invasive varieties of the alien tree *Sapium sebiferum* to a generalist herbivore. Oecologia 135:451–457
- Soler R, Bezemer TM, Cortesero AM, Van Der Putten WH, Vet LEM, Harvey JA (2007) Impact of foliar herbivory on the development of a root-feeding insect and its parasitoid. Oecologia 152:257–264
- Spiegel Y, Mcclure MA (1995) The surface-coat of plant-parasitic nematodes: chemical-composition, origin, and biological role—a review. J Nematol 27:127–134
- Tan Y (1994) Study on the bionomics of Cassida pipsrata Hope (Coleoptera: Cassididae). Entomol Knowl 31:158–160

- van der Putten WH, Bardgett RD, de Ruiter PC, Hol WHG, Meyer KM, Bezemer TM, Bradford MA, Christensen S, Eppinga MB, Fukami T, Hemerik L, Molofsky J, Schadler M, Scherber C, Strauss SY, Vos M, Wardle DA (2009) Empirical and theoretical challenges in aboveground-belowground ecology. Oecologia 161:1–14
- Vogt GB, McGurie Jr JU, Cushman AD (1979) Probable evolution and morphological variation in South American Disonychine flea beetles (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) and their Amaranthaceous hosts. USDA Technical Bulletin 1593, pp 148
- Wardle DA, Bardgett RD, Klironomos JN, Setala H, van der Putten WH, Wall DH (2004) Ecological linkages between aboveground and belowground biota. Science 304:1629–1633
- Wyss U, Zunke U (1986) Observations on the behaviour of second stage juveniles of *Heterodera schachtii* inside host roots. Rev De Ne'matol 9:153–165