



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1002/rra.3513](https://doi.org/10.1002/rra.3513)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Francis, R. A., Chadwick, M., & Turbelin, A. J. (2019). An overview of non-native species invasions in urban river corridors. *RIVER RESEARCH AND APPLICATIONS*, 35(8), 1269-1278. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rra.3513>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **An overview of non-native species invasions in urban river corridors**

2

3 Robert A. Francis*, Michael A. Chadwick and Anna J. Turbelin

4

5 Department of Geography, King's College London, Strand Campus, Bush House (North East Wing), 30

6 Aldwych, London, WC2B 4BG

7

8 *corresponding author: robert.francis@kcl.ac.uk; Tel: +44(0)20 7848 8192

9

10 **Abstract**

11

12 Recent studies have highlighted cities as prime locations for the introduction, establishment and
13 spread of non-native and invasive species. As the hydrological arteries of cities, urban river corridors
14 have an important role to play in influencing species invasions. This overview examines existing
15 literature to consider (1) how the landscape functions of urban river corridors (habitat, conduit,
16 barrier/filter, sink and source) relate to species invasions; (2) the organismal and geographical foci of
17 research into non-native species invasions along urban rivers; and (3) the need to more fully
18 consider the roles that non-native species may play in the recombinant communities of novel urban
19 river ecosystems. The review ends with an identification of research priorities at the intersection of
20 urban river corridor function and invasion biology.

21

22 **Keywords:** Non-native, alien, invasive, urban, stream, river, corridor function

23

24 **Word count:** 6768 inc. references.

25

26 **Introduction**

27

28 Cities are centres for non-native species introductions, as well as sources for the spread of non-
29 natives throughout surrounding regions (Aikio *et al.* 2012; Duquette *et al.* 2016; Padayachee *et al.*
30 2017). Their role as nodes in global trade networks facilitates the intentional and accidental
31 introduction of species as people and goods circulate between cities, and their large human
32 populations inevitably result in (for example) high numbers of non-native species planted in public
33 and private green space (Padayachee *et al.* 2017). These trends are well known: Mack (2003)
34 estimated between 7000-10000 species in transit globally via shipping on any given day, mainly to

35 urban ports, while multiple studies have observed notable proportions of non-native species in
36 urban ecosystems (e.g. Tait *et al.* 2005; Kowarik *et al.* 2013).

37

38 Urban ecosystems have been the concern of only a relatively small portion of the biological invasion
39 literature (Gaertner *et al.* 2017). Most studies that *are* concerned with urban non-natives have
40 focused on terrestrial ecosystems, with aquatic urban ecosystems such as rivers, lakes and ponds
41 being only a minority of cases: as of 4 March 2019, of 4,804 studies listed in Web of Science
42 including the terms “urban*” AND the term “non-native*” OR “alien*” OR “invasive*” OR “exotic*”,
43 only 90 (1.9%) focused on urban rivers, streams, lakes and ponds. Of these, 66 studies focused on
44 urban rivers/streams. Likewise, these articles form only a small proportion (2.6%) of the 2,532
45 studies found using the search term “urban river*” OR “urban stream*”, indicating that invasion
46 biology is only a relatively small focus within urban river research. These searches will not have
47 encapsulated all studies into urban rivers and non-native species, but as a subset are indicative of
48 the relatively limited extent of work performed to date. Nonetheless, there is growing interest in
49 understanding patterns and processes of invasion in urban rivers, in part to prevent spread of non-
50 natives within and without the city.

51

52 Freshwater invasions are inherently spatial, and are best explored at the landscape scale; rivers
53 function as dynamic corridors conducting materials (including organisms) through the landscape,
54 and a body of work has developed on riverine landscape ecology (or sometimes ‘riverscapes’) in
55 recent decades (Haslam, 2008). This paper examines the existing literature on urban rivers and
56 streams (hereafter ‘rivers’ as there is little technical distinction) to explore (1) interactions between
57 urban river corridor functions (habitat, conduit, barrier/filter, sink and source) and non-native
58 species invasions; (2) the geographical and organismal foci of research into non-native species in
59 urban rivers; and (3) the role that non-native species play in novel urban river ecosystems and their
60 recombinant communities. The term ‘river’ used here includes all riverine structural components,
61 including riparian zones. The review ends with an identification of research priorities at the
62 intersection of urban rivers and invasion biology.

63

64 The term ‘non-native’ is used here as a catch-all meaning any species introduced outside its natural
65 range, and essentially synonymous with ‘alien’ and ‘exotic’. We do not distinguish between ‘non-
66 native’ and ‘invasive’, recognising that whilst many species may be classified as ‘non-native’, only a
67 small proportion will go on to be ‘invasive’, i.e. having detrimental ecological, societal or economic
68 impacts (Caley *et al.* 2008).

69

70 **Urban rivers as landscape corridors for non-natives**

71

72 Urban rivers are typically ecologically degraded and have limited functionality compared to their
73 more natural exurban counterparts (Petts *et al.*, 2002; Walsh *et al.* 2005). This trend has been
74 encapsulated with the ‘urban stream syndrome’ (Walsh *et al.* 2005), which has highlighted a suite of
75 common impacts of urbanisation within river catchments across hydrology, ecology, geomorphology
76 and society, with growing evidential support (Table 1; cf Booth *et al.* 2016). These changes to
77 riverine and riparian structure and processes are in many cases unprecedented, and have essentially
78 created environmental conditions with limited, or no, natural analogues; to the extent that some
79 have argued that urban rivers represent novel ecosystems (Catford *et al.* 2013; Francis, 2014). The
80 ecological outcomes of such impacts often include a reduction in native species populations and
81 diversity, and an increase in non-natives (Kuglerová *et al.* 2019).

82

83 Despite their often degraded state, urban rivers still fulfil landscape corridor functions; and each of
84 these functions is important in the context of species invasions. Functions include (1) habitat, (2)
85 conduit, (3) barrier or filter, (4) sink and (5) source (*sensu* Forman, 1996). These functions vary with
86 river size and catchment position, reflecting variation in channel size and slope, discharge, sediment
87 dynamics and so on (e.g. Poole, 2002), and the level of modification found in urbanised catchments
88 creates complicated and heterogeneous responses throughout river networks (Gurnell *et al.* 2007),
89 though there has so far been limited investigation across catchment or landscape scales.

90

91 The evidence for how these different corridor functions interact with non-native species, based on
92 available literature, is now explored.

93

94 *Habitat*

95

96 Urban rivers exhibit degraded within-channel and riparian habitat (Kuglerová *et al.* 2019). Physical
97 habitat is often simplified and homogenized, whether through removal or reconstruction of
98 vegetation and bank habitat (e.g. hard engineering) or the interruption of natural processes (e.g.
99 sediment transport and deposition). Such changes create challenges for ecological communities that
100 are attuned to the original (pre-modification) habitat conditions, and can favour non-native species
101 that are more able to exploit novel conditions (e.g. Nelson, 2011). Non-natives may (for example) be
102 better able to tolerate stress or disturbance, may benefit from a lack of predators/herbivores,

103 and/or may be able to compete more effectively for resources. Certainly one of the most reported
104 observations from urban rivers is that they tend to have notable proportions of non-native species,
105 and that this is often higher than in exurban reaches (Engman and Ramirez, 2012; Landis and
106 Leopold, 2014); though this is not a universal trend (Beauchamp *et al.* 2015). Proportions of non-
107 native species vary according to location and community type (Table 2). These studies are broadly in
108 line with urban ecosystems in general, which, while also variable, tend to have mean proportions of
109 non-natives at around 10-35% (Francis and Chadwick, 2013).

110

111 Proportions of urban non-natives tend to increase over time (e.g. Kowarik *et al.* 2013). Few studies
112 have looked at temporal change in non-native species along urban rivers, though Jackson and Grey
113 (2013) noted that of the 96 non-native species recorded in the River Thames (UK) catchment, 53%
114 (51 species) have established in the last 50 years; and that new invasions are recorded every 50
115 weeks on average. Leuvan *et al.* (2009) explored the heavily modified and partly urbanised River
116 Rhine catchment (Germany), and found an increase in invasion rate from <1 species per decade to
117 13, since the eighteenth century. Freshwater systems are amongst the most invaded globally
118 (Francis and Chadwick, 2012), and urban riverine and riparian habitats are likely to be consistent
119 hotspots of introduction and establishment, especially under conditions of growing urban
120 populations and climate change (Catford *et al.* 2013).

121

122 Several studies have demonstrated the links between urban conditions and species invasion along
123 rivers. There are broad-scale linkages between key urban indicators such as levels of impervious
124 surface cover adjacent to rivers, and human population density, to the presence or abundance of
125 non-natives (e.g. Dallimer *et al.* 2012; Kuglerová *et al.* 2019). Some studies have found more specific
126 associations between urban river habitat conditions and the presence or abundance of non-natives,
127 including changes in pH (Grella *et al.*, 2018), cultural eutrophication (King and Buckney, 2000), and
128 disturbance regimes (MacCoy and Blew, 2005). Establishing drivers for species invasions in any
129 habitat can be problematic (MacDougall and Turkington, 2005), and the complexity (and novelty) of
130 environmental changes in urban river systems makes this especially challenging; but certainly
131 changes in habitat conditions, combined with an abundance of source populations in association
132 with human habitation and infrastructure, facilitates non-native introduction and establishment.

133

134 Species invasions can also change habitat conditions. In freshwater systems impacts of invasion
135 include changes to biodiversity and community composition, physical habitat, ecosystem function

136 and resilience, and degradation of ecosystem services (Francis and Chadwick, 2012). In urban rivers,
137 documented impacts include:

138

139 (1) Changes to the physical environment, particularly when species act as ecosystem engineers.
140 Crayfish, for example, can have complex but profound negative impacts on submerged macrophytes,
141 phytoplankton, nutrient dynamics and benthic macroinvertebrates by increasing sediment
142 suspension and bioturbation through feeding and burrowing activities (Matsuzaki *et al.* 2009),
143 changing predator-prey relationships (Ficetola *et al.* 2012), and causing bank erosion (Faller *et al.*
144 2016). Non-native plants such as Japanese knotweed (*Fallopia japonica*) can cause high rates of bank
145 erosion, particularly where channels are incised (Arnold and Toran, 2018), while non-native tree
146 colonisation of bed sediments in reduced flows can lead to channel narrowing (MacCoy and Blew,
147 2005).

148

149 (2) Biogeochemical impacts, in particular changes in leaf litter and organic detritus resulting from
150 invasion by non-native tree species, and the impacts this may have on macroinvertebrate or
151 microbial communities that rely on such resources. Some studies have found little impact (Kennedy
152 and El-Sabaawi, 2018), while others have determined lower macroinvertebrate abundance (Fargen
153 *et al.* 2015), altered macroinvertebrate feeding groups or communities (Fargen *et al.* 2015), lower
154 detritivore densities (Miller and Boulton, 2005) and increased occurrence of detritivores in
155 association with non-native litter (Swan *et al.* 2008); or differences in decay rates (Swan *et al.* 2008).

156

157 (3) Changes in biotic interactions, such as competition (Masters and Emery, 2016) and predator-prey
158 relationships that can lead to shifts in trophic position, as observed for fish (Lisi *et al.*, 2018) and
159 reptiles (Wilhelm and Plummer, 2012) as diet becomes more focused on non-native consumption.
160 Such changes are likely to be prolific, but remain largely unexplored.

161

162 Responses of other elements of urban river habitat structure and function to non-native invasion
163 remain largely unexplored, for example how invasions may impact on habitat heterogeneity, seral
164 processes, metapopulation dynamics and reproductive success. Such impacts are likely to be
165 spatially and temporally complex, and the degraded nature of urban rivers makes isolating invasions
166 as driving factors challenging. It should also be remembered that habitat changes are not always
167 negative (Albertson and Daniels, 2016).

168

169 *Conduit*

170

171 Urban rivers conduct flows of water, sediment, nutrients, pollutants and biota through the urban
172 landscape. Urban rivers are often regulated, with controls placed on their flow dynamics, meaning
173 that the conduit function is suppressed compared to more natural rivers (Table 1; Kuglerová *et al.*
174 2019); though flashy responses to urban hydrological conditions can lead to pulses of material
175 through the urban system. Flow connectivity within the catchment network is often restricted due to
176 the presence of impoundments or other obstacles (discussed as barriers/filters below).

177

178 From patterns of plant and animal spread and propagule deposition observed, it seems that flows
179 are often sufficient to enable the spread of non-natives through urban river catchments (e.g. Leuvan
180 *et al.* 2009; Dallimer *et al.* 2012) and beyond (e.g. Foxcroft *et al.* 2007), though this will vary
181 according to local conditions and organism type. Although base flows are often reduced in urban
182 systems, peak and overbank flows can be increased, especially where urban river planning or
183 management is ineffective or channels are no longer able to cope with changes to urban hydrology
184 (Table 1). This leads to the deposition of species in riparian or bankside zones, and can also result in
185 non-natives reaching other aquatic ecosystems (both natural and artificial), including drainage
186 ditches, ponds and artificial wetlands.

187

188 Certainly direction and dimensionality of flows are important in influencing non-native spread,
189 particularly for organisms reliant on flows for dispersal, such as hydrochorous plants. Dallimer *et al.*
190 (2012) found that neophyte richness along rivers in Sheffield increased downstream – in most cases
191 this resulted in increases in non-native plants in the urban core, but for a single river flowing out of
192 the urban core the opposite trend was found, highlighting that flow direction (rather than simple
193 urban proximity) was the key driver of spread.

194

195 Dispersal along urban catchments can be rapid. Leuvan *et al.* (2009) estimate rates of spread for
196 several non-native macroinvertebrates within the River Rhine catchment to be 44-112km year⁻¹,
197 with rates higher in larger reaches. Non-native plant propagules can be transported long distances.
198 Säumel and Kowarik (2010) tested secondary dispersal of three non-native tree species along an
199 urban river using tagged samaras. Although the number of propagules declined exponentially with
200 distance from point of release, partly due to the influence of river traffic, a substantial proportion
201 (20-25%) floated 1200m within three hours, with no interspecific differences; as 1200m was the limit
202 of the experiment, it is likely that some samaras would have continued to float over greater
203 distances.

204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236

As a result, the conduit function is very important for spread of non-native species through urban river catchments and their surrounding landscapes (Leuvan *et al.* 2009; Dallimer *et al.* 2012), though how this varies for different conditions and species within an urban context remains to be fully explored.

Barrier/Filter

Just as integral flows can be important, barriers to flow and organism movement will shape processes of non-native spread and establishment. Barrier and filter effects result from physical or environmental interruptions to system connectivity, for example resulting from impoundments, weirs or areas of shallow flow. Absolute barriers are rare, and most interruptions to riverine and riparian connectivity will have filter effects, restricting some species or individuals but not others (Catford *et al.* 2011). Loss of connectivity can impact native species, compromising their meta-populations and thereby encouraging community dominance by non-natives; as observed for some urban rivers on tropical islands (Ramirez *et al.* 2012). However, lack of connectivity can also help prevent non-native spread.

Filter effects may operate longitudinally and laterally. Longitudinal barriers may occur naturally, as change in habitat conditions (e.g. channel width, flow velocity, sediment coarseness, vegetation) with catchment position limit available habitat for non-native species (Kornis and Vander Zanden, 2010). For example, saltwater barriers between estuary catchments have been suggested to act as limits on the spread of non-native fish (Leidy *et al.* 2011); while a dry reach within the Santa Clara River in California (USA), containing water only in exceptional storm events, was found to limit 'genetic dilution' of a native population of the Santa Ana sucker (*Catostomus santaanae*) by a non-native sucker present downstream (Richmond *et al.* 2018).

Anthropogenic barriers can also be effective in preventing the spread of non-natives through river systems, including urbanised catchments; for example, Bentley (2012) notes that the upstream migration of Chinese mitten crabs (*Eriocheir sinensis*) may be blocked by weirs. Multiple barriers can be especially effective in restricting movement (Favaro and Moore, 2015), and intentional fragmentation has been suggested as a prevention strategy for aquatic invasions (Rahel, 2013).

237 The capacity of urban rivers to act as lateral filters for organism movement in the urban landscape is
238 poorly understood. River channels in general can act as behavioural filters for the movement of
239 organisms, with for example forest bird communities being different on either side of large rivers
240 (Heyes and Sewlal, 2004). Tremblay and St. Clair (2009) found that urban rivers were more effective
241 barriers to bird movement than roads, railways and bridges, possibly because of an intuitive aversion
242 to rivers as areas of high predation risk or territorial boundaries, but also because of a lack of
243 vegetation, which was found to be important for movement across barriers in general. Lateral filter
244 effects are generally unknown, though many urban organisms tend to be generalists that can move
245 over barriers more easily, and so filter functions may also be suppressed in the urban environment,
246 as species negatively impacted may already have been lost from the urban landscape.

247

248 *Sink*

249

250 Rivers occupy areas of low elevation, and are therefore repositories for sediments, nutrients,
251 propagules and pollutants. This is particularly the case in urban catchments, where high levels of
252 impervious surface cover results in substantial increases in runoff following rainfall events, which, in
253 combination with storm drains and sewerage networks (e.g. combined sewer overflow outfalls), can
254 wash seeds and other materials into urban rivers. Zedler and Kercher (2004) note that wetlands
255 dominated by surface runoff are especially vulnerable to invasion, and this is likely another driver of
256 high proportions of non-natives in urban rivers.

257

258 Certainly urban rivers may accumulate and transport (see above) huge numbers of propagules.
259 Hoggart and Francis (2014) placed 180 coir rolls (total volume around 4000 m²) along walls of the
260 River Thames to sample the mobile seed bank. Following translocation to a laboratory environment,
261 over 7,600 seeds germinated from the rolls, of which 11% were from a single non-native species:
262 *Buddleja davidii*. The sink function is also reflected in riparian soil seed bank studies, where
263 germination experiments have found abundant seeds, with significant proportions of non-natives
264 (e.g. 21% of germinated seeds along the River Brent, UK; Cockel and Gurnell 2012). Landis and
265 Leopold (2014) surveyed the riparian seedbank of an urbanised stream in Syracuse, NY, and found
266 that non-native species accounted for around 25% of all germinants.

267

268 Presence in the seed bank is also reflected in riverine and riparian community composition; for
269 example, Stromberg *et al.* (2016) observed that many urban riparian species in the Salt River (USA)
270 were trees cultivated in nearby cities, while Meek *et al.* (2010) found that riparian non-native plant

271 cover was highest in areas bordered by urban land. In this way, urban areas directly contribute non-
272 native species to rivers from their component ecosystems (gardens, parks, brownfield sites etc.).

273

274 While there has been substantial focus of research into urban rivers as sinks for pollutants (Scholes
275 *et al.* 2008) and more recently plastics (Nel *et al.* 2018), more work is needed on patterns and
276 processes of non-native species accumulation, and river and riparian seed banks in particular.

277

278 *Source*

279

280 Urban rivers both accumulate and disseminate non-native species from and through the surrounding
281 landscape, and therefore are a source for invasions. Urban areas are suggested to be sources of non-
282 native species invasions outside urban regions, with, for example, Aikio *et al.* (2012) finding that first
283 records of non-native species are associated with proximity to urban areas; and also that ‘urban’ and
284 ‘streamside’ habitats were frequent sites of initial invasion. This suggests that urban rivers may act
285 as both initial sources of non-native spread, and reservoirs of propagules that may disseminate along
286 river networks if conduit functions allow – though direct observation and quantification of this is
287 rare. For example, Duquette *et al.* (2016) observed that riparian Japanese knotweed (*F. japonica*)
288 distributions were associated to proximity with nearby towns and villages.

289

290 The source function is arguably one of the most important in terms of facilitating invasions through
291 the landscape (aquatic, riparian and terrestrial), but has received little attention in an urban context.
292 The active role of urban rivers in facilitating spread to exurban regions remains to be more
293 thoroughly investigated.

294

295 **Geographical spread and organism focus of urban river invasions research**

296

297 To obtain a broad picture of the geographical spread and organism focus of urban river invasions
298 research, a Web of Science search using the terms “urban*” AND the term “non-native*” OR
299 “alien*” OR “invasive*” OR “exotic*” was executed (n = 4,804), then narrowed to incorporate only
300 those studies focused on “urban river*” OR “urban stream*” (n = 65). These search terms were used
301 to narrow the focus to those studies that focused specifically on urban river/stream and invasion
302 research, as the incorporation of broader terms (e.g. “city”, “channel”, “river”, “stream” or
303 “riparian” more generally) found many studies that included these terms incidentally (e.g. in location
304 or place names) or only very peripherally or tangentially related to urban river, stream or riparian-

305 specific invasions. This body of work was then supplemented with further literature searches using
306 Google and Google Scholar (including grey literature), to result in 77 studies with a focus or part-
307 focus on non-native invasions in urban rivers/streams. These were then classified according to
308 organism focus and study location (where applicable). Some studies examined more than one
309 organism type, and so were counted twice.

310

311 The majority of studies (56%) focused on plant species, with macroinvertebrates (32%) and fish
312 (18%) following. A smaller number of studies focused on avifauna (4%), bacteria (4%), annelids (4%),
313 fungi (3%), amphibians (3%), mammals (3%) and reptiles (1%). Most studies (84%) focused on a
314 single organism type. This distribution of organism foci generally reflects that observed in non-
315 native/invasive species records globally (Turbelin *et al.* 2017). Plants account for the majority of
316 records in invasion biology and create a significant bias in research (Turbelin *et al.* 2017). Insects and
317 fish are also relatively abundant in records and urban river studies in general (Wenger *et al.* 2009),
318 and this trend is echoed here. Macroinvertebrates in particular are a staple of freshwater ecology
319 research and their presence in so many studies here is unsurprising. The relative lack of studies into
320 mammals and avifauna, in contrast with global invasion records (Turbelin *et al.* 2017), probably
321 reflects the general paucity of such taxa in urban rivers (Wenger *et al.* 2009).

322

323 The geographical distribution of work to date also largely reflects that of species invasion records,
324 with North America (mainly the USA) being the location of most work (44%), followed by Europe
325 (29%) and Australia/New Zealand (13%). South America (9%), Africa (3%) and Asia (3%) are in the
326 minority. This pattern also indicates not only research capacity and English language bias, but also
327 history of urbanisation and river modification, as those regions that urbanised earlier, and thus have
328 longer-standing documented invasions and urban river impacts, have seen the most research. This
329 does highlight the need for greater research in developing and rapidly urbanising countries such as
330 Asia and Africa, which are also likely to see rapid increases in species invasions.

331

332 This is a relatively small body of literature that may not be fully comprehensive, but it is indicative
333 that urban river invasions research follows broader patterns observed across other ecosystems.
334 There is a need for studies that incorporate multiple taxa, that consider geographical regions not
335 well represented, especially those undergoing rapid urbanisation where before/after effects could
336 be measured, and that have a more comparative approach.

337

338 **The good, the bad and the uncharismatic**

339

340 Biological invasions are recognised as threats to ecosystems globally. Urban rivers are no exception,
341 in that exposure to non-native species can lead to ecological, socio-economic and cultural impacts,
342 despite their already degraded state. It is nonetheless important to recognise that not all non-native
343 species are problematic; only a small proportion become invasive (Caley *et al.* 2008), and some non-
344 natives contribute useful functions to the communities they establish within, or to ecosystem
345 services more broadly (Schlaepfer *et al.*, 2011; Trueman and Erber, 2013). There has been little
346 research into non-impactful assimilation of non-natives into ecological communities, or positive
347 benefits, with most work focusing on individual species, and particularly those with observed
348 negative impacts. Often, the simple designation of species as non-native (or alien, exotic, non-
349 indigenous or invasive) labels them as problematic and makes them uncharismatic and unappealing,
350 regardless of their functional role within an ecological community.

351

352 Interestingly, this perception is most often challenged in urban ecosystems, because of the
353 recognition that non-natives will continue to be part of urban ecological communities, and because
354 urban communities do not hold to traditional community typologies (Rotherham, 2017). Indeed,
355 study of cosmopolitan, recombinant communities – those formed of species that originate from a
356 range of habitats, and which often include non-native species – has often taken place in urban
357 ecosystems, including urban rivers (Francis and Hoggart, 2012; Rotherham, 2017). Urban river
358 conditions can create locally unique communities, especially around novel habitats, as observed by
359 Nelson (2011) for macroinvertebrates and McLellan *et al.* (2010) for microbes in sewerage systems.
360 Such assemblages also lead to increased chance of species hybridization, as well as greater rates of
361 phenotypic change (Alberti *et al.* 2017).

362

363 Non-native species and their recombinant characteristics have also influenced urban river
364 restoration efforts and frameworks (e.g. Richardson *et al.*, 2007; Meek *et al.* 2013). The removal of
365 non-natives is often one objective of restoration or rehabilitation techniques, though so far studies
366 have indicated only limited success, with non-natives recolonising restored channels rapidly after
367 interventions (e.g. Suren, 2009; Arango *et al.* 2015). Even extensive restoration can show limited
368 reduction of non-natives, leading to several authors to recognise that non-natives and the
369 recombinant communities of which they are a part are relatively unavoidable, and that urban rivers
370 should be more adaptively managed as novel ecosystems to maximise ecological community
371 function rather than native composition (Meek *et al.*, 2010; Francis, 2014).

372

373 Urban rivers are microcosms of urban ecological processes and how these may affect community
374 structure and function, including non-native spread, establishment and impact. They represent
375 important field sites for such investigations, and are an opportunity for urban ecology and invasion
376 biology that deserves greater research focus.

377

378 **Research priorities at the intersection of urban river corridor function and species invasions**

379

380 Urban rivers occupy only a small part of the literature on riverine landscapes and non-native species
381 invasions, and as such, corridor functions are poorly understood. There is a need for greater
382 fundamental research on how corridor functions influence introduction, establishment, spread and
383 impact of non-natives in urban systems; and likewise how invasions influence function. In the urban
384 context, more research is especially needed on:

385

- 386 • Comparison of pre- and post-urban river function in relation to patterns and processes of
387 invasion. Before-After-Control-Impact research designs in urbanising areas will help to more
388 accurately determine drivers of change and response; this should include rigorous
389 quantification of pre- and post-urbanisation conditions, rather than just comparison of
390 urban with non-urban reference reaches, to more accurately pinpoint changes resulting
391 from urbanisation. The greatest opportunities for such comparative research are in rapidly
392 urbanising countries in Asia and Africa; regions that are somewhat under-represented (with
393 the exception of China) in both urban river and invasion biology research (Francis, 2012;
394 Turbelin *et al.* 2017).
- 395 • Systemic spatio-temporal changes in river function and invasion response through urban
396 river catchments. This should be placed within the wider riparian/landscape context and
397 should take into account both systemic changes that would occur naturally within the
398 catchment (e.g. functional and community changes associated with the river continuum) as
399 well as anthropogenic drivers, such as those associated with varying urban stream syndrome
400 characteristics (Table 1).
- 401 • Comparisons of inter-relationships between function and invasion across multiple (rather
402 than single) taxa, and across a broader range of organisms, especially broadening
403 investigations beyond plants, fish and macroinvertebrates.
- 404 • Comparison of urban river systems geographically, to avoid reliance on unique case studies
405 and address geographical variation in response. Despite commonalities in urban stream
406 syndrome characteristics, each river catchment, and indeed individual reaches, have specific

407 and unique characteristics that will influence patterns and processes of invasion (e.g.
408 Brierley and Fryirs, 2009); as will the biogeographic context the catchment is situated within
409 (Richardson *et al.* 2007). This includes the wider environmental and ecological urban context
410 of the river, which will present its own characteristics and idiosyncrasies. While this should
411 not stop generalisations and broad trends from being elucidated, the high level of
412 geographical variability should be appropriately investigated.

- 413 • Exploration of urban rivers from more varied climatic, developmental and biogeographical
414 regions (not just temperate cities in developed countries) to more fundamentally
415 understand how patterns and processes of invasion vary.
- 416 • Consideration of the role of non-natives in recombinant communities, and their negative,
417 neutral and positive impacts. This will in particular involve research into the capacity of such
418 species to provide ecosystem services (and disservices), and will utilise knowledge and
419 methods from (among other areas) river restoration, ecological economics, citizen science,
420 and environmental psychology to appropriately engage various stakeholders in urban rivers
421 and their communities.
- 422 • How urban river corridor functions and invasions may be influenced by broader global and
423 regional environmental changes (e.g. climate change, pollution, biodiversity loss).

424

425 **Data availability statement:** Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were
426 created or analyzed in this study.

427

428 **References**

429

430 Aikio, S., Duncan, R.P. & Hulme, P.E. (2012). The vulnerability of habitats to plant invasion:
431 disentangling the roles of propagule pressure, time and sampling effort. *Global Ecology and*
432 *Biogeography*, 21(8), 778-786. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2011.00711.x>

433 Alberti, M., Correa, C., Marzluff, J.M., Hendry, A.P., Palkovacs, E.P., Gotanda, K.M., Hunt, V.M.,
434 Apgar, T.M. & Zhou, Y. (2017). Global urban signatures of phenotypic change in animal and
435 plant populations. *PNAS*, 114(34), 8951-8956. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1606034114>

436 Albertson, L.K. & Daniels, M.D. (2016). Effects of invasive crayfish on fine sediment accumulation,
437 gravel movement, and macroinvertebrate communities. *Freshwater Science*, 35(2), 644-653.
438 <https://doi.org/10.1086/685860>

439 Arango, C.P., James, P.W. & Hatch, K.B. (2015). Rapid ecosystem response to restoration in an urban
440 stream. *Hydrobiologia*, 749(1), 197–211. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-014-2167-z>

441 Arnold, E. & Toran, L. (2018). Effects of bank vegetation and incision on erosion rates in an urban
442 stream. *Water*, 10(4), 482. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w10040482>

443 Beauchamp, V.B., Swan, C.M., Szlavecz, K. & Hu, J. (2015). Riparian community structure and soil
444 properties of restored urban streams. *Ecohydrology*, 8(5), 880-895.

445 Bentley, M.G. (2012). *Eriocheir sinensis* H. Milne-Edwards (Chinese mitten crab), in Francis, R.A. (ed)
446 *A Handbook of Global Freshwater Invasive Species*, London, Routledge, pp. 185-194.

447 Booth D.B., Roy, A.H., Smith, B. & Capps, K.A. (2016). Global perspectives on the urban stream
448 syndrome. *Freshwater Science*, 35(1), 412-420. <https://doi.org/10.1086/684940>

449 Brierley, G. & Fryirs, K. (2009). Don't fight the site: three geomorphic considerations in catchment-
450 scale river rehabilitation planning. *Environmental Management*, 43(6), 1201-1218.
451 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-008-9266-4>

452 Brown, L.R., Burton, C.A. & Belitz, K. (2005). Aquatic assemblages of the highly urbanized Santa Ana
453 River Basin, California. *American Fisheries Society Symposium*, 47, 263–287.

454 Caley, P., Groves, R.H. & Barker, R. (2008). Estimating the invasion success of introduced plants.
455 *Diversity and Distribution*, 14(2), 196-203. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2007.00440.x>

456 Catford, J.A., Downes, B.J., Gippel, C.J. & Vesk, P.A. (2011). Flow regulation reduces native plant
457 cover and facilitates exotic invasion in riparian wetlands. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 48(2), 432-
458 442. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01945.x>

459 Catford, J.A., Naiman, R.J., Chambers, L.E., Roberts, J., Douglas, M. & Davies, P. (2013). Predicting
460 novel riparian ecosystems in a changing climate. *Ecosystems*, 16(3), 382–400.
461 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-012-9566-7>

462 Cockel, C.P. & Gurnell, A.M. (2012). An investigation of the composition of the urban riparian soil
463 propagule bank along the River Brent, Greater London, UK, in comparison with previous
464 propagule bank studies in rural areas. *Urban Ecosystems*, 15(2), 367-387.
465 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-011-0203-6>

466 Daga, V.S., Gubiani, E.A., Cunico, A.M. & Baumgartner, G. (2012). Effects of abiotic variables on the
467 distribution of fish assemblages in streams with different anthropogenic activities in southern
468 Brazil. *Neotropical Ichthyology*, 10(3), 643-652.

469 Dallimer, M., Rouquette, J.R., Skinner, A.M.J., Armsworth, P.R., Maltby, L.M., Warren, P.H. & Gaston,
470 K.J. (2012). Contrasting patterns in species richness of birds, butterflies and plants along riparian
471 corridors in an urban landscape. *Diversity and Distributions*, 18, 742-753.
472 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2012.00891.x>

473 Dos Anjos Santos, O., Couceiro, S.R.M., Rezende, A.C.C. & de Sousa Silva, M.D. (2016). Composition
474 and richness of woody species in riparian forests in urban areas of Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil.
475 *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 150, 70-78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2016.03.004>

476 Duquette, M.-C., Comp erot, A., Hayes, L.F., Pagola, C., Belzile, F., Dub e, J. & Lavoie, C. (2016). From
477 the Source to the Outlet: understanding the Distribution of Invasive Knotweeds along a North
478 American River. *River Research and Applications*, 32(5), 958-966.
479 <https://doi.org/10.1002/rra.2914>

480 Engman A.C. & Ram irez, A. (2012). Fish assemblage structure in urban streams of Puerto Rico: the
481 importance of reach- and catchment-scale abiotic factors. *Hydrobiologia*, 693(1), 141–155.
482 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-012-1100-6>

483 Faller, M., Harvey, G.L., Henshaw, A.J., Bertoldi, W., Bruno, M.C. & England, J. (2016). River bank
484 burrowing by invasive crayfish: Spatial distribution, biophysical controls and biogeomorphic
485 significance. *Science of the Total Environment*, 569-570, 1190-1200.
486 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.06.194>

487 Fargen, C., Emery, S.M. & Carreiro, M.M. (2015). Influence of *Lonicera maackii* invasion on leaf litter
488 decomposition and macroinvertebrate communities in an urban stream. *Natural Areas Journal*,
489 35(3), 392-403. <https://doi.org/10.3375/043.035.0303>

490 Favaro, C. & Moore, J.W. (2015). Fish assemblages and barriers in an urban stream network.
491 *Freshwater Science*, 34(3), 991-1005. <https://doi.org/10.1086/681917>

492 Ficetola, G.F., Siesa, M.E., De Bernardi, F. & Padoa-Schioppa, E. (2012). Complex impact of an
493 invasive crayfish on freshwater food webs. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 21(10), 2641–2651.
494 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-012-0323-1>

495 Forman, R.T.T. (1996) *Land Mosaics: The Ecology of Landscapes and Regions*. Cambridge: Cambridge
496 University Press.

497 Foxcroft, L.C., Rouget, M. & Richardson, D.M. (2007). Risk assessment of riparian plant invasions into
498 protected areas. *Conservation Biology*, 21(2), 412-421. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2007.00673.x)
499 [1739.2007.00673.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2007.00673.x)

500 Francis, R.A. (2012). Positioning urban rivers within urban ecology. *Urban Ecosystems*, 15(2), 285-
501 291. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-012-0227-6>

502 Francis, R.A. (2014). Urban rivers: novel ecosystems, new challenges. *WIREs Water*, 1(1), 19-29.

503 Francis, R.A. & Chadwick, M.A. (2012). Invasive alien species in freshwater ecosystems: a brief
504 overview, in Francis, R.A. (ed) *A Handbook of Global Freshwater Invasive Species*, London,
505 Routledge, pp. 3-21.

506 Francis, R.A. & Chadwick, M.A. (2013). *Urban Ecosystems: Understanding the Human Environment*.
507 London: Routledge.

508 Francis, R.A. & Hoggart, S.P.G. (2012). The flora of urban river walls. *River Research and*
509 *Applications*, 28(8), 1200-1216. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rra.1497>

510 Gaertner, M., Wilson, J.R.U., Cadotte, M.W., MacIvor, J.S., Zenni, R.D. & Richardson, D.M. (2017).
511 Non-native species in urban environments: patterns, processes, impacts and challenges.
512 *Biological Invasions*, 19(12), 3461–3469. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-017-1598-7>

513 Grella, C., Renshaw, A. & Wright, I.A. (2018). Invasive weeds in urban riparian zones: the influence of
514 catchment imperviousness and soil chemistry across an urbanization gradient. *Urban*
515 *Ecosystems* 21(3), 505–517. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-018-0736-z>

516 Gurnell, A., Lee, M. & Souch, C. (2007). Urban rivers: Hydrology, geomorphology, ecology and
517 opportunities for change. *Geography Compass*, 1(5), 1118-1137.
518 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2007.00058.x>

519 Haslam, S. (2008). *The Riverscape and the River*. Cambridge, CUP.

520 Hayes, F.E. & Sewlal, J-A.N. (2004). The Amazon River as a dispersal barrier to passerine birds: effects
521 of river width, habitat and taxonomy. *Journal of Biogeography*, 31(11), 1809-1818.
522 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2004.01139.x>

523 Hoggart, S.P.G. & Francis, R.A. (2014). Use of coir rolls for habitat enhancement of urban river walls.
524 *Fundamental and Applied Limnology*, 185(1), 19-30. <https://doi.org/10.1127/fal/2014/0571>

525 Jackson, M.C. & Grey, J. (2013). Accelerating rates of freshwater invasions in the catchment of the
526 River Thames. *Biological Invasions*, 15(5), 945–951.

527 Kennedy, K.T.M. & El-Sabaawi, R.W. (2018). Decay patterns of invasive plants and plastic trash in
528 urban streams. *Urban Ecosystems*, 21(5), 817–830. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-018-0771-9>

529 King, S.A. & Buckney, R.T. (2000). Urbanization and exotic plants in northern Sydney streams. *Austral*
530 *Ecology*, 25(5), 455-461. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1442-9993.2000.01085.x>

531 Kornis, M.S. & Vander Zanden, M.J. (2010). Forecasting the distribution of the invasive round goby
532 (*Neogobius melanostomus*) in Wisconsin tributaries to Lake Michigan. *Canadian Journal of*
533 *Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 67(3), 553-562. <https://doi.org/10.1139/F10-002>

534 Kowarik, I., von der Lippe, M. & Cierjacks, A. (2013) Prevalence of alien versus native species of
535 woody plants in Berlin differs between habitats and at different scales. *Preslia*, 85(2), 113-132.

536 Kuglerová, L., Kielstra, B.W., Moore, R.D. & Richardson, J.S. (2019). Importance of scale, land-use,
537 and stream network properties for riparian plant communities along an urban gradient.
538 *Freshwater Biology* 64(3), 587-600. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13244>

539 Landis, C.L. & Leopold, D.J. (2014). Natural plant establishment along an urban stream, Onondaga
540 Creek, New York. *Northeastern Naturalist*, 21(2), 303-322.
541 <https://doi.org/10.1656/045.021.0211>

542 Leidy, R.A., Cervantes-Yoshida, K. & Carlson, S.M. (2011). Persistence of native fishes in small
543 streams of the urbanized San Francisco Estuary, California: acknowledging the role of urban
544 streams in native fish conservation. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*,
545 21(5), 472-483. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.1208>

546 Leuven, R.S.E.W., van der Velde, G., Baijens, I., Snijders, J., van der Zwart, C., Lenders, H.J.R., & bij de
547 Vaate, A. (2009). The river Rhine: a global highway for dispersal of aquatic invasive species.
548 *Biological Invasions*, 11: 1989. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-009-9491-7>

549 Lisi, P.J., Childress, E.S., Gagne, R.B., Hain, E.F., Lamphere, B.A., Walter, R.P., Hogan, J.D., Gilliam,
550 J.F., Blum, M.J. & McIntyre, P.B. (2018). Overcoming urban stream syndrome: Trophic flexibility
551 confers resilience in a Hawaiian stream fish. *Freshwater Biology*, 63(5), 492-502.
552 <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13091>

553 MacCoy, D. & Blew, D. (2005). Impacts of land-use changes and hydrologic modification on the lower
554 Boise River, Idaho, USA. *American Fisheries Society Symposium*, 47, 133-156.

555 MacDougall, A.S. & Turkington, R. (2005). Are invasive species the drivers or passengers of change in
556 degraded ecosystems? *Ecology*, 86(1), 42-55.

557 Mack, R.N. (2003) Global plant dispersal, naturalization, and invasion: pathways, modes and
558 circumstances, in G.M. Ruiz and J.T. Carlton (eds.) *Invasive Species: Vectors and Management*
559 *Strategies*, Washington: Island Press.

560 Masters, J.A. & Emery, S.M. (2016). Do multiple mechanisms drive the dominance of an invasive
561 plant (*Ranunculus ficaria*, Ranunculaceae) along an urban stream? *The Journal of the Torrey*
562 *Botanical Society*, 143(4), 359-366. <https://doi.org/10.3159/TORREY-D-15-00020.1>

563 Matsuzaki, S.S., Usio, N. Takamura, N. & Washitani, I. (2009). Contrasting impacts of invasive
564 engineers on freshwater ecosystems: an experiment and meta-analysis. *Oecologia*, 158(4), 673–
565 686. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-008-1180-1>

566 McLellan, S.L., Huse, S.M., Mueller-Spitz, S.R., Andreishcheva, E.N. & Sogin, M.L. (2010). Diversity
567 and population structure of sewage-derived microorganisms in wastewater treatment plant
568 influent. *Environmental Microbiology*, 12(2), 378-392. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-
569 2920.2009.02075.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2009.02075.x)

570 Meek, C.S., Richardson, D.M. & Mucina, L. (2010). A river runs through it: Land-use and the
571 composition of vegetation along a riparian corridor in the Cape Floristic Region, South Africa.
572 *Biological Conservation*, 143, 156-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2009.09.021>

573 Meek, C.S., Richardson, D.M. & Mucina, L. (2013). Plant communities along the Eerste River,
574 Western Cape, South Africa: Community descriptions and implications for restoration. *Koedoe*,
575 55(1), Art. #1099. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/koedoe.v55i1.1099>

576 Miller, W. & Boulton, A.J. (2005). Managing and rehabilitating ecosystem processes in regional urban
577 streams in Australia. *Hydrobiologia*, 552(1), 121-133. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-005-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-005-1510-9)
578 1510-9

579 Nel, H.A., Dalu, T. & Wasserman, R.J. (2018). Sinks and sources: assessing microplastic abundance in
580 river sediment and deposit feeders in an Austral temperate urban river system. *Science of the*
581 *Total Environment*, 612, 950-956. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.08.298>

582 Nelson, S.M. (2011). Response of stream macroinvertebrate assemblages to erosion control
583 structures in a wastewater dominated urban stream in the southwestern U.S. *Hydrobiologia*,
584 663(1), 51–69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-010-0550-y>

585 Padayachee, A.L., Irlich, U.M., Faulkner, K.T., Gaertner, M., Procheş, S., Wilson, J.R.U. & Rouget, M.
586 (2017) How do invasive species travel to and through urban environments? *Biological Invasions*,
587 19(12), 3557–3570. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-017-1596-9>

588 Petts, G.E., Heathcote, J. & Martin, D. (2002). *Urban Rivers: Our Inheritance and Future*. London: IWA
589 Publishing.

590 Poole, G.C. (2002). Fluvial landscape ecology: addressing uniqueness within the river discontinuum.
591 *Freshwater Biology*, 47(4), 641-660. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2427.2002.00922.x>

592 Rahel, F.J. (2013). Intentional fragmentation as a management strategy in aquatic systems.
593 *BioScience*, 63(5), 362–372. <https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2013.63.5.9>

594 Ramírez, A., Engman, A., Rosas, K.G., Perez-Reyes, O. & Martinó-Cardona, D.M. (2012). Urban
595 impacts on tropical island streams: Some key aspects influencing ecosystem response. *Urban*
596 *Ecosystems*, 15(2), 315–325. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-011-0214-3>

597 Richardson, D.M., Holmes, P.M., Esler, K.J., Galatowitsch, S.M., Stromberg, J.C., Kirkman, S.P., Pyšek,
598 P. & Hobbs, R.J. (2007). Riparian vegetation: degradation, alien plant invasions, and restoration
599 prospects. *Diversity and Distributions*, 13(1), 126-139. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1366-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1366-9516.2006.00314.x)
600 9516.2006.00314.x

601 Richmond, J.Q., Backlin, A.R., Galst-Cavalcante, C., O'Brien, J.W. & Fisher, R.N. (2018). Loss of
602 dendritic connectivity in southern California's urban riverscape facilitates decline of an endemic
603 freshwater fish. *Molecular Ecology*, 27(2), 369-386. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.14445>

604 Rotherham, I.D. (2017). *Recombinant Ecology – A Hybrid Future?* Cham: Springer.

605 Säumel, I. & Kowarik, I. (2010). Urban rivers as dispersal corridors for primarily wind-dispersed
606 invasive tree species. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 3-4, 244-249.
607 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2009.10.009>

608 Schlaepfer, M.A., Sax, D.F. & Olden, J.D. (2011). The potential conservation value of non-native
609 species. *Conservation Biology*, 25(3), 428-437. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-
610 1739.2010.01646.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01646.x)

611 Scholes, L., Faulkner, H., Tapsell, S. & Downward, S. (2008). Urban rivers as pollutant sinks and
612 sources: a public health concern for recreational river users? *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution: Focus*,
613 8(5-6), 543-553. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11267-008-9178-6>

614 Stefańska-Krzaczek, E. & Podgrudna, K. (2015). Floristic and phytocenotic indicators of the
615 conditions of riparian forests in the urban river valley. *Sylvan*, 159(1), 82-88.

616 Stromberg, J.C., Makings, E., Eyden, A., Madera, R., Samsky III, J., Coburn, F.S. & Scott, B.D. (2016).
617 Provincial and cosmopolitan: floristic composition of a dryland urban river. *Urban Ecosystems*,
618 19(1), 429–453. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-015-0482-4>

619 Suren, A.M. (2009). Using macrophytes in urban stream rehabilitation: a cautionary tale. *Restoration
620 Ecology*, 17(6), 873-883. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100X.2008.00446.x>

621 Swan, C.M., Healey, B. & Richardson, D.C. (2008). The role of native riparian tree species in
622 decomposition of invasive tree of heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*) leaf litter in an urban stream.
623 *Écoscience*, 1, 27-35. [https://doi.org/10.2980/1195-6860\(2008\)15\[27:TRONRT\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.2980/1195-6860(2008)15[27:TRONRT]2.0.CO;2)

624 Tait, C.J., Daniels, C.B. & Hill, R.S. (2005). Changes in species assemblages within the Adelaide
625 metropolitan area, Australia, 1836-2002. *Ecological Applications*, 15(1), 346-359.
626 <https://doi.org/10.1890/04-0920>

627 Tremblay, M.A. & St Clair, C.C. (2009). Factors affecting the permeability of transportation
628 and riparian corridors to the movements of songbirds in an urban landscape. *Journal of Applied
629 Ecology*, 46, 1314-1322. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2009.01717.x>

630 Trueman, R.J. & Erber, L. (2013). Invasive species may offer advanced phytoremediation of
631 endocrine disrupting chemicals in aquatic ecosystems. *Emirates Journal of Food & Agriculture*,
632 25(9), 648-656. <https://doi.org/10.9755/ejfa.v25i9.16393>

633 Turbelin A.J., Malamud, B.D.M. & Francis, R.A. (2017). Mapping the global state of invasive alien
634 species: patterns of invasion and policy responses. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 26(1), 78-
635 92.

636 Walsh, C.J., Roy, A.H., Feminella, J.W., Cottingham, P.D., Groffman, P.M. & Morgan, R.P. (2003). The
637 urban stream syndrome: current knowledge and the search for a cure, *Journal of the North
638 American Benthological Society*, 24, 706–723. <https://doi.org/10.1899/04-028.1>

639 Wenger, S.J., Roy, A.H., Jackson, C.R., Bernhardt, E.S., Carter, T.L., Filoso, S., Gibson, C.A. Hession,
640 W.C., Kaushal, S.S., Martí, E., Meyer, J.L., Palmer, M.A., Paul, M.J., Purcell, A.H., Ramírez, A.,
641 Rosemond, A.D., Schofield, K.A., Sudduth, E.B. & Walsh, C.J. (2009). Twenty-six key research
642 questions in urban stream ecology: an assessment of the state of the science. *Freshwater*
643 *Science*, 28(4), 1080-1098. <https://doi.org/10.1899/08-186.1>

644 Wilhelm, C.E. & Plummer, M.V. (2012). Diet of radiotracked musk turtles, *Sternotherus oderatus*, in a
645 small urban stream. *Herpetological Conservation and Biology*, 7(2), 258–264.

646 Zedler, J.B. & Kercher, S. (2004). Causes and consequences of invasive plants in wetlands:
647 opportunities, opportunists, and outcomes. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences*, 23(5), 431-452.
648 <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352680490514673>

649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684

685
686
687

Domain	Feature	Potential Symptom*	Urban-specific drivers	Influence on invasions
Physical	Hydrology	More overland flows; Faster rise to peak flows; Higher storm discharge; Decrease baseflows; Increased baseflows; Increased frequency of overbank floods	Changes in storm hydrology relate to decreased infiltration and increased runoff related to increased impervious surfaces; changes in baseflow relate to increased water abstractions and decreased groundwater recharge affecting groundwater levels; bed downcutting can increase surface water via reduced hyporheic habitat volumes; point sources can raise average discharges.	Changes in disturbance regimes can remove or reduce native communities and support dispersal and establishment of non-natives; overland flows transport non-native propagules from urban land cover to the river.
	Temperature	Increased stream water temperature	Urban heat island; hotter than ambient discharges.	Warmer temperatures can favour non-natives from warmer climates.
	Geomorphology	Increased channel width; Scouring; Accumulation of fine sediments; Increased substrate embeddedness; Modified sediment loads	Modification to hydrology (see above) and sediment supply from catchment-level urban development; channelization, habitat simplification and modification for flood control affects scouring flows and sediment supply at reach-scales.	Changes in disturbance regimes as noted above for hydrology; newly scoured or deposited sediment can be rapidly colonised by non-natives.
	Instream habitat	Decreased habitat complexity; Changes in habitat dimensions (e.g. pool depth); Culvert, weirs, modified channels	Modified hydrology, geomorphology and addition of anthropogenic structures (e.g., weirs, culverts, banks modifications) lead to simplification and destabilized dynamics.	Simpler habitats (and particularly artificial structures) may be more susceptible to invasion.
	Riparian habitat	Loss of bankside vegetation; Increased light	Loss of species richness due to land clearing and flood management activities; increases in lawns and parks with decreases in trees; flooding scours riparian habitats	Degraded native communities offer opportunities for non-native colonisation, especially when planted in riparian or adjacent zones.
Chemical	Point Sources: Sewage Industrial Waste	Increased nutrients; Increase organic matter loading; Industry related pollutants	Wastewater and industrial effluents; combined sewer overflows.	Eutrophication may further favour non-natives that already have a competitive advantage over natives, or that have a higher tolerance for pollution.
	Non-Point Sources: Macronutrients	Increased nutrients; Sediment loading;	Non-point source runoff of terrestrial derived pollutants;	

	Toxics	Pesticides; Contaminated road runoff;		
Biological	Algae Invertebrates Fish Riparian vegetation Water bird Riparian animals	Decreases in richness and abundance of sensitive taxa with corresponding increases in tolerant taxa; Simplification of food webs via loss of sensitive taxa; Potential increases in invasive and non-native species; Modified links between aquatic and terrestrial species	Impaired water quality and loss of habitat decreases overall biodiversity; Changes in habitat structure affects animal behaviours; Acute mortality event and chronic toxicity from degrade water quality.	Degraded and simplified native communities create niches and offer opportunities for non-native colonisation and dominance; non-natives can facilitate further non-native invasions of associated species.
Ecological	Ecosystems Functions Ecosystems Services	More work needed to elucidate how both ecosystem functions and services are modified by urbanization of aquatic systems; degradation of urban systems are linked to over-extraction of ecosystem services (e.g. waste assimilation associated with sewage effluents)	Modification of natural process at catchment scale (i.e. land use changes with increased impervious surfaces) and finer scales (e.g. habitat modifications; local pollution).	Disturbances, interruptions and modifications to functions and services offer opportunities and facilitate invasions as noted above for individual features.

688 Table 1. Summary of the Urban Steam Syndrome with evaluation of physical, chemical, biological and ecological patterns, and indications of how patterns
689 can influence species invasions (modified from Walsh *et al.* 2005, Richardson *et al.* 2007; Wenger *et al.* 2009, Kominkova 2012, Hale *et al.* 2016).

690

Location	Organism type	Finding	Source
Riparian zones of urban rivers in Sheffield (UK)	Plants	28% of plant species were neophytes, (introduced after 1500 AD) with a further 8% archaeophytes (introduced before 1500 AD)	Dallimer <i>et al.</i> (2012)
Riparian zones of urban rivers in Sheffield (UK)	Birds	3 out of 74 (4%) bird species were non-native	Dallimer <i>et al.</i> (2012)
Urban streams in Manaus (Brazil)	Plants (woody)	15% of woody species were non-native.	dos Anjos Santos <i>et al.</i> (2016)
Riparian zones of an urban stream in NY (USA)	Plants	51% non-native species (34% at more rural sites).	Landis and Leopold (2014)

Urbanised catchment in Puerto Rico (USA)	Fish	5 out of 11 (45%) species were non-native.	Engman and Ramírez (2012)
Urban streams of Toledo, Southern Brazil	Fish	4 out of 26 (15%) species were non-native.	Daga <i>et al.</i> (2012)
Urban river walls of the River Thames, London (UK)	Plants	14 out of 90 (16%) species were non-native.	Francis and Hoggart (2012)
Streams of the urbanized San Francisco Estuary, California	Fish	7 out of 17 (41%) species were non-native.	Leidy <i>et al.</i> 2011
Urban streams in the Santa Ana River basin, CA (USA)	Fish	12 of 16 species (75%) were non-native.	Brown <i>et al.</i> (2005)
Urban riparian zones in SW Poland	Plants	9% of plant species were non-native.	Stefanska-Krzaczek and Podgrudna (2015)
Urban riparian soils in the River Brent, London (UK)	Plants	21% of species observed from the seed bank were non-native.	Cockel and Gurnell (2012)
Mobile seed bank along the River Thames, London.	Plants	33% of species observed from the seed bank were non-native.	Hoggart and Francis (2014)
Urbanised River Rhine catchment in Germany	Macroinvertebrates	11.3% of species were non-native on average across different freshwater sections of the river.	Leuvan <i>et al.</i> (2009)

691 Table 2: A sample of studies showing proportions of non-natives in ecological communities.

692

693

694