



**HAL**  
open science

## Recent advances in availability and synthesis of the economic costs of biological invasions

Danish A. Ahmed, Phillip J. Haubrock, Ross N. Cuthbert, Alok Bang, Ismael Soto, Paride Balzani, Ali Serhan Tarkan, Rafael L. Macêdo, Laís Carneiro, Thomas W. Bodey, et al.

### ► To cite this version:

Danish A. Ahmed, Phillip J. Haubrock, Ross N. Cuthbert, Alok Bang, Ismael Soto, et al.. Recent advances in availability and synthesis of the economic costs of biological invasions. *Bioscience*, In press, 10.22541/au.167907497.77590504/v1 . hal-04148456v1

**HAL Id: hal-04148456**

**<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-04148456v1>**

Submitted on 6 Jul 2023 (v1), last revised 16 Oct 2023 (v2)

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

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



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

1 *Overview article*

2 **Recent advances in availability and synthesis of the economic costs of biological invasions**

3 Danish A. Ahmed<sup>1,\*</sup>, Phillip J. Haubrock<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup>, Ross N. Cuthbert<sup>4,\*</sup>, Alok Bang<sup>5,6,7</sup>, Ismael Soto<sup>3</sup>,  
4 Paride Balzani<sup>3</sup>, Ali Serhan Tarkan<sup>8,9</sup>, Rafael L. Macêdo<sup>10,11,12</sup>, Laís Carneiro<sup>13</sup>, Thomas W.  
5 Bodey<sup>14</sup>, Francisco J. Oficialdegui<sup>3</sup>, Pierre Courtois<sup>15</sup>, Melina Kourantidou<sup>16,17</sup>, Elena Angulo<sup>18</sup>,  
6 Gustavo Heringer<sup>19</sup>, David Renault<sup>20</sup>, Anna J. Turbelin<sup>21,22</sup>, Emma J. Hudgins<sup>23</sup>, Chunlong  
7 Liu<sup>24,25</sup>, Showkat Ahmad Gojery<sup>26</sup>, Ugo Arbieu<sup>21,27,28</sup>, Christophe Diagne<sup>29</sup>, Boris Leroy<sup>30</sup>,  
8 Elizabeta Briski<sup>31</sup>, Corey J. A. Bradshaw<sup>32,33,‡</sup>, Franck Courchamp<sup>21,‡</sup>

9 <sup>1</sup>Center for Applied Mathematics and Bioinformatics, Department of Mathematics and Natural  
10 Sciences, Gulf University for Science and Technology, Hawally, Kuwait

11 <sup>2</sup>Senckenberg Research Institute and Natural History Museum Frankfurt, Department of River  
12 Ecology and Conservation, Gelnhausen, Germany

13 <sup>3</sup>University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice, Faculty of Fisheries and Protection of  
14 Waters, South Bohemian Research Center of Aquaculture and Biodiversity of Hydrocenoses,  
15 Zátiší 728/II, 389 25 Vodňany, Czech Republic

16 <sup>4</sup>Institute for Global Food Security, School of Biological Sciences, Queen's University Belfast,  
17 Belfast, BT9 5DL, Northern Ireland

18 <sup>5</sup>School of Arts and Sciences, Azim Premji University, Bangalore 562125, India

19 <sup>6</sup>School of Arts and Sciences, Azim Premji University, Bhopal, India

20 <sup>7</sup>Society for Ecology, Evolution and Development, Wardha 442001, India

21 <sup>8</sup>Department of Basic Sciences, Faculty of Fisheries, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, 48000,  
22 Muğla, Turkey

23 <sup>9</sup>Department of Life and Environmental Sciences, Faculty of Science and Technology,  
24 Bournemouth University, Poole, Dorset, United Kingdom

25 <sup>10</sup>Graduate Program in Conservation and Ecotourism, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro State  
26 (UNIRIO), Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

27 <sup>11</sup>Institute of Biology, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

28 <sup>12</sup>Neotropical Limnology Group (NEL), Federal University of Rio de Janeiro State, Av. Pasteur,  
29 458, 22290-240, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil

30 <sup>13</sup>Laboratório de Ecologia e Conservação, Departamento de Engenharia Ambiental, Setor de  
31 Tecnologia, Universidade Federal do Paraná, 81531-980, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil

32 <sup>14</sup>School of Biological Sciences, King's College, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen AB24 3FX,  
33 United Kingdom

34 <sup>15</sup>Centre for Environmental Economics — Montpellier, Université Montpellier, Centre national  
35 de recherche scientifique, Institut national de recherche pour l'agriculture, l'alimentation et  
36 l'environnement, Institut Agro, Montpellier, France

37 <sup>16</sup>Department of Sociology, Environmental and Business Economics, University of Southern  
38 Denmark, Degnevej 14, 6705, Esbjerg Ø, Denmark

39 <sup>17</sup>Université de Bretagne Occidentale, UMR 6308 AMURE, IUEM, rue Dumont d'Urville, 29280  
40 Plouzané, France

41 <sup>18</sup>Estación Biológica de Doñana (CSIC), Seville, Spain

42 <sup>19</sup>Departamento de Ecologia e Conservação, Instituto de Ciências Naturais, Universidade Federal  
43 de Lavras - UFLA, CEP 37200-900, Lavras-MG, Brazil

44 <sup>20</sup>Centre national de recherche scientifique, Ecosystèmes, Biodiversité, Evolution, UMR 6553,  
45 University of Rennes, F-35000 Rennes, France

46 <sup>21</sup>Université Paris-Saclay, Centre national de recherche scientifique, AgroParisTech, Ecologie  
47 Systématique Evolution, 91405, Orsay, France

48 <sup>22</sup>Great Lakes Forestry Centre, Canadian Forestry Services, Natural Resources Canada, Sault Ste  
49 Marie, Ontario P6A 2E5, Canada

50 <sup>23</sup>Department of Biology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5B6, Canada

51 <sup>24</sup>College of Fisheries, Ocean University of China, Qingdao 266003, China

52 <sup>25</sup>Institute of Hydrobiology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan 430072 China

53 <sup>26</sup>Department of Botany, University of Kashmir, Hazratbal Srinagar-190006, Kashmir, India

54 <sup>27</sup>Senckenberg Biodiversity and Climate Research Centre (SBIK-F), Senckenberganlage, 60325  
55 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

56 <sup>28</sup>Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute, National Zoological Park, 1500 Remount Road,  
57 Front Royal, VA 22630, United States of America

58 <sup>29</sup>Institut de Recherche pour le Développement, UMR CBGP (IRD, INRA, Cirad, Montpellier  
59 SupAgro), Montpellier Université d'Excellence, 755 Avenue du campus Agropolis, 34988  
60 Montferrier-sur-Lez Cedex, France

61 <sup>30</sup>Unité Biologie des Organismes et Ecosystèmes Aquatiques (BOREA UMR 8067), Muséum  
62 National d'Histoire Naturelle, Sorbonne Universités, Université de Caen Normandie, Université  
63 des Antilles, CNRS, IRD, Paris, France

64 <sup>31</sup>GEOMAR Helmholtz-Zentrum für Ozeanforschung Kiel, 24105 Kiel, Germany

65 <sup>32</sup>Global Ecology | *Partuyarta Ngadluku Wardli Kuu*, College of Science and Engineering,  
66 Flinders University, GPO Box 2100, Adelaide, South Australia 5001, Australia

67 <sup>33</sup>ARC Centre of Excellence for Australian Biodiversity and Heritage, Wollongong, New South  
68 Wales, Australia, EpicAustralia.org.au

69 \*Co-first authors

70 ‡Co-senior authors

71 **Keywords:** environmental management, guiding policy, InvaCost, invasive species, economic  
72 impacts

73 **Corresponding author:** Danish A. Ahmed<sup>1,\*</sup>, E-mail: [ahmed.d@gust.edu.kw](mailto:ahmed.d@gust.edu.kw)

#### 74 **Abstract**

75 Biological invasions are a global challenge that has received insufficient attention. Recently  
76 available cost syntheses have provided policy and decision makers with reliable and up-to-date  
77 information on the economic impacts of invasive alien species, aiming to motivate effective  
78 management. The resultant InvaCost database is now publicly and freely accessible and enables  
79 rapid extraction of monetary cost information globally. This has facilitated knowledge sharing,  
80 developed a more integrated and multidisciplinary network of researchers, and forged  
81 multidisciplinary collaborations among diverse organisations and stakeholders. Over 50  
82 scientific publications so far have used the database and provided detailed assessments of  
83 invasion costs across geographic, taxonomic, and spatio-temporal scales. These studies have  
84 been instrumental in guiding policy and legislative decisions, while attracting public and media  
85 attention. We provide an overview of the improved availability, reliability, and defragmentation  
86 of monetary costs, how this has enhanced invasion science as a discipline, and outline directions  
87 for future development.

## 88 **1. Introduction**

89 Globalisation of economies and societies has accelerated trade, travel, and connectivity,  
90 increasing the potential for exchanges of biological material between distant regions and eroding  
91 natural biogeographical barriers (Vander Zanden & Olden 2008; Duffy *et al.* 2017). Increased  
92 global trade and transport have concomitantly accelerated the translocation of alien species to  
93 unprecedented rates (Essl *et al.* 2011; Seebens *et al.* 2017). The intentional (e.g., for biocontrol  
94 or leisure activities) or unintentional (e.g., by 'hitchhiking') translocation of species by humans  
95 can result in the establishment of self-sustaining populations of alien species that consequently  
96 spread within their new environment (i.e., invasive alien species), with the potential to cause  
97 staggering ecological (Blackburn *et al.* 2011; Bellard *et al.* 2021), health (Zhang *et al.* 2022),  
98 socio- ((Bradshaw *et al.* 2016; Bacher *et al.* 2018; Diagne *et al.* 2021)), and economic damages  
99 (Bradshaw *et al.* 2016; Bacher *et al.* 2018; Diagne *et al.* 2021).

100 Invasive alien species are among the main drivers of (i) global biodiversity loss through their  
101 degradation of ecological communities and functions (Bellard *et al.* 2022), (ii) alteration of  
102 functional diversity (Milardi *et al.* 2019; Kaushik *et al.* 2022; Renault *et al.* 2022b), (iii)  
103 disruption of ecosystem services such as pollination, freshwater provisioning, nutrient cycling,  
104 and soil fertility (Pejchar & Mooney 2009; Vilà *et al.* 2010), and (iv) massive economic losses  
105 worldwide (Bradshaw *et al.* 2016; Diagne *et al.* 2021). This has propelled invasion biology as a  
106 major discipline in ecology, and a resulting increased awareness of their threats and rates of  
107 introduction highlights the need to prevent, control, and eradicate invasive alien species  
108 (Simberloff *et al.* 2013).

109 However, biological invasions have not yet been acknowledged to the extent the problems  
110 they impose deserve, by either the public or policy makers (Courchamp *et al.* 2017). This

111 blindness to the importance and risks conveyed by invasions is further accentuated through doubt  
112 cast by works questioning the severity of the problem (Russell & Blackburn 2017). Additionally,  
113 challenges such as unclear definitions, lack of general rules, a multitude of impact- and risk-  
114 assessment scoring systems, inadequate funding, and inappropriate or absent legislation have  
115 reduced awareness and uptake of management approaches for biological invasions in  
116 conservation programs (Courchamp *et al.* 2017; Jarić *et al.* 2020). The resulting concepts,  
117 theories, threats, and laws have made it difficult to navigate the field and to disseminate novel  
118 findings, especially for decision makers. These challenges have led to insufficient efforts to  
119 mitigate biological invasions in tandem with other major global environmental changes (e.g.,  
120 climate change), resulting in large impacts that potentially could have been circumvented if they  
121 had been addressed earlier (Ahmed *et al.* 2022).

122 Public health and monetary costs are salient metrics to communicate the effects of biological  
123 invasions with policy makers and the public (Diagne *et al.* 2021; Zhang *et al.* 2022), and  
124 economic impacts represent a familiar and readily standardised measure of impact across  
125 contexts. Reliable information on the costs of damage caused by biological invasions and the  
126 costs of managing them is also essential for setting priorities and developing effective  
127 management strategies (Dana *et al.* 2014; Booy *et al.* 2020). A limitation to overcome is the lack  
128 of openly available information on the monetary costs arising from invasive alien species.  
129 Overarching attempts to improve governance approaches for greater proactiveness towards  
130 invasions, for example by the European Commission (European Union 2014) or the US  
131 government (Reid *et al.* 2021; Meyerson *et al.* 2022), have successfully highlighted the  
132 importance of invasive alien species control and have formulated management prescriptions.  
133 However, such legislation often lacks a strong evidence base, which weakens operational

134 effectiveness (Faulkner *et al.* 2020; Lukey & Hall 2020). The cornerstone of these regulations is  
135 the list of priority species at the territorial level, modelled on the list of the world's 100 worst  
136 invasive alien species (Lowe *et al.* 2000; Nentwig *et al.* 2018). However, although assessment  
137 methods on which these lists are based generally mention the costs caused by invasions, the lack  
138 of broad-scale cost information, and the flaws and untested assumptions of many local and  
139 regional cost studies (Bradshaw *et al.* 2016; Diagne *et al.* 2021) are major drawbacks.

140 While broad-scale economic cost estimates had been made previously, they are often based on  
141 unsupported extrapolations, unrealistic assumptions or undocumented sources (Pimentel *et al.*  
142 2000, 2001, 2005; Kettunen *et al.* 2009; Pimentel 2011). Fortunately, structured and reproducible  
143 syntheses of monetary impacts from biological invasions have gained traction recently through  
144 the *InvaCost* database (Diagne *et al.* 2020; Leroy *et al.* 2022). These recent works have  
145 profoundly altered the focus of investigation into the monetary costs of alien species across  
146 regions and taxonomic scales (Zenni *et al.* 2021), and have demonstrated how effective control  
147 can benefit legislators and stakeholders (Ahmed *et al.* 2022; Cuthbert *et al.* 2022). *InvaCost* has  
148 established a sound socio-economic and political foundation for legislative change. Here, we  
149 synthesise the advances made through this extended approach, highlighting knowledge gaps and  
150 identifying future research avenues. Our main objective is to provide a comprehensive overview  
151 of this process, which necessarily includes a detailed description of *InvaCost* given its recent  
152 widespread uptake in the field of invasion costs.

## 153 **2. Historical lack of accurate cost syntheses**

154 Prior to *InvaCost*, most attempts to inventory the monetary costs of invasive species at broad  
155 scales were fraught with subjectivity, lack of empirical support, and/or speculation (see also Box  
156 1). In many cases, cost estimates were given without citation, were obsolete, referred to



157 untraceable sources such as personal communications with experts or unpublished data, or the  
158 sources cited — when cross-referenced — did not report the numbers claimed (see incidences  
159 provided in Lovell & Stone 2005; Oreska & Aldridge 2010; Goldstein 2011). Where citations  
160 were traceable and reliable, many estimates were crude, arising from overestimation, e.g., a total  
161 cost multiplied by the proportion of invasive species among many candidate species within the  
162 system; or extrapolations of case studies to the entire (often only suspected) distribution or  
163 population size of a particular invasive species. Additionally, many of these regional costs are  
164 based on extrapolations that draw from bioeconomic models that go beyond the intended  
165 contexts (e.g., Hoagland & Jin 2006; Yemshanov *et al.* 2009; Goldstein 2011; McDermott *et al.*  
166 2013). Moreover, explanations for extrapolations, when provided, often had logical flaws or the  
167 multipliers used had no empirical basis (i.e., they were not measured quantitatively) (Goldstein  
168 2011).

### **Box 1. Urban legends in invasion biology**

Perpetuating citations of retracted papers in ecology spreads misinformation and retards research (Cosentino & Veríssimo 2016). An analogous phenomenon occurs in invasion biology, where citations of irreproducible estimates spread unreliable information (Section 2). However, irreproducible estimates can sometimes be concealed within convoluted citation chains.

For example, reviews of the Formosan termite *Coptotermes formosanus* in peer-reviewed journals suggest this species costs nearly US\$40 billion year<sup>-1</sup> globally (Rust & Su 2012; Ahmad *et al.* 2021); many studies cite these reviews to justify this estimate. However, the price tag was an unsubstantiated and unreferenced increase on a previous estimate of US\$22 billion

year<sup>-1</sup> (Su 2002), but even that estimate was a dubious speculation extrapolated from a single value of US\$1.5 billion year<sup>-1</sup> for the USA (Su 1994). Digging deeper, it turns out that the USA-wide value came from another source (Su 1991), which was itself extrapolated from an unrefereed report in a symposium proceedings that only gave an unsubstantiated estimate of US\$60 million for Hawai'i in 1985.

Therefore, an irreproducible local estimate of US\$60 million in 1985 eventually mushroomed — without evidence — into a global value of US\$40 billion year<sup>-1</sup> by 2021, gaining the unwarranted endorsement of peer review in the process. Although this is an egregious example, it is unfortunately not an isolated case (Section 2). We urge invasion biologists to adopt best citation practices (e.g., Teixeira *et al.* 2013; Sanz-Martín *et al.* 2016) to avoid unsubstantiated statements and inflation. We therefore recommend (i) not citing a paper that is not itself the source of a monetary value, (ii) identifying when the original sources cannot be accessed/confirmed, (iii) highlighting uncertainties and inconsistencies in any dubious estimates, and (iv) avoiding updating or otherwise modifying previous estimates without providing detailed methods and justifications.

InvaCost has started a procedure to measure and report the reproducibility of each cost record; however, it is a laborious process for the more than 13,000 records currently reported in the database. The onus is therefore on cost reporters to be vigilant, detailed, and authentic.

169

170 To demonstrate these issues, consider the four major papers that provided cost estimates of  
171 invasive species at a global, national, or regional scale (Pimentel *et al.* 2000, 2001, 2005;  
172 Pimentel 2011) prior to the advent of the *InvaCost* database. These four sources, updated in  
173 succession, have consistently served as primary references in invasion cost-related studies, to

174 date receiving several thousands of citations, underpinning other influential studies. Despite  
175 these acknowledged limitations, values from these publications are still cited today without  
176 recognition of the limitations embedded. Although the cost estimates formulated therein were  
177 arguably the best and the only available at that time and brought attention to the problem of  
178 invasions, in hindsight they all contained serious flaws.

179 For example, Sagoff (2008) outlined several flaws in the cost values presented, and Holmes *et*  
180 *al.* (2009) identified large biases in the estimates of damages arising from forest pests.  
181 Additionally, many values were not accompanied by any supporting citations or raw data, such  
182 as the value of 50,000 non-indigenous species having been introduced to the United States. The  
183 purported cost of zebra mussels at US\$1 billion year<sup>-1</sup> was not supported (U. S. Department of  
184 State 2009), although there were two credible sources citing the costs of this species, both  
185 substantially < US\$1 billion year<sup>-1</sup> (O'Neill 1997; U. S. Department of State 2009). Another  
186 example in Pimentel's 2011 book cited a cost of US\$631 million for West Nile virus, but the  
187 corresponding table therein (Table 1) provides no citation, making it difficult for the reader to  
188 trace the source. Other references contained costs from non-peer-reviewed sources (e.g.,  
189 Armstrong 1995) that were themselves based on unpublished reports that were difficult to  
190 source. Yet, other calculations were based on unsubstantiated costs, such as those given for rats  
191 (*Rattus* spp.) (without citation) as US\$15 rat<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup> and birds killed by cats (US\$30 bird<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>)  
192 (critiqued by Goldstein 2011; Lamb 2013). Similarly, neither the data nor calculations were  
193 summarised in Pimentel *et al.* (2001) for the values of introduced mammals to Brazil (Mares *et*  
194 *al.* 1989). Other calculations were based on flawed logic — the total cost of dog bites was given  
195 as US\$250 million year<sup>-1</sup>, when most bites are from domestic (pet) dogs and not invasive (stray)  
196 dogs. Weeds were reported (U. S. Bureau of the Census 1998) to cause a 12% loss in yield,

197 which translated to US\$32 billion year<sup>-1</sup>. However, this was based on the erroneous assumption  
198 that the damage by weed species to crops are distributed equally; a similar line of reasoning was  
199 applied to crop insect pests (US\$14.4 billion year<sup>-1</sup>), forest insect pests (US\$2.1 billion year<sup>-1</sup>),  
200 plant pathogens for crops (US\$21.5 billion year<sup>-1</sup>), and for forests (US\$2.1 billion year<sup>-1</sup>). Based  
201 on an unsubstantiated damage cost of US\$200 pig<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>, they implicitly assumed that every  
202 single pig (*Sus scrofa*) attacks crops and therefore all entail this per-capita cost. This was the  
203 same approach taken to estimate the damage arising from starlings (*Sturnus* spp.) (US\$800  
204 million year<sup>-1</sup>).

205 Perhaps the most egregious example of unsubstantiated estimates concerns the reported cost  
206 for fire ants (*Solenopsis* spp.) and Formosan termites (*Coptotermes formosanus*; see also Box 1).  
207 The *Solenopsis* estimates were derived from dubious sources (irretrievable: Vinson 1992; from a  
208 newspaper: Corn *et al.* 2002), and then simply multiplied by the number of U.S. states where the  
209 species were present, to arrive at a total value of US\$1 billion year<sup>-1</sup>. This figure has been cited  
210 many times since and continues to garner citations. Other estimates were grounded in ecological  
211 *non sequuntur* (Goldstein 2011). For example, if rats (that eat grain and other human  
212 commodities) are deemed to cost US\$19 billion, and cats (that eat birds) are deemed to cost  
213 US\$17 billion, but the beneficial impact of cats eating rats is ignored, these values are an  
214 overestimate. The papers also confused control and damage costs (Sagoff 2008) — the estimated  
215 control cost of one pigeon in a localised survey was multiplied by an unsubstantiated estimate of  
216 the total number of pigeons. The resulting value could be interpreted as the cost to control all  
217 pigeons (if such a program existed), but was instead claimed to be the cost of the total accrued  
218 damage caused by them.

219 Building on improving previous works that were methodologically flawed, yet widely needed  
220 and cited (Pimentel *et al.* 2000, 2005; Kettunen *et al.* 2009), assessments of economic damages  
221 due to invasions mostly focused on either few model taxa (Bradshaw *et al.* 2016), specific  
222 economic sectors (Paini *et al.* 2016) or ecosystems (Lovell *et al.* 2006), and limited spatial scales  
223 (Hoffmann & Broadhurst 2016). Despite their potential shortcomings, most published studies  
224 had the benefit of raising awareness on the consequences associated with the monetary burden of  
225 invasive alien species. Moreover, while being essential for the purpose of policy, management,  
226 and reporting, the lack of an accessible and broad inventory of the monetary costs of invasive  
227 alien species hindered improved understanding of the burden of invasions.

228 Due to the lack of precise cost estimates, flawed syntheses became widely cited and led to  
229 unsubstantiated values, which in turn provided ammunition for denialists to challenge the  
230 legitimacy of the field. Given this background and limitations in existing cost estimates, there  
231 was a clear need for improved calibration and synthesis of the economic costs of biological  
232 invasions worldwide, and most importantly including traceability of sources for costs. This need  
233 resulted in the creation of an interdisciplinary team of experts from ecology, economy and  
234 invasion sciences starting in 2014 (invacost.fr), who together contributed to the public release of  
235 the *InvaCost* database (Diagne *et al.* 2020).

### 236 **3. History of InvaCost**

#### 237 **3.1 Evolution of the *InvaCost* database**

238 *InvaCost* is a global compilation of available estimates of the costs associated with invasive  
239 species and largely fills these gaps. Estimates in *InvaCost* are derived largely from peer-reviewed  
240 scientific articles and published grey literature, with particular attention paid to reproducibility  
241 and data descriptors. The original *InvaCost* database ('v0') only included data related to the

242 damage and management costs incurred by invasive insects, containing 260 entries (i.e., rows of  
243 data, each including a cost estimate) at a global scale (Bradshaw *et al.* 2016). The first officially  
244 released version of *InvaCost* (v1.0) had grown to 2419 entries by September 2020  
245 (doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.12668570.v1). The next publicly released version (v3.0) included 9823  
246 entries and an associated complementary database consisting mainly of references not yet  
247 processed, as well as a database compiling data from 10 non-English languages (Angulo *et al.*  
248 2021b). In June 2021, the number of entries increased to 13123 (v4.0), with the most-recent  
249 version (v4.1, January 2022) of *InvaCost* contains 13553 entries and compiles literature in 22  
250 languages (Diagne *et al.* 2022; Kourantidou *et al.* 2022a). Moreover, the *InvaCost* project now  
251 includes a ‘living figure’ that uses the latest database version to represent the most up-to-date  
252 cost breakdowns across geographic and taxonomic contexts graphically (Diagne *et al.* 2021;  
253 Leroy *et al.* 2021).

254 The ongoing growth in cost information inevitably modified summaries of cost trends  
255 reported over time (Fig. 1), including number of database entries (Fig. 1a), number of species  
256 (Fig 1b), and annual costs (Fig. 1c). These trends each display a similar dynamic, characterised  
257 by a rapid accrual of the number of documents reporting costs, number of species reported as the  
258 cause, and the costs themselves, followed by an apparent decline in the most recent years. As  
259 with other aspects of invasion science, the incurring of economic costs is subject to pervasive  
260 time lags due to delays (Essl *et al.* 2011) in (i) the official reporting following species  
261 establishment, and (ii) the potential impacts post-establishment. These delays, particularly those  
262 pertaining to eventual publication of monetary cost estimates, explain the apparent decline over  
263 the most recent decades (Fig. 1). Several studies have accounted for these delays when  
264 summarising temporal trends in costs (Diagne *et al.* 2021; Haubrock *et al.* 2021) by removing or

265 reweighting later ‘incomplete’ years based on the time delay between cost incurrence and  
266 reporting (Leroy *et al.* 2022). Nevertheless, excluding recent data or correcting for the lag in  
267 reporting as noted by Diagne *et al.* (2021) and Heringer *et al.* (2021), the analysis suggests that  
268 the rate and magnitude of invasion costs continue to rise.

### 269 **3.2 Capturing the multi-faceted nature of invasion costs**

270 There are large differences in how agencies assess the costs of biological invasions, reflecting  
271 differing, and sometimes competing, interests at local, regional, and national scales. The earlier  
272 attempts on reporting the costs of invasive species focused primarily on the United States (e.g.,  
273 Pimentel *et al.* 2000, 2005; Pimentel 2011), whereas elsewhere, cost estimates were also  
274 provided for several other nations (including Australia, Brazil, India, South Africa, United  
275 Kingdom) (Pimentel *et al.* 2001) and European countries (Kettunen *et al.* 2009). These studies  
276 were constrained not only by geography, but also by taxonomic coverage, targeted sectors and  
277 habitats.

278 Recognising and addressing such limitations, 23 publications that have used the *InvaCost*  
279 database have provided cost assessments on national, regional or continental scales (Fig. 2). Of  
280 these, focus has been on nations (e.g., Spain: Angulo *et al.* 2021a; France: Renault *et al.* 2021),  
281 an important scale given its correspondence with relevant levels of governance and legal  
282 jurisdiction. Others focusing on regional scales (e.g., North America: Crystal-Ornelas *et al.*  
283 2021; Europe: Haubrock *et al.* 2021; Mediterranean: Kourantidou *et al.* 2021) have provided  
284 useful comparisons between neighbouring locations or trading partners that face similar invasion  
285 threats. Global-scale assessments have provided comparisons of practice across areas with  
286 differing political geographies (Bodey *et al.* 2022a) or common management goals (Moodley *et*  
287 *al.* 2022)

288 In addition, 11 studies have focused on various taxonomic groups (Fig. 2). Taxonomic studies  
289 can be ‘nested’ at different scales, such as analyses of aquatic invaders as a whole (Cuthbert *et*  
290 *al.* 2021) followed by a detailed assessment for invasive fish (Haubrock *et al.* 2022), or a  
291 compilation of costs of terrestrial invertebrates (Renault *et al.* 2022a) followed by a specific  
292 assessment of ants (Angulo *et al.* 2022). Such distinctions are useful because, while a higher  
293 level of classification can reveal the general state of knowledge, different management strategies  
294 are often needed for specific taxonomic groups, and organisations/stakeholders can have  
295 particular taxonomic foci.

296 For a more holistic approach, cost assessments have also been provided for other thematic  
297 categories, such as habitats (e.g., costs incurred for island conservation) (Bodey *et al.* 2022a),  
298 sectoral (e.g., biosecurity and prevention) (Cuthbert *et al.* 2022), conceptual (e.g., additional  
299 expenditure due to delayed action or inaction) (Ahmed *et al.* 2022), and generic studies (e.g.,  
300 increase in cost data by considering non-English sources) (Angulo *et al.* 2021b) (Fig. 2).

301 Assessments of invasion costs at more macro-scales are important because, without regional  
302 or national breakdowns of cost assessments, the motivation for national decision making is  
303 lacking. However, these studies have revealed research gaps, particularly for cost estimation in  
304 poorly investigated regions such as in many African nations. It is also essential to contextualise  
305 and summarise costs at more granular taxonomic, sectoral and geographically localised scales,  
306 because this information provides the detailed understanding of the impacts and costs associated  
307 with specific species or industries, and can help to prioritise resources and efficiently allocate  
308 funding at subnational scales. However, such finer-scale information is often lacking at the  
309 resolutions required for effectively targeting responses (Angulo *et al.* 2022; Soto *et al.* 2022).  
310 Yet, this additional detail in reporting of costs would provide a more comprehensive



311 understanding of the impacts of biological invasions and, ultimately, contribute to a more  
312 effective response to the threat they pose.

### 313 **3.3 Policy and communication impacts**

#### 314 **3.3.1 Policy guidance**

315 The study on environmental and economic costs in the United States by Pimentel *et al.* (2000)  
316 has been referred to in 21 policy documents, including a report by the National Research Council  
317 (2000) that explores the role of chemical pesticides to identify opportunities for increasing the  
318 benefits and reducing the risks of pesticide use, and a report on evidence-based and scientifically  
319 robust risk assessments for the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of  
320 invasive species (European Commission 2022). Subsequent updates and additions have been  
321 cited in 9 (Pimentel *et al.* 2001) and 21 policy documents (Pimentel *et al.* 2005). Pimentel's 2011  
322 book has not appeared in policy documents, and Kettunen *et al.* (2009) is a technical report to  
323 guide European environmental policy, with the first full assessment on different environmental,  
324 social, and economic costs and benefits across Europe.

325 A focus of invasion biology research is to raise awareness about the economic costs of  
326 biological invasions and to compel policy makers to increase focus on these species. Since its  
327 conception in 2014, scientific publications based on the *InvaCost* database have been cited in  
328 several notable policy documents. To date, 10 *InvaCost* studies spanning 5 thematic categories  
329 have been cited in at least 8 policy documents or governmental reports. A few prominent  
330 examples are (see Supplementary Information Table S2 for sources): (i) *General*. A policy guide  
331 prepared by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) on aligning  
332 budgetary and fiscal policy with biodiversity goals for G7 and other countries (Organisation for  
333 Economic Co-operation and Development 2021) referred to Diagne *et al.* (2021). The report was

334 designed to inform finance, economic, and environment ministries, emphasising the massive  
335 global economic costs of biological invasions, and outlining the transformative changes required  
336 to slow biodiversity loss. (ii) *Conceptual*. A report from the European Commission that reviewed  
337 pre-existing regulations on the prevention, management, and spread of invasive alien species  
338 highlighted the importance of timely management (European Commission 2014). The report  
339 revisited assumptions made in previous impact assessments and reaffirmed that the costs of  
340 inaction or delayed action outweigh the cost of early intervention (Ahmed *et al.* 2022). Also, a  
341 recent study demonstrated that the already massive economic costs of biological invasions in the  
342 European Union were previously underestimated (Henry *et al.* 2023). (iii) *Habitat*. A report by  
343 Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia, which provides guidance  
344 to ministers and senior government officials from 11 partner countries (Partnerships in  
345 Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia 2021), is focused on the regional state of  
346 oceans and coasts. That report stressed the severe economic impacts of aquatic invasive alien  
347 species on native fisheries, agricultural productivity, public utility operations, property values,  
348 tourism, and outdoor recreation, as well as the global expenditure of US\$345 billion associated  
349 with their control (Cuthbert *et al.* 2021). (iv) *Geographical*. A scientific report compiled by the  
350 Australian Academy of Science highlighted the need for a unified national biosecurity data  
351 system, and that the timely and accurate identification of invasive alien species is critical for  
352 environmental protection (Australian Academy of Science 2022). The report emphasised that  
353 invasive alien species are a serious burden to Australia with ecological, health, and economic  
354 impacts, costing an estimated AU\$24.5 billion year<sup>-1</sup> — citing Bradshaw *et al.* (2021a).

355 There is an inevitable temporal lag between publication and impact of such studies through  
356 conversion into practical measures, so the aforementioned examples indicate promising progress

357 in guiding policy and legislative decisions, and with the potential for more to come as more  
358 studies continue to reveal these costs.

### 359 **3.3.2 Media attention**

360 Another key objective of highlighting the economic costs of invasive species is to raise public  
361 awareness in a tangible way about the damage caused by biological invasions (Shackleton *et al.*  
362 2019). As for climate change, which costs have been widely documented in successive IPCC  
363 reports, the costs of biological invasions are more likely to spark media interest and showcase the  
364 relevance and urgency of this issue to their readers. Societal awareness partly determines the  
365 level of support, commitment and effectiveness of public policy initiatives, as societies tend to  
366 protect only what they recognise as important (Akerlof *et al.* 2013). Yet, general awareness of  
367 this issue is still limited, for instance in comparison to climate change (Jarić *et al.* 2020). As  
368 such, large-scale research into the costs of biological invasions, and most importantly, frequent  
369 scientific publications on the topic, are expected to increase its salience and relevance to media  
370 organisations, change public perception of invasive species, and to improve collective support  
371 for their management (Novoa *et al.* 2017; Sosa *et al.* 2021).

372 The Altmetric tool has proved very useful to measure the media ‘attention’ received by  
373 scholarly articles, based on the volume, the importance of the sources, and the authors of media  
374 publications, blog and social network posts (see Supplementary Information Table S3 for details  
375 on each InvaCost-related study). These descriptive statistics highlight the breadth of policy  
376 reports, media outlets and social network discussions that InvaCost studies have generated  
377 online, demonstrating a current momentum for putting biological invasions on the media agenda.  
378 Most importantly, some studies have been prominently featured in the media landscape: 8 studies  
379 got an Altmetric score > 100, which, when put in the context of the Altmetric performance of

380 their respective journals, correspond to the top 2% of scientific publications tracked by Altmetric  
381 (Diagne *et al.* 2021, Soto *et al.* 2022, Bradshaw *et al.* 2016, Diagne *et al.* 2020, Bradshaw *et al.*  
382 2021a, Cuthbert *et al.* 2022, Cuthbert *et al.* 2021 & Angulo *et al.* 2022). From the earlier works  
383 on economic costs of invasive species, the study by Pimentel *et al.* (2000) has an Altmetric score  
384 of < 100, but this value is not comparable because this can only be done for research outputs of a  
385 similar age or source (Elmore 2018).

386 Media outreach has also been achieved through the production of magazine articles aimed at  
387 scientists, politicians, and the public. Examples include an article on the economic costs of  
388 aquatic invasions in *Eco Magazine* (Eco 2021) and *World Fishing and Aquaculture* (World  
389 Fishing and Aquaculture 2021), features in *Science for Environment Policy* (European  
390 Commission, Directorate-General for Environment 2022) to inform management strategies, as  
391 well as *The Environment* (Cuthbert 2022) and *The Conversation* (Bernery *et al.* 2021; Bradshaw  
392 & Hoskins 2021; Bradshaw *et al.* 2021b; Courchamp 2021; Soto & Hudgins 2022). Such  
393 evidence underscores the importance, interest and applicability of assessing the costs of invasive  
394 species for end-users.

### 395 **3.3.3 Scientific dissemination of socio-economic cost research**

396 In addition to their influence on policy and media uptake, cost syntheses have opened dialogues  
397 among scientists from different disciplines in academic and nonacademic organisations and  
398 institutions through both scientific publications (Fig. 2) and invited presentations. For example,  
399 invited talks to international conferences (e.g., NeoBiota 2020, IUCN congress 2021, INTECOL  
400 2022, International Conference on Aquatic Invasive Species 2022 plenaries, FAO-UN, Global  
401 Conference on Sustainable Plant Production) have had a focus on economic cost studies. Such  
402 discussion has also enhanced method development and built an increasing consortium of

403 researchers. Invited talks have also been given at regional events (e.g., Alberta Invasive Species  
404 Council, Canada’s Invasive Species Centre), helping disseminate results to stakeholders, citizens,  
405 and decision makers. These events are an immediate form of engagement that can influence  
406 future long-term policy changes and research directions.

407 Citizen science can be a powerful way to disseminate scientific knowledge and raise public  
408 awareness. It can be effective in achieving early detection and rapid response objectives (Howard  
409 *et al.* 2022), especially if public awareness of problematic invasive species is raised. Successful  
410 examples include the case of the network set-up to monitor the invasions of two hornet species  
411 causing problems for beekeepers and wildlife: the European hornet (*Vespa crabro*) in Sardinia  
412 (Pusceddu *et al.* 2019) and the yellow-legged hornet (*V. velutina*) in Europe (Lioy *et al.* 2019,  
413 2022), the latter being the object of national and international projects that include public  
414 mobilisation and engagement (stopvelutina.it; vespavelutina.eu). Therefore, public engagement  
415 about the costliest species could improve their monitoring, reporting and allow for more effective  
416 management while reducing future potential costs.

#### 417 **4. Post-InvaCost: future directions**

##### 418 **4.1 Further development of the *InvaCost* database, version 5.0**

419 *InvaCost* is a dynamic database, and has therefore evolved over time as more cost entries are  
420 added or existing ones are corrected. The living figure provides the most up to date global value  
421 of the taxonomic and geographic costs of biological invasions based on the latest version 4.1 (at  
422 the time of writing; last updated 15 February 2022) (see Leroy *et al.* 2021). Here, we outline  
423 further developments that are currently in the process for the launch of *InvaCost* 5.0.

424 The maintenance of an up-to-date database ensures ongoing access to the most recent  
425 information, but also requires the development of assistance to the users so that they can

426 appreciate the full content and diversity of data descriptors. Improved data accessibility can  
427 assist potential users and provide a baseline for environmental decision-making. By developing  
428 dashboards where data can be visualised interactively, users can obtain their desired information  
429 quickly without requiring programming skills. The development of open-source projects like  
430 *InvaCost* should ideally include tools facilitating data exploration such as *shiny*, an R package  
431 to build interactive web interfaces for data visualisation. *InvaCost* members are now developing  
432 such apps that will assist in creating a more interactive environment for non-experts.

433 At the same time, expertise from additional disciplines has been added to *InvaCost*. Previous  
434 versions of the *InvaCost* database were assembled primarily by natural scientists, but recently  
435 social scientists (e.g., resource economists) have been working to strengthen the economic  
436 dimensions associated with the cost data collected. These new efforts encompass a more detailed  
437 analysis of the methods used for the estimation of costs in every study, that will ultimately allow  
438 for an assessment of the methodology used. The need for a more granular analysis of the  
439 methods for every cost entry has arisen from the need to understand whether and to what degree  
440 the cited study is reproducible and/or reliable (Box 1). Because the sources of costs vary (e.g., in  
441 terms of quality, estimation methods, nature of costs estimated), this analysis will provide a  
442 qualitative indicator of each of the entries in the database and will help to better specify the  
443 evaluation methods used and the costs assessed. Beyond this, the *InvaCost* database will  
444 continuously be developed to standardise the methods of classification so that future contributors  
445 can identify these different cost characteristics for every study.

446

447

## 448 **4.2 Improving communication with managers and policy makers**

449 The management of invasive species can often instigate social conflicts, such that managers and  
450 policy makers can be mandated to find appropriate compromises that satisfy different groups of  
451 stakeholders (Crowley *et al.* 2017). Conjoint considerations of costs and benefits from biological  
452 invasions have promoted dialogue to resolve conflicts among stakeholders with different  
453 economic and environmental interests (Kourantidou *et al.* 2022a). Moreover, the language used  
454 plays a role in effectively communicating the risks and current/potential impacts caused by  
455 invasive species to all stakeholders (Copp *et al.* 2021). For example, including non-English cost  
456 entries revealed communication gaps between English-speaking scientists and local practitioners  
457 (Angulo *et al.* 2021b). However, while information in 21 languages has been added, there remain  
458 substantial gaps, particularly across large areas of Africa and Asia where future targeted searches  
459 would bolster outreach and the shared knowledge base. Both these language- and benefits-based  
460 initiatives could be further advanced to improve our socioeconomic understanding of costs and  
461 our ability to address how impacts affect and are distributed across stakeholders.

462 Future directions to improve communication among stakeholders could involve public,  
463 industry, and policy engagement events to raise awareness of the importance and relevance of  
464 costs and open-access databases such as *InvaCost*, as well as through implementing more  
465 streamlined processes to add data from different regions, cost types, and sources. For example,  
466 the French Invasive Alien Species Resource Centre ([especies-exotiques-envahissantes.fr](https://especies-exotiques-envahissantes.fr))  
467 provides a dynamic spatial mapping tool of management feedbacks, where targeted species, the  
468 managed area, and in some instances, the cost of management and its effectiveness, can be  
469 viewed. These approaches could, in turn, identify the most cost-effective species to manage,  
470 independent of their impact. A relevant analogue, *Conservation Evidence*

471 (conservationevidence.com) distils science into decision support for managers to bolster  
472 conservation by summarising research, directing actions and providing synopses. Expansion of  
473 such initiatives would provide a more comprehensive picture at multiple geographic scales and  
474 facilitate the identification of knowledge gaps, thereby allowing policymakers and other  
475 stakeholders to improve and optimise strategies (e.g., ideal timing of intervention). Improved  
476 resources and better communications with decision makers (e.g., municipalities or ministries)  
477 could provide increased awareness for better future recording/classifications of costs, and more  
478 reliable cost estimates that could be incorporated in future versions of *InvaCost*. Engaging with  
479 affected industries could further catalyse actions by governments, given their operational impacts  
480 and policy influence.

481 Dynamic databases and the resources that flow from them allow for future corrections and  
482 updates, such as ensuring old and new taxonomy are aligned to facilitate ongoing regulatory  
483 efforts. Because invasive species require adaptive management strategies, such tools enable the  
484 assessment of the effectiveness of particular strategies across contexts (after a reasonable period  
485 that accounts for lags), and the need for refinement if conditions change (e.g., increased  
486 population sizes, ranges, or propagule pressure). This continuous calibration allows for taking  
487 proportionate actions while optimising intervention and public expenditure.

#### 488 **4.3 Linking *InvaCost* to other biodiversity databases**

489 Biodiversity databases compile, collate, and standardise information on biological diversity,  
490 monitor compositional and functional changes across different levels of biological organisation,  
491 provide a basis for exploring relationships between species and their environments, and identify  
492 specific geographical, taxonomic, ecological, and other knowledge gaps related to biodiversity.  
493 Although challenging, correlating data from different sources is recommended (Hobern *et al.*



494 2019; König *et al.* 2019). Linking the *InvaCost* database with pre-existing biodiversity databases  
495 (e.g., on traits, niche, and genetic datasets) has the potential to provide invasion science with  
496 better tools to quantify the links between ecological mechanisms and invasion impacts, and  
497 establish relationships between costs, ecosystems composition, and invasion dynamics (Heger *et*  
498 *al.* 2021; Ricciardi *et al.* 2021; Daly *et al.* 2023). Integrating information on costs to a broader  
499 spectrum of biological groups (not solely invasive) and invaded socio-ecosystems can provide  
500 insights on (i) how invasive species impact non-native environments, (ii) areas where more  
501 resources might be needed (financial, technological, or research), and (iii) cost efficiency of  
502 current and alternative management options. In particular, this information will enable  
503 management efforts to be prioritised on economically vulnerable sites and on the most costly  
504 species.

505 Over the past decade, many online databases and repositories have been established,  
506 providing digital information in thousands of primary studies on taxonomic, temporal, and  
507 spatial information, allowing broad syntheses (Hardisty *et al.* 2013; Guralnick *et al.* 2016;  
508 Dornelas *et al.* 2018). Although the *InvaCost* database has many similarities to those pre-existing  
509 databases, it differs in that it serves rather specific purposes of standardising costs of invasive  
510 species and therefore has a different structure, content, and functionality. One database that has  
511 been used to augment several cost analyses so far is the *Standardising and Integrating Alien*  
512 *Species* workflow (Seebens *et al.* 2020), which includes information from five taxon-specific  
513 databases and two cross-taxon databases. This database leverages standardised biodiversity  
514 terminology (Darwin Core) to provide the most comprehensive distribution data for invasive  
515 species worldwide, with dates of first record wherever available, as well as evidence of impacts.  
516 Comparisons to *InvaCost* (Crystal-Ornelas *et al.* 2021) have provided estimates of missing data

517 within the latter to test the predictiveness of first-record dates in invasion costs (Turbelin *et al.*  
518 2023), and measure the total spending burden of invasive species (Cuthbert *et al.* 2022). Even  
519 when only considering species deemed impactful in the *Standardising and Integrating Alien*  
520 *Species* workflow — which itself has biases and data gaps — comparisons reveal widespread  
521 gaps, especially in taxonomic and geographic coverage. Merging such databases with  
522 extrapolations of the real, but unrecorded, cost of invasions will therefore provide a more  
523 comprehensive overview of the true economic impact of invasive species.

524 One of the greatest challenges of connecting biodiversity databases is the lack of  
525 standardisation (Feng *et al.* 2022), due to their particular objectives and different protocols for  
526 data acquisition and filtration, sometimes requiring specialised training (Maldonado *et al.* 2015).  
527 Another shortfall in integrating multiple datasets is the reliability of data entries (Harris 2003) or  
528 the lack of data to sustain evidence-based actions (Dickey *et al.* 2020). On the other hand,  
529 monetary loss is an international and defined proxy, capable of connecting and quantifying  
530 values arising from biodiversity losses. To stimulate the next stage of data integration between  
531 *InvaCost* and multiple existing and future derivative databases, automated tools such as machine  
532 learning and artificial intelligence should be developed to integrate and analyse these different  
533 but complementary data sources (Jeschke *et al.* 2021). Automation could facilitate comparisons  
534 to identify taxonomic, geographic, and other research gaps across datasets, thereby providing an  
535 evidence-based tool for decision-making within and outside invasion science. A connection with  
536 the *Global Biodiversity Information Facility* (gbif.org) could enable the identification of cost  
537 gaps at different geographic scales and social demand by integrating citizen science data.  
538 Merging existing databases of invasive species' distributions with the *Global Biodiversity*  
539 *Information Facility* could be further leveraged for this purpose (Seebens & Kaplan 2022). For

540 example, understanding social-ecological networks can identify opportunities for cost-effective  
541 management and the potential benefits of invasive species (Hulme *et al.* 2017; McGeoch & Jetz  
542 2019).

543 Within and outside the context of invasive species impacts, there are numerous opportunities  
544 for combining this quantitative measure for social and ecological losses to produce more  
545 comprehensive databases alongside other biodiversity threats such as climate change and habitat  
546 loss/exploitation (Seebens *et al.* 2018; Roxburgh *et al.* 2020; García-León *et al.* 2021).

#### 547 **4.4 Benefits alongside costs of biological invasions**

548 Despite these recent advances in assessing the monetary costs of biological invasions at different  
549 spatial and temporal scales, the estimates are rather conservative and currently capture only a  
550 fraction of total costs. These knowledge gaps occur because there are many inaccessible, non-  
551 monetised, and missing costs, alongside costs from sources that are difficult to assess (e.g., grey  
552 literature such as internal reports) (Vaissière *et al.* 2022). The presence of benefits alongside  
553 costs has also been contested, given that *InvaCost* only focuses on assessing costs (Sagoff 2020;  
554 Boltovskoy *et al.* 2022; Sax *et al.* 2022). Part of this criticism relates to the fact that innocuous  
555 species, ancillary costs, and failed eradication programmes are potentially dominating and/or  
556 biasing cost analyses at present. Based on selected examples of species, it has also been argued  
557 that benefits of invasions might even outweigh costs — for example, the ecosystem services  
558 provided by exotic bivalves (Burlakova *et al.* 2022).

559 Currently, there is no comprehensive database that compiles the benefits of invasions in a way  
560 similar to what *InvaCost* does for costs. However, the argument that the presence of benefits  
561 lessens the importance or risks conveyed by invasive species does a disservice to natural  
562 resource managers and conservation practitioners, and conveys large risks to conservation

563 programs and human wellbeing. This lack of knowledge about the magnitude, origin and  
564 distribution of benefits of invasive alien species has been inappropriately used to undermine or  
565 refute existing and synthesised estimates of costs (Boltovskoy *et al.* 2022; Sax *et al.* 2022).  
566 While it is important to quantify any simultaneous benefits alongside the costs of invasions  
567 (Kourantidou *et al.* 2022a), the presence of these benefits cannot be used to undermine the  
568 importance of negative impacts or costs. In fact, the presence of benefits from invasions is  
569 frequently a path-dependent outcome of the invasion itself. For example, a community might  
570 benefit today from a new species only because its introduction degrades a former native species  
571 in the region e.g., black wattle *Acacia mearnsii* (de Wit *et al.* 2001), Nile perch *Lates niloticus*  
572 (Aloo *et al.* 2017), pirarucu *Arapaima gigas* (Miranda-Chumacero *et al.* 2012), and other  
573 invasive fish in the Amazonia region (Doria *et al.* 2021). Even so, costs and benefits are often  
574 not directly comparable because they frequently do not impact the same stakeholders, and so  
575 likely need to be assessed case by case to avoid drawing incorrect conclusions.

#### 576 **4.5 Promoting cost reporting**

577 *InvaCost* aims to increase the quantity and quality of cost reporting. Initially, this was done  
578 through the catalysing effect of high-profile studies synthesising estimates at different biological,  
579 spatial, and sectoral scales (Zenni *et al.* 2021). New scientific, stakeholder, and public  
580 awareness, coupled with extensive media coverage, encouraged further primary research to  
581 uncover additional costs, and for researchers, stakeholders, and other entities to make existing  
582 and emerging costs available for syntheses. Templates to enter cost information into the  
583 database, alongside associated explanatory files, examples, and an e-mail account for data  
584 submissions (updates@invacost.fr) have all improved cost reporting (Diagne *et al.* 2020). This

585 infrastructure will continue to allow new and updated cost syntheses to be readily constructed,  
586 while raising project visibility and increasing international collaborations.

587 The research network has grown globally and across disciplines, and has enabled many new  
588 studies synthesising and analysing costs. The network has grown from a core group of around a  
589 dozen scientists in 2019, to over 145 active collaborators today  
590 ([invacost.fr/en/consortium/experts](http://invacost.fr/en/consortium/experts)), with the network also increasing rapidly via positive  
591 feedback loops from the pools of connections harnessed from new colleagues. With a wealth of  
592 expertise, perspectives, and technical knowledge, these diverse colleagues renew interests in  
593 capturing costs under particular contexts related to their core foci (taxonomic, sectoral,  
594 geographical), or employ new modelling techniques to extrapolate, and new descriptors to  
595 explain documented costs. Examples include studies with new geographic focus instigated by  
596 collaborations with scientists from India (Bang *et al.* 2022), New Zealand (Bodey *et al.* 2022b),  
597 and Nordic countries (Kourantidou *et al.* 2022b). Other examples are taxon-focussed, including  
598 assessments of costs of invasive plankton (Macêdo *et al.* 2022), mammals (Wang *et al.* 2023),  
599 and herpetofauna (Soto *et al.* 2022). Aside from leading the analyses and preparing scientific  
600 articles, such projects also targeted additional collections of cost data from relevant publications,  
601 stakeholders, and organisations. They were often permitted by a foundation of national  
602 knowledge and existing connections, as well as breaching language and access barriers.

603 New research to address missing data has been promoted by InvaCost projects. Because many  
604 studies identify gaps in costs, there is now an impetus to collect these missing data. In the past,  
605 research has been hampered by a lack of syntheses, meaning that cost assessments have been  
606 partly fuelled by positive feedback loops — costly species are well-publicised and continue to  
607 accrue scientific attention (and thus costs) (Cuthbert *et al.* 2021). This has contributed to poor

608 coverage of cost assessments for most known invaders globally. Indeed, this is illustrated when  
609 comparing the total number of invasive alien species established per country (Fig. 3a) with the  
610 total costs reported in the *InvaCost* database (Fig. 3b), and the still low number of invasive alien  
611 species included therein (Fig. 3c). However, given the absence of costs and the disparity in  
612 values among countries (e.g., countries in Africa), the costs incurred by invasive alien species  
613 usually depend on the number of species with reported costs, with a few exceptions (Fig. 3d). A  
614 major strength in cost syntheses is therefore not only putting an aggregate monetary value on the  
615 negative impacts of biological invasions, but also highlighting knowledge gaps and future  
616 research needs.

## 617 **5. Conclusions**

618 The InvaCost project improves the quality and quantity of reported costs. This information can  
619 improve targeting and prioritising of resource investments and/or which species or pathways  
620 should be managed. To maximise their utility, we therefore recommend that future studies  
621 clearly specify the location(s), cost per species where possible, and the period when the costs  
622 occurred. Authors are welcome to adopt the nomenclature used in the *InvaCost* database (Diagne  
623 *et al.* 2020; Supplementary Table 4), and while not exhaustive, it is sufficient to encompass the  
624 main aspects of the potentially impacted sectors, and describe the type of cost and the  
625 management related to the time of introduction (Diagne *et al.* 2020). Promoting improved  
626 granularity and quality of cost reporting has therefore been another positive outcome, helping to  
627 direct efficient allocation of resources, foster method alignment, and detect overlaps in cost  
628 assessments. While InvaCost provides a solid foundation for estimating costs of invasive species,  
629 we acknowledge that the derived estimates are merely the tip of the cost iceberg, with the  
630 biodiversity and social impacts they entail in particular requiring much additional assessment.

631 **Acknowledgements**

632 The InvaCost project was funded by the French National Research Agency (ANR-14-CE02-  
633 0021), the BNP-Paribas Foundation Climate Initiative, the AXA Research Fund Chair of  
634 Invasion Biology of University Paris Saclay and by the BiodivERsA and Belmont-Forum call  
635 2018 on biodiversity scenarios (AlienScenarios; BMBF/PT DLR 01LC1807C). M.K. received  
636 funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research programme under a Marie  
637 Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement 899546. C.J.A.B. acknowledges the Australian Research  
638 Council (CE170100015) for support. R.N.C. is funded by the Leverhulme Trust (ECF-2021-  
639 001). A.B. acknowledges Azim Premji University’s grants programme (UNIV-RC00326) for  
640 support. G.H. was supported by Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior  
641 — Brasil (Capes) — (001) and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

642 **Statement of authorship**

643 D.A.A., P.J.H., and R.N.C. led organising and writing the first draft, along with C.J.A.B. and  
644 F.C. R.N.C. and P.J.H. led Section 1. C.J.A.B. led Section 2. B.L. led writing Box 1. P.J.H.,  
645 C.J.A.B., and I.S. led Section 3.1. D.A.A., P.J.H. and T.W.B. led Section 3.2. D.A.A. led Section  
646 3.3.1. D.A.A., P.B., I.S., and P.C. led Section 3.3.2. R.N.C. and P.B. led Section 3.3.3. M.K. and  
647 D.R. led Section 4.1. R.N.C., F.J.O., D.R., and P.B. led Section 4.2. A.B., R.L.M., E.J.H and  
648 D.R. led Section 4.3. A.B., L.C., M.K. led Section 4.4. R.N.C. led Section 4.5. C.J.A.B. and  
649 F.J.O. made the figures. All authors contributed to all or most sections of the manuscript.

650 **Conflict of interest statement**

651 The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

652 **Data accessibility statement**

653 All data presented are available via the `invacost` R package. Related code and supplementary  
654 data available at [github.com/cjabradshaw/InvaCostVersionTrends](https://github.com/cjabradshaw/InvaCostVersionTrends).

## 655 **References**

- 656 Ahmad, F., Fouad, H., Liang, S.-Y., Hu, Y. & Mo, J.-C. (2021). Termites and Chinese  
657 agricultural system: applications and advances in integrated termite management and  
658 chemical control. *Insect Sci.*, 28, 2–20 doi:10.1111/1744-7917.12726.
- 659 Ahmed, D.A., Hudgins, E.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Kourantidou, M., Diagne, C., Haubrock, P.J., *et al.*  
660 (2022). Managing biological invasions: the cost of inaction. *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 1927–  
661 1946 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02755-0.
- 662 Akerlof, K., Maibach, E.W., Fitzgerald, D., Cedeno, A.Y. & Neuman, A. (2013). Do people  
663 “personally experience” global warming, and if so how, and does it matter? *Glob.*  
664 *Environ. Change*, 23, 81–91 doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.07.006.
- 665 Aloo, P.A., Njiru, J., Balirwa, J.S. & Nyamweya, C.S. (2017). Impacts of Nile Perch, *Lates*  
666 *niloticus*, introduction on the ecology, economy and conservation of Lake Victoria, East  
667 Africa. *Lakes Reserv. Sci. Policy Manag. Sustain. Use*, 22, 320–333  
668 doi:10.1111/lre.12192.
- 669 Angulo, E., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Novoa, A., Duboscq-Carra, V.G., Diagne, C. & Courchamp,  
670 F. (2021a). Economic costs of invasive alien species in Spain. *NeoBiota*, 67, 267–297  
671 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59181.
- 672 Angulo, E., Diagne, C., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Adamjy, T., Ahmed, D.A., Akulov, E., *et al.*  
673 (2021b). Non-English languages enrich scientific knowledge: the example of economic  
674 costs of biological invasions. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 775, 144441  
675 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144441>.



676 Angulo, E., Hoffmann, B.D., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Taheri, A., Balzani, P., Bang, A., *et al.*  
677 (2022). Economic costs of invasive alien ants worldwide. *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 2041–2060  
678 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02791-w.

679 Armstrong, S. (1995). Rare plants protect Cape’s water supplies. *New Sci.*, 11, 8.

680 Australian Academy of Science. (2022). *Australia’s data-enabled research future: Science*  
681 [https://www.science.org.au/supporting-science/science-policy-and-analysis/reports-and-](https://www.science.org.au/supporting-science/science-policy-and-analysis/reports-and-publications/australias-data-enabled-research-future-science)  
682 [publications/australias-data-enabled-research-future-science.](https://www.science.org.au/supporting-science/science-policy-and-analysis/reports-and-publications/australias-data-enabled-research-future-science)

683 Bacher, S., Blackburn, T.M., Essl, F., Genovesi, P., Heikkilä, J., Jeschke, J.M., *et al.* (2018).  
684 Socio-economic impact classification of alien taxa (SEICAT). *Methods Ecol. Evol.*, 9,  
685 159–168 doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12844.

686 Bang, A., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Fernandez, R.D., Moodley, D., Diagne, C., *et al.*  
687 (2022). Massive economic costs of biological invasions despite widespread knowledge  
688 gaps: a dual setback for India. *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 2017–2039 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-  
689 02780-z.

690 Bellard, C., Bernery, C. & Leclerc, C. (2021). Looming extinctions due to invasive species:  
691 irreversible loss of ecological strategy and evolutionary history. *Glob. Change Biol.*, 27,  
692 4967–4979 doi:10.1111/gcb.15771.

693 Bellard, C., Marino, C. & Courchamp, F. (2022). Ranking threats to biodiversity and why it  
694 doesn’t matter. *Nat. Commun.*, 13, 2616 doi:10.1038/s41467-022-30339-y.

695 Bernery, C., Leroy, B., Diagne, C. & Courchamp, F. (2021). 1 288 milliards de dollars : chiffrer  
696 les dégâts causés par les invasions biologiques pour enfin agir. *The Conversation*  
697 [https://theconversation.com/1-288-milliards-de-dollars-chiffrer-les-degats-causes-par-les-](https://theconversation.com/1-288-milliards-de-dollars-chiffrer-les-degats-causes-par-les-invasions-biologiques-pour-enfin-agir-158204)  
698 [invasions-biologiques-pour-enfin-agir-158204.](https://theconversation.com/1-288-milliards-de-dollars-chiffrer-les-degats-causes-par-les-invasions-biologiques-pour-enfin-agir-158204)

699 Blackburn, T.M., Pyšek, P., Bacher, S., Carlton, J.T., Duncan, R.P., Jarošík, V., *et al.* (2011). A  
700 proposed unified framework for biological invasions. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 26, 333–339  
701 doi:10.1016/j.tree.2011.03.023.

702 Bodey, T.W., Angulo, E., Bang, A., Bellard, C., Fantle-Lepczyk, J., Lenzner, B., *et al.* (2022a).  
703 Economic costs of protecting islands from invasive alien species. *Conserv. Biol.*, e14034  
704 doi:10.1111/cobi.14034.

705 Bodey, T.W., Carter, Z.T., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Welsh, M.J., Diagne, C., *et al.*  
706 (2022b). Building a synthesis of economic costs of biological invasions in New Zealand.  
707 *PeerJ*, 10, e13580 doi:10.7717/peerj.13580.

708 Boltovskoy, D., Guiaşu, R., Burlakova, L., Karatayev, A., Schlaepfer, M.A. & Correa, N. (2022).  
709 Misleading estimates of economic impacts of biological invasions: Including the costs  
710 but not the benefits. *Ambio*, 51, 1786–1799 doi:10.1007/s13280-022-01707-1.

711 Booy, O., Robertson, P.A., Moore, N., Ward, J., Roy, H.E., Adriaens, T., *et al.* (2020). Using  
712 structured eradication feasibility assessment to prioritize the management of new and  
713 emerging invasive alien species in Europe. *Glob. Change Biol.*, 26, 6235–6250  
714 doi:10.1111/gcb.15280.

715 Bradshaw, C.J.A. & Hoskins, A. (2021). Pest plants and animals cost Australia around \$25  
716 billion a year – and it will get worse. *The Conversation* [https://theconversation.com/pest-](https://theconversation.com/pest-plants-and-animals-cost-australia-around-25-billion-a-year-and-it-will-get-worse-164969)  
717 [plants-and-animals-cost-australia-around-25-billion-a-year-and-it-will-get-worse-164969](https://theconversation.com/pest-plants-and-animals-cost-australia-around-25-billion-a-year-and-it-will-get-worse-164969).

718 Bradshaw, C.J.A., Hoskins, A.J., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Diagne, C., Leroy, B., *et al.*  
719 (2021a). Detailed assessment of the reported economic costs of invasive species in  
720 Australia. *NeoBiota*, 67, 511–550 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58834.

721 Bradshaw, C.J.A., Leroy, B., Bellard, C., Roiz, D., Albert, C., Fournier, A., *et al.* (2016).

722 Massive yet grossly underestimated global costs of invasive insects. *Nat. Commun.*, 7,  
723 12986 doi:10.1038/ncomms12986.

724 Bradshaw, C.J.A., Leroy, B., Bernery, C., Diagne, C. & Courchamp, F. (2021b). Attack of the  
725 alien invaders: pest plants and animals leave a frightening \$1.7 trillion bill. *The*  
726 *Conversation* [https://theconversation.com/attack-of-the-alien-invaders-pest-plants-and-](https://theconversation.com/attack-of-the-alien-invaders-pest-plants-and-animals-leave-a-frightening-1-7-trillion-bill-158628)  
727 [animals-leave-a-frightening-1-7-trillion-bill-158628](https://theconversation.com/attack-of-the-alien-invaders-pest-plants-and-animals-leave-a-frightening-1-7-trillion-bill-158628).

728 Burlakova, L.E., Karatayev, A.Y., Boltovskoy, D. & Correa, N.M. (2022). Ecosystem services  
729 provided by the exotic bivalves *Dreissena polymorpha*, *D. rostriformis bugensis*, and  
730 *Limnoperna fortunei*. *Hydrobiologia* doi:10.1007/s10750-022-04935-4.

731 Copp, G.H., Vilizzi, L., Wei, H., Li, S., Piria, M., Al-Faisal, A.J., *et al.* (2021). Speaking their  
732 language – development of a multilingual decision-support tool for communicating  
733 invasive species risks to decision makers and stakeholders. *Environ. Model. Softw.*, 135,  
734 104900 doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2020.104900.

735 Corn, M.L., Buck, E.H., Rawson, J., Segarra, A. & Fischer, E. (2002). *Invasive Non-Native*  
736 *Species: Background and Issues for Congress*. Congressional Research Service, Library  
737 of Congress, Washington, D.C., USA.

738 Cosentino, A.M. & Veríssimo, D. (2016). Ending the citation of retracted papers. *Conserv. Biol.*,  
739 30, 676–678 doi:10.1111/cobi.12676.

740 Courchamp, F. (2021). Les invasions biologiques, un fardeau économique pour la France. *The*  
741 *Conversation* [https://theconversation.com/les-invasions-biologiques-un-fardeau-](https://theconversation.com/les-invasions-biologiques-un-fardeau-economique-pour-la-france-165119)  
742 [economique-pour-la-france-165119](https://theconversation.com/les-invasions-biologiques-un-fardeau-economique-pour-la-france-165119).

743 Courchamp, F., Fournier, A., Bellard, C., Bertelsmeier, C., Bonnaud, E., Jeschke, J.M., *et al.*  
744 (2017). Invasion biology: specific problems and possible solutions. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*,

745 32, 13–22 doi:10.1016/j.tree.2016.11.001.

746 Crowley, S.L., Hinchliffe, S. & McDonald, R.A. (2017). Conflict in invasive species  
747 management. *Front. Ecol. Environ.*, 15, 133–141 doi:10.1002/fee.1471.

748 Crystal-Ornelas, R., Hudgins, E.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Fantle-Lepczyk, J., Angulo,  
749 E., *et al.* (2021). Economic costs of biological invasions within North America.  
750 *NeoBiota*, 67, 485–510 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58038.

751 Cuthbert, R.N. (2022). A world of invaders. *Environ. Chart. Inst. Water Environ. Manag.*  
752 <https://www.ciwem.org/the-environment/a-world-of-invaders>.

753 Cuthbert, R.N., Diagne, C., Hudgins, E.J., Turbelin, A., Ahmed, D.A., Albert, C., *et al.* (2022).  
754 Biological invasion costs reveal insufficient proactive management worldwide. *Sci. Total*  
755 *Environ.*, 819, 153404 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153404.

756 Cuthbert, R.N., Pattison, Z., Taylor, N.G., Verbrugge, L., Diagne, C., Ahmed, D.A., *et al.*  
757 (2021). Global economic costs of aquatic invasive alien species. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 775,  
758 145238 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145238.

759 Daly, E.Z., Chabrierie, O., Massol, F., Facon, B., Hess, M.C.M., Tasiemski, A., *et al.* (2023). A  
760 synthesis of biological invasion hypotheses associated with the introduction–  
761 naturalisation–invasion continuum. *Oikos*, e09645 doi:10.1111/oik.09645.

762 Dana, E.D., Jeschke, J.M. & García-de-Lomas, J. (2014). Decision tools for managing biological  
763 invasions: existing biases and future needs. *Oryx*, 48, 56–63  
764 doi:10.1017/S0030605312001263.

765 de Wit, M.P., Crookes, D.J. & van Wilgen, B.W. (2001). Conflicts of interest in environmental  
766 management: estimating the costs and benefits of a tree invasion. *Biol. Invasions*, 3, 167–  
767 178 doi:10.1023/A:1014563702261.

768 Diagne, C., Leroy, B., E. Gozlan, R., Vaissière, A.-C., Assailly, C., Nuninger, L., *et al.* (2022).  
769 InvaCost: Economic cost estimates associated with biological invasions worldwide.  
770 *Figshare* doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.12668570.v5.

771 Diagne, C., Leroy, B., Gozlan, R.E., Vaissière, A.-C., Assailly, C., Nuninger, L., *et al.* (2020).  
772 *InvaCost*, a public database of the economic costs of biological invasions worldwide. *Sci.*  
773 *Data*, 7, 277 doi:10.1038/s41597-020-00586-z.

774 Diagne, C., Leroy, B., Vaissière, A.-C., E. Gozlan, R., Roiz, D., Jarić, I., *et al.* (2021). High and  
775 rising economic costs of biological invasions worldwide. *Nature*, 592, 571–576  
776 doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03405-6.

777 Dickey, J.W.E., Cuthbert, R.N., South, J., Britton, J.R., Caffrey, J., Chang, X., *et al.* (2020). On  
778 the RIP: using relative impact potential to assess the ecological impacts of invasive alien  
779 species. *NeoBiota*, 55, 27–60 doi:10.3897/neobiota.55.49547.

780 Doria, C.R. da C., Agudelo, E., Akama, A., Barros, B., Bonfim, M., Carneiro, L., *et al.* (2021).  
781 The silent threat of non-native fish in the Amazon: ANNF database and review. *Front.*  
782 *Ecol. Evol.*, 9, 646702 doi:10.3389/fevo.2021.646702.

783 Dornelas, M., Antão, L.H., Moyes, F., Bates, A.E., Magurran, A.E., Adam, D., *et al.* (2018).  
784 BioTIME: a database of biodiversity time series for the Anthropocene. *Glob. Ecol.*  
785 *Biogeogr.*, 27, 760–786 doi:10.1111/geb.12729.

786 Duffy, G.A., Coetzee, B.W.T., Latombe, G., Akerman, A.H., McGeoch, M.A. & Chown, S.L.  
787 (2017). Barriers to globally invasive species are weakening across the Antarctic. *Divers.*  
788 *Distrib.*, 23, 982–996 doi:10.1111/ddi.12593.

789 Eco. (2021). Invasive Species Cost UK Economy Over £5 Billion Over Past 40-50 Years. *Eco*  
790 *Mag.* <https://www.ecomagazine.com/news/policy/invasive-species-cost-uk-economy->

791 over-5-billion-over-past-40-50-years.

792 Elmore, S.A. (2018). The Altmetric attention score: what does it mean and why should I care?  
793 *Toxicol. Pathol.*, 46, 252–255 doi:10.1177/0192623318758294.

794 Essl, F., Dullinger, S., Rabitsch, W., Hulme, P.E., Hulber, K., Jarosik, V., *et al.* (2011).  
795 Socioeconomic legacy yields an invasion debt. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 108, 203–207  
796 doi:10.1073/pnas.1011728108.

797 European Commission. (2014). *Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the*  
798 *Council on the review of the application of Regulation (EU) No 1143/2014 of the*  
799 *European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2014 on the prevention and*  
800 *management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species COM/2021/628*  
801 *final* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021DC0628>.

802 European Commission. (2022). *Study on invasive alien species: development of risk assessments*  
803 *to tackle priority species and enhance prevention: final report*  
804 <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2779/5726>.

805 European Commission, Directorate-General for Environment. (2022). Expenditure on preventing  
806 biological invasions is far below environmental damage costs. *Sci. Environ. Policy*  
807 [https://environment.ec.europa.eu/news/expenditure-preventing-biological-invasions-far-](https://environment.ec.europa.eu/news/expenditure-preventing-biological-invasions-far-below-environmental-damage-costs-2022-10-05_en)  
808 [below-environmental-damage-costs-2022-10-05\\_en](https://environment.ec.europa.eu/news/expenditure-preventing-biological-invasions-far-below-environmental-damage-costs-2022-10-05_en).

809 European Union. (2014). Regulation No 1143/2014 of the European Parliament and of the  
810 Council on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive  
811 alien species. *Off. J. Eur. Union*, L315, 35–55.

812 Faulkner, K.T., Robertson, M.P. & Wilson, J.R.U. (2020). Stronger regional biosecurity is  
813 essential to prevent hundreds of harmful biological invasions. *Glob. Change Biol.*, 26,

814 2449–2462 doi:10.1111/gcb.15006.

815 Feng, X., Enquist, B.J., Park, D.S., Boyle, B., Breshears, D.D., Gallagher, R.V., *et al.* (2022). A  
816 review of the heterogeneous landscape of biodiversity databases: opportunities and  
817 challenges for a synthesized biodiversity knowledge base. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 31,  
818 1242–1260 doi:10.1111/geb.13497.

819 García-León, D., Casanueva, A., Standardi, G., Burgstall, A., Flouris, A.D. & Nybo, L. (2021).  
820 Current and projected regional economic impacts of heatwaves in Europe. *Nat. Commun.*,  
821 12, 5807 doi:10.1038/s41467-021-26050-z.

822 Goldstein, L.D. (2011). *17 Reasons the Economic Impact of the Domestic Cat as a Non-Native*  
823 *Species in the U.S. Does Not Cost \$17 Billion* straypetadvocacy.org/PDF/17reasons.pdf.  
824 Available at: straypetadvocacy.org/PDF/17reasons.pdf. Last accessed 13 February 2023.

825 Guralnick, R.P., Zermoglio, P.F., Wieczorek, J., LaFrance, R., Bloom, D. & Russell, L. (2016).  
826 The importance of digitized biocollections as a source of trait data and a new VertNet  
827 resource. *Database*, 2016, baw158 doi:10.1093/database/baw158.

828 Hardisty, A., Roberts, D. & the Biodiversity Informatics Community. (2013). A decadal view of  
829 biodiversity informatics: challenges and priorities. *BMC Ecol.*, 13, 16 doi:10.1186/1472-  
830 6785-13-16.

831 Harris, D.J. (2003). Can you bank on GenBank? *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 18, 317–319  
832 doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(03)00150-2.

833 Haubrock, P.J., Bernery, C., Cuthbert, R.N., Liu, C., Kourantidou, M., Leroy, B., *et al.* (2022).  
834 Knowledge gaps in economic costs of invasive alien fish worldwide. *Sci. Total Environ.*,  
835 803, 149875 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149875.

836 Haubrock, P.J., Turbelin, A.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Novoa, A., Taylor, N.G., Angulo, E., *et al.*

837 (2021). Economic costs of invasive alien species across Europe. *NeoBiota*, 67, 153–190  
838 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58196.

839 Heger, T., Jeschke, J.M. & Kollmann, J. (2021). Some reflections on current invasion science  
840 and perspectives for an exciting future. *NeoBiota*, 68, 79–100  
841 doi:10.3897/neobiota.68.68997.

842 Heringer, G., Angulo, E., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Capinha, C., Courchamp, F., Diagne, C., *et al.*  
843 (2021). The economic costs of biological invasions in Central and South America: a first  
844 regional assessment. *NeoBiota*, 67, 401–426 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59193.

845 Hoagland, P. & Jin, D. (2006). Science and economics in the management of an invasive species.  
846 *BioScience*, 56, 931–935 doi:10.1641/0006-3568(2006)56[931:saeitm]2.0.co;2.

847 Hobern, D., Baptiste, B., Copas, K., Guralnick, R., Hahn, A., van Huis, E., *et al.* (2019).  
848 Connecting data and expertise: a new alliance for biodiversity knowledge. *Biodivers.*  
849 *Data J.*, 7, e33679 doi:10.3897/BDJ.7.e33679.

850 Hoffmann, B.D. & Broadhurst, L.M. (2016). The economic cost of managing invasive species in  
851 Australia. *NeoBiota*, 31, 1–18 doi:10.3897/neobiota.31.6960.

852 Holmes, T.P., Aukema, J.E., Von Holle, B., Liebhold, A. & Sills, E. (2009). Economic impacts  
853 of invasive species in forests. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.*, 1162, 18–38 doi:10.1111/j.1749-  
854 6632.2009.04446.x.

855 Howard, L., van Rees, C.B., Dahlquist, Z., Luikart, G. & Hand, B.K. (2022). A review of  
856 invasive species reporting apps for citizen science and opportunities for innovation.  
857 *NeoBiota*, 71, 165–188 doi:10.3897/neobiota.71.79597.

858 Hulme, P.E., Bacher, S., Kenis, M., Kühn, I., Pergl, J., Pyšek, P., *et al.* (2017). Blurring alien  
859 introduction pathways risks losing the focus on invasive species policy. *Conserv. Lett.*,



860 10, 265–266 doi:10.1111/conl.12262.

861 Jarić, I., Bellard, C., Courchamp, F., Kalinkat, G., Meinard, Y., Roberts, D.L., *et al.* (2020).

862 Societal attention toward extinction threats: a comparison between climate change and

863 biological invasions. *Sci. Rep.*, 10, 11085 doi:10.1038/s41598-020-67931-5.

864 Jeschke, J.M., Heger, T., Kraker, P., Schramm, M., Kittel, C. & Mietchen, D. (2021). Towards

865 an open, zoomable atlas for invasion science and beyond. *NeoBiota*, 68, 5–18

866 doi:10.3897/neobiota.68.66685.

867 Kaushik, P., Pati, P.K., Khan, M.L. & Khare, P.K. (2022). Plant functional traits best explain

868 invasive species' performance within a dynamic ecosystem - a review. *Trees For. People*,

869 8, 100260 doi:10.1016/j.tfp.2022.100260.

870 Kettunen, M., Genovesi, P., Gollasch, S., Pagad, S., Starfinger, U., ten Brink, P., *et al.* (2009).

871 *Technical support to EU strategy on invasive alien species (IAS)*. Institute for European

872 Environmental Policy, Brussels.

873 König, C., Weigelt, P., Schrader, J., Taylor, A., Kattge, J. & Kreft, H. (2019). Biodiversity data

874 integration—the significance of data resolution and domain. *PLOS Biol.*, 17, e3000183

875 doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3000183.

876 Kourantidou, M., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Novoa, A., Taylor, N.G., Leroy, B., *et al.*

877 (2021). Economic costs of invasive alien species in the Mediterranean basin. *NeoBiota*,

878 67, 427–458 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58926.

879 Kourantidou, M., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Bodey, T.W., Lenzner, B., Gozlan, R.E., *et al.*

880 (2022a). Invasive alien species as simultaneous benefits and burdens: trends, stakeholder

881 perceptions and management. *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 1905–1926 doi:10.1007/s10530-021-

882 02727-w.

883 Kourantidou, M., Verbrugge, L.N.H., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Angulo, E., Ahonen, I., *et*  
884 *al.* (2022b). The economic costs, management and regulation of biological invasions in  
885 the Nordic countries. *J. Environ. Manage.*, 324, 116374  
886 doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2022.116374.

887 Lamb, W. (2013). Commentary on economic valuations of biodiversity. *Ecol. Econ.*, 89, 170–  
888 173 doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2013.02.017.

889 Leroy, B., Diagne, C., Angulo, E., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Adamjy, T., Assailly, C., *et al.* (2021).  
890 *Global Costs of Biological Invasions: Living Figure*  
891 [borisleroy.com/invacost/invacost\\_livingfigure.html](https://borisleroy.com/invacost/invacost_livingfigure.html).

892 Leroy, B., Kramer, A.M., Vaissière, A.-C., Kourantidou, M., Courchamp, F. & Diagne, C.  
893 (2022). Analysing economic costs of invasive alien species with the invacost R package.  
894 *Methods Ecol. Evol.*, 13, 1930–1937 doi:10.1111/2041-210X.13929.

895 Lioy, S., Bergamino, C. & Porporato, M. (2022). The invasive hornet *Vespa velutina*:  
896 distribution, impacts and management options. *CABI Rev.*, 2022  
897 doi:10.1079/cabireviews202217030.

898 Lioy, S., Manino, A., Porporato, M., Laurino, D., Romano, A., Capello, M., *et al.* (2019).  
899 Establishing surveillance areas for tackling the invasion of *Vespa velutina* in outbreaks  
900 and over the border of its expanding range. *NeoBiota*, 46, 51–69  
901 doi:10.3897/neobiota.46.33099.

902 Lovell, S.J. & Stone, S.F. (2005). *The Economic Impacts of Aquatic Invasive Species: A Review*  
903 *of the Literature. Working Paper # 05-02.* NCEE Working Paper Series. National Center  
904 for Environmental Economics, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

905 Lovell, S.J., Stone, S.F. & Fernandez, L. (2006). The economic impacts of aquatic invasive

906 species: a review of the literature. *Agric. Resour. Econ. Rev.*, 35, 195–208  
907 doi:10.1017/S1068280500010157.

908 Lowe, S., Browne, M., Boudjelas, S. & De Poorter, M. (2000). *100 of the world's worst invasive*  
909 *alien species: a selection from the global invasive species database*  
910 <https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/2000-126.pdf>.

911 Lukey, P. & Hall, J. (2020). Biological invasion policy and legislation development and  
912 implementation in South Africa. In: *Biological Invasions in South Africa* (eds. van  
913 Wilgen, B.W., Measey, J., Richardson, D.M., Wilson, J.R. & Zengeya, T.A.). Springer  
914 International Publishing, Cham, pp. 515–551.

915 Macêdo, R.L., Franco, A.C.S., Kozłowsky-Suzuki, B., Mammola, S., Dalu, T. & Rocha, O.  
916 (2022). The global social-economic dimension of biological invasions by plankton:  
917 grossly underestimated costs but a rising concern for water quality benefits? *Water Res.*,  
918 222, 118918 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2022.118918.

919 Maldonado, C., Molina, C.I., Zizka, A., Persson, C., Taylor, C.M., Albán, J., *et al.* (2015).  
920 Estimating species diversity and distribution in the era of Big Data: to what extent can we  
921 trust public databases? *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 24, 973–984 doi:10.1111/geb.12326.

922 Mares, M.A., Braun, J.K. & Gettinger, D. (1989). Observations on the distribution and ecology  
923 of the mammals of the Cerrado grasslands of central Brazil. *Ann. Carnegie Mus.*, 58, 1–  
924 60.

925 McDermott, S.M., Finnoff, D.C. & Shogren, J.F. (2013). The welfare impacts of an invasive  
926 species: endogenous vs. exogenous price models. *Ecol. Econ.*, 85, 43–49  
927 doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.08.020.

928 McGeoch, M. & Jetz, W. (2019). Measure and reduce the harm caused by biological invasions.

929 *One Earth*, 1, 171–174 doi:10.1016/j.oneear.2019.10.003.

930 Meyerson, L.A., Pauchard, A., Brundu, G., Carlton, J.T., Hierro, J.L., Kueffer, C., *et al.* (2022).

931 Moving toward global strategies for managing invasive alien species. In: *Global Plant*

932 *Invasions* (eds. Clements, D.R., Upadhyaya, M.K., Joshi, S. & Shrestha, A.)

933 doi:10.1007/978-3-030-89684-3\_16.

934 Milardi, M., Gavioli, A., Soininen, J. & Castaldelli, G. (2019). Exotic species invasions

935 undermine regional functional diversity of freshwater fish. *Sci. Rep.*, 9, 17921

936 doi:10.1038/s41598-019-54210-1.

937 Miranda-Chumacero, G., Wallace, R., Calderón, H., Calderón, G., Willink, P., Guerrero, M., *et*

938 *al.* (2012). Distribution of arapaima (*Arapaima gigas*) (Pisces: Arapaimatidae) in Bolivia:

939 implications in the control and management of a non-native population. *BioInvasions*

940 *Rec.*, 1, 129–138 doi:10.3391/bir.2012.1.2.09.

941 Moodley, D., Angulo, E., Cuthbert, R.N., Leung, B., Turbelin, A., Novoa, A., *et al.* (2022).

942 Surprisingly high economic costs of biological invasions in protected areas. *Biol.*

943 *Invasions*, 24, 1995–2016 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02732-7.

944 National Research Council. (2000). *The Future Role of Pesticides in US Agriculture*

945 doi:10.17226/9598.

946 Nentwig, W., Bacher, S., Kumschick, S., Pyšek, P. & Vilà, M. (2018). More than “100 worst”

947 alien species in Europe. *Biol. Invasions*, 20, 1611–1621 doi:10.1007/s10530-017-1651-6.

948 Novoa, A., Dehnen-Schmutz, K., Fried, J. & Vimercati, G. (2017). Does public awareness

949 increase support for invasive species management? Promising evidence across taxa and

950 landscape types. *Biol. Invasions*, 19, 3691–3705 doi:10.1007/s10530-017-1592-0.

951 O’Neill, C. (1997). Economic impact of zebra mussels: results of the 1995 zebra mussel

952 information clearinghouse study. *Gt. Lakes Res. Rev.*, 3, 35–42.

953 Oreska, M.P.J. & Aldridge, D.C. (2010). Estimating the financial costs of freshwater invasive  
954 species in Great Britain: a standardized approach to invasive species costing. *Biol.*  
955 *Invasions*, 13, 305–319 doi:10.1007/s10530-010-9807-7.

956 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). Biodiversity, natural capital  
957 and the economy. *OECD Environ. Policy Pap.* doi:10.1787/1a1ae114-en.

958 Paini, D.R., Sheppard, A.W., Cook, D.C., De Barro, P.J., Worner, S.P. & Thomas, M.B. (2016).  
959 Global threat to agriculture from invasive species. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 113, 7575–7579  
960 doi:10.1073/pnas.1602205113.

961 Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia. (2021). *Regional State of*  
962 *Ocean and Coasts 2021: The East Asian Seas Region (VOLUME 1)*  
963 [http://pemsea.org/sites/default/files/RSOC%20Report%202021%20\(FINAL\)%20202206](http://pemsea.org/sites/default/files/RSOC%20Report%202021%20(FINAL)%2020220609.pdf)  
964 [09.pdf](http://pemsea.org/sites/default/files/RSOC%20Report%202021%20(FINAL)%2020220609.pdf).

965 Pejchar, L. & Mooney, H.A. (2009). Invasive species, ecosystem services and human well-being.  
966 *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 24, 497–504 doi:10.1016/j.tree.2009.03.016.

967 Pimentel, D. (2011). *Biological Invasions: Economic and Environmental Costs of Alien Plant,*  
968 *Animal, and Microbe Species*. 2nd edn. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, USA.

969 Pimentel, D., Lach, L., Zuniga, R. & Morrison, D. (2000). Environmental and economic costs of  
970 nonindigenous species in the United States. *BioScience*, 50, 53–65 doi:10.1641/0006-  
971 3568(2000)050[0053:aecon]2.3.co;2.

972 Pimentel, D., McNair, S., Janecka, J., Wightman, J., Simmonds, C., O’Connell, C., *et al.* (2001).  
973 Economic and environmental threats of alien plant, animal, and microbe invasions. *Agric.*  
974 *Ecosyst. Environ.*, 84, 1–20 doi:10.1016/S0167-8809(00)00178-X.

975 Pimentel, D., Zuniga, R. & Morrison, D. (2005). Update on the environmental and economic  
976 costs associated with alien-invasive species in the United States. *Ecol. Econ.*, 52, 273–  
977 288 doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2004.10.002.

978 Pusceddu, M., Floris, I., Mannu, R., Cocco, A. & Satta, A. (2019). Using verified citizen science  
979 as a tool for monitoring the European hornet (*Vespa crabro*) in the island of Sardinia  
980 (Italy). *NeoBiota*, 50, 97–108 doi:10.3897/neobiota.50.37587.

981 Reid, C.H., Hudgins, E.J., Guay, J.D., Patterson, S., Medd, A.M., Cooke, S.J., *et al.* (2021). The  
982 state of Canada’s biosecurity efforts to protect biodiversity from species invasions.  
983 *FACETS*, 6, 1922–1954 doi:10.1139/facets-2021-0012.

984 Renault, D., Angulo, E., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Capinha, C., Bang, A., *et al.* (2022a).  
985 The magnitude, diversity, and distribution of the economic costs of invasive terrestrial  
986 invertebrates worldwide. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 835, 155391  
987 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.155391.

988 Renault, D., Hess, M.C.M., Braschi, J., Cuthbert, R.N., Sperandii, M.G., Bazzichetto, M., *et al.*  
989 (2022b). Advancing biological invasion hypothesis testing using functional diversity  
990 indices. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 834, 155102 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.155102.

991 Renault, D., Manfrini, E., Leroy, B., Diagne, C., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Angulo, E., *et al.* (2021).  
992 Biological invasions in France: alarming costs and even more alarming knowledge gaps.  
993 *NeoBiota*, 67, 191–224 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59134.

994 Ricciardi, A., Iacarella, J.C., Aldridge, D.C., Blackburn, T.M., Carlton, J.T., Catford, J.A., *et al.*  
995 (2021). Four priority areas to advance invasion science in the face of rapid environmental  
996 change. *Environ. Rev.*, 29, 119–141 doi:10.1139/er-2020-0088.

997 Roxburgh, T., Ellis, K., Johnson, J.A., Baldos, U.L., Hertel, T., Nootenboom, C., *et al.* (2020).

998            *Global Futures: Assessing the Global Economic Impacts of Environmental Change to*  
999            *Support Policy-making. Summary Report* <https://www.wwf.org.uk/globalfutures>.

1000 Russell, J.C. & Blackburn, T.M. (2017). The rise of invasive species denialism. *Trends Ecol.*  
1001            *Evol.*, 32, 3–6 doi:10.1016/j.tree.2016.10.012.

1002 Rust, M.K. & Su, N.-Y. (2012). Managing social insects of urban importance. *Annu. Rev.*  
1003            *Entomol.*, 57, 355–375 doi:10.1146/annurev-ento-120710-100634.

1004 Sagoff, M. (2008). Environmental harm: political not biological. *J. Agric. Environ. Ethics*, 22,  
1005            81–88 doi:10.1007/s10806-008-9127-4.

1006 Sagoff, M. (2020). Fact and value in invasion biology. *Conserv. Biol.*, 34, 581–588  
1007            doi:10.1111/cobi.13440.

1008 Sanz-Martín, M., Pitt, K.A., Condon, R.H., Lucas, C.H., Novaes de Santana, C. & Duarte, C.M.  
1009            (2016). Flawed citation practices facilitate the unsubstantiated perception of a global  
1010            trend toward increased jellyfish blooms. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 25, 1039–1049  
1011            doi:10.1111/geb.12474.

1012 Sax, D.F., Schlaepfer, M.A. & Olden, J.D. (2022). Valuing the contributions of non-native  
1013            species to people and nature. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 37, 1058–1066  
1014            doi:10.1016/j.tree.2022.08.005.

1015 Seebens, H., Blackburn, T.M., Dyer, E.E., Genovesi, P., Hulme, P.E., Jeschke, J.M., *et al.*  
1016            (2017). No saturation in the accumulation of alien species worldwide. *Nat. Commun.*, 8,  
1017            14435 doi:10.1038/ncomms14435.

1018 Seebens, H., Blackburn, T.M., Dyer, E.E., Genovesi, P., Hulme, P.E., Jeschke, J.M., *et al.*  
1019            (2018). Global rise in emerging alien species results from increased accessibility of new  
1020            source pools. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 115, E2264–E2273 doi:10.1073/pnas.1719429115.

1021 Seebens, H., Clarke, D.A., Groom, Q., Wilson, J.R.U., García-Berthou, E., Kühn, I., *et al.*  
1022 (2020). A workflow for standardising and integrating alien species distribution data.  
1023 *NeoBiota*, 59, 39–59 doi:10.3897/neobiota.59.53578.

1024 Seebens, H. & Kaplan, E. (2022). DASC0: a workflow to downscale alien species checklists  
1025 using occurrence records and to re-allocate species distributions across realms. *NeoBiota*,  
1026 74, 75–91 doi:10.3897/neobiota.74.81082.

1027 Shackleton, R.T., Richardson, D.M., Shackleton, C.M., Bennett, B., Crowley, S.L., Dehnen-  
1028 Schmutz, K., *et al.* (2019). Explaining people’s perceptions of invasive alien species: A  
1029 conceptual framework. *J. Environ. Manage.*, 229, 10–26  
1030 doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.04.045.

1031 Simberloff, D., Martin, J.-L., Genovesi, P., Maris, V., Wardle, D. a, Aronson, J., *et al.* (2013).  
1032 Impacts of biological invasions: what’s what and the way forward. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*,  
1033 28, 58–66 doi:10.1016/j.tree.2012.07.013.

1034 Sosa, A.J., Jiménez, N.L., Faltlhauser, A.C., Righetti, T., Mc Kay, F., Bruzzone, O.A., *et al.*  
1035 (2021). The educational community and its knowledge and perceptions of native and  
1036 invasive alien species. *Sci. Rep.*, 11, 21474 doi:10.1038/s41598-021-00683-y.

1037 Soto, I., Cuthbert, R.N., Kouba, A., Capinha, C., Turbelin, A., Hudgins, E.J., *et al.* (2022).  
1038 Global economic costs of herpetofauna invasions. *Sci. Rep.*, 12, 10829  
1039 doi:10.1038/s41598-022-15079-9.

1040 Soto, I. & Hudgins, E. (2022). Invasive reptile and amphibian species are causing billions of  
1041 dollars in damages globally. *The Conversation* [https://theconversation.com/invasive-](https://theconversation.com/invasive-reptile-and-amphibian-species-are-causing-billions-of-dollars-in-damages-globally-188680)  
1042 [reptile-and-amphibian-species-are-causing-billions-of-dollars-in-damages-globally-](https://theconversation.com/invasive-reptile-and-amphibian-species-are-causing-billions-of-dollars-in-damages-globally-188680)  
1043 188680.



- 1044 Su, N. (1991). Termites of the United States and their control. *SP World*, 17, 12–15.
- 1045 Su, N. (2002). Novel technologies for subterranean termite control. *Sociobiology*, 39, 1–7.
- 1046 Su, N.-Y. (1994). Field evaluation of a hexaflumuron bait for population suppression of  
1047 subterranean termites (Isoptera: Rhinotermitidae). *J. Econ. Entomol.*, 87, 389–397  
1048 doi:10.1093/jee/87.2.389.
- 1049 Teixeira, M.C., Thomaz, S.M., Michelan, T.S., Mormul, R.P., Meurer, T., Fasolli, J.V.B., *et al.*  
1050 (2013). Incorrect citations give unfair credit to review authors in ecology journals. *PLOS*  
1051 *ONE*, 8, e81871 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0081871.
- 1052 Turbelin, A.J., Hudgins, E.J., Catford, J.A., Cuthbert, R.N., Kourantidou, M., Roiz, D., *et al.*  
1053 (2023). Biological invasions as burdens to primary economic sectors. *Res. Sq.*  
1054 doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-2444595/v1.
- 1055 U. S. Bureau of the Census. (1998). *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1996. 200th ed.* US  
1056 Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- 1057 U. S. Department of State. (2009). *Case Study: Zebra Mussel* [https://2001-](https://2001-2009.state.gov/g/oes/ocns/inv/cs/2304.htm)  
1058 [2009.state.gov/g/oes/ocns/inv/cs/2304.htm](https://2001-2009.state.gov/g/oes/ocns/inv/cs/2304.htm).
- 1059 Vaissière, A.-C., Courtois, P., Courchamp, F., Kourantidou, M., Diagne, C., Essl, F., *et al.*  
1060 (2022). The nature of economic costs of biological invasions. *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 2081–  
1061 2101 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02837-z.
- 1062 Vander Zanden, M.J. & Olden, J.D. (2008). A management framework for preventing the  
1063 secondary spread of aquatic invasive species. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*, 65, 1512–1522  
1064 doi:10.1139/F08-099.
- 1065 Vilà, M., Basnou, C., Pyšek, P., Josefsson, M., Genovesi, P., Gollasch, S., *et al.* (2010). How  
1066 well do we understand the impacts of alien species on ecosystem services? A pan-

1067 European, cross-taxa assessment. *Front. Ecol. Environ.*, 8, 135–144 doi:10.1890/080083.

1068 Vinson, S.B. (1992). *The Economic Impact of the Imported Fire Ant Infestation on the State of*  
1069 *Texas*. Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas.

1070 Wang, S., Deng, T., Zhang, J. & Li, Y. (2023). Global economic costs of mammal invasions. *Sci.*  
1071 *Total Environ.*, 857, 159479 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.159479.

1072 World Fishing and Aquaculture. (2021). Invaders in our waters: at what cost? *World Fish.*  
1073 *Aquac.* [https://www.worldfishing.net/invaders-in-our-waters-at-what-](https://www.worldfishing.net/invaders-in-our-waters-at-what-cost/1405302.article)  
1074 [cost/1405302.article](https://www.worldfishing.net/invaders-in-our-waters-at-what-cost/1405302.article).

1075 Yemshanov, D., McKenney, D.W., Pedlar, J.H., Koch, F.H. & Cook, D. (2009). Towards an  
1076 integrated approach to modelling the risks and impacts of invasive forest species.  
1077 *Environ. Rev.*, 17, 163–178 doi:10.1139/A09-007.

1078 Zenni, R.D., Essl, F., García-Berthou, E. & McDermott, S.M. (2021). The economic costs of  
1079 biological invasions around the world. *NeoBiota*, 67, 1–9 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.69971.

1080 Zhang, L., Rohr, J., Cui, R., Xin, Y., Han, L., Yang, X., *et al.* (2022). Biological invasions  
1081 facilitate zoonotic disease emergences. *Nat. Commun.*, 13, 1762 doi:10.1038/s41467-022-  
1082 29378-2.


1083 **Figure captions**

1084 **Figure 1** The growth of the living database *InvaCost* from 1960 to 2021, showing temporal  
1085 trends in (a) recorded database entries, (b) recorded species, including cumulative curves of  
1086 unique species (dashed lines, right y axis; v1.0 = blue; v2.1 = green; v3.0 = brown; v4.1 = red;  
1087 unidentified/diverse species categories removed), and (c) total costs (without any filter, but  
1088 *expanded*) among versions v1.0, v2.1, v3.0, and v4.1. The high costs associated with v1.0 in the  
1089 latter years is due to refinement in subsequent versions and not filtering for cost reliability in the  
1090 costs presented here. The apparent logistic form of the cumulative number of unique species  
1091 might arise from the reporting lag in cost data, so should not be taken to indicate saturation. R  
1092 code to generate the data for these plots available at  
1093 [github.com/cjabradshaw/InvaCostVersionTrends](https://github.com/cjabradshaw/InvaCostVersionTrends).

1094 **Figure 2** A total of 52 research works are based on the *InvaCost* database, with studies spanning  
1095 several thematic categories: taxonomic (11 studies), conceptual (7), habitat (3), sectoral (3),  
1096 general (5), and geographical (23). See supporting information S1 for references and the  
1097 database version used in each study.


1098 **Figure 3** Global maps showing (a) number of established invasive alien species per country  
1099 (based on Briski *et al.*, unpublished data;  $\log_{10}$  scale), (b) total costs of invasive alien species  
1100 (US\$ billion, 2017 value;  $\log_{10}$  scale) per country, (c) number of invasive alien species reported  
1101 in *InvaCost* per country, and (d) average cost (US\$ billion 2017 value) per invasive alien species  
1102 (sp) reported in *InvaCost* in each country. Blank countries indicate absence of data.

1103 **Figure 1**







1104

1105 **Figure 2**



1106

**Figure 3**



**Supporting Information for Recent advances in availability and synthesis of the economic costs of biological invasions**

Ahmed DA, Haubrock PJ, Cuthbert RN, Bang A, Soto I, Balzani P, Tarkan AS, Macêdo RL, Carneiro L, Bodey TW, Oficialdegui FJ, Courtois P, Kourantidou M, Angulo E, Heringer G, Renault D, Turbelin AJ, Hudgins EJ, Liu C, Gojery SA, Arbieu U, Diagne C, Leroy B, Briski E, Bradshaw CJA, Courchamp F

Tables S1–S4 also available as .csv files at [github.com/cjabradshaw/InvaCostVersionTrends](https://github.com/cjabradshaw/InvaCostVersionTrends)

Updated on 9th March 2023



**Table S1 InvaCost publications** List of 52 peer-reviewed articles that have used the InvaCost database, categorised according to themes: taxonomic (11), conceptual (7), habitat (3), sectoral (3) and geographical (23; regional, continental and national). The studies, trees (Fernandez et al. 2022), primary (Turbelin et al. 2023b) are available in preprint repositories, and hazards (Turbelin et al. 2023a) is 'in press'. All other studies are published in journals.

taxonomic				
no.	category	citation	reference	version
1	ants	Angulo et al. (2022)	Angulo, E., Hoffmann, B.D., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Taheri, A., Balzani, P., Bang, A., et al. (2022). Economic costs of invasive alien ants worldwide. <i>Biol. Invasions</i> , 24, 2041–2060 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02791-w.	4
2	bivalves	Haubrock et al. (2022c)	Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Ricciardi, A., Diagne, C. & Courchamp, F. (2022). Economic costs of invasive bivalves in freshwater ecosystems. <i>Divers. Distrib.</i> , 28, 1010–1021 doi:10.1111/ddi.13501	4
3	crustaceans	Kouba et al. (2022)	Kouba, A., Oficialdegui, F.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Kourantidou, M., South, J., Tricarico, E., et al. (2022). Identifying economic costs and knowledge gaps of invasive aquatic crustaceans. <i>Sci. Total Environ.</i> , 813, 152325 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.152325	4
4	fish	Haubrock et al. (2022a)	Haubrock, P.J., Bernery, C., Cuthbert, R.N., Liu, C., Kourantidou, M., Leroy, B., et al. (2022). Knowledge gaps in economic costs of invasive alien fish worldwide. <i>Sci. Total Environ.</i> , 803, 149875 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149875	4
5	gastropods	Jiang et al. (2022)	Jiang, X., Zheng, P., Soto, I., Haubrock, P.J., Chen, J. & Ji, L. (2022). Global economic costs and knowledge gaps of invasive gastropods. <i>Ecol. Indic.</i> , 145, 109614 doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2022.109614	4.1
6	herpetofauna	Soto et al. (2022)	Soto, I., Cuthbert, R.N., Kouba, A., Capinha, C., Turbelin, A., Hudgins, E.J., et al. (2022). Global economic costs of herpetofauna invasions. <i>Sci. Rep.</i> , 12, 10829 doi:10.1038/s41598-022-15079-9	4



7	insects	Bradshaw et al. (2016)	Bradshaw, C.J.A., Leroy, B., Bellard, C., Roiz, D., Albert, C., Fournier, A., et al. (2016). Massive yet grossly underestimated global costs of invasive insects. <i>Nat. Commun.</i> , 7, 12986 doi:10.1038/ncomms12986	0
8	mammals	Wang et al. (2023)	Wang, S., Deng, T., Zhang, J. & Li, Y. (2023). Global economic costs of mammal invasions. <i>Sci. Total Environ.</i> , 857, 159479 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.159479	4.1
9	plankton	Macêdo et al. (2022)	Macêdo, R.L., Franco, A.C.S., Kozlowsky-Suzuki, B., Mammola, S., Dalu, T. & Rocha, O. (2022). The global social-economic dimension of biological invasions by plankton: grossly underestimated costs but a rising concern for water quality benefits? <i>Water Res.</i> , 222, 118918 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2022.118918	4
10	trees	Fernandez et al. (2022)	Fernandez, R.D., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R., Heringer, G., Kourantidou, M., Hudgins, E.J., et al. (2022). Underexplored and growing economic costs of invasive alien trees. SSRN doi:10.2139/ssrn.4196468	4.1
11	terrestrial invertebrates	Renault et al. (2022)	Renault, D., Angulo, E., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Capinha, C., Bang, A., et al. (2022). The magnitude, diversity, and distribution of the economic costs of invasive terrestrial invertebrates worldwide. <i>Sci. Total Environ.</i> , 835, 155391 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.155391	4.1

conceptual				
no.	category	citation	reference	version
1	100 worst	Cuthbert et al. (2022a)	Cuthbert, R.N., Diagne, C., Haubrock, P.J., Turbelin, A.J. & Courchamp, F. (2022). Are the “100 of the world’s worst” invasive species also the costliest? <i>Biol. Invasions</i> , 24, 1895–1904 doi:10.1007/s10530-021-02568-7	3
2	canals	Balzani et al. (2022)	Balzani, P., Cuthbert, R.N., Briski, E., Galil, B., Castellanos-Galindo, G.A., Kouba, A., et al. (2022). Knowledge needs in economic costs of invasive species facilitated by canalisation. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 78, 207–223 doi:10.3897/neobiota.78.95050	4.1
3	cost dynamics	Haubrock et al. (2022b)	Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Hudgins, E.J., Crystal-Ornelas, R., Kourantidou, M., Moodley, D., et al. (2022). Geographic and taxonomic trends of rising biological invasion costs. <i>Sci. Total Environ.</i> , 817, 152948 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.152948	3
4	inaction costs	Ahmed et al. (2022b)	Ahmed, D.A., Hudgins, E.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Kourantidou, M., Diagne, C., Haubrock, P.J., et al. (2022). Managing biological invasions: the cost of inaction. <i>Biol. Invasions</i> , 24, 1927–1946 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02755-0	4
5	modelling damage costs	Ahmed et al. (2022a)	Ahmed, D.A., Hudgins, E.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Renault, D., Bonnaud, E., et al. (2022). Modelling the damage costs of invasive alien species. <i>Biol. Invasions</i> , 24, 1949–1972 doi:10.1007/s10530-021-02586-5	1
6	nature of costs	Vaissière et al. (2022)	Vaissière, A.-C., Courtois, P., Courchamp, F., Kourantidou, M., Diagne, C., Essl, F., et al. (2022). The nature of economic costs of biological invasions. <i>Biol. Invasions</i> , 24, 2081–2101 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02837-z	4

7	species with benefits + costs	Kourantidou et al. (2022a)	Kourantidou, M., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Bodey, T.W., Lenzner, B., Gozlan, R.E., et al. (2022). Invasive alien species as simultaneous benefits and burdens: trends, stakeholder perceptions and management. <i>Biol. Invasions</i> , 24, 1905–1926 doi:10.1007/s10530-021-02727-w	4
---	-------------------------------	----------------------------	--	---

**habitat**

no.	category	citation	reference	version
1	aquatic	Cuthbert et al. (2021b)	Cuthbert, R.N., Pattison, Z., Taylor, N.G., Verbrugge, L., Diagne, C., Ahmed, D.A., et al. (2021). Global economic costs of aquatic invasive alien species. <i>Sci. Total Environ.</i> , 775, 145238 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145238	3
2	islands	Bodey et al. (2022a)	Bodey, T.W., Angulo, E., Bang, A., Bellard, C., Fantle-Lepczyk, J., Lenzner, B., et al. (2022). Economic costs of protecting islands from invasive alien species. <i>Conserv. Biol.</i> , e14034 doi:10.1111/cobi.14034	4
3	protected areas	Moodley et al. (2022)	Moodley, D., Angulo, E., Cuthbert, R.N., Leung, B., Turbelin, A., Novoa, A., et al. (2022). Surprisingly high economic costs of biological invasions in protected areas. <i>Biol. Invasions</i> , 24, 1995–2016 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02732-7	4

**sectoral**

no.	category	citation	reference	version
1	biosecurity	Cuthbert et al. (2022b)	Cuthbert, R.N., Diagne, C., Hudgins, E.J., Turbelin, A., Ahmed, D.A., Albert, C., et al. (2022). Biological invasion costs reveal insufficient proactive management worldwide. <i>Sci. Total Environ.</i> , 819, 153404 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153404	4

2	pathways	Turbelin et al. (2022)	Turbelin, A.J., Diagne, C., Hudgins, E.J., Moodley, D., Kourantidou, M., Novoa, A., et al. (2022). Introduction pathways of economically costly invasive alien species. <i>Biol. Invasions</i> , 24, 2061–2079 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02796-5	4
3	primary	Turbelin et al. (2023b)	Turbelin, A.J., Hudgins, E.J., Catford, J.A., Cuthbert, R.N., Kourantidou, M., Roiz, D., et al. (2023). Biological invasions as burdens to primary economic sectors. <i>Res. Sq.</i> doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-2444595/v1	4.1

general				
no.	category	citation	reference	version
1	database	Diagne et al. (2020)	Diagne, C., Leroy, B., Gozlan, R.E., Vaissière, A.-C., Assailly, C., Nuninger, L., et al. (2020). InvaCost, a public database of the economic costs of biological invasions worldwide. <i>Sci. Data</i> , 7, 277 doi:10.1038/s41597-020-00586-z	1
2	global costs	Diagne et al. (2021a)	Diagne, C., Leroy, B., Vaissière, A.-C., E. Gozlan, R., Roiz, D., Jarić, I., et al. (2021). High and rising economic costs of biological invasions worldwide. <i>Nature</i> , 592, 571–576 doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03405-6	1
3	hazards	Turbelin et al. (2023a)	Turbelin, A.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Essl, F., Haubrock, P.J., Ricciardi, A. & Courchamp, F. (2023a). Biological invasions are as costly as natural hazards. <i>Perspect. Ecol. Conserv.</i> , in press	4.1
4	non-English sources	Angulo et al. (2021b)	Angulo, E., Diagne, C., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Adamjy, T., Ahmed, D.A., Akulov, E., et al. (2021). Non-English languages enrich scientific knowledge: the example of economic costs of biological invasions. <i>Sci. Total Environ.</i> , 775, 144441 doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144441	3

5	R package	Leroy et al. (2022)	Leroy, B., Kramer, A.M., Vaissière, A.-C., Kourantidou, M., Courchamp, F. & Diagne, C. (2022). Analysing economic costs of invasive alien species with the invacost R package. <i>Methods Ecol. Evol.</i> , 13, 1930–1937 doi:10.1111/2041-210X.13929	4
---	-----------	---------------------	---	---

<b>geographical</b>				
<b>no.</b>	<b>category</b>	<b>citation</b>	<b>reference</b>	<b>version</b>
<i>continental</i>				
1	Africa	Diagne et al. (2021b)	Diagne, C., Turbelin, A.J., Moodley, D., Novoa, A., Leroy, B., Angulo, E., et al. (2021). The economic costs of biological invasions in Africa: a growing but neglected threat? <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 11–51 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59132	3
2	Asia	Liu et al. (2021)	Liu, C., Diagne, C., Angulo, E., Banerjee, A.-K., Chen, Y., Cuthbert, R.N., et al. (2021). Economic costs of biological invasions in Asia. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 53–78 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58147	1
3	Europe	Haubrock et al. (2021d)	Haubrock, P.J., Turbelin, A.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Novoa, A., Taylor, N.G., Angulo, E., et al. (2021). Economic costs of invasive alien species across Europe. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 153–190 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58196	1
4	North America	Crystal-Ornelas et al. (2021)	Crystal-Ornelas, R., Hudgins, E.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Fantle-Lepczyk, J., Angulo, E., et al. (2021). Economic costs of biological invasions within North America. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 485–510 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58038	3
5	South and Central America	Heringer et al. (2021)	Heringer, G., Angulo, E., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Capinha, C., Courchamp, F., Diagne, C., et al. (2021). The economic costs of biological invasions in Central and South America: a first regional assessment. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 401–426 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59193	3
<i>regional</i>				

6	Mediterranean	Kourantidou et al. (2021)	Kourantidou, M., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Novoa, A., Taylor, N.G., Leroy, B., et al. (2021). Economic costs of invasive alien species in the Mediterranean basin. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 427–458 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58926	3
7	Nordic	Kourantidou et al. (2022b)	Kourantidou, M., Verbrugge, L.N.H., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Angulo, E., Ahonen, I., et al. (2022). The economic costs, management and regulation of biological invasions in the Nordic countries. <i>J. Environ. Manage.</i> , 324, 116374 doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2022.116374	4.1
8	Southeast Asia	Haubrock et al. (2021c)	Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Yeo, D.C.J., Banerjee, A.K., Liu, C., Diagne, C., et al. (2021). Biological invasions in Singapore and Southeast Asia: data gaps fail to mask potentially massive economic costs. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 131–152 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.64560	3
<b><i>national</i></b>				
9	Argentina	Duboscq-Carra et al. (2021)	Duboscq-Carra, V.G., Fernandez, R.D., Haubrock, P.J., Dimarco, R.D., Angulo, E., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., et al. (2021). Economic impact of invasive alien species in Argentina: a first national synthesis. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 329–348 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.63208	3
10	Australia	Bradshaw et al. (2021)	Bradshaw, C.J.A., Hoskins, A.J., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Diagne, C., Leroy, B., et al. (2021). Detailed assessment of the reported economic costs of invasive species in Australia. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 511–550 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58834	1
11	Brazil	Adelino et al. (2021)	Adelino, J.R.P., Heringer, G., Diagne, C., Courchamp, F., Faria, L.D.B. & Zenni, R.D. (2021). The economic costs of biological invasions in Brazil: a first assessment. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 349–374 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59185	3

12	Ecuador	Ballesteros-Mejia et al. (2021)	Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Angulo, E., Diagne, C., Cooke, B., Nuñez, M.A. & Courchamp, F. (2021). Economic costs of biological invasions in Ecuador: the importance of the Galapagos Islands. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 375–400 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59116	3
13	France	Renault et al. (2021)	Renault, D., Manfrini, E., Leroy, B., Diagne, C., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Angulo, E., et al. (2021). Biological invasions in France: alarming costs and even more alarming knowledge gaps. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 191–224 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59134	3
14	Germany	Haubrock et al. (2021a)	Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Sundermann, A., Diagne, C., Golivets, M. & Courchamp, F. (2021). Economic costs of invasive species in Germany. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 225–246 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59502	3
15	India	Bang et al. (2022)	Bang, A., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Fernandez, R.D., Moodley, D., Diagne, C., et al. (2022). Massive economic costs of biological invasions despite widespread knowledge gaps: a dual setback for India. <i>Biol. Invasions</i> , 24, 2017–2039 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02780-z	3
16	Italy	Haubrock et al. (2021b)	Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Tricarico, E., Diagne, C., Courchamp, F. & Gozlan, R.E. (2021). The recorded economic costs of alien invasive species in Italy. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 247–266 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.57747	3
17	Japan	Watari et al. (2021)	Watari, Y., Komine, H., Angulo, E., Diagne, C., Ballesteros-Mejia, L. & Courchamp, F. (2021). First synthesis of the economic costs of biological invasions in Japan. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 79–101 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59186	3

18	Mexico	Rico-Sánchez et al. (2021)	Rico-Sánchez, A.E., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Angulo, E., Ballesteros-Mejía, L., López-López, E., et al. (2021). Economic costs of invasive alien species in Mexico. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 459–483 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.63846	3
19	New Zealand	Bodey et al. (2022b)	Bodey, T.W., Carter, Z.T., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Welsh, M.J., Diagne, C., et al. (2022). Building a synthesis of economic costs of biological invasions in New Zealand. <i>PeerJ</i> , 10, e13580 doi:10.7717/peerj.13580	4
20	Russia	Kirichenko et al. (2021)	Kirichenko, N., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Akulov, E., Karimova, E., Shneider, Y., et al. (2021). Economic costs of biological invasions in terrestrial ecosystems in Russia. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 103–130 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58529	1
21	Spain	Angulo et al. (2021a)	Angulo, E., Ballesteros-Mejía, L., Novoa, A., Duboscq-Carra, V.G., Diagne, C. & Courchamp, F. (2021a). Economic costs of invasive alien species in Spain. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 267–297 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59181	3
22	United Kingdom	Cuthbert et al. (2021a)	Cuthbert, R.N., Bartlett, A.C., Turbelin, A.J., Haubrock, P.J., Diagne, C., Pattison, Z., et al. (2021). Economic costs of biological invasions in the United Kingdom. <i>NeoBiota</i> , 67, 299–328 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59743	3
23	USA	Fantle-Lepczyk et al. (2022)	Fantle-Lepczyk, J.E., Haubrock, P.J., Kramer, A.M., Cuthbert, R.N., Turbelin, A.J., Crystal-Ornelas, R., et al. (2022). Economic costs of biological invasions in the United States. <i>Sci. Total Environ.</i> , 806, 151318 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.151318	3



**Table S2** Compilation of policy documents that have referenced InvaCost studies. See also supporting information Table S1 for complete citation for each InvaCost study.

policy document (citation)	published date	link (DOI/URL)	InvaCost studies cited (citation)	thematic category
OECD (2021), "Biodiversity, natural capital and the economy: A policy guide for finance, economic and environment ministers", OECD Environment Policy Papers, No. 26, OECD Publishing, Paris.	May-21	doi:10.1787/1a1ae114-en	Diagne et al. (2021a), global	general
Australian Academy of Science (2022). Australia's data-enabled research future: Science.	Jun-22	science.org.au/supporting-science/science-policy-and-analysis/reports-and-publications/australias-data-enabled-research-future-science	Bradshaw et al. (2021), Australia	geographical
European Commission, Directorate-General for Environment, Nesbit, M., Whiteoak, K., Underwood, E., et al., Biodiversity financing and tracking : final report, Publications Office of the European Union, 2022.	May-22	doi:10.2779/950856	Haubrock et al. (2021d), Europe	geographical
IPPC Secretariat. 2022. Report on the analysis to support the transition to a sustainable Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS). Rome, FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention.	Sep-22	doi:10.4060/cc0799en	Cuthbert et al. (2021b), aquatic	habitat

<p>Report from the commission to the EU parliament and the council on the review of the application of Regulation (EU) No 1143/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2014 on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species.</p>	<p>Oct-21</p>	<p><a href="http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021DC0628">eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021DC0628</a></p>	<p>Diagne et al. (2021a), global</p> <p>Cuthbert et al. (2021b), aquatic</p> <p>Ahmed et al. (2022b), inaction costs</p>	<p>general</p> <p>habitat</p> <p>conceptual</p>
<p>Regional State of Ocean and Coasts 2021: The East Asian Seas Region (Volume 1).</p>	<p>Jun-22</p>	<p><a href="http://app.overton.io/document.php?policy_document_id=pemsea-30680e5825f82040e533f9a66eff2dd9">app.overton.io/document.php?policy_document_id=pemsea-30680e5825f82040e533f9a66eff2dd9</a></p>	<p>Cuthbert et al. (2021b), aquatic</p>	<p>habitat</p>
<p>European Commission, Directorate-General for Environment, Study on invasive alien species : development of risk assessments to tackle priority species and enhance prevention : final report, Publications Office of the European Union, 2022.</p>	<p>Dec-22</p>	<p><a href="https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2779/5726">https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2779/5726</a></p>	<p>Kouba et al. (2022), crustaceans</p> <p>Angulo et al. (2022), ants</p>	<p>taxonomic</p> <p>taxonomic</p>

**Table S3 News articles** Altmetric scores, examples of news stories with associated outlets, and number of tweets. The examples provided are those captured either by Altmetric or PlumX and therefore the media coverage listed below is not exhaustive.

taxonomic							
no.	category	citation	Altmetric (or PlumX)	news story examples	associated outlet(s)	news stories (outlets)	tweets (users)
1	ants	Angulo et al. (2022)	101	Le formiche invasive sono una minaccia più grande del previsto	<i>National Geographic</i>	6 (5)	96 (86)
				Invasive ants are a bigger threat than we thought	<i>NewsBeezer, MSN, National Geographic</i>		
				Cuantifican los efectos de las hormigas invasoras	<i>Catalunya Avanguardista</i>		
				El coste económico provocado por el impacto de las hormigas invasoras alcanza los 46.000 millones de euros	<i>Dicyt</i>		
2	crustaceans	Kouba et al. (2022)	PlumX	The Signal Crayfish: The Cost of Invasion	<i>The Orkney News</i>	2 (2)	-
				Hohe wirtschaftliche Schäden durch invasive Krebstiere	<i>Wissenschaft.de</i>		
3	fish	Haubrock et al. (2022a)	PlumX	-	-	-	28
4	gastropods	Jiang et al. (2022)	PlumX	-	-	-	16
5	herpetofauna	Soto et al. (2022)	626	BEYOND LOCAL: Invasive species are causing billions of dollars in damages globally	<i>TimminsToday.com</i>	98 (76)	40 (35)
				Costs of amphibian and reptile invasions exceeded US\$17 billion between 1986 and 2020	<i>Phys.org, Swift Telecast, Nature Asia, Whats new, Environewsbits</i>		
				Environment: Costs of amphibian and reptile invasions exceeded US\$ 17 billion between 1986 and 2020	<i>EurekAlert!</i>		

				Invasive reptiles have cost the global economy billions	<i>Earth</i>		
				Invasive species bullfrog and snake cost world \$16bn - study	<i>BBC News</i>		
6	insects	Bradshaw et al. (2016)	622	Invasive insects cost the world billions per year	<i>Seed daily, Environment institute blog</i>	70 (57)	247 (209)
				Invasive insects—an underestimated cost to the world economy	<i>Phys.org</i>		
				Global costs of invasive insects	<i>DNA barcoding</i>		
				Flexible Reproduction 'Mite' Explain Invasion Success	<i>Entomology today</i>		
				Invasive tawny crazy ants have an intense craving for calcium – with implications for their spread in the US	<i>Environewsbits</i>		
7	mammals	Wang et al. (2023)	PlumX	李义明研究团队揭示外来哺乳动物入侵的全球货币成本	<i>ScienceNet.cn</i>	1 (1)	-
8	terrestrial invertebrates	Renault et al. (2022)	PlumX	-	-	-	18

conceptual							
no.	category	citation	Altmetric (or PlumX)	news story examples	associated outlet(s)	news stories (outlets)	tweets (users)
1	100 worst	Cuthbert et al. (2022a)	155	-	-	-	235 (215)
2	canals	Balzani et al. (2022)	6	-	-	-	10
3	cost dynamics	Haubrock et al. (2022b)	PlumX	Geographic and taxonomic trends of rising biological invasion costs	<i>DocWireNews</i>	1 (1)	1
4	inaction costs	Ahmed et al. (2022b)	20	-	-	-	42 (33)

5	modelling damage costs	Ahmed et al. (2022a)	12	-	-	-	22 (20)
6	nature of costs	Vaissière et al. (2022)	13	-	-	-	25 (21)
7	species with benefits + costs	Kourantidou et al. (2022a)	16	-	-	-	37 (28)

### habitat

no.	category	citation	Altmetric (or PlumX)	news story examples	associated outlet(s)	news stories (outlets)	tweets (users)
1	aquatic	Cuthbert et al. (2021b)	PlumX	University Of Florida Scientist Helps Perfect Tool To Reduce Invasive Species Worldwide	<i>NewsBreak</i>	3	130
				Aquatic invasive species cause billions of dollars in damage	<i>Phys.org</i>		
				Aquatic invasive species cause damage worth billions of dollars	<i>EurekAlert!</i>		
2	protected areas	Moodley et al. (2022)	34	-	-	-	62 (54)

### sectoral

no.	category	citation	Altmetric (or PlumX)	news story examples	associated outlet(s)	news stories (outlets)	tweets (users)
1	biosecurity	Cuthbert et al. (2022b)	PlumX	Invasive reptile and amphibian species are causing billions of dollars in damages globally	<i>Phys.org, The Conversation, NewsBreak</i>	4 (9)	63
				Invasive species prevention 'could save trillions'	<i>Eco-Business, SciDev.net, SciDev.Net: Asia &amp; Pacific</i>		

				Rack of squirrel, anyone? The chefs putting invasive species on the menu	<i>MSN UK, The Guardian: Environment News,</i>		
				Capitol rioter who dressed as Jack Skellington on Jan. 6 will be donning prison garb for up to 8 years	<i>Raw Story</i>		
2	pathways	Turbelin et al. (2022)	9	-	-	-	18 (17)

general							
no.	category	citation	Altmetric (or PlumX)	news story examples	associated outlet(s)	news stories (outlets)	tweets (users)
1	database	Diagne et al. (2020)	296	BEYOND LOCAL: Invasive species are causing billions of dollars in damages globally	<i>TimminsToday.com</i>	32 (21)	217 (187)
				Invasive reptile and amphibian species are causing billions of dollars in damages globally	<i>Winnipeg free press, Futures tradingCharts.com, Phys.org, Foregin Affairs New Zealand, Phys.org, Newsbreak, The conversation</i>		
				Invasive species have cost UK at least £5bn since 1970s, study reveals	<i>Google News, Yahoo! News, Newsbreak, The Guardian</i>		
				Attack of the alien invaders	<i>COSMOS magazine, Newsbreak, The conversation</i>		
				Ecology: Global cost of biological invasions(Scientific Data)	<i>Nature Asia</i>		
2	global costs	Diagne et al. (2021a)	1033	Pests are destroying Canada's trees — and a warming climate threatens to send more insects north	<i>MorningNews</i>	72 (61)	869 (786)

				Invasive species are costing the world billions every year	<i>The Boar</i>		
				Pest plants and animals leave a frightening \$1.7 trillion bill	<i>Brazil News.net, Newsbreak, The conversation</i>		
				Attack of the alien invaders: Pest plants and animals leave a \$1.7 trillion bill	<i>Phys.org</i>		
				Invasive exotic species: how much are they costing us?	<i>MarketScreener</i>		
3	non-English sources	Angulo et al. (2021b)	PlumX	Pest plants and animals leave a frightening \$1.7 trillion bill	South Africa Today	2 (3)	501
				Attack of the alien invaders: Pest plants and animals leave a \$1.7 trillion bill	Phys.org, The Conversation		

geographical							
no.	category	citation	Altmetric (or PlumX)	news story examples	associated outlet(s)	news stories (outlets)	tweets (users)
<b>continental</b>							
1	Africa	Diagne et al. (2021b)	6	-	-	-	7 (7)
2	Asia	Liu et al. (2021)	9	-	-	-	14
3	Europe	Haubrock et al. (2021d)	64	Fremmede arter koster milliarder La costosa invasione delle specie aliene in Europa	<i>ABC Nyheter</i> <i>Green Report (Italy)</i>	3 (3)	58 (44)
				I danni delle specie invasive in Europa crescono di 10 volte ogni decennio	<i>Innovazione</i>		
4	North America	Crystal-Ornelas et al. (2021)	41	More Than 400 Invasive Fish Dumped From Aquariums Found in Texas River	<i>Smithsonian magazine</i>	1 (1)	48 (39)
5	South and Central America	Heringer et al. (2021)	11	-	-	-	22 (19)
<b>regional</b>							
6	Mediterranean	Kourantidou et al. (2021)	24	-	-	-	38 (30)

7	Nordic	Kourantidou et al. (2022b)	PlumX	-	-	-	2
8	Southeast Asia	Haubrock et al. (2021c)	10	-	-	-	19 (15)
<b>national</b>							
9	Argentina	Duboscq-Carra et al. (2021)	28	-	-	-	57 (43)
10	Australia	Bradshaw et al. (2021)	204	To lock out foot-and-mouth disease, Australia must help its neighbor countries bolster their biosecurity	<i>Phys.org, Futures TradingCharts.com, Yahoo! News, The conversation, Newsbreak</i>	27 (19)	133 (65)
				Rapid response team tackles invasive species	<i>Australian Greens, Mirage News</i>		
				Fish robots put a scare into invasive species	<i>COSMOS magazine</i>		
				Pest plants and animals cost Australia around \$25 billion a year – and it will get worse	<i>Outlook India, Devdiscourse, Mirage news, Newsbreak</i>		
				Ryegrass, fire ants and feral cats: major Australian study identifies costliest pests in past 60 years	<i>MSN, The Guardian</i>		
11	Brazil	Adelino et al. (2021)	12	-	-	-	7 (7)
12	Ecuador	Ballesteros-Mejia et al. (2021)	6	-	-	-	10 (9)
13	France	Renault et al. (2021)	92	A new species of flatworm in our gardens that comes from Asia: <i>Humbertium covidum</i>	<i>Phys.org, Foreign affairs New Zealand, Global advisors, The conversation</i>	7 (6)	66 (55)
				Biodiversité : Pourquoi les « invasions biologiques » coûtent (vraiment) très cher à la France	<i>MSN</i>		
				News story from 20minutes on Wednesday 15 September 2021	<i>20minutes</i>		
				Les invasions biologiques, un fardeau économique pour la France	<i>The conversation</i>		



14	Germany	Haubrock et al. (2021a)	6	-	-	-	10 (9)
15	India	Bang et al. (2022)	47	Colonialism Changed the Way Plants Are Distributed Around the World: Study	<i>The Wire</i>	4 (4)	34 (23)
				Poorly planned plantation drives are helping invasive species bloom in India	<i>Moneycontrol.com</i>		
				भारत में घुसपैठ कर गए जीव-जंतुओं से हो रहा लाखों-करोड़ों का नुकसान	<i>Yourstory</i>		
				"Aliens" have cost the Indian economy \$127 billion over 60 years	<i>Quartz</i>		
16	Italy	Haubrock et al. (2021b)	7	-	-	-	6 (6)
17	Japan	Watari et al. (2021)	34	-	-	-	56 (56)
18	Mexico	Rico-Sánchez et al. (2021)	5	-	-	-	9 (7)
19	New Zealand	Bodey et al. (2022b)	-	-	-	-	11
20	Russia	Kirichenko et al. (2021)	5	-	-	-	9 (7)
21	Spain	Angulo et al. (2021a)	28	-	-	-	43 (34)
22	United Kingdom	Cuthbert et al. (2021a)	110	European Colonialism Has Had A Lasting Legacy On How Plants Are Distributed Around The World	<i>Futures TradingCharts.com, Foreign affairs New Zealand, Yahoo! News, The conversation</i>	15 (10)	47 (35)
				Specieswatch: run rabbit – why they are disappearing from the countryside	<i>MSN, Newsbreak, Yahoo! News, The Guardian</i>		
				Fremmede arter koster milliarder	<i>ABC Nyheter</i>		
				Invasive species cost UK economy over £5 billion over past 40-50 years	<i>Envirotec Magazine, Google News, Yahoo! News, Newsbreak, The Guardian</i>		
23	USA	Fantle-Lepczyk et al. (2022)	PlumX	Noble false widows: The tiny spiders taking a big bite out of British and Irish wildlife	<i>Phys.org, The Conversation</i>	7	64
				the tiny spiders taking a big bite out of British and Irish wildlife	<i>United Kingdom KNews.MEDIA</i>		
				Rat killers in paradise: An eradication program remakes a tropical atoll	<i>Mongabay</i>		

				Auburn University researcher co-authors study determining economic impact of invasive species in US exceeds \$1.2 trillion	<i>RocketNews, Agri Marketing</i>		
				Invasive Species Cost The US \$21 Billion Per Year, Study Finds	<i>FocusOn Equipment Rentals</i>		

**Table S4 Summary of the descriptors** *Type of cost merged* and *Management type* used in *InvaCost* database. The complete summary of the descriptive columns of *InvaCost* is available at: [github.com/Farewe/invacost/blob/master/data-raw](https://github.com/Farewe/invacost/blob/master/data-raw).

<b>Type of cost merged</b>	<b>Categories of the Type of cost column reassigned</b>
Damage	Economic losses due to direct and/or indirect impacts of invaders, such as yield loss, health injury, land alteration, infrastructure damage, or income reduction.
Management	In a broad sense of management. When monetary resources are allocated to mitigate the spread or impacts of invaders, such as prevention, control, research, long-term management ( <i>sensu stricto</i> ), eradication.
Mixed	When costs included both 'damage' and 'management' components.
Unspecified	Every cost for which the nature of cost was not clearly defined.
<b>Management type</b>	<b>Management in a broad sense in relation to the moment of the invasive species introduction</b>
Pre-invasion management	Monetary investments for preventing successful invasions in an area — including quarantine or border inspection, risk analyses, biosecurity management, etc.
Post-invasion management	Money spent for species management in invaded areas - including control, eradication, containment.
Knowledge/funding	Money allocated to all actions and operations that could be of interest at all steps of management at pre- and post-invasion stages — including administration, communication, education, research, etc.
Mixed	When costs include at least (and without possibility to disentangle the specific proportion of) two of the previous categories.
Unspecified	Every cost for which the nature of cost was not clearly defined.
NA	Every entry that has partly or fully associated with damage costs was assigned.

## References

- Adelino, J.R.P., Heringer, G., Diagne, C., Courchamp, F., Faria, L.D.B. & Zenni, R.D. (2021). The economic costs of biological invasions in Brazil: a first assessment. *NeoBiota*, 67, 349–374 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59185.
- Ahmed, D.A., Hudgins, E.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Renault, D., Bonnaud, E., *et al.* (2022a). Modelling the damage costs of invasive alien species. *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 1949–1972 doi:10.1007/s10530-021-02586-5.
- Ahmed, D.A., Hudgins, E.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Kourantidou, M., Diagne, C., Haubrock, P.J., *et al.* (2022b). Managing biological invasions: the cost of inaction. *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 1927–1946 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02755-0.
- Angulo, E., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Novoa, A., Duboscq-Carra, V.G., Diagne, C. & Courchamp, F. (2021a). Economic costs of invasive alien species in Spain. *NeoBiota*, 67, 267–297 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59181.
- Angulo, E., Diagne, C., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Adamjy, T., Ahmed, D.A., Akulov, E., *et al.* (2021b). Non-English languages enrich scientific knowledge: the example of economic costs of biological invasions. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 775, 144441 doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144441.
- Angulo, E., Hoffmann, B.D., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Taheri, A., Balzani, P., Bang, A., *et al.* (2022). Economic costs of invasive alien ants worldwide. *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 2041–2060 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02791-w.
- Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Angulo, E., Diagne, C., Cooke, B., Nuñez, M.A. & Courchamp, F. (2021). Economic costs of biological invasions in Ecuador: the importance of the Galapagos Islands. *NeoBiota*, 67, 375–400 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59116.
- Balzani, P., Cuthbert, R.N., Briski, E., Galil, B., Castellanos-Galindo, G.A., Kouba, A., *et al.* (2022). Knowledge needs in economic costs of invasive species facilitated by canalisation. *NeoBiota*, 78, 207–223 doi:10.3897/neobiota.78.95050.
- Bang, A., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Fernandez, R.D., Moodley, D., Diagne, C., *et al.* (2022). Massive economic costs of biological invasions despite widespread knowledge gaps: a dual setback for India. *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 2017–2039 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02780-z.
- Bodey, T.W., Angulo, E., Bang, A., Bellard, C., Fantle-Lepczyk, J., Lenzner, B., *et al.* (2022a). Economic costs of protecting islands from invasive alien species. *Conserv. Biol.*, e14034 doi:10.1111/cobi.14034.

Bodey, T.W., Carter, Z.T., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Welsh, M.J., Diagne, C., *et al.* (2022b). Building a synthesis of economic costs of biological invasions in New Zealand. *PeerJ*, 10, e13580 doi:10.7717/peerj.13580.

Bradshaw, C.J.A., Hoskins, A.J., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Diagne, C., Leroy, B., *et al.* (2021). Detailed assessment of the reported economic costs of invasive species in Australia. *NeoBiota*, 67, 511–550 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58834.

Bradshaw, C.J.A., Leroy, B., Bellard, C., Roiz, D., Albert, C., Fournier, A., *et al.* (2016). Massive yet grossly underestimated global costs of invasive insects. *Nat. Commun.*, 7, 12986 doi:10.1038/ncomms12986.

Crystal-Ornelas, R., Hudgins, E.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Fantle-Lepczyk, J., Angulo, E., *et al.* (2021). Economic costs of biological invasions within North America. *NeoBiota*, 67, 485–510 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58038.

Cuthbert, R.N., Bartlett, A.C., Turbelin, A.J., Haubrock, P.J., Diagne, C., Pattison, Z., *et al.* (2021a). Economic costs of biological invasions in the United Kingdom. *NeoBiota*, 67, 299–328 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59743.

Cuthbert, R.N., Diagne, C., Haubrock, P.J., Turbelin, A.J. & Courchamp, F. (2022a). Are the “100 of the world’s worst” invasive species also the costliest? *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 1895–1904 doi:10.1007/s10530-021-02568-7.

Cuthbert, R.N., Diagne, C., Hudgins, E.J., Turbelin, A., Ahmed, D.A., Albert, C., *et al.* (2022b). Biological invasion costs reveal insufficient proactive management worldwide. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 819, 153404 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153404.

Cuthbert, R.N., Pattison, Z., Taylor, N.G., Verbrugge, L., Diagne, C., Ahmed, D.A., *et al.* (2021b). Global economic costs of aquatic invasive alien species. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 775, 145238 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145238.

Diagne, C., Leroy, B., Gozlan, R.E., Vaissière, A.-C., Assailly, C., Nuninger, L., *et al.* (2020). *InvaCost*, a public database of the economic costs of biological invasions worldwide. *Sci. Data*, 7, 277 doi:10.1038/s41597-020-00586-z.

Diagne, C., Leroy, B., Vaissière, A.-C., E. Gozlan, R., Roiz, D., Jarić, I., *et al.* (2021a). High and rising economic costs of biological invasions worldwide. *Nature*, 592, 571–576 doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03405-6.

Diagne, C., Turbelin, A.J., Moodley, D., Novoa, A., Leroy, B., Angulo, E., *et al.* (2021b). The economic costs of biological invasions in Africa: a growing but neglected threat? *NeoBiota*, 67, 11–51 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59132.

Duboscq-Carra, V.G., Fernandez, R.D., Haubrock, P.J., Dimarco, R.D., Angulo, E., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., *et al.* (2021). Economic impact of invasive alien species in Argentina: a first national synthesis. *NeoBiota*, 67, 329–348 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.63208.

Fantle-Lepczyk, J.E., Haubrock, P.J., Kramer, A.M., Cuthbert, R.N., Turbelin, A.J., Crystal-Ornelas, R., *et al.* (2022). Economic costs of biological invasions in the United States. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 806, 151318 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.151318.

Fernandez, R.D., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R., Heringer, G., Kourantidou, M., Hudgins, E.J., *et al.* (2022). Underexplored and growing economic costs of invasive alien trees. *SSRN* doi:10.2139/ssrn.4196468.

Haubrock, P.J., Bernery, C., Cuthbert, R.N., Liu, C., Kourantidou, M., Leroy, B., *et al.* (2022a). Knowledge gaps in economic costs of invasive alien fish worldwide. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 803, 149875 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149875.

Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Hudgins, E.J., Crystal-Ornelas, R., Kourantidou, M., Moodley, D., *et al.* (2022b). Geographic and taxonomic trends of rising biological invasion costs. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 817, 152948 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.152948.

Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Ricciardi, A., Diagne, C. & Courchamp, F. (2022c). Economic costs of invasive bivalves in freshwater ecosystems. *Divers. Distrib.*, 28, 1010–1021 doi:10.1111/ddi.13501.

Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Sundermann, A., Diagne, C., Golivets, M. & Courchamp, F. (2021a). Economic costs of invasive species in Germany. *NeoBiota*, 67, 225–246 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59502.

Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Tricarico, E., Diagne, C., Courchamp, F. & Gozlan, R.E. (2021b). The recorded economic costs of alien invasive species in Italy. *NeoBiota*, 67, 247–266 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.57747.

Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Yeo, D.C.J., Banerjee, A.K., Liu, C., Diagne, C., *et al.* (2021c). Biological invasions in Singapore and Southeast Asia: data gaps fail to mask potentially massive economic costs. *NeoBiota*, 67, 131–152 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.64560.

Haubrock, P.J., Turbelin, A.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Novoa, A., Taylor, N.G., Angulo, E., *et al.* (2021d). Economic costs of invasive alien species across Europe. *NeoBiota*, 67, 153–190 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58196.

Heringer, G., Angulo, E., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Capinha, C., Courchamp, F., Diagne, C., *et al.* (2021). The economic costs of biological invasions in Central and South America: a first regional assessment. *NeoBiota*, 67, 401–426 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59193.

Jiang, X., Zheng, P., Soto, I., Haubrock, P.J., Chen, J. & Ji, L. (2022). Global economic costs and knowledge gaps of invasive gastropods. *Ecol. Indic.*, 145, 109614 doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2022.109614.

Kirichenko, N., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Akulov, E., Karimova, E., Shneider, Y., *et al.* (2021). Economic costs of biological invasions in terrestrial ecosystems in Russia. *NeoBiota*, 67, 103–130 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58529.

Kouba, A., Oficialdegui, F.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Kourantidou, M., South, J., Tricarico, E., *et al.* (2022). Identifying economic costs and knowledge gaps of invasive aquatic crustaceans. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 813, 152325 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.152325.

Kourantidou, M., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Novoa, A., Taylor, N.G., Leroy, B., *et al.* (2021). Economic costs of invasive alien species in the Mediterranean basin. *NeoBiota*, 67, 427–458 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58926.

Kourantidou, M., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Bodey, T.W., Lenzner, B., Gozlan, R.E., *et al.* (2022a). Invasive alien species as simultaneous benefits and burdens: trends, stakeholder perceptions and management. *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 1905–1926 doi:10.1007/s10530-021-02727-w.

Kourantidou, M., Verbrugge, L.N.H., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Angulo, E., Ahonen, I., *et al.* (2022b). The economic costs, management and regulation of biological invasions in the Nordic countries. *J. Environ. Manage.*, 324, 116374 doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2022.116374.

Leroy, B., Kramer, A.M., Vaissière, A.-C., Kourantidou, M., Courchamp, F. & Diagne, C. (2022). Analysing economic costs of invasive alien species with the invacost R package. *Methods Ecol. Evol.*, 13, 1930–1937 doi:10.1111/2041-210X.13929.

Liu, C., Diagne, C., Angulo, E., Banerjee, A.-K., Chen, Y., Cuthbert, R.N., *et al.* (2021). Economic costs of biological invasions in Asia. *NeoBiota*, 67, 53–78 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.58147.

Macêdo, R.L., Franco, A.C.S., Kozłowsky-Suzuki, B., Mammola, S., Dalu, T. & Rocha, O. (2022). The global social-economic dimension of biological invasions by plankton: grossly underestimated costs but a rising concern for water quality benefits? *Water Res.*, 222, 118918 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2022.118918.

Moodley, D., Angulo, E., Cuthbert, R.N., Leung, B., Turbelin, A., Novoa, A., *et al.* (2022). Surprisingly high economic costs of biological invasions in protected areas. *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 1995–2016 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02732-7.

Renault, D., Angulo, E., Cuthbert, R.N., Haubrock, P.J., Capinha, C., Bang, A., *et al.* (2022). The magnitude, diversity, and distribution of the economic costs of invasive terrestrial invertebrates worldwide. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 835, 155391 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.155391.

Renault, D., Manfrini, E., Leroy, B., Diagne, C., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., Angulo, E., *et al.* (2021). Biological invasions in France: alarming costs and even more alarming knowledge gaps. *NeoBiota*, 67, 191–224 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59134.

Rico-Sánchez, A.E., Haubrock, P.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Angulo, E., Ballesteros-Mejia, L., López-López, E., *et al.* (2021). Economic costs of invasive alien species in Mexico. *NeoBiota*, 67, 459–483 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.63846.

Soto, I., Cuthbert, R.N., Kouba, A., Capinha, C., Turbelin, A., Hudgins, E.J., *et al.* (2022). Global economic costs of herpetofauna invasions. *Sci. Rep.*, 12, 10829 doi:10.1038/s41598-022-15079-9.

Turbelin, A.J., Cuthbert, R.N., Essl, F., Haubrock, P.J., Ricciardi, A. & Courchamp, F. (2023a). Biological invasions are as costly as natural hazards. *Perspect. Ecol. Conserv.*, in press.

Turbelin, A.J., Diagne, C., Hudgins, E.J., Moodley, D., Kourantidou, M., Novoa, A., *et al.* (2022). Introduction pathways of economically costly invasive alien species. *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 2061–2079 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02796-5.

Turbelin, A.J., Hudgins, E.J., Catford, J.A., Cuthbert, R.N., Kourantidou, M., Roiz, D., *et al.* (2023b). Biological invasions as burdens to primary economic sectors. *Res. Sq.* doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-2444595/v1.

Vaissière, A.-C., Courtois, P., Courchamp, F., Kourantidou, M., Diagne, C., Essl, F., *et al.* (2022). The nature of economic costs of biological invasions. *Biol. Invasions*, 24, 2081–2101 doi:10.1007/s10530-022-02837-z.

Wang, S., Deng, T., Zhang, J. & Li, Y. (2023). Global economic costs of mammal invasions. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 857, 159479 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.159479.

Watari, Y., Komine, H., Angulo, E., Diagne, C., Ballesteros-Mejia, L. & Courchamp, F. (2021). First synthesis of the economic costs of biological invasions in Japan. *NeoBiota*, 67, 79–101 doi:10.3897/neobiota.67.59186.