

PLOS ONE

Landscape and female fertility evaluation of seven heavenly bamboo cultivars as potential non-invasive alternatives to the wildtype

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	PONE-D-23-16117
Article Type:	Research Article
Full Title:	Landscape and female fertility evaluation of seven heavenly bamboo cultivars as potential non-invasive alternatives to the wildtype
Short Title:	Landscape and female fertility of heavenly bamboo
Corresponding Author:	Julia Rycyna University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences Gainesville, Florida UNITED STATES
Keywords:	cultivar trialing; invasive plants; woody shrubs
Abstract:	<p>In recent years, breeding initiatives have been made to reduce the fecundity of plants leading to sterile cultivars. The wildtype form of heavenly bamboo (<i>Nandina domestica</i>) and seven cultivars were evaluated for landscape performance, fruit production and seed viability at three sites in Florida located in southwest, northcentral, and north Florida. For heavenly bamboo in north Florida, 'Emerald Sea', 'Greray' (Sunray®), 'Lemon-Lime', 'Murasaki' (Flirt™), 'SEIKA' (Obsession™), and 'Twilight' performed well throughout much of the study with average visual quality ratings between 3.54 and 4.60 (scale of 1 to 5). In northcentral Florida, 'Emerald Sea', 'Greray', 'Lemon-Lime', 'Murasaki', 'SEIKA', and 'Twilight' performed well throughout much of the study with average quality ratings between 4.49 and 4.94. In southwest Florida, 'Emerald Sea', 'Greray', 'Lemon-Lime', 'Murasaki', and 'SEIKA' performed well with average quality ratings between 3.40 and 4.83. At all three sites, 'Emerald Sea' and the wildtype were similar in size, having the greatest growth indices compared to medium-sized cultivars ('Greray', 'Lemon-Lime', 'Twilight' and 'SEIKA') and dwarf-sized cultivars ('Chime' and 'Murasaki').</p> <p>For three consecutive fall-winter seasons of the study, 'Chime', 'Greray', and 'Lemon-Lime' heavenly bamboo did not fruit at any of the study sites. Among the three sites, 'Murasaki' had 97.7% to 99.9% fruit reduction, 'SEIKA' had 97.7% to 100% fruit reduction, and 'Twilight' had 95.9% to 100% fruit reduction compared to the wildtype at respective sites. One-third to two-thirds of seeds collected from low fruiting cultivars ('Murasaki', 'SEIKA', and 'Twilight') had 33.3% to 66.7% viability, as determined by tetrazolium tests. In comparison, 'Emerald Sea' produced as much, if not more, fruit as the wildtype, especially in northern Florida, with seed viability ranging from 6.7% to 29.0% among sites. Nuclear DNA content of cultivars were comparable to the wildtype, suggesting they are diploids. These findings identified four low to no fruiting heavenly bamboo cultivars recommended for landscape use.</p>
Order of Authors:	Julia Rycyna Sandra Wilson Zhanao Deng Basil Iannone Gary Knox
Additional Information:	
Question	Response
Financial Disclosure	Financial support of this project was from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Agricultural Marketing Service through grant number AM180100XXXXG046 and the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) Specialty Crop Block Grant Program (SCBGP) contract # 025784. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the
Enter a financial disclosure statement that describes the sources of funding for the work included in this submission. Review	

the [submission guidelines](#) for detailed requirements. View published research articles from [PLOS ONE](#) for specific examples.

This statement is required for submission and **will appear in the published article** if the submission is accepted. Please make sure it is accurate.

Unfunded studies

Enter: *The author(s) received no specific funding for this work.*

Funded studies

Enter a statement with the following details:

- Initials of the authors who received each award
- Grant numbers awarded to each author
- The full name of each funder
- URL of each funder website
- Did the sponsors or funders play any role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript?
- **NO** - Include this sentence at the end of your statement: *The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.*
- **YES** - Specify the role(s) played.

* typeset

manuscript.

Competing Interests

Use the instructions below to enter a competing interest statement for this submission. On behalf of all authors, disclose any [competing interests](#) that could be perceived to bias this work—acknowledging all financial support and any other relevant financial or non-financial competing interests.

This statement is **required** for submission and **will appear in the published article** if the submission is accepted. Please make sure it is accurate and that any funding sources listed in your Funding Information later in the submission form are also

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

declared in your Financial Disclosure statement.

View published research articles from [PLOS ONE](#) for specific examples.

NO authors have competing interests

Enter: *The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.*

Authors with competing interests

Enter competing interest details beginning with this statement:

I have read the journal's policy and the authors of this manuscript have the following competing interests: [insert competing interests here]

* typeset

Ethics Statement

N/A

Enter an ethics statement for this submission. This statement is required if the study involved:

- Human participants
- Human specimens or tissue
- Vertebrate animals or cephalopods
- Vertebrate embryos or tissues
- Field research

Write "N/A" if the submission does not require an ethics statement.

General guidance is provided below. Consult the [submission guidelines](#) for detailed instructions. **Make sure that all information entered here is included in the Methods section of the manuscript.**

Format for specific study types

Human Subject Research (involving human participants and/or tissue)

- Give the name of the institutional review board or ethics committee that approved the study
- Include the approval number and/or a statement indicating approval of this research
- Indicate the form of consent obtained (written/oral) or the reason that consent was not obtained (e.g. the data were analyzed anonymously)

Animal Research (involving vertebrate animals, embryos or tissues)

- Provide the name of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) or other relevant ethics board that reviewed the study protocol, and indicate whether they approved this research or granted a formal waiver of ethical approval
- Include an approval number if one was obtained
- If the study involved *non-human primates*, add *additional details* about animal welfare and steps taken to ameliorate suffering
- If anesthesia, euthanasia, or any kind of animal sacrifice is part of the study, include briefly which substances and/or methods were applied

Field Research

Include the following details if this study involves the collection of plant, animal, or other materials from a natural setting:

- Field permit number
- Name of the institution or relevant body that granted permission

Data Availability

Authors are required to make all data underlying the findings described fully available, without restriction, and from the time of publication. PLOS allows rare exceptions to address legal and ethical concerns. See the [PLOS Data Policy](#) and [FAQ](#) for detailed information.

Yes - all data are fully available without restriction

A Data Availability Statement describing where the data can be found is required at submission. Your answers to this question constitute the Data Availability Statement and **will be published in the article**, if accepted.

Important: Stating 'data available on request from the author' is not sufficient. If your data are only available upon request, select 'No' for the first question and explain your exceptional situation in the text box.

Do the authors confirm that all data underlying the findings described in their manuscript are fully available without restriction?

Describe where the data may be found in full sentences. If you are copying our sample text, replace any instances of XXX with the appropriate details.

- If the data are **held or will be held in a public repository**, include URLs, accession numbers or DOIs. If this information will only be available after acceptance, indicate this by ticking the box below. For example: *All XXX files are available from the XXX database (accession number(s) XXX, XXX).*
- If the data are all contained **within the manuscript and/or Supporting Information files**, enter the following: *All relevant data are within the manuscript and its Supporting Information files.*
- If neither of these applies but you are able to provide **details of access elsewhere**, with or without limitations, please do so. For example:

Data cannot be shared publicly because of [XXX]. Data are available from the XXX Institutional Data Access / Ethics Committee (contact via XXX) for researchers who meet the criteria for access to confidential data.

The data underlying the results presented in the study are available from (include the name of the third party

All relevant data are within the manuscript and its Supporting Information files

and contact information or URL).

- This text is appropriate if the data are owned by a third party and authors do not have permission to share the data.

* typeset

Additional data availability information:

Landscape and female fertility of heavenly bamboo

1 **Landscape and female fertility evaluation of seven heavenly bamboo cultivars as potential**
2 **non-invasive alternatives to the wildtype**

3 Julia Rycyna^{1*}, Sandra B. Wilson¹, Zhanao Deng², Basil Iannone³, and Gary Knox⁴

4

5 ¹ Department of Environmental Horticulture, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences,
6 University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, United States of America

7 ² Department of Environmental Horticulture, Gulf Coast Research and Education Center,
8 Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida, Wimauma, Florida, United
9 States of America

10 ³ School of Forest, Fisheries, and Geomatics Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville,
11 Florida, United States of America

12 ⁴ Department of Environmental Horticulture, North Florida Research and Education Center,
13 Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida, Quincy, Florida, United States
14 of America

15

16 *Corresponding author

17 E-mail: juliarycyna@ufl.edu (JR)

18

19 Author contributions

20 SW and Z D conceptualized and oversaw the grant deliverables of the project. GK acquired
21 study materials and provided critical suggestions in design and implementation of experiments. J
22 R performed the experiments and data collection. J R and BI performed formal analysis. JR and
23 SW wrote the manuscript with support from all authors.

24

25 **Abstract**

26 In recent years, breeding initiatives have been made to reduce the fecundity of plants
27 leading to sterile cultivars. The wildtype form of heavenly bamboo (*Nandina domestica*) and
28 seven cultivars were evaluated for landscape performance, fruit production and seed viability at
29 three sites in Florida located in southwest, northcentral, and north Florida. For heavenly bamboo
30 in north Florida, ‘Emerald Sea’, ‘Greray’ (Sunray®), ‘Lemon-Lime’, ‘Murasaki’ (Flirt™),
31 ‘SEIKA’ (Obsession™), and ‘Twilight’ performed well throughout much of the study with
32 average visual quality ratings between 3.54 and 4.60 (scale of 1 to 5). In northcentral Florida,
33 ‘Emerald Sea’, ‘Greray’, ‘Lemon-Lime’, ‘Murasaki’, ‘SEIKA’, and ‘Twilight’ performed well
34 throughout much of the study with average quality ratings between 4.49 and 4.94. In southwest
35 Florida, ‘Emerald Sea’, ‘Greray’, ‘Lemon-Lime’, ‘Murasaki’, and ‘SEIKA’ performed well with
36 average quality ratings between 3.40 and 4.83. At all three sites, ‘Emerald Sea’ and the wildtype
37 were similar in size, having the greatest growth indices compared to medium-sized cultivars
38 (‘Greray’, ‘Lemon-Lime’, ‘Twilight’ and ‘SEIKA’) and dwarf-sized cultivars (‘Chime’ and
39 ‘Murasaki’).

40 For three consecutive fall-winter seasons of the study, ‘Chime’, ‘Greray’, and ‘Lemon-
41 Lime’ heavenly bamboo did not fruit at any of the study sites. Among the three sites, ‘Murasaki’
42 had 97.7% to 99.9% fruit reduction, ‘SEIKA’ had 97.7% to 100% fruit reduction, and ‘Twilight’
43 had 95.9% to 100% fruit reduction compared to the wildtype at respective sites. One-third to
44 two-thirds of seeds collected from low fruiting cultivars (‘Murasaki’, ‘SEIKA’, and ‘Twilight’)
45 had 33.3% to 66.7% viability, as determined by tetrazolium tests. In comparison, ‘Emerald Sea’
46 produced as much, if not more, fruit as the wildtype, especially in northern Florida, with seed

47 viability ranging from 6.7% to 29.0% among sites. Nuclear DNA content of cultivars were
48 comparable to the wildtype, suggesting they are diploids. These findings identified four low to
49 no fruiting heavenly bamboo cultivars recommended for landscape use.

50

51 **Introduction**

52 Heavenly bamboo (*Nandina domestica*) is a commonly used landscaping shrub, often
53 chosen for its evergreen foliage, white panicles of flowers in the summer, and brilliant red
54 berries in the colder months. Depending on the cultivar, it can be planted in borders, containers,
55 hedges, and mass plantings and can also provide fall color in a range of burgundy-red to light
56 pink hues. The plants do well in full sun to part shade, are tolerant of a wide range of soils, and
57 are considered low maintenance and drought tolerant [1].

58 Native to central China, Japan, and India heavenly bamboo was introduced to the United
59 States for ornamental use in 1804. Over 150 years later it was first noted as naturalizing in North
60 Carolina [2]. In 2000, Cherry [3] documented self-sustaining and expanding populations of
61 heavenly bamboo altering light conditions in natural plant communities of northern and central
62 Florida. Under natural conditions, seeds of heavenly bamboo berries typically develop in fall,
63 persist through winter in leaf litter, undergo warm stratification in summer months, and then
64 eventually germinate [4]. Thus, seeds of the species have a morphophysiological dormancy [5-7]
65 described as a combination of morphological dormancy and physiological dormancy [8].

66 While the heavenly bamboo resident taxon (referred to as wildtype from this point) is still
67 commercially available, the current nursery inventory predominately consists of cultivated
68 selections that have been bred for improved and novel form and foliage color [4]. In fact, there
69 are 65 named cultivars in Japan, and over 40 cultivars have been catalogued in the JC Raulston

70 Arboretum (Raleigh, NC) [9]. As early as 2003, Wilson and her colleagues began to evaluate
71 cultivated forms of heavenly bamboo that could potentially serve as suitable non-invasive
72 replacements to the wildtype [4]. From two separate studies, they identified eight cultivars
73 ('AKA', 'Firepower', 'Firestorm', 'Firehouse', 'Moon Bay', 'Gulf Stream', 'Harbour Dwarf',
74 and 'Jaytee') that not only performed well at multiple locations in Florida, but also had greater
75 than 98% fruit reduction at one or more locations [10-11]. An additional cultivar, 'Filamentosa',
76 was absent of fruit, but it was less suitable for Florida's landscape conditions [11]. Other
77 significant findings were 1) fruit production was significantly greater in northern Florida than in
78 southern Florida, and 2) the wildtype and all cultivars evaluated were diploids.

79 Since these trials, other cultivars have been released to the industry, but their invasive
80 potential has not been evaluated in replicated research trials. Modern, reportedly berry-free
81 cultivars (produced from whole plant mutations, sports or intentional crosses) have been
82 marketed for their superior uniformity and extended foliage color [12]. Despite these
83 advancements in sterile cultivar development, at the University of Florida (UF) all cultivars must
84 be evaluated and approved as noninvasive by the UF/IFAS Intraspecific Taxon Protocol (ITP)
85 assessment before recommending their use. This protocol consists of 12 questions to determine
86 1) if the cultivar can be readily distinguished from the wildtype and displays invasive traits that
87 cause greater ecological impact than the wildtype or resident species; and 2) the fecundity of the
88 cultivar and its chances of regression or hybridization to characteristics of the wildtype (or
89 naturalized resident species) [13].

90 Cultivar evaluation of invasive potential is dynamic and increasingly important with new
91 plant introductions. To date, five cultivars ('Firepower', 'Harbour Dwarf', 'AKA', 'Firehouse',
92 and 'Firestorm') have been approved for use throughout Florida by the UF/IFAS ITP, and two

93 cultivars ('Jaytee' and 'Gulf Stream') were approved for use with caution in southern Florida
 94 (but not approved in northern or central Florida) [4]. Continuing this work, the overall goal of
 95 this study was to identify additional good-performing and non-fruiting cultivars of heavenly
 96 bamboo that could serve as viable alternatives to the wildtype. Specific objectives were to: 1)
 97 determine the effects of location and cultivar on landscape performance, growth and female
 98 fertility of heavenly bamboo grown in replicated trials, 2) assess the seed viability of resultant
 99 fruit, and 3) determine the nuclear DNA content to infer if the ploidy level of these cultivars
 100 differed from that of the invasive wildtype.

101

102 **Materials and Methods**

103 **Plant material and site conditions**

104 Seven heavenly bamboo cultivars were evaluated in this study in addition to the wildtype.
 105 These cultivars included 'Chime', 'Greray', 'Lemon-Lime', 'Murasaki', 'SEIKA', 'Twilight',
 106 and 'Emerald Sea'; their characteristics are described in Table 1. Plants were obtained as
 107 finished 11.4-L plants (Greenleaf Nursery Co., El Campo, TX; Monrovia Nursery Co., Azusa,
 108 CA; and May Nursery, Havana, FL) except for 'Emerald Sea', which was received as liners and
 109 finished as 2.84-L plants prior to planting.

110

111 **Table 1. Botanical description of heavenly bamboo (*Nandina domestica*) taxa evaluated for**
 112 **landscape performance, growth, fruiting, and ploidy level.**

Taxon	Size Category ^z	Description
Chime	Dwarf	Compact mounded form with thread-like, chartreuse green finely dissected foliage that turns orange-red in winter.

Landscape and female fertility of heavenly bamboo

Emerald Sea	Large	Upright habit with emerald-green foliage having a purplish tint near base.
Greray Sunray®	Medium	Symmetrical shape with an orange hue to young foliage.
Lemon-Lime	Medium	Compact plant habit with chartreuse new foliage and contrasting green interior foliage.
Murasaki Flirt™	Dwarf	Compact, mounding habit with wine-red colored young foliage and grey green mature foliage.
SEIKA Obsession™	Medium-large	Densely foliated with bright red, young foliage that is retained while the plant is actively growing.
Twilight	Dwarf-medium	Compact form with pink, young foliage and white variegation; mature foliage with green, pink, and white variegation.
Wildtype	Large	Upright, rhizomatous shrub reaching 1.8-2.4 m tall with tripinnately compound, grey-green leaves turning reddish purple in winter. White terminal panicles beginning in May followed by globular red berries ripening in fall and persisting through the winter.

113
 114 ^z Overall plant sizes from field trials were used to assign size categories of small, medium, or
 115 large.
 116

117 Experiments were conducted at three locations located in southwest FL [Gulf Coast
 118 Research and Education Center (GCREC), Balm], northcentral FL [Plant Science Research and
 119 Education Unit (PSREU), Citra], and north FL [North Florida Research and Education Center
 120 (NFREC), Quincy]. Before planting, beds were prepared by applying glyphosate herbicide
 121 (Roundup; Monsanto Co., St. Louis, MO) and slightly disked before covering with black
 122 semipermeable landscape fabric (Lumite Inc., Baldwin, GA). In northcentral FL, ground beds
 123 were treated with a multipurpose liquid fumigant (Pic-Clor 60; active ingredients 1,3-
 124 dichloropropene and chloropicrin) 3 weeks before planting. Taxon were spaced 1.2 m on center
 125 under full sun conditions in three locations. Plants were initially watered with drip-irrigation
 126 twice a day for 35-60 mins. Once established, the irrigation was reduced to three times a week.

127 All plants were fertilized with approximately 84 g of 15N–3.9P–10K 8-9 month controlled-
128 release fertilizer (Osmocote Plus; Scotts, Marysville, OH) in the area 15 to 30 cm from the
129 crown. Plants were top-dressed with Osmocote every six months.

130 Maximum and minimum daily temperature at two meters, total rainfall, and relative
131 humidity were recorded on site by the Florida Automated Weather Network (FAWN
132 <https://fawn.ifas.ufl.edu>), as presented in S1 Figure. Prior to planting, soil samples were collected
133 from each row at each site, mixed for uniformity, and air dried for standard analysis (UF
134 Extension Soil Testing Laboratory, Gainesville, FL). Initial potassium (K), phosphorous (P),
135 magnesium (Mg), and calcium (Ca) of soils based on Mehlich-3 extraction indicated sufficient
136 nutrient ranges at all three field sites (S1 Table). The field conditions in southwest Florida were
137 as follows: 2.14% organic matter, pH 6.35, electrical conductivity (EC) 0.05 dS/m, average
138 monthly rainfall 11.43 cm, average monthly relative humidity 79.4%, average monthly
139 temperature 25.8°C, average monthly minimum temperature 21.5°C, and average monthly
140 maximum temperature 28.8°C. The field conditions in northcentral Florida were as follows:
141 1.01% organic matter, pH 5.65, EC 0.10 dS/m, average monthly rainfall 9.7cm, average monthly
142 relative humidity 81.1%, average monthly temperature 25.4°C, average monthly minimum
143 temperature 18.6°C, and average monthly maximum temperature 33.1°C. The field conditions in
144 northern Florida were as follows: 2.1% organic matter, pH 5.35, EC 0.07 dS/m, average monthly
145 rainfall 13.97 cm, average monthly relative humidity 80.6%, average monthly temperature
146 20.8°C, average monthly minimum temperature 13.7°C, and average maximum temperature
147 28.5°C.

148

149 **Fig. 1. Average monthly minimum and maximum temperatures, total rainfall (cm), and**
150 **relative humidity (%), and soil recorded at trail site.**

151 Sites located at southwest FL [Gulf Coast Research and Education Center (GCREC), Balm],
152 northcentral FL [Plant Science Research and Education Unit (PSREU), Citra], and north FL
153 [North Florida Research and Education Center (NFREC), Quincy]. Where week 0 started in May
154 2019 and Week 82 ended in January 2020.
155

156 **Visual quality and plant growth**

157 Assessments of foliage color and form (visual quality or plant performance) were
158 performed in 3-month intervals at each site on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 = very poor quality,
159 not acceptable, severe leaf necrosis, 2 = poor quality, not acceptable or marketable, some areas
160 of necrosis, poor form, 3 = adequate quality, somewhat desirable form and color, fairly
161 marketable, 4 = good quality, very desirable color and form, and 5 = excellent quality, perfect
162 condition, premium color and form. Plant size was measured every three months over a 79-week
163 period by calculating growth indices as an average of the measured height (measured from crown
164 to natural break in foliage) and two perpendicular widths $[(width1 + width2)/2]$.

165

166 **Fruit production and seed viability**

167 Every month the presence of flowering and fruiting of each plant was recorded at each
168 site for the duration of the experiment. Before fruit ripening, mesh netting was placed over
169 panicles to prevent predation. When most fruits were fully mature (second and third years of the
170 study), they were manually harvested, and then counted at each location. Fruits were separated
171 by color (mature vs immature) and then mature fruits were cleaned by hand using a dehulling
172 trough (Hoffman Manufacturing, Inc., Albany, OR). Seeds were counted and those with insect or
173 pathogen damage or abnormal appearance were noted. Seeds were stored in glass containers at
174 room temperature until use.

175 Using fruit collected from the final (third) year of the landscape trials, seed viability tests
176 were performed by an independent seed testing facility (US Forest Service National Seed
177 Laboratory, Dry Branch, GA). First, x-ray analysis (Faxitron Ultrafocus, Tucson, AZ) was used
178 to nondestructively determine embryo presence inside seeds. Afterwards, a subsample of two
179 replicates of 100 seed (when available) collected from the wildtype and ‘Emerald Sea’ plants
180 (from each of the three locations) were subjected to a tetrazolium (TZ) staining test adapted from
181 the Association of Official Seeds Analysts (AOSA) rules for Tetrazolium testing [14]. For very
182 low fruiting cultivars (‘Murasaki’, ‘SEIKA’, and Twilight), all available, mature seeds were used
183 for TZ testing without the ability to replicate. Seeds were cut laterally and stained overnight (12-
184 18 h) at 37°C in a 1.0% TZ solution. Seeds were considered viable when firm embryos stained
185 evenly red.

186

187 **Nuclear DNA content and ploidy level**

188 Young leaves were collected from heavenly bamboo plants (3 to 5 years old) grown at
189 the GCREC (Balm). Three leaf samples (biological replicates) were analyzed per cultivar and
190 replicated 3 times. Three leaf samples from three plants of each cultivar were collected for
191 analysis. Flow cytometry was performed as described by Doležel et al. [15] to determine nuclear
192 DNA content and infer the ploidy. Methodology followed Wilson et al. [10] who reported
193 inferred ploidy levels for other cultivars of heavenly bamboo. Young leaf tissue (≈ 20 mg) was
194 co-chopped with an equal amount of young reference tissue in 1 mL of the LB01 nuclei isolation
195 buffer using a sharp razor blade, the released nuclei were stained with propidium iodide (50
196 $\mu\text{g/mL}$), the resultant nuclei suspension was filtered through a 50 μm pore size filter, propidium
197 iodide was added, and the stained nuclei were analyzed on the flow cytometer Cyflow® Ploidy

198 Analyzer (Sysmex Europe GmbH, Norderstedt, Germany) for fluorescence intensity. The LB01
199 buffer contained 15 mM Tris, 2 mM Na₂EDTA, 0.5 mM spermine tetrahydrochloride, 80 mM
200 KCl, 20 mM NaCl, and 0.1% (v/v) Triton X-100 and was adjusted to pH 7.5. Before use, RNase
201 (New England BioLabs, Ipswich, MA) was added to the buffer to a final concentration of 50
202 µg/mL. Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L. ‘Stupické polní rané’) (2C nuclear DNA content =
203 1.96 pg/2C) was used as an internal reference in the analysis [10,15].

204

205 **Experimental design and data analysis**

206 The field experiments utilized a randomized complete block experimental design that was
207 applied separately for each site. There were five blocks and eight treatments (seven cultivars and
208 the wildtype heavenly bamboo), $n=40$ at each of three locations (southwest, northcentral and
209 north FL) for a total sample size, $N=120$.

210 Data were analyzed using R (R.3.5.2, The R Foundation, Vienna, Austria) and RStudio
211 (R 1.1.463, Boston, MA) linear mixed effects-models assuming normally distributed data. The
212 assumptions for linear models were confirmed via QQ plots and plotting model residuals. No
213 model selection was used since this was a planned experiment. Quality ratings measured across
214 the entire experiment were modeled in response to cultivar, location, month, and all possible
215 interactions with plot nested within block treated as a random effect. We analyzed quality data
216 for year 1 and year 2 separately, and also for year 1 and year 2 combined. Height, width, and
217 growth index at the end of the experiment (month 21) were modeled in response to cultivar,
218 location, and cultivar*location interaction with experimental block being treated as a random
219 effect. For all response variables, we then used Tukey’s HSD to detect differences among
220 treatment levels ($P\leq 0.05$) of statistically significant model terms.

221 Results

222 Landscape performance

223 Heavenly bamboo plant visual quality ratings varied by cultivar ($F_{7,92} = 19.78$; $P < 0.0001$)
 224 and location ($F_{2,92} = 19.03$; $P < 0.0001$) with a positive cultivar*location interaction ($F_{14,92} = 6.95$;
 225 $P < 0.0001$), revealing that cultivars responded differently across locations (Table 2). At
 226 southwest FL in year 1 mean visual quality was higher for ‘SEIKA’ (4.87) compared to ‘Greray’
 227 (3.49), ‘Lemon-Lime’ (3.93), and ‘Twilight’ (3.73) but similar to that of ‘Chime’, ‘Emerald Sea’,
 228 ‘Murasaki’, and the wildtype (Table 3). In year 2, visual quality of ‘Emerald Sea’, ‘Murasaki’,
 229 and the wildtype were excellent (4.75 to 5.0) compared to ‘Chime’, ‘Greray’, ‘Lemon-Lime’,
 230 ‘SEIKA’ (that had adequate to good quality between 2.70 to 3.40) and ‘Twilight’ having poor
 231 quality (1.70). Averaged over years 1 and 2, ‘Emerald Sea’, ‘Murasaki’, ‘SEIKA’ and the
 232 wildtype were the most attractive whereas ‘Chime’ and ‘Twilight’ were the least attractive
 233 (Table 3).

234 **Table 2. Linear mixed model results for analysis of the effects of location and cultivar on**
 235 **plant quality.**

Year(s)	Treatment	DF num	DF den	F value	P
Year 1	Cultivar	7	92	1.66	0.1286
	Location	2	92	1.06	0.3515
	Month	3	283	32.72	<0.0001
	Location*Cultivar	14	92	0.81	0.6530
	Cultivar*Month	21	283	3.25	<0.0001
	Location*Month	6	283	0.51	0.7972
	Location*Cultivar*Month	42	283	1.28	0.1247
Year 2	Cultivar	7	86	23.77	<0.0001
	Location	2	86	55.40	<0.0001
	Month	3	272	11.25	<0.0001
	Location*Cultivar	14	86	7.40	<0.0001
	Cultivar*Month	21	272	4.62	<0.0001
	Location*Month	6	272	25.62	<0.0001
	Location*Cultivar*Month	42	272	3.09	<0.0001
Year 1 & 2	Cultivar	7	92	19.78	<0.0001

Location	2	92	19.03	<0.0001
Month	6	550	16.16	<0.0001
Location*Cultivar	14	92	6.95	<0.0001
Cultivar*Month	42	550	4.16	<0.0001
Location*Month	12	550	35.40	<0.0001
Location*Cultivar*Month	84	550	3.26	<0.0001

236 DF is degrees of freedom

237 **Table 3. Mean plant quality ratings of eight heavenly bamboo (*Nandina domestica*) taxa**
 238 **during year 1, year 2 and across years 1 and 2.**

Plant quality rating (scale 1-5)			
	Year 1 ^z	Year 2 ^y	Year 1 and 2 ^x
Taxon	Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE
Southwest Florida			
Chime	3.87 ± 0.35 abc	2.70 ± 0.27 b	3.20 ± 0.23 d
Emerald Sea	4.60 ± 0.39 ab	5.00 ± 0.18 a	4.83 ± 0.22 a
Greray	3.49 ± 0.22 bc	3.40 ± 0.21 b	3.44 ± 0.16 cd
Lemon-Lime	3.93 ± 0.22 bc	3.00 ± 0.05 b	3.40 ± 0.11 cd
Murasaki	4.40 ± 0.24 ab	4.75 ± 0.11 a	4.60 ± 0.12 ab
SEIKA	4.87 ± 0.19 a	3.40 ± 0.11 b	4.03 ± 0.14 ab
Twilight	3.73 ± 0.32 c	1.70 ± 0.28 c	2.57 ± 0.21 e
Wild type	4.40 ± 0.13 ab	4.75 ± 0.09 a	4.60 ± 0.08 ab
Northcentral Florida			
Chime	2.83 ± 0.39 bc	2.63 ± 0.18 b	2.71 ± 0.22 b
Emerald Sea	4.20 ± 0.24 a	4.70 ± 0.11 a	4.49 ± 0.12 a
Greray	4.35 ± 0.13 a	4.80 ± 0.09 a	4.61 ± 0.08 a
Lemon-Lime	4.53 ± 0.18 a	4.58 ± 0.11 a	4.56 ± 0.1 a
Murasaki	4.67 ± 0.27 a	4.94 ± 0.06 a	4.82 ± 0.13 a
SEIKA	5.00 ± 0.16 a	4.89 ± 0.07 a	4.94 ± 0.08 a
Twilight	4.67 ± 0.13 a	4.50 ± 0.12 a	4.57 ± 0.08 a
Wild type	4.60 ± 0.22 a	4.85 ± 0.08 a	4.74 ± 0.11 a
North Florida			
Chime	3.33 ± 0.22 ab	43.0 ± 0.21 bc	3.89 ± 0.16 b
Emerald Sea	3.49 ± 0.19 a	4.85 ± 0.11 ab	3.96 ± 0.14 ab

Greray	3.73 ± 0.17 a	4.70 ± 0.11 ab	4.29 ± 0.11 ab
Lemon-lime	3.93 ± 0.15 a	4.70 ± 0.13 ab	4.37 ± 0.13 ab
Murasaki	3.67 ± 0.32 a	4.94 ± 0.06 a	4.39 ± 0.17 a
SEIKA	4.27 ± 0.17 a	4.90 ± 0.00 a	4.63 ± 0.10 a
Twilight	3.20 ± 0.2 bc	3.80 ± 0.21 c	3.54 ± 0.17 cd
Wild type	4.20 ± 0.19 a	4.90 ± 0.07 a	4.60 ± 0.11 a

239

240 Qualitative scale (1 to 5) where 1 = very poor quality, 2 = poor quality, 3 = adequate quality, 4 =
 241 good quality, and 5 = excellent quality.

242 Different letters within columns are significantly different by Tukey–Kramer’s honestly
 243 significant difference range test at $P \leq 0.05$

244 ^zYear 1 data were collected from August 2019 to February 2020, beginning 3 months after
 245 planting.

246 ^yYear 2 data were collected from May 2020 to February 2021.

247 ^xYear 1 and 2 data are the means across both years.

248

249

250 In northcentral FL during the first year, both the wildtype and cultivars had similarly very
 251 good to excellent visual quality ratings (ranging from 4.20 to 5.00 on a scale of 1 to 5) that were
 252 greater than ‘Chime’ that had poor to adequate quality ratings (2.63) (Table 3). This trend
 253 continued for the second year of the study where wildtype plants and all cultivars, except
 254 ‘Chime’, had high visual quality ratings (ranging from 4.50 to 5.00). Combined over both years
 255 plants had 1.7 times higher visual quality ratings (ranging from 4.49 to 4.94) than ‘Chime’ that
 256 had below average ratings (2.71).

257 In north FL, during the first year, both the wildtype and cultivars received adequate to
 258 good visual quality ratings (3.33 to 4.20 on a scale of 1 to 5) that were similar to each other but
 259 greater than ‘Twilight’ with average quality (3.20). This trend continued during the second year
 260 where the wildtype and all cultivars, except ‘Chime’ (4.30), had very good to excellent visual
 261 quality ratings (4.70 to 4.94) compared to ‘Twilight’ with lower quality ratings of adequate to

262 good (3.80). Combined over both years, 'Murasaki' and 'SEIKA' had 1.2 and 1.3 times higher
 263 visual quality ratings as 'Chime' and 'Twilight', respectively.

264

265 **Plant size and growth**

266 Seventy-nine weeks post planting final plant heights, widths and growth indices varied
 267 among cultivars and locations with significant main effects ($P < 0.0001$) and their interaction for
 268 perpendicular widths ($F_{14,84} = 2.54$; $P < 0.0045$), height ($F_{14,84} = 2.58$; $P < 0.0039$) and growth
 269 index ($F_{14,84} = 1.81$; $P \leq 0.0508$) (Table 4). Among cultivars, plant widths at each site ranged from
 270 25.73 to 80.70 cm (southwest FL), 31.90 to 94.17 cm (northcentral FL), and 42.65 to 88.32 cm
 271 (north FL) (Table 5). Plant heights ranged from 27.08 to 94.36 cm (southwest FL), 25.75 to
 272 128.80 cm (northcentral FL), and 24.78 to 86.92 cm (north FL). Growth indices ranged from
 273 26.46 to 87.53 cm (southwest FL), 28.83 to 111.49 cm (northcentral FL), and 35.34 to 85.66 cm
 274 (north FL). At all three sites, 'Emerald Sea' and the wildtype plants were among the widest and
 275 tallest compared to most cultivars with growth indices 1.1 times greater than medium-sized
 276 cultivars ('Greray', 'Lemon-Lime', 'Twilight', and 'SEIKA') and 1.63 times that of dwarf-sized
 277 cultivars ('Chime' and 'Murasaki') (Table 5). Also, among sites growth indices of 'Greray',
 278 'Lemon-Lime', 'SEIKA', and 'Twilight' were nonsignificant from each other (except at the
 279 southwest location) and greater than 'Chime' and 'Murasaki'.

280

281 **Table 4. Results of linear mixed model analysis which examined the effects of location and**
 282 **cultivar on growth measurements (height, width, and growth index).**

	Effect	DF num	DF den	F value	<i>P</i>
Width	Location	2	84	71.87	<0.0001
	Cultivar	7	84	53.33	<0.0001
	Location*Cultivar	14	84	2.54	<0.0045
Height	Location	2	84	25.21	<0.0001
	Cultivar	7	84	79.84	<0.0001

Landscape and female fertility of heavenly bamboo

	Location* Cultivar	14	84	2.58	0.0039
Growth index	Location	2	84	44.59	<0.0001
	Cultivar	7	84	94.29	<0.0001
	Location* Cultivar	14	84	1.81	0.0508

283 DF is degrees of freedom

284

285 **Table 5. Average perpendicular plant width, plant height, and growth index of eight heavenly bamboo (*Nandina domestica*)**
 286 **taxa.**

Taxon	Width (cm)			Height (cm)			Growth index (cm) ^z		
	Southwest	Northcentral	North	Southwest	Northcentral	North	Southwest	Northcentral	North
Chime	25.83 c	31.90 d	42.65 d	27.08 c	25.75 c	28.02 c	26.46 f	28.83 d	35.34 e
Emerald Sea	80.70 a	94.17 a	88.32 a	94.36 a	128.80 a	83.00 a	87.53 a	111.49 a	85.66 a
Greray	41.49 bc	70.32 b	60.03 cd	56.74 b	67.06 b	54.02 b	49.12 cd	68.69 c	57.03 cd
Lemon-Lime	37.94 bc	65.63 bc	61.93 bc	59.00 b	70.70 b	52.36 b	48.47 cde	68.17 c	57.15 d
Murasaki	35.60 bc	37.81 cd	46.83 cd	28.06 c	28.53 c	24.78 c	31.85 ef	30.32 d	35.80 e
SEIKA	46.72 b	76.87 ab	69.73 bc	82.80 a	79.62 b	65.70 ab	64.76 bc	78.25 bc	67.72 bc
Twilight	25.73 c	69.40 bc	52.31 cd	56.68 b	73.38 b	56.76 b	41.20 def	71.39 c	54.54 de
Wildtype	65.99 a	78.86 ab	81.42 ab	82.40 a	109.7 a	86.92 a	74.20 ab	94.28 ab	84.10 a

287 Plants grown in southwest Florida [Gulf Coast Research and Education Center (GCREC), Balm], northcentral Florida [Plant Science
 288 Research and Education Unit (PSREU), Citra], and north Florida [North Florida Research and Education Center (NFREC), Quincy]
 289 for 79 weeks.

290 Different letters within columns are significantly different by Tukey–Kramer’s honestly significant difference range test at $P \leq 0.05$.

291 ^z Growth Index determined by (average of two perpendicular widths + height)/2

292

293 Flowering, fruiting, and DNA nuclear content

294 At all three locations, flowering was observed for ‘Emerald Sea’, ‘Murasaki’, ‘SEIKA’,
295 ‘Twilight’, and the wildtype heavenly bamboo; typically began in April/May and lasted until
296 June (data not presented). ‘Emerald Sea’ and the wildtype were the only two taxa that fruited at
297 all three locations during both the second and third year of the study. In the second year across
298 all taxa within locations, ‘Emerald Sea’ produced 25 (southwest), 126 (northcentral), and 132
299 (north) fruit when compared to wildtype plants that produced 293 (southwest), 363
300 (northcentral), and 917 (north) fruit. In the third year, this same cultivar produced 1549
301 (southwest), 1416 (northcentral), and 7756 (north) fruit when compared to wildtype plants that
302 produced 1980 (southwest), 5159 (northcentral), and 5619 (north) fruit. This resulted in a 21.8%,
303 72.6% and 0% fruit reduction of ‘Emerald Sea’ for these sites (Table 6). For ‘Murasaki’, only
304 one fruit was observed the second year from one location (northcentral FL). In the third year,
305 three fruits were observed in southwest FL, two fruits were observed in northcentral FL, and 120
306 fruits were observed in north FL. This resulted in a 99.9%, 99.9%, and 97.7% fruit reduction in
307 southwest, northcentral, and north FL, respectively, when compared to the wildtype plants at
308 each location. For ‘SEIKA’, fruit was not observed in any location the second year. In the third
309 year, fruit was also not produced in southwest FL, but five fruits were observed in northcentral
310 FL and 132 fruits were observed in north FL (Table 6). This resulted in a 99.9% and 97.7% fruit
311 reduction in northcentral FL and north FL, respectively, when compared to the wildtype plants at
312 each of these locations. For ‘Twilight’, fruits were not observed during the second or third year
313 at southwest and central FL sites, but 230 fruits were observed in north FL (year 3). This resulted
314 in a 95.9% fruit reduction of ‘Twilight’ when compared to the wildtype plants at the same

315 location. 'Chime', 'Greray' and 'Lemon-Lime' did not fruit at any time or location during the
316 study and were considered female sterile (100% fruit reduction) (Table 6).

317 **Table 6. Total fruit production (from five plants) in years 2 and 3 of heavenly bamboo (*Nandina domestica*) taxa grown in**
 318 **southwest FL (Balm), northcentral FL (Citra), and north FL (Quincy).**
 319

Taxon	Fruit no. year 2			Fruit no. year 3			Fruit reduction year 3 (%) ^z		
	Southwest	Northcentral	North	Southwest	Northcentral	North	Southwest	Northcentral	North
Chime	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Emerald Sea	25	126	132	1549	1416	7756	21.7	72.6	0.0
Greray	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Lemon-Lime	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Murasaki	0	1	0	3	2	120	99.9	99.9	97.7
SEIKA	0	0	0	0	5	132	100.0	99.9	97.7
Twilight	0	0 ^y	0	0	0	230	100.0	100.0	95.9
Wildtype	293	363	917	1980	5159	5619	NA	NA	NA

320 Fruit typically have 1- 2 seeds

321 ^z Percent fruit reduction is calculated by [1-(no. cultivar's fruit/no. of wildtype's fruit)] based on respective wildtype fruiting at each
 322 site.

323 ^y Fruit observed in year 2 but did not reach maturity.

Regardless of whether taxa fruited or not, nuclear DNA content ranged from 4.09 to 4.37 pg/2C among cultivars compared to the wildtype (4.07 pg/2C). This indicates that the heavenly bamboo taxa tested are diploids (Table 7).

Table 7. Fruiting categories, ploidy level, of eight heavenly bamboo (*Nandina domestica*) taxa

Taxon	Fruiting category (0-3 scale)	Ploidy level	Nuclear DNA content \pm SD (pg/2C)
Chime	0	2x	4.14 \pm 0.15
Emerald Sea	3	2x	4.19 \pm 0.05
Greray	0	2x	4.37 \pm 0.02
Lemon-Lime	0	2x	4.09 \pm 0.06
Murasaki	1	2x	4.32 \pm 0.12
SEIKA	1	2x	4.11 \pm 0.11
Twilight	1	2x	4.22 \pm 0.07
Wildtype	3	2x	4.07 \pm 0.02

Scale where 0 = no fruiting, 1 = low fruiting, 2 = moderate fruiting, or 3 = heavy fruiting during the timeframe of the study.

Average nuclear DNA content ($n=3$) is presented \pm standard deviation (SD).

Based on these assessments and use of a numerical fruiting scale (0-3), ‘Chime’, ‘Greray’, and ‘Lemon-Lime’ were categorized as 0 = nonfruiting, ‘Murasaki’, ‘Twilight’ and ‘SEIKA’ were categorized as 1 = low fruiting, and the wildtype and ‘Emerald Sea’ were categorized as 3 = heavy fruiting (Table 7). A moderate fruiting category was not observed among the cultivars in this study.

Seed viability

Each fruit typically contained two seeds. The number of mature seeds available to conduct seed viability tests is shown in Table 8. Seed numbers were very low (less than six) for

‘Murasaki’ (from all three sites), ‘SEIKA’ (northcentral site), and ‘Twilight’ (north site), making it impossible to conduct replicated TZ tests or germination evaluation for these cultivars.

Nevertheless, seed viability of available seed varied widely among cultivars and locations, ranging from 0% to 66.7% compared to 15.3% to 36.0% for the wildtype (Table 8). Of the ‘Emerald Sea’ seeds, 8.3% were viable from the southwest location, 29.0% were viable from the northcentral location, and 6.7% viable from the north location. Of the ‘Murasaki’ seeds, 0%, 40.0%, and 33.3% were viable from southwest, northcentral, and north Florida locations, respectively. For ‘SEIKA’, there were no seeds available for TZ testing for the southwest location; and 66.7% and 33.9% seeds were viable from the northcentral and north locations, respectively. ‘Twilight’ only produced seeds in the north location that were 40.0% viable. Of the wildtype seeds, viability was 28.0%, 36.0%, and 15.3% from southwest, northcentral and north locations, respectively (Table 8).

Table 8. Seed viability of five heavenly bamboo (*Nandina domestica*) taxa grown for 3 fall-winter seasons (124 weeks) in southwest FL, northcentral FL, and north FL.

	Southwest	Northcentral	North	Southwest	Northcentral	North
	No. seeds tested			Seed viability (%)		
Emerald Sea	145	200	15	8.3	29.0	6.7
Murasaki	5	5	3	0	40.0	33.3
SEIKA	--	6	56	--	66.7	33.9
Twilight	--	--	5	--	--	40.0
Wildtype	200	200	111	28.0	36.0	15.3

The no. of seeds tested value of 200 indicates two replicates of 100 seed were tested and fewer than 200 were treated as one replicate.

Discussion

Overall, at least half of the heavenly bamboo cultivars evaluated performed very well across Florida under full sun conditions and Florida's hot and humid summers. Cultivars that performed best (i.e., having quality ratings above 4.0) both years at all three locations included 'Murasaki' and 'SEIKA', having attractive reddish foliage on new growth. The wildtype similarly performed very well, regardless of year or location. This suggests the wide adaptability of these cultivars and the wildtype to temperature, soils, and harsh growing conditions with minimal inputs. In fact, the field site in northcentral FL had half the amount of organic matter than southwest or north Florida field sites, but this did not impact plant quality. 'Chime' and 'Twilight' typically underperformed in this study and may be more suitable to container or shaded conditions. The influence of geographic location on plant performance is consistent with prior studies that evaluated heavenly bamboo cultivars in south and north FL under similar full sun conditions [10-11]. In those studies, a limited proportion of cultivars (less than 25%) underperformed at one or both locations not meriting recommendation for landscape use, even if fruiting was absent.

Plant width, height and growth index measurements were useful in the overall categorization of plant size for heavenly bamboo. Plants were assigned to size categories, as large ('Emerald Sea' and wildtype), medium ('Greray', 'Lemon-Lime', 'SEIKA' and 'Twilight') or dwarf ('Chime' and 'Murasaki'). This information can be helpful when selecting plants for different areas of landscapes and gardens and may relate to plant vigor, a trait associated with invasiveness [16]. Geographical location (southwest, northcentral, or north FL) influenced the plant size (growth index) of some cultivars. Plants tended to have moderately higher ('Emerald Sea') to slightly higher ('Greray', 'Lemon-Lime', 'SEIKA', 'Twilight', wildtype) growth indices at the northcentral location compared to the north or southwest locations. This effect of location

on plant growth was not observed for dwarf forms ('Chime' and 'Murasaki'). Also of interest is that the wildtype and 'Emerald Sea' plants displayed cane-like growth qualities whereas this was absent in more densely foliated cultivars. Indeed, the wildtype can spread vegetatively from suckers and rhizomes, allowing it to form dense thickets that displace native vegetation [2-3]. This could be a relevant factor in an ITP assessment, as aggressive vegetative growth of sterile cultivars of another species, [Mexican petunia (*Ruellia simplex*)] led to its cautionary ITP conclusion (approved for use if managed to prevent escape) [17].

Flowering and fruiting were observed on 'Emerald Sea', 'Murasaki', 'SEIKA', 'Twilight', and the wildtype, but not every year and not at all locations. Flower abundance and duration are traits that have been associated with invasiveness. Gallagher et al. [18] reviewed data on 56 invasive species and 56 native species to Australia and found flowering of the invasive species to be one month longer than the native species, suggesting that longer flowering periods could allow for more pollinator visitation, seed set and increased propagule pressure. However, in the present study, and former heavenly bamboo studies [10-11] the onset and duration of flowering of wildtype plants was comparable to that of the cultivars.

In the timeframe of this study, fruit production of heavenly bamboo cultivars was absent ('Chime', 'Greray', and 'Lemon-Lime'), greatly reduced ('Murasaki', 'SEIKA' and 'Twilight'), or comparable ('Emerald Sea') to the wildtype taxon. Anecdotal information from Kluepfel and Polomski [1] claimed 'Murasaki', 'SEIKA', and 'Lemon-Lime' to be fruitless. We also did not observe fruit for 'Lemon-Lime', but after three years, a very small number of fruits were observed for 'Murasaki' and 'SEIKA'. There was a notable effect of location on fruiting during this study. In the cooler north FL location, fruiting of the wildtype taxon was more abundant (area annually receiving 420 chill hours) compared to northcentral (area annually receiving 110

but fewer than 420 chill hours) or southwest FL (area receiving 110 or fewer chill hours). This is consistent with a prior study that reported heavenly bamboo produced 9.8 times more fruit in north FL compared to south FL [10] and emphasizes the value of replicated trials in different geographic conditions as chilling hours are a requirement for some species. Additionally, the greater fruit production in north FL compared to northcentral and southwest FL emphasizes the importance of distinguishing the invasive status of plants independently for different regions of Florida, as exemplified by the *IFAS Assessment of Non-native Plants in Natural Areas*. To date, the heavenly bamboo wildtype taxon is only listed as invasive in central and north Florida [19].

Regardless of their capacity to fruit, both cultivated and wildtype forms of the heavenly bamboo that we evaluated were diploids (Table 8). Similarly, all 40 cultivars sampled from the JC Raulston Arboretum were found to be diploids [10,20]. Thus, polyploidy does not appear to be the driving factor behind the sterility of heavenly bamboo cultivars. In nature, polyploidy may confer advantages that could facilitate invasive potential such as faster growth and herbivore resistance [21]; and as such, polyploidy is one of the dataset variables used in invasive plant modeling [22]. Ploidy manipulation is a commonly used genetic approach to produce triploids that are often highly male- and female-sterile [23-25]. Using such an interploid hybridization system requires tetraploids that are either selected among existing cultivars or induced from diploids by chromosome doubling [26-28]. In addition to sometimes lengthy and expensive planned breeding programs to induce sterility in invasive ornamentals, naturally occurring whole plant mutations can be sources of novel and non-fruiting variants of heavenly bamboo.

Seed viability TZ testing is a destructive method to determine the potential for a seed lot to germinate, as it measures respiration [5]. In the present study, viability of the wildtype seeds ranged from 15.3% to 36.0% among locations. This is considerably lower than the viability of

wildtype seeds reported in prior studies that was as high as 85.0% [11] and 86.5% [10]. The modest viability encountered in the present study may likely be a consequence of differences in plant maturity or environmental conditions such as temperature, soil chemistry, and rainfall in different growing regions over time. Qun et al. [29] describe three major deciding factors determining the level of seed vigor: the genetic constitution, the environment during development and the parameters of storage. More pertinent to this study, seed vigor may help with invasive plants' ability to outcompete and overtake an area.

Cultivars of heavenly bamboo were also found to have viable seed. Disagreement remains about what level of fecundity in cultivars can be tolerated without posing a risk to the environment. For instance, the Oregon Department of Agriculture approved seedless cultivars of a noxious weed, butterfly bush, for propagation, transportation, and sale provided that they produce less than 2% viable seeds [30]. Indeed, Knight et al. [31] raised the question of how much of a reduction in seed production or seed viability is necessary to create a cultivar that will not be invasive in natural areas. The authors emphasized that reduced seed production may be insufficient to eliminate the invasive potential of a species. Likewise, Bufford and Daehler [32] cautioned that horticultural selection for sterility (i.e., induced through transgenic techniques, through interspecific hybridization, or through chemically induced polyploidy to create triploid plants) can yield low-risk sterile cultivars of popular ornamentals provided that further hybridization or allopolyploidy does not restore fertility and vegetative spread is limited. Regardless, inducing sterility in plants is an ongoing effort of breeders and will continue to play a pivotal role in the ornamental industry. Certainly, intentionally bred sterile cultivars of ornamental plant species such as lantana (*Lantana strigocamara*) [33], Japanese barberry (*Barberis thunbergii*) [34], Norway maple (*Acer platanoides*) [35], and Mexican petunia (*Ruellia*

simplex) [36] will ultimately decrease the propagule pressure and likelihood of invasion compared to the unregulated wildtype species. User-friendly resources and extension education will undoubtedly play a key role for consumers to distinguish between invasive and noninvasive cultivars as alternatives [37].

A notable limitation of the study was the inability to report the female fertility index of cultivars, where the number of fruits per peduncle is multiplied by the seed germination (in decimal form). The benefit of reporting the female reproductive potential of a given breeding line or cultivar is well described by Czarnecki and Deng [23]. Future studies should carefully consider counting the flowers and subsequent fruit produced per peduncle. Creating a female fertility index would help in answering the noteworthy questions pertaining to risk assessment posed by Datta et al. [26]. For example, what are the trait differences between cultivar alternatives and corresponding invasive species, how does this translate into differences in invasion risk and regulation and are these differences spatially and temporally stable. Another limitation of this study was the inability to conduct germination tests on a subsample of seeds to compare with viability tests either due to insufficient seed availability and/or the morphophysiological dormancy inherent with this species. Outside of this study, germination of heavenly bamboo seeds was found to be substantially delayed with the onset typically occurring around 77 d and extending to at least 168 d at 25/15°C (unpublished data).

Conclusions

In summary, we have evaluated plant performance and fruiting of the wildtype heavenly bamboo **taxon and seven cultivars** at multiple locations in Florida. Based on these observations, ‘Lemon-Lime’, ‘SEIKA’, ‘Murasaki’, and ‘Greray’ are good candidates for non-invasive status

approval. Characteristics typical of these cultivars, such as desirable plant form, leaf morphology, color, and low to no fruiting, were consistent over time, with no observations of wildtype trait reversion. Thus, they are less likely to become invasive. These cultivars have been formally submitted to the UF/IFAS Assessment ITP and are pending approval. It is hoped that the promotion and wider use of these non-invasive cultivars can help reduce or eliminate the availability of heavily fruiting cultivars.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge Mark Kann, Keri Druffel, and Kelly Thomas, for their management of the research plots and assistance with data collection. We also thank James Colee for his assistance with the statistical analysis.

References

1. Kluepfel M, Polomski B. *Nandina*. Clemson Cooperative Extension Homes & Garden Information Center. 4 Dec 2018 [cited 2022 Sept 1]. Available from: <https://hgic.clemson.edu/factsheet/nandina/>.
2. Langeland KA, Cherry HM, McCormick CM, Craddock Burks KA. Identification and biology of nonnative plants in Florida's natural areas. 2nd ed. IFAS Commun. Services, Univ. Florida Publ.; 2008.
3. Cherry HM. Ecophysiology and control of *Nandina domestica* Thunb. M.Sc. Thesis. University of Florida. 2002.

4. Wilson SB, Rycyna J, Deng Z, Knox G. Summary of 26 heavenly bamboo selections evaluated for invasive potential in Florida. *HortTechnology*. 2021;31(4): 367-381. doi: 10.21273/HORTTECH04798-21.
5. Davies FT, Geneve RL, Wilson SB. *Hartmann and Kester's plant propagation: Principles and practices*. 9th ed. New York: Pearson Education; 2018.
6. Dirr MA, Heuser CW. *The reference manual of woody plant propagation: From seed to tissue culture: A practical working guide to the propagation of over 1100 species, varieties, and cultivars*. Portland: Timber Press Inc; 2006.
7. Rhie YH, Kim J, Lee SY, Kim KS. Non-deep simple morphophysiological dormancy in seeds of heavenly bamboo (*Nandina domestica* Thunb.). *Sci Hortic*. 2016;210: 180-187. doi: 10.1016/j.scienta.2016.07.022.
8. Baskin, CC, Baskin JM. *Seeds: Ecology, biogeography, and evolution of dormancy and germination*. 2nd ed. New York: Academic Press; 2014.
9. Raulston JC. *Nandina domestica* cultivars in the NCSU Arboretum. Friends of the Arboretum Newsletter. 1984 Dec [cited 2022 Sept 1]. Available from: <https://jcra.ncsu.edu/publications/newsletters/ncsu-arboretum-newsletters/newsletter-11-1984-12.php>.
10. Wilson SB, Knox GW, Deng Z, Nolan KL, Aldrich J. Landscape performance and fruiting of nine heavenly bamboo selections grown in northern and southern Florida. *HortScience*. 2014;49(6): 706-713. doi: 10.21273/HORTSCI.49.6.706.
11. Knox GW, Wilson SB. Evaluating north and south Florida landscape performance and fruiting of ten cultivars and a wild-type selection of *Nandina domestica*, a potentially invasive shrub. *J Environ Hortic*. 2006;24(3): 137-142. doi: 10.24266/0738-2898-24.137.

12. Toscano K. Five ways to use *Nandina* in your landscape. Southern Living. 2021 Aug 12
[Cited 2023 April 28] Available from: <https://southernlivingplants.com/plan-your-garden/nandina-five-ways/#:~:text=Blush%20Pink%E2%84%A2%20Nandina,-Nandina%20domestica%20'AKA&text=Our%20nandinas%20are%20non%20invasive,berry%20infrequently%2C%20if%20at%20all>
13. Lieurance D, Flory SL, Gordon DR. The UF/IFAS assessment of nonnative plants in Florida's natural areas: History, purpose, and use. University of Florida Institute of Food Agricultural Sciences. 2013 Nov; revised 2020 June [cited 2022 Sept 1]. Available from: <http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/pdffiles/AG/AG37600.pdf>.
14. Peters J. Tetrazolium testing handbook. Las Cruces: Association of Official Seed Analysts; 2017.
15. Doležel, J, Greilhuber J, Suda J. Estimation of nuclear DNA content in plants using flow cytometry. Nat Protoc. 2007;2(9): 2233-2244. doi: 10.1038/nprot.2007.310.
16. Van Kleunen M, Weber E, Fischer M. A meta- analysis of trait differences between invasive and non- invasive plant species. Ecol Lett. 2010;13(2): 235-245. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01418.x.
17. University of Florida, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences. Assessment of nonnative plants in Florida's natural areas. *Ruellia simplex*. [cited 2022 Sept 1]. Available from: <https://assessment.ifas.ufl.edu/assessments/?num=48> .
18. Gallagher RV, Randall RP, Leishman M. Trait differences between naturalized and invasive plant species independent of residence time and phylogeny. Conservation Biol. 2015; 29(2): 360-369. doi: 10.1111/cobi.12399.

19. University of Florida, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences. Assessment of nonnative plants in Florida's natural areas. *Nandina domestica*. [cited 2022 Sept 1]. Available from: <https://assessment.ifas.ufl.edu/assessments/nandina-domestica/>.
20. Knox GW, Wilson SB, Deng Z. Noninvasive nandina cultivars for the green industry. Center Applied Nursery Res. Rpt. 2012. <http://www.canr.org/pastprojects/2007005.pdf>
21. Leonhardt KW. Polyploidy as a management strategy for invasive species. *HortTechnology*. 2019;29(5): 554-558. doi: 10.21273/HORTTECH04324-19.
22. Barbier EB, Gwatipedza J, Knowler D, Reichard SH. The North American horticultural industry and the risk of plant invasion. *Agron Econ*. 2011;42: 113-130, doi: 10.1111/j.1574-0862.2011.00556.
23. Czarnecki DM, Deng Z. Assessment of the female fertility of 26 commercial *Lantana camara* cultivars and six experimental lines. *HortScience*. 2020;55(5): 709-715. doi: 10.21273/HORTSCI14963-20.
24. Bhattarai K, Van Huylbroeck J. Breeding, genetics, and genomics of ornamental plants. *Horticulturae*. 2022;8(2): 148.
25. Wang X, Cheng A-M, Zhi S, Xu F. Breeding triploid plants: A review. *Czech J Genet Plant Breed*. 2016;52(2): 41-54. doi: 10.17221/151/2015-CJGPB
26. Datta A, Kumschick S, Geerts S, Wilson JR. Identifying safe cultivars of invasive plants: Six questions for risk assessment, management, and communication. *NeoBiota*. 2020;62: 81–97. doi: 10.3897/neobiota.62.51635.
27. Fetouh, MI, Deng Z, Wilson SB, Adams CR, Knox GW. Induction and characterization of tetraploids in Chinese privet (*Ligustrum sinense* Lour.). *Sci Hortic*. 2020;271, doi: 10.1016/j.scienta.2020.109482.

28. Vining, KJ, Contreras RN, Ranik M, Strauss SH. Genetic methods for mitigating invasiveness of woody ornamental plants: research needs and opportunities. *HortScience*. 2012;47(9): 1210-1216, doi:10.21273/HORTSCI.47.9.1210.
29. Qun S, Wang JH, Sun BQ. Advances on seed vigor physiological and genetic mechanisms. *Agric Sci in China*. 2007;6(9):1060-1066, doi: 10.1016/S1671-2927(07)60147-3.
30. Oregon Department of Agriculture. Butterfly bush approved cultivars. [cited 2022 Sept 1]. Available from: <https://www.oregon.gov/oda/programs/NurseryChristmasTree/Pages/ButterflyBush.aspx>.
31. Knight TM, Havens K, Vitt P. Will the use of less fecund cultivars reduce the invasiveness of perennial plants? *BioScience*. 2011;61(10): 816-822, doi: 10.1525/bio.2011.61.10.11.
32. Bufford JL, Daehler CC. Sterility and lack of pollinator services explain reproductive failure in non-invasive ornamental plants. *Diversity Distr*. 2014;20(8): 975-985, doi: 10.1111/ddi.12224.
33. Deng Z, Wilson SB, Czarnecki D. 'UF-1013-1': An infertile cultivar of *Lantana camara*. *HortScience*, 2020;55(6): 953-958, doi: 10.21273/HORTSCI14911-20.
34. Brand MH, Durocher SN. Four sterile or near-sterile cultivars of Japanese barberry in three foliage colors. *HortScience*. 2022;57(4): 581-587, doi: 10.21273/HORTSCI16488-22.
35. Contreras RN, Hoskins TC. Developing triploid maples. *Horticulturae*. 2020;6(4): 70, doi: 10.3390/horticulturae6040070
36. Freyre R, Deng Z, Knox GW, Zayas VA. Fruitless and Semi-dwarf *Ruellia simplex* R13-5-3, R15-24-17, and R16-1-1. *HortScience*. 2018;53(10): 1528-1533, doi: /10.21273/HORTSCI13015-18.

37. Wilson SB, Deng Z. 2023. Ornamental invasive plants in Florida with research-founded alternatives. HortTechnology. Forthcoming.

Supporting information captions

S1 Fig. Average monthly minimum and maximum temperatures, total rainfall (cm), and relative humidity (%), and soil recorded at trail site.


Sites located at southwest FL [Gulf Coast Research and Education Center (GCREC), Balm], northcentral FL [Plant Science Research and Education Unit (PSREU), Citra], and north FL [North Florida Research and Education Center (NFREC), Quincy]. Where week 0 starts in May 2019 and Week 82 ends in January 2020.

S1 Table. Soil characteristics of trial sites located at southwest FL [Gulf Coast Research and Education Center (GCREC), Balm], northcentral FL [Plant Science Research and Education Unit (PSREU), Citra], and north FL [North Florida Research and Education Center (NFREC), Quincy].



Click here to access/download
Supporting Information
SIFig.1.tif





Click here to access/download
Supporting Information
SI Table 1.docx

