

# Supporting Information

Thomas and Palmer 10.1073/pnas.1423995112

**Table S1. Median (interquartile range) number of, and changes in, percentage cover (per quadrat per site) and number of sites of native species, neophytes, and archaeophytes, before and after exclusion of five neophytes, which are actively planted for wood products (*P. sitchensis*, *P. abies*, *P. contorta*), vegetable oil (*B. napus*), and grass forage (*L. multiflorum*)**

Response	Archaeophyte	Native	Neophyte
Number of sites (1990)			
All species	2 (8)	3 (20.25)	1 (2.00)
Minus managed species	2 (8)	3 (20.25)	1 (2.00)
Number of sites (2007)			
All species	3 (11)	4 (21)	1 (2.00)
Minus managed species	3 (11)	4 (21)	1 (2.25)
Cover (1990)			
All species	0.02 (0.02)	0.06 (0.17)	0.26 (0.33)
Minus managed species	0.02 (0.02)	0.06 (0.17)	0.05 (0.12)
Cover (2007)			
All species	0.03 (0.04)	0.06 (0.20)	0.31 (0.43)
Minus managed species	0.03 (0.04)	0.06 (0.20)	0.12 (0.10)
Change in number of sites			
All species	1 (3)	0 (4)	1 (2.00)
Minus managed species	1 (3)	0 (4)	1 (2.00)
Change in cover			
All species	0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.05)	0.10 (0.16)
Minus managed species	0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.05)	0.09 (0.11)

**Table S2.** Kruskal-Wallis  $\chi^2$  tests comparing the number of, and changes in, percentage cover (per quadrat per site) and number of sites between native species, neophytes, and archaeophytes, after exclusion of five neophytes, which are actively planted for wood products (*P. sitchensis*, *P. abies*, *P. contorta*), vegetable oil (*B. napus*), and grass forage (*L. multiflorum*)

Response and species groups	Test statistic
Number of sites (1990)	
All groups	$\chi^2 (2) = 39.44, P < 0.0001$
Native vs. neophyte	$\chi^2 (1) = 36.72, P < 0.0001$
Native vs. archaeophyte	$\chi^2 (1) = 4.50, P = 0.03$
Archaeophyte vs. neophyte	$\chi^2 (1) = 12.32, P < 0.001$
Number of sites (2007)	
All groups	$\chi^2 (2) = 32.87, P < 0.0001$
Native vs. neophyte	$\chi^2 (1) = 31.58, P < 0.0001$
Native vs. archaeophyte	$\chi^2 (1) = 2.04, P = 0.15$
Archaeophyte vs. neophyte	$\chi^2 (1) = 13.97, P < 0.001$
Cover (1990)	
All groups	$\chi^2 (2) = 11.90, P = 0.003$
Native vs. neophyte	$\chi^2 (1) = 0.04, P = 0.05$
Native vs. archaeophyte	$\chi^2 (1) = 11.68, P < 0.001$
Archaeophyte vs. neophyte	$\chi^2 (1) = 3.84, P = 0.05$
Cover (2007)	
All groups	$\chi^2 (2) = 8.14, P = 0.02$
Native vs. neophyte	$\chi^2 (1) = 1.27, P = 0.26$
Native vs. archaeophyte	$\chi^2 (1) = 6.30, P = 0.01$
Archaeophyte vs. neophyte	$\chi^2 (1) = 8.01, P = 0.005$
Change in number of sites	
All groups	$\chi^2 (2) = 4.57, P = 0.10$
Change in cover	
All groups	$\chi^2 (2) = 1.04, P = 0.60$

Significant differences between groups are highlighted in bold; Bonferroni thresholds for *P* values for three-group comparisons and for pairwise comparisons were 0.025 (repeated tests in 1990 and 2007) and 0.0167 (three pairwise comparisons), respectively.

## Other Supporting Information Files

[Dataset S1 \(DOCX\)](#)