Global drivers of historical true fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) invasions

Jiří Trombik (✉ jiri.trombik@gmail.com)

Czech University of Life Sciences in Prague Faculty of Forestry and Wood Sciences: Ceska Zemedelska Univerzita v Praze Fakulta lesnicka a drevarska <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5141-3222>

Samuel Ward

Mississippi State University

Allen L. Norrbom

USDA Agricultural Research Service

Andrew M. Liebhold

USDA Forest Service: US Department of Agriculture Forest Service

Research Article

Keywords: Tephritidae, non-native species, invasion drivers, patterns of invasions, global insect invasion dynamics, generalized linear mixed-effects models, risks of future invasions

Posted Date: February 7th, 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1292488/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Journal of Pest Science on April 19th, 2022. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-022-01498-0>.

Global drivers of historical true fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) invasions

Jiří Trombik^{1*}, Samuel Ward², Allen L. Norrbom³ and Andrew M. Liebhold^{1,4}

¹ Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Faculty of Forestry and Wood Sciences, Kamýcká 129, 165 00 Praha 6 - Suchbát, Czech Republic

² Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology, Entomology and Plant Pathology, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS 39762

³ Systematic Entomology Laboratory, USDA, ARS, c/o Smithsonian Institution, P.O. Box 37012, MRC 168, Washington, DC, 20013-7012, USA

⁴ USDA Forest Service Northern Research Station, Morgantown, WV, 15349 USA

*Corresponding author:

Jiří Trombik

Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Faculty of Forestry and Wood Sciences

Kamýcká 129, 165 00 Praha 6 - Suchbát, Czech Republic

jiri.trombik@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Given the high costs associated with fruit fly (Tephritidae) invasions, there is a need to better understand and predict the risks of future invasions. We assembled a global database of historical Tephritidae invasions with the objective to identify the biological and socioeconomic drivers that explain these invasions. We investigate the tendencies of certain species to invade and the characteristics of regions that make them more prone to invasions.

We used various published sources and online databases to assemble a database documenting the occurrence (presence/absence) and status (native/non-native) of individual species for each country in the world. Values of several socio-economic and environmental variables were also assembled and considered as explanatory variables. A generalized linear mixed-effects model framework was used to evaluate the utility of these variables for predicting the country-level occurrence of each species outside of its native range.

A total 44 species were identified as having been accidentally introduced in the world. Most species of invading Tephritidae have established in only five or fewer countries. The number of invasions has rapidly increased since the 1950s. Climatic similarity between native and invaded countries, gross domestic product of the invaded country and distance from the native range are significant predictors of tephritid invasions.

Our analysis revealed that both economic and biological factors explain patterns of historical Tephritid invasions. Despite the rising efforts to prevent new invasions, additional species may continue to invade, and many currently established species will likely continue to expand their ranges into new areas.

KEYWORDS: Tephritidae, non-native species, invasion drivers, patterns of invasions, global insect invasion dynamics, generalized linear mixed-effects models, risks of future invasions

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of advanced human civilizations in various world regions has historically been closely linked with the domestication of plants for agricultural purposes and their propagation (Rindos 1987; Sauer 1993). Many agricultural crops exhibit remarkable productivity when grown outside of their native range where they may escape the impacts of herbivores and plant pathogens. In many cases, however, such escape has been short lived as plant pests are accidentally moved outside of their native ranges and these invading species may adversely impact agricultural productivity, ultimately resulting in serious socioeconomic consequences (Paini et al. 2016; Santini et al. 2018).

Among such damaging non-native agricultural pests are the notorious true fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae), which comprise ca. 5,000 species worldwide (White and Elson-Harris 1992; Norrbom et al. 1999; Norrbom unpubl. data). Most tephritids share a common life history of larval feeding on living plant tissue, feeding upon seeds, flowers, fruits or within galls or mines on leaves and stems; however, about 1/3 feed on fruits. Tephritids exhibit considerable variation in other life history traits, such as pre-adult survival and duration of immature stages, as well as variation in population demographics that may affect their success as invaders (Carey et al. 1988; Malacrida et al. 2007; Papadopoulos 2014; Vargas et al. 2000). The Tephritidae includes some of the world's most damaging fruit and vegetable pest species with particularly serious pests in the genera *Anastrepha* (native to the Neotropical Region), *Bactrocera* and *Zeugodacus* (mainly native to Indomalayan and Australasian Regions), *Ceratitis* (native to the Afrotropical Region) and *Rhagoletis* (native to the Nearctic, Neotropical and Palearctic Regions) (Courtney et al. 2009; White and Elson-Harris 1992; Norrbom et al. 1999).

While several Tephritidae species have had massive economic impacts as a result of direct losses to agricultural yield and increased pest management costs, additional impacts have also resulted from diminished access to export markets due to quarantine bans imposed by importing countries (Siebert and Cooper 1995; Mumford 2002; Papadopoulos 2014). Because of the severe socio-economic consequences of Tephritidae invasions, many countries expend considerable resources to prevent establishment of new and potentially damaging species. Historically, the principal pathways responsible for Tephritidae invasions have been international movement of fruit and vegetables, either in trade or in passenger baggage (Kiritani and Yamamura 2003, Liebhold et al. 2006; Karsten et al. 2015). Biosecurity approaches to preventing the arrival of fruit flies include importation prohibitions, inspection and mandatory phytosanitary treatments (Li et al. 2013; Phillips 2013). In addition to these measures, biosecurity efforts include continual surveillance and, if an incursion is detected, eradication (Quilici and Donner 2012; Suckling et al. 2016).

Given the extreme costs associated with Tephritidae invasions and the limited resources that most countries have available for carrying-out biosecurity programs, there is a need to better understand and predict the risks of future invasions (Qin et al. 2015). Here we assemble a comprehensive database of all known historical Tephritidae invasions and analyze these data to identify biological and socioeconomic drivers that explain these invasions. We investigate whether there are tendencies of certain species to more successfully invade new regions and if there are characteristics of regions that make them more prone to Tephritidae invasions. These analyses provide insight into the factors that may promote new invasions and provide critical information for predicting invasions in the future.

METHODS

2.1 Tephritidae invasion records

We compiled data on the global distribution of both the native and non-native ranges of all Tephritidae species that are known to be unintentionally established outside of their native ranges. Multiple Tephritidae species have been intentionally introduced as biological control agents of weeds (Bess and Haramoto 1972; White and Clement 1987; White and Elson-Harris 1992; Turner 1996) but these species were not included in our analyses (see Table S1.1 for the list of these species). The geographical distribution of each species was recorded as non-native, native or not established in each country in the world. These data were compiled from various published sources including the scientific literature (e.g., Foote et al. 1993; Wu et al. 2009) and online databases (e.g., CoFFHI 2020; EPPO 2014, 2020; GBIF Secretariat 2021) (see Table S2.2 for details). Only records of species that have clearly established a self-sustaining population in the non-native range were included. For species where the native range is uncertain, their presence in countries was considered to be part of the native range unless there was evidence otherwise; thus, the number of non-native species and the extent of their invaded areas may be underestimated. In defining non-native ranges, the Russian Federation was divided into its European and Asian portions. Outlying states, territories and other autonomous regions (e.g., Hawaiian Islands, Guam, Puerto Rico, Christmas Island, New Caledonia, Guam) with sufficient data available were treated as separate units in the analysis.

For each record of a non-native tephritid species (excluding biocontrol agents) in a country, we recorded the year of first recorded discovery if such data were available. Furthermore, the Global Eradication and Response Database (GERDA; Kean et al. 2021) was used to summarize documented eradication attempts against non-native tephritids worldwide (Table S3.3).

To examine the inter- and intra-regional invasion dynamics and to determine the most common source-recipient combinations at the regional level, numbers of native and established non-native species were summarized for each of eight biogeographic regions: Nearctic, Neotropic, European Palearctic, Asian Palearctic, Indo-Malaya, Afrotropic, Australasia and Oceania. These regions were slightly modified from Wallace's classification to match national political boundaries in accordance with the country-level approach used here to record species distributions; for purposes of this analysis, all of any country that extends into two biogeographic regions was included in the region in which the majority of its territory occurs (Figure S4.1). Countries such as Mexico, China and Indonesia that are often split between biogeographic regions were not divided in our analysis because historical invasion data are not available for subdivisions of these countries. The Hawaiian Islands were included in the Oceania region rather than the Nearctic, which includes the continental USA. The European portion of the Russian Federation was included in the European Palearctic region and the Asian part of Russia was allocated to the Asian Palearctic region. Species that are only non-native within portions of the same countries that form part of their native ranges were excluded from these and further analyses.

The climatic distribution (combined native and non-native) of each non-native tephritid species was characterized using the proportion of georeferenced occurrence records for each species from the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF, <https://www.gbif.org/>) recorded in each climatic subgroup of the Köppen-Geiger climate classification system (Kottek et al. 2006).

2.2 Explanatory variables

To explore possible mechanisms explaining the establishment of each non-native Tephritidae species in each country, we explored associations with a set of candidate socio-economic and

environmental variables (Table 1). Some of these variables were related to propagule pressure while others were related to habitat invasibility.

TABLE 1 List of explanatory variables for each country used for analysis of invasion probability for each tephritid species in each country

Variable	Description	Source
Human population	Total Human population in each country in 2015	World Bank Open Data (https://data.worldbank.org/)
Gross domestic product (GDP)	Gross domestic product in each country 2015	World Bank Open Data (https://data.worldbank.org/)
Number of visiting tourists	Number of tourist arrivals in country in 2015	World Bank Open Data (https://data.worldbank.org/)
Cumulative imports	Total value of imports to each country (adjusted USD) from all countries in the native range	Bilateral Trade Historical Series: New Dataset 1827-2014 (TRADHIST, Fouquin and Hugot, 2017)
Fruit production	Total area of agricultural land producing fruit in each country in 2015 (km ²)	Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations (http://www.fao.org/home/en/)
Country area	Total area of the country (km ²)	GIS analysis
Distance to native range	Shortest (border-border) distance between each country and the native range of species (km)	GIS analysis
Climatic similarity	Fraction of the country with suitable climate for specific Tephritidae invasion	Koppen classes; GBIF records (GBIF Secretariat 2021)
Suitable climate area	Area of the country with suitable climate for Tephritidae species invasion (km ²)	Koppen classes; GBIF records (GBIF Secretariat 2021)

Socio-economic variables considered here that serve as proxies for propagule pressure included human population, gross domestic product (GDP), tourism and cumulative value of imports 1827-2014 to each country. Because of changes in national identities, independence of former colonies and other reasons, the imports of presently non-existent countries and previously colonial territories were grouped or divided to match current national boundaries. Annual imports were expressed in USA dollars per year, adjusted to 2018 values utilizing the Consumer Price Index

(Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis 2021). The cumulative value of all imports from countries in the native region of each Tephritidae species to each remaining country was calculated to express total trade flow from the native region to every other country.

Variables related to country invasibility that were considered included annual fruit production and climatic suitability. From the total of 44 non-native tephritid species identified, sufficient information for further analysis of climatic suitability was found for only 36 species. Climatic suitability was calculated for each country both as the total area of suitable climate for each species and as the fraction of the country with suitable climate. This suitability was characterized based on the climatic niche for each species. The climatic niche was estimated by identifying the climatic subgroups of the Köppen-Geiger system (Kottek et al. 2006) that overlapped the range (both native and invaded) of the species. The geographic range of each species was characterized by downloading georeferenced occurrence records for each species from the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF, <https://www.gbif.org/>) database. Only records matching the country boundaries of the native and invaded ranges for each species were used. Then, we calculated the number of occurrence records falling in each of the 30 climatic subgroups. Climatic suitability of each country outside of the species native range was calculated using the Jaccard similarity coefficient as:

$$CS_{i,j} = \frac{\sum_{KG=1}^{30} p_{KG,i} p_{KG,j}}{(\sum_{KG=1}^{30} p_{KG,i}^2 + p_{KG,j}^2)/2}$$

where $CS_{i,j}$ is the climatic similarity of country i with the estimated climatic niche of Tephritidae species j , $p_{KG,i}$ is the fraction of country i comprised of Köppen-Geiger climate subgroup KG and $p_{KG,j}$ is the fraction of species j GBIF records located in subgroup KG . The suitable climatic area

for each country-species combination was calculated as country area multiplied by $CS_{i,j}$. The same procedure was used to estimate the “suitable” native and invaded range of each species.

Country area and proximity to the native range of each individual species were calculated using ESRI Arcmap 10.5.1. Country borders were extracted from the GISCO database (<https://ec.europa.eu>) as GIS shapefiles of scale 1:10 mil. Distance to the native range was calculated for each country-species combination. The distance between the native region and each country outside of the native range was calculated as the shortest geographic distance (border to border).

2.2 Data analysis

A generalized linear mixed-effects model framework was used to analyze the incidence (0/1) of invasion for each species in each country. The analysis was based on a full matrix database such that each country was repeated in the data for each species and vice versa. To account for repeated observations on countries and unobservable effects of species, terms for country and species were fit as random intercepts. All models were fit with a binomial distribution and logit link function. Data were analyzed using the R statistical software v4.0.0 (R Core Team 2020) and mixed-effects models were fit using the lme4 package in R (Bates et al. 2014). Prior to analysis, several predictors were $\ln(x)$ -transformed to reduce skewness and, for predictors containing zero values, a small constant of 1 was added to all observations. Modeling was then conducted in two steps. First, we fit bivariate models between our response variable and each predictor and calculated Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) values for each model (Figure S5.2A). For the second stage, we aimed to develop a full, best-fitting model that evaluated all predictors simultaneously, but first checked for collinearity ($|r| > 0.5$) by calculating pairwise Pearson’s correlation coefficients (Table S5.4).

In instances of collinearity, predictors occurring in bivariate models with the lowest AIC were used.

While surveillance and eradication represent an important component of biosecurity measures targeting exclusion of non-native Tephritidae species, questions have been raised about the efficacy of some of these programs (Carey 1991, Papadopoulos et al. 2013). Specifically, some scientists believe that detections of insects in the same general area of the site of an earlier eradication most likely reflect the persistence of the initial population (i.e., as a result of eradication failure) rather than a new invasion following successful invasion (Zhao et al. 2019). However, this theory has been lively debated in the scientific literature (Gutierrez et al. 2014, McInnis et al. 2017). Here we attempted to remain agnostic with regard to this theory and performed two versions of our analysis. In the first analysis, we fit the mixed-effects model using species-country records for which we only recorded a country as invaded based on the presence of a self-sustaining population. In the second analysis, we fit the same model but in addition classified countries as invaded if an eradication project for the species was carried out in the country even if there were no subsequent detections. Our logic here was that had the eradication not been carried out, then the species would have established. By analyzing these data both ways we were able to avoid assumptions about the true success of eradication.

An additional analysis was conducted to determine which species, after adjusting for the effects of predictors remaining in our best-fitting model, exhibited the highest mean probability of invasion. This was achieved by estimating marginal means using the emmeans package in R (Lenth 2020). First, species were fit as a fixed (vs. random) effect with country still included as a random intercept to obtain species-level mean invasiveness, but this resulted in convergence issues in the mixed-effect framework. Thus, a simpler approach was used by (i) fitting a fixed-effects only

model that included predictors from the best fitting model (i.e., human population density, proportional climatic similarity, distance from the native range; see “Results”) along with a term for species and (ii) only evaluating species for which the number of countries invaded / total countries was >10% (i.e., invaded more than 30 countries).

3 RESULTS

3.1 Intra- and Inter-regional invasions

In total, we identified 44 non-native Tephritidae species (Table 2, Table S2.2).

TABLE 2 Tephritidae species known to have established in areas outside of their native ranges (excluding biocontrol agents purposefully introduced). Biogeographic regions are abbreviated: AT – Afrotropic, AU – Australasia, AP – Asian Palearctic, EP – European Palearctic, IM – Indo-Malaya, NA – Nearctic, NT – Neotropic, OC - Oceanian

Species	Biogeographic region of native range	Biogeographic region of invaded range	N. of countries invaded
<i>Anastrepha curvicauda</i> *	NT	NA	1
<i>Anastrepha fraterculus</i> "Brazil-1 morph"	NT	NT	4
<i>Anastrepha fraterculus</i> "Peruvian morph"*	NT	NT	1
<i>Anastrepha grandis</i>	NT	NT	1
<i>Anastrepha ludens</i>	NT	NT	2
<i>Anastrepha obliqua</i>	NT	NT	13
<i>Anastrepha suspensa</i>	NT	NA	1
<i>Bactrocera carambolae</i>	IM	NT	4
<i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i>	AP, IM	AP, AT, AU, EP, IM, OC	54
<i>Bactrocera frauenfeldi</i>	AU, OC	AU	1
<i>Bactrocera latifrons</i>	IM	AP, AT, OC	4
<i>Bactrocera ochrosiae</i>	OC	OC	1
<i>Bactrocera oleae</i>	AT	AP, AT, EP, IM, NA, NT, OC	34
<i>Bactrocera tryoni</i>	AU	AU, OC	3
<i>Bactrocera zonata</i>	IM	AP, AT, EP	12
<i>Campiglossa producta</i>	AP, EP, IM	AP, IM	5
<i>Campiglossa sororcula</i> *	AP, AU, AT, EP, IM, OC	AU, OC	2

<i>Carpomya incompleta</i> *	AT, EP	AT	2
<i>Carpomya pardalina</i> *	AP, EP, IM	AP, EP	8
<i>Carpomya vesuviana</i> *	AP, EP, IM	AP, AT, EP, IM, OC	21
<i>Ceratitis capitata</i>	AT	AP, AT, AU, EP, NT, OC	61
<i>Ceratitis quilicii</i>	AT	AT	2
<i>Chaetorellia succinea</i>	AP, EP	NA	1
<i>Dacus ciliatus</i>	AT	AP, AT, EP, IM	19
<i>Dacus frontalis</i>	AT, EP	EP	5
<i>Dicheniotes ternarius</i> *	AT	AU	1
<i>Dirioxa pornia</i>	AU	OC	1
<i>Ensina sonchi</i>	AP, EP, IM	AT, IM, OC	4
<i>Euaresta bullans</i>	NT	AP, AT, AU, EP, NA, NT	30
<i>Euarestoides acutangulus</i>	NA	NT	9
<i>Myopites tenellus</i> *	EP	AP	1
<i>Neoceratitis cyanescens</i>	AT	AT	3
<i>Rhagoletis batava</i>	AP, EP	EP	4
<i>Rhagoletis cerasi</i>	AP, EP	NA	2
<i>Rhagoletis cingulata</i>	NA, NT	EP	12
<i>Rhagoletis completa</i>	NA, NT	NA, EP	14
<i>Rhagoletis meigenii</i>	EP	NA	2
<i>Rhagoletis pomonella</i> *	NA, NT	NA, NT	3
<i>Strauzia longipennis</i>	NA	EP	1
<i>Terellia fuscicornis</i>	AP, EP	EP, NA	2
<i>Terellia ruficauda</i>	AP, EP	NA	2
<i>Terellia tussilaginis</i>	AP, EP	AP	1
<i>Urophora jaceana</i>	AP, EP	NA	1
<i>Zeugodacus cucurbitae</i>	AP, IM	AP, AT, AU, EP, OC	34

* insufficient records available in GBIF database to quantify climatic range; excluded from climatic analyses

The highest number of successful invasions are documented in the European Palearctic region (15 species), followed by the Asian Palearctic region (14 species each). Indo-Malaya has the lowest number (6) of invasions (Table 3). The most intra-regional invasions are documented in the Neotropical Region (8). The European Palearctic has the highest number of native Tephritidae species that invaded elsewhere (16), while Oceania has the lowest number of species invading elsewhere (3, Table 3). Most inter-regional invasions occur between neighboring

regions such as between the Asian and European Palearctic (6) and between Indo-Malaya and the Asian Palearctic (5).

TABLE 3 Intra- and inter-regional invasions of Tephritidae between biogeographic regions. Biogeographic regions are abbreviated: AT – Afrotropic, AU – Australasia, AP – Asian Palearctic, EP – European Palearctic, IM – Indo-Malaya, NA – Nearctic, NT – Neotropic, OC – Oceania

Biogeographic region	N. of non-native species native to the region*	Total N. of non-native species	N. of intra-regional invasions**	N. of inter-regional invasions***	N. of native species that invaded other regions							
					AT	AP	AU	EP	IM	NA	NT	OC
AT	9	13	5	11	—	3	2	3	2	1	2	3
AP	14	13	5	14	4	—	3	6	3	5	0	4
AU	4	8	1	4	0	—	—	0	0	0	0	3
EP	16	15	5	16	3	4	1	—	3	5	0	3
IM	10	6	4	10	4	5	1	2	—	0	1	4
NA	5	11	1	11	0	0	0	3	0	—	2	0
NT	11	11	8	6	1	1	1	3	0	4	—	0
OC	3	11	2	10	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	—
Total	44*	44*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

* only species that invaded other regions included

** some species invaded multiple regions, hence sum of species across all regions don't match total species

*** the native ranges of some species span multiple regions, and the origin of invading populations is unknown.

Thus, some species may be listed as both intra- and inter-regional

3.2 Country-level invasions history

Most species of invading Tephritidae have established in only five or fewer countries, with 13 species only invading a single country (Figure 1A). Only six species have invaded more than 20 countries: *Carpomya vesuviana* (21), *Euaresta bullans* (30), *Bactrocera oleae* (34), *Zeugodacus cucurbitae* (34), *Bactrocera dorsalis* (54) and *Ceratitis capitata* (61). The first records of fruit fly invasion date back to the 1830s with *Ceratitis capitata* establishing in Madeira (Portugal) and the

Azores (Spain). For the next hundred years, only about 20 more invasions were recorded until the 1930s when the number of new species-country records doubled to around 40 (Figure 1B).

Since then, the cumulative number of Tephritidae invasions steadily increased to a total of 189 reported dated invasions in 2018 (Figure 1B). Unfortunately, dates for the first records of species in many countries (more than 200) could not be located. The complete list of records is provided in Table S2.2.

FIGURE 1 Distributions of invasions among species and through time. A. Frequencies of number of countries invaded per species; B. Number of species-country invasion discoveries per

decade (blue columns, left y-axis) and cumulative number of species-country invasion combinations since 1820 (red line, right y-axis)

Eradication attempts against non-native tephritids date to the early 1900's, and in total nearly 300 successful eradication programs are documented (Kean et al., 2021; Figure 2). Numbers of eradication programs have been steadily increasing since the 1970s with more than 60 eradications documented each decade since the 1990's (Figure 2). Most such programs were carried out against *Ceratitis capitata* and *Bactrocera dorsalis*, followed by *Bactrocera tryoni* in the last decades (Figure 2).

FIGURE 2 Number of successful eradication programs of Tephritidae since 1900

3.3 Native and Invaded and native ranges

The current distributions of invading Tephritidae species span four out of the five main Köppen–Geiger climatic group areas. The largest number of occurrence records fall in group C

(temperate) (62% of GBIF records), followed by group A (tropical) (16%), then group D (continental) (12%) and finally Group B (dry) (10%). There were no non-native Tephritidae records from the polar climatic group area. The climatic subgroup with the most native range records was the temperate oceanic subgroup followed by the tropical wet and humid subtropical subgroups (Figure 3). Most of the records from non-native ranges are documented from the warm- and hot-summer Mediterranean climatic subgroups.

FIGURE 3 Distribution of Tephritidae GBIF records among Köppen–Geiger climate classification subgroups

Total numbers of native and non-native species present in each country are shown in Figure 4. The countries with the largest number of established non-native Tephritidae species (8) were the USA and Mauritius, though Reunion and the Hawaiian Islands were very close with 7 species. Australia, France, and several countries in the Middle East also have high numbers (6 species) of

documented invasions (Figure 4A). Overall, at least one tephritid invasion is documented in every world biogeographic region aside from Antarctica (Figure 4A). The greatest number of non-native tephritids originate from the European Palearctic region (9 from Spain and France) and Indo-Malaya (8 from India) (Figure 4B).

FIGURE 4 Number of known non-native tephritid species per country (A) and number of these non-native species originating from each country (B).

3.4 Generalized linear mixed-effects invasion model

We first present results from analyzing insect-country records where classification of establishment was limited to the clear presence of self-sustaining populations. Collinear predictors (Table S5.4), defined as having a correlation $>|0.5|$, could be split into two groups: those related to human activity (human population density, GDP, fruit production, tourism and land area) or climate (climatic similarity, suitable climate area). For consideration in the full candidate model, we selected the variable from each group that occurred in the bivariate model with the lowest AIC: GDP and proportional climatic similarity (Figure S5.2A). Thus, a full candidate model considered GDP, cumulative imports, proportional climatic similarity, and distance from the native range as fixed effects. Cumulative imports did not appear to influence the incidence of invasion ($Z = 1.58$, $p > 0.05$) and was consequently removed as a predictor variable; the model was refit, and all remaining predictors were associated with changes in invasion incidence ($|Z| > 4.92$, $p < 0.0001$; Table 4). In the final model, climatic similarity between native and invaded countries and GDP increased the incidence of invasion whereas distance to the native range significantly decreased the probability that a given country would be invaded (Table 4). Results from fitting the model to data where we included insect-country combinations based on the presence of an eradication program in addition to the presence of a self-sustaining population, yielded nearly identical results to those described above.

TABLE 4 Final generalized linear mixed-effects model of tephritid species invasion incidence per country. Model results including the eradication as successful invasions are presented in brackets. Model fit with a logit link function and binomial error structure with terms for species and country fit as random intercepts

Predictor	Coefficient	SE	Z	P
Intercept	-9.87 (-10.72)	1.25 (1.29)	-7.93 (-8.31)	<0.0001
GDP	0.21 (0.24)	0.04 (0.04)	4.92 (5.50)	<0.0001
Climatic similarity	3.47 (3.43)	0.28 (0.28)	12.26 (12.22)	<0.0001
Distance to native range	-0.15 (-0.16)	0.03 (0.03)	-5.18 (-5.65)	<0.0001

The estimated model for the mean probability of invasion (Table 5) indicated that *Ceratitis capitata* had the highest invasion probability (38%), followed by *Bactrocera dorsalis* (25%), *Bactrocera oleae* (18%), *Zeugodacus cucurbitae* (13%) and *Euaresta bullans* (11%).

TABLE 5 Probability of invasion for the six most widely invaded Tephritidae species according to a fixed-effects only model after adjusting for predictors (i.e., estimated marginal means)

Species	Unadjusted means		Marginal means	
	P(Inv)	SE	P(Inv)	SE
<i>Euaresta bullans</i>	0.11	0.03	0.07	0.02
<i>Bactrocera oleae</i>	0.18	0.03	0.13	0.02
<i>Zeugodacus cucurbitae</i>	0.13	0.03	0.09	0.02
<i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i>	0.25	0.03	0.19	0.03
<i>Ceratitis capitata</i>	0.38	0.04	0.30	0.05

DISCUSSION

The family Tephritidae is one of the groups of insects with the greatest impact on agriculture and thus of high biosecurity concern (White and Elson-Harris 1992; Qin et al. 2015). The genera containing the most species that have established outside of their native range are *Anastrepha*, *Bactrocera* and *Rhagoletis* (Table 2). Along with *Ceratitis*, these three genera include some of the most destructive pests to global production of fresh fruit and vegetables (White and Elson-Harris 1992; Malacrida et al. 2007). Historical records show that the majority of non-native tephritids have established in only one or two countries and there are only five species (*B. dorsalis*, *B. oleae*, *C. capitata*, *Euaresta bullans* and *Zeugodacus cucurbitae*) that have invaded over 20 countries (Figure 1A). Tephritids are found in almost all fruit growing areas of the world (White and Elson-Harris 1992). While the native ranges of the most damaging non-native pests within this group are mostly concentrated in tropical and subtropical climatic zones (Papadopoulos 2014), many of these species have invaded more varied climatic regions (Figure 3,4); for example, the two pest species *Ceratitis capitata* and *Bactrocera oleae* are native to the Afrotropics, but the non-native ranges of these species are more widely distributed, including temperate and continental regions (Duyck et al. 2004; Ekesi et al. 2009). Several studies also predict further expansion of fruit fly invasions to temperate and continental habitats, which will be increasingly suitable for tropical species as a result of climate change (e.g., Stephens et al. 2007; Ponti et al. 2009; Gutierrez et al. 2010). Furthermore, it is not unusual for species to expand or shift their climatic niche in invaded territories (Guisan et al. 2014; Hill et al. 2017) and this may explain why the number of occurrences in each Koppen-Geiger classification differ between native and non-native ranges (Figure 3).

Numbers of non-native Tephritidae vary considerably among the world regions. The Indo-Malaya region has the lowest number of established non-native species (Table 3) even though

there are many species native to the region (it is the second largest source of invading species) including half of the non-native *Bactrocera* spp. The Nearctic region is the second most invaded region, mainly by *Anastrepha* spp. originating from the Neotropic region and *Rhagoletis* spp. from the European Palearctic. Very strong historical trade connectivity and the high climatic similarity between the Nearctic and European Palearctic regions partly explains the high number of invasions among these regions with *Rhagoletis* spp. successfully invading from one region to another and vice versa (Tables 2, 3).

Despite its relatively low total land area, Oceania (especially the Hawaiian Islands) has been invaded by a large number of Tephritidae species, and these species have originated from all world regions. Favorable climatic conditions in the Oceanic islands, together with an abundance of cultivated non-native tropical fruit species has facilitated numerous Tephritid invasions (Jang 2007).

Historically, the first documented Tephritidae invasions date back to the early 19th century with *Ceratitis capitata* establishing in Madeira (Portugal) and the Azores (Spain) (Fimiani 1989). These invasions most likely resulted from movement of contaminated fruit among countries. Several more, mostly European and Mediterranean countries, were then invaded by this species prior to its discovery in Australia in 1896 (Permkam and Hancock 1995). The number of fruit fly invasions accelerated as a result of increasing global movement of humans and international trade in agricultural commodities (Figure 1B). Several major invasions were discovered during the early 20th century, including the introduction of *Ceratitis capitata* and *Zeugodacus cucurbitae* to Hawaii between 1902-1907, *C. capitata* to Brazil in 1901 and *Anastrepha curvicauda* to Florida, USA in 1905. The number of documented invasions spiked between the two world wars (1930-1940) (Figure 1B). Dramatic increases in global trade as a result of the free trade movement following

the Second World War, as well as the burgeoning intercontinental air passenger transport network, presumably facilitated further increases in new invasions (Early et al. 2016; Paini et al. 2016). In addition, there are increasingly well-documented recent invasions and interceptions of various tephritid species globally despite major efforts to control their movement (Hill and Terblanche 2014; Papadopoulos 2014).

International movement of plant parts, particularly fruit, is considered the dominant pathway by which Tephritidae have been accidentally introduced around the world (Gould 1995; Kiritani and Yamamura 2003; Kendra et al. 2007). Fruit is moved internationally both in commercial shipments but also by international air passengers. While early Tephritidae invasions may have resulted from commercial shipments of contaminated fruit, modern biosecurity policies impose bans on fruit imports from certain regions or require preclearance inspection in the country of origin or phytosanitary treatments (fumigation, cold treatments, etc.) that greatly reduce introduction risk (Hennessey et al. 2013; Peterson et al. 2013). Consequently, during the post-World War II era the pathway of increasing dominance for Tephritid invasions has been movement of immature life stages in fruit carried by airline passengers (Satoh et al. 1985; Liebhold et al. 2006; Ma et al. 2012; Papadopoulos 2014). Thus, it seems likely that the rapid acceleration of invasions from 1950 onward (Figure 1B) can be attributed to the expansion of commercial air passenger travel over the last 6 decades (Matsumoto 2007).

Successful invasion and establishment outside the natural range is a complex process influenced by characteristics of the environment that affect habitat invasibility, but also external processes related to propagule pressure (Simberloff 2009). For most insects, critical factors that influence habitat invasibility include climatic suitability and the availability of suitable hosts (Ward and Masters 2007; Bacon et al. 2014). Our analysis revealed that climate suitability is a key predictor

of historical Tephritid invasions (Table 4). Hill et al. (2016) used climate suitability as a prerequisite for predicting future Tephritid invasions, however they pointed out that propagule pressure and host availability are also critical to invasion success (Ward and Masters 2007; Bacon et al. 2014). We included national fruit production as another candidate explanatory variable with the expectation that it reflects Tephritid host availability in the receiving country, however it did not enter as a significant factor predicting probabilities of invasion. This lack of prediction may reflect the fact that commercial fruit plantations are not the only resource facilitating Tephritid establishments; natural stands of native plant species and plantings of native or introduced fruit trees in residential settings may also provide crucial habitat for nascent populations (Shimizu et al. 2007; Leblanc et al. 2014).

In order to capture the effect of propagule pressure as a driver of historical tephritid invasions we included as explanatory variables, human population, gross domestic product, number of air passengers, total cumulative imports and distance to native range (Table 1). Of these, only GDP and distance to native range significantly contributed to explaining invasion probabilities in our final model (Table 4). However, all of these variables were positively associated with invasion incidence when fit individually (Figure S5.2B). Invasions of many types of organisms are often related to human population size (Cadotte et al. 2017; Ward et al. 2019). Urbanization may be closely related to propagule pressure associated with general movement of humans and their goods but also with invasibility related to disturbance and habitat modification. The latter is likely important in the case of tephritid resource availability in residential gardens as described above. Countries with less-developed economies typically have weaker biosecurity programs (Early et al. 2016) and this could increase invasion probabilities. Such an effect would act opposite of the positive effect of GDP described above and possibly mask a stronger impact.

The negative effect of distance to the native range on invasion probability (Table 4) probably reflects higher levels of trade and travel from nearby countries along with natural diffusive spread. The absence of fruit imports from our final model may initially seem perplexing. However, fruit imports was a highly significant predictor when fit alone, but not as strongly correlated with invasion incidence as GDP (Figure S5.2C). Fruit imports likely represent a small, variable fraction of total imports and as discussed earlier, may no longer represent the dominant pathway by which tephritids are introduced. Unfortunately, data on cumulative fruit imports dating back to the early 1800's were not available which would have allowed more critical testing of this pathway. Furthermore, we only considered imports from native ranges whereas new invasions often originate from previously invaded regions, a phenomenon described as the “bridgehead effect” (Bertelsmeier and Keller 2018). Indeed, for widespread non-native tephritids, such as *Ceratitis capitata*, most new invasions may not originate from the native range (Karsten et al. 2015).

Despite the implementation of intense biosecurity efforts designed to prevent new tephritid invasions in many countries (including extensive surveillance and eradication programs, Figure 2) (Suckling et al. 2016), it can be anticipated that more invasions will continue in the future. Probably most species have not yet invaded all areas that contain suitable hosts and are climatically suitable, especially under a changing climate (Vera et al. 2002; Stephens et al. 2007). Though Figure 1B suggests a drastic decrease in numbers of new invasions since 2010, this may be an artifact of the typical delay in reporting (Smith et al. 2018). As is the case for most invading species, there is likely a considerable “invasion debt” of Tephritidae, i.e., species may have established that have not yet been discovered (Essl 2010, MacLachlan et al. 2021). Furthermore, it is probable that many of the species that so far have only invaded relatively small areas (Figure 1A) may continue to expand into much larger areas in the future.

463

464 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

465 We thank Michaela Skřivanová for technical assistance. This work was supported by grant
466 EVA4.0, No. CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16_019/0000803 financed by OP RDE and by the National
467 Socio-Environmental Synthesis Center (SESYNC) under funding received from the National
468 Science Foundation DBI-1639145. Mention of trade names or commercial products in this
469 publication is solely for the purpose of providing specific information and does not imply
470 recommendation or endorsement by USDA. USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

REFERENCES

- Bacon SJ, Aebi A, Calanca P, Bacher S (2014) Quarantine arthropod invasions in Europe: The role of climate, hosts and propagule pressure. *Divers Distrib* 20(1):84–94.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12149>
- Bates DM, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S (2014) Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *ArXiv e-prints*. a&rXiv:1406. 10.18637/jss.v067.i01.
- Bertelsmeier C, Keller L (2018) Bridgehead Effects and Role of Adaptive Evolution in Invasive Populations. *Trends Ecol Evol* 33(7):527–534. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2018.04.014>
- Bess HA, Haramoto FH (1972) Biological control of Pamakani, *Eupatorium adenophorum*, in Hawaii by a tephritid gall fly, *Procecidochares utilis*. 3. Status of the weed, fly and parasites of the fly in 1966–71 versus 1950–57. *Proc Hawaii Entomol Soc* 21(2):165–178.
- Cadotte MW, Yasui SLE, Livingstone S, MacIvor JS (2017) Are urban systems beneficial, detrimental, or indifferent for biological invasion? *Biol Invasions* 19(12):3489–3503.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-017-1586-y>
- Carey JR (1991) Establishment of the Mediterranean fruit fly in California. *Science* 253(5026):1369–1373. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1896848>
- Carey JR, Yang P, Foote D (1988) Demographic analysis of insect reproductive levels, patterns and heterogeneity: case study of laboratory strains of three Hawaiian tephritids. *Entomol Exp Appl* 46(1):85–91.
- CoFFHI (2020) USDA Compendium of fruit fly host information (CoFFHI). Edition 4.0, <https://coffhi.cphst.org/>.
- Courtney GW, Pape T, Skevington JH, Sinclair BJ (2009) Biodiversity of Diptera. In: Adler PH, Footitt RG (eds) *Insect biodiversity: Science and society*. Wiley–Blackwell, pp 185–222.

494 Duyck P, David P, Quilici S (2004) A review of relationships between interspecific competition
 495 and invasions in fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae). *Ecol Entomol* 29(5):511–520.
 496 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0307-6946.2004.00638.x>
 497 Early R, Bradley BA, Dukes JS et al (2016) Global threats from invasive alien species in the
 498 twenty-first century and national response capacities. *Nat Commun* 7:12485. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms12485)
 499 [10.1038/ncomms12485](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms12485)
 500 Ekesi S, Billah MK, Nderitu PW, Lux SA, Rwomushana I (2009) Evidence for competitive
 501 displacement of *Ceratitidis cosyra* by the invasive Fruit Fly *Bactrocera invadens* (Diptera:
 502 Tephritidae) on mango and mechanisms contributing to the displacement. *J Econ Entomol*
 503 102(3):981–991. <https://doi.org/10.1603/029.102.0317>
 504 EPPO (2014) PQR database. Paris, France: European and Mediterranean Plant Protection
 505 Organization. <http://www.eppo.int/DATABASES/pqr/pqr.htm>.
 506 EPPO (2020) EPPO Global database. In: EPPO Global database, Paris, France: EPPO.
 507 <https://gd.eppo.int/>.
 508 Essl F, Dullinger S, Rabitsch W et al (2010) Socioeconomic legacy yields an invasion debt. *Proc*
 509 *Natl Acad Sci USA* 108(1):203–207. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1011728108>
 510 Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (2018) Consumer Price Index (Estimate) 1800. Retrieved
 511 November 18, 2020, from [https://www.minneapolisfed.org/community/financial-and-](https://www.minneapolisfed.org/community/financial-and-economic-education/cpi-calculator-information/consumer-price-index-1800)
 512 [economic-education/cpi-calculator-information/consumer-price-index-1800](https://www.minneapolisfed.org/community/financial-and-economic-education/cpi-calculator-information/consumer-price-index-1800).
 513 Fimiani P (1989) Pest status: Mediterranean region. In: Robinson AS, Hooper G (eds) *Fruit flies:*
 514 *Their Biology, natural enemies and control*, Volume 3A, World crop pests. Elsevier,
 515 Amsterdam, The Netherlands, pp 37–50.

516 Foote RH, Blanc, FL, Norrbom A (1993) Handbook of the fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae) of
 517 America north of Mexico. Cornell University Press.

518 Fouquin M, Hugot J (2017) Two centuries of bilateral trade and gravity data: 1827-2014. CEPII
 519 Working Paper, CEPII.

520 GBIF Secretariat (2021). GBIF backbone taxonomy. Checklist dataset.
 521 <https://doi.org/10.15468/39omei>

522 Gould WP (1995) Probability of detecting Caribbean fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) infestations
 523 by fruit dissection. Fla Entomol 78(3):502.

524 Guisan A, Petitpierre B, Broennimann O, Daehler C, Kueffer C (2014) Unifying niche shift
 525 studies: Insights from biological invasions. Trends Ecol Evol 29(5):260–269.
 526 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2014.02.009>

527 Gutierrez AP, Ponti L, Gilioli G (2010) Climate change effects on plant-pest-natural enemy
 528 interactions. In: Hillel D, Rosenzweig C (eds) Handbook of climate change and
 529 agroecosystems, Imperial College Press, pp 209–237.

530 Gutierrez AP, Ponti L, Gilioli G (2014) Comments on the concept of ultra-low, cryptic tropical
 531 fruit fly populations. Proc Royal Soc B 281(1782):20132825.
 532 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.2825>

533 Hennessey MK, Jeffers L, Nendick, D et al (2013) Phytosanitary Treatments. The Handbook of
 534 Plant Biosecurity. Springer Netherlands.

535 Hill MP, Terblanche JS (2014) Niche overlap of congeneric invaders supports a single-species
 536 hypothesis and provides insight into future invasion risk: Implications for global management
 537 of the *Bactrocera dorsalis* Complex. PLoS ONE 9(2):e90121.
 538 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0090121>

539 Hill MP, Bertelsmeier C, Clusella–Trullas S, Garnas J, Robertson MP, Terblanche JS (2016)
 540 Predicted decrease in global climate suitability masks regional complexity of invasive fruit fly
 541 species response to climate change. *Biol Invasions* 18(4):1105–1119.
 542 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-016-1078-5>
 543 Hill MP, Gallardo B, Terblanche JS (2017) A global assessment of climatic niche shifts and
 544 human influence in insect invasions. *Glob Ecol Biogeogr* 26:679–689.
 545 <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12578>
 546 Jang, E. B. (2007). Fruit flies and their impact on agriculture in Hawaii. *Proc Hawaii Entomol*
 547 *Soc* 39:117–119.
 548 Karsten M, Jansen van Vuuren B, Addison P, Terblanche JS (2015) Deconstructing
 549 intercontinental invasion pathway hypotheses of the Mediterranean fruit fly (*Ceratitis*
 550 *capitata*) using a Bayesian inference approach: are port interceptions and quarantine protocols
 551 successfully preventing new invasions? *Divers Distrib* 21(7):813–825.
 552 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12333>
 553 Kean JM, Suckling DM, Sullivan NJ et al (2021) Global eradication and response database.
 554 <http://b3.net.nz/gerda>.
 555 Kendra PE, Hennessey MK, Montgomery WS, Jones EM, Epsky ND (2007) Residential
 556 composting of infested fruit: a potential pathway for spread of *Anastrepha* fruit flies (Diptera:
 557 Tephritidae). *Fla Entomol* 90(2):314–320. [https://doi.org/10.1653/0015-](https://doi.org/10.1653/0015-4040(2007)90[314:RCOIFA]2.0.CO;2)
 558 [4040\(2007\)90\[314:RCOIFA\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1653/0015-4040(2007)90[314:RCOIFA]2.0.CO;2)
 559 Kiritani K, Yamamura K (2003) Exotic insects and their pathways for invasion. In: Ruiz GM,
 560 Carlton JT (eds) *Invasive species: vectors and management strategies*. Island Press,
 561 Washington, DC, pp 44–67

562 Kottek M, Grieser J, Beck C, Rudolf B, Rubel F (2006) World map of the Köppen–Geiger
 563 climate classification updated. *Meteorol Zeitschrift* 15(3):259–263.
 564 <https://doi.org/10.1127/0941-2948/2006/0130>
 565 Leblanc L, Graham S, McNeil S, Pohlman K, Dinneen M, Fujita B (2014) Abundance and
 566 seasonal occurrence of pest fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae) in residential and rural areas of
 567 Oahu (Hawaiian Islands). *Proc Hawaii Entomol Soc* 46:9–24.
 568 Lenth R (2020) emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means. R package
 569 version 1.5.0-5. <https://github.com/rvlenth/emmeans>.
 570 Li Z, Jiang F, Ma X, Fang Y, Sun Z, Qin Y, Wang Q (2013) Review on prevention and control
 571 techniques of Tephritidae invasion. *Plant Quarantine*, 27(2):1–10.
 572 Liebhold AM, Work TT, McCullough DG, Cavey JF (2006) Airline baggage as a pathway for
 573 alien insect species invading the United States. *Am Entomol* 52(1):48–54.
 574 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ae/52.1.48>
 575 Ma X, Li Z, Ni W, Qu W, Wu J, Wan F, Hu X (2012) The current and future potential
 576 geographical distribution of the solanum fruit fly *Bactrocera latifrons* (Diptera: Tephritidae)
 577 in China. In: Li D, Chen Y (eds) *Computer and computing technologies in agriculture V*,
 578 Springer, Berlin, pp 157–164.
 579 MacLachlan MJ, Liebhold AM, Yamanaka T, Springborn MR (2021) Hidden patterns of insect
 580 establishment risk revealed from two centuries of alien species discoveries. *Sci*
 581 *Adv* 7(44):eabj1012. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abj1012>
 582 Malacrida AR, Gomulski LM, Bonizzoni M, Bertin S, Gasperi G, Guglielmino CR (2007)
 583 Globalization and fruit fly invasion and expansion: the medfly paradigm. *Genetica* 131(1):1–
 584 9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10709-006-9117-2>

585 Matsumoto H (2007) International air network structures and air traffic density of world cities.
 586 Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review 43(3):269–282.
 587 McInnis DO, Hendrichs J, Shelly T et al (2017) Can polyphagous invasive tephritid pest
 588 populations escape detection for years under favorable climatic and host conditions? Am
 589 Entomol 63(2):89–99. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ae/tmx038>
 590 Mumford JD (2002) Economic issues related to quarantine in international trade. Eur Rev Agric
 591 Econ 29(3):329–348.
 592 Norrbom AL, Carroll LE, Thompson FC, White IM, Freidberg A (1999) Systematic database of
 593 names. In: Thompson FC (ed) Fruit fly expert identification system and systematic
 594 information database. Myia (1998) 9, vii + 524 pp & Diptera Data Dissemination Disk (CD-
 595 ROM) (1998) 1, pp 65–251.
 596 Paini DR, Sheppard AW, Cook DC, De Barro PJ, Worner SP, Thomas MB (2016) Global threat
 597 to agriculture from invasive species. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 113(27):7575–7579.
 598 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1602205113>
 599 Papadopoulos NT, Plant RE, Carey JR (2013) From trickle to flood: the large-scale, cryptic
 600 invasion of California by tropical fruit flies. Proc Royal Soc B 280(1768):20131466.
 601 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.1466>
 602 Papadopoulos NT (2014) Fruit fly invasion: historical, biological, economic aspects and
 603 management. In: Shelly T et al. (eds), Trapping and the detection, control, and regulation of
 604 Tephritid fruit flies, Springer Netherlands, pp 219–252.
 605 Permkam S, Hancock DL (1995) Australian Trypetinae (Diptera: Tephritidae). Invertebr Syst
 606 9(6):1047–1209.

607 Peterson E, Grant J, Roberts D, Karov V (2013) Evaluating the trade restrictiveness of
 608 phytosanitary measures on U.S. fresh fruit and vegetable imports. *Am J Agric Econ*
 609 95(4):842–858. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajae/aat015>
 610 Phillips C (2013) Living without Fruit Flies: Biosecuring horticulture and its markets.
 611 *Environ Plan* 45(7):1679–1694. <https://doi.org/10.1068%2Fa45274>
 612 Ponti L, Cossu QA, Gutierrez AP (2009) Climate warming effects on the *Olea europaea*-
 613 *Bactrocera oleae* system in Mediterranean islands: Sardinia as an example. *Glob Change Biol*
 614 15(12):2874–2884. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01938.x>
 615 Qin Y, Paini DR, Wang C, Fang Y, Li Z (2015) Global establishment risk of economically
 616 important fruit fly species (Tephritidae). *PLoS ONE* 10(1):1–8.
 617 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0116424>
 618 Quilici S, Donner P (2012) Analysis of Exotic Fruit Fly Trapping Networks. *EPPO Bulletin*,
 619 42(1):102–108.
 620 Rindos D (1987) The origins of agriculture: an evolutionary perspective. Academic Press. San
 621 Diego.
 622 Santini A, Liebhold AM, Migliorini D, Woodward S (2018) Tracing the role of human
 623 civilization in the globalization of plant pathogens. *The ISME Journal* 12(3):647–652.
 624 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-017-0013-9>
 625 Satoh I, Yamabe M, Satoh S, Ohki A (1985) Study on the frequency of finding of the fruit flies
 626 infesting the fruits imported as air baggage. *Research Bulletin of the Plant Protection Service*,
 627 Japan (21):71-73.
 628 Sauer J (1993) Historical geography of crop plants: a select roster. CRC Press. Boca Raton.

629 Shimizu Y, Kohama T, Uesato T, Matsuyama T, Yamagishi M. (2007) Invasion of solanum fruit
 630 fly *Bactrocera latifrons* (Diptera: Tephritidae) to Yonaguni Island, Okinawa prefecture,
 631 Japan. Appl Entomol Zool 42(2):269–275. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1303/aez.2007.269>
 632 Siebert JB, Cooper T (1995) If Medfly Infestation Triggered a Trade Ban: Embargo on
 633 California Produce Would Cause Revenue, Job Loss. Calif Agric 49(4):7–12.
 634 Simberloff D (2009) The role of propagule pressure in biological invasions. Annu Rev Ecol Evol
 635 40, 81–102. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.110308.120304>
 636 Smith RM, Baker RHA, Collins DW et al (2018) Recent trends in non–native, invertebrate, plant
 637 pest establishments in Great Britain, Accounting for time lags in reporting. Agric For Entomol
 638 20(4):496–504. <https://doi.org/10.1111/afe.12282>
 639 Stephens AEA, Kriticos DJ, Leriche A (2007) The current and future potential geographical
 640 distribution of the oriental fruit fly, *Bactrocera dorsalis* (Diptera: Tephritidae). Bull Entomol
 641 Res 97(4):369–378. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007485307005044>
 642 Suckling DM, Kean JM, Stringer LD et al (2016) Eradication of Tephritid fruit fly pest
 643 populations: outcomes and prospects. Pest Mana Sci 72(3):456–465.
 644 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.3905>
 645 Turner CE (1996) Tephritidae in the biological control of weeds. In: McPherson A, Steck GJ
 646 (eds) Fruit fly pests: a world assessment of their biology and management, St. Lucie Press,
 647 Delray, Florida, pp 157–164.
 648 Vargas RI, Walsh WA, Kanehisa D, Stark JD, Nishida T (2000) Comparative demography of
 649 three Hawaiian fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae) at alternating temperatures. Ann Entomol Soc
 650 Am 93(1):75–81. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1603/0013-8746\(2000\)093\[0075:CDOTHF\]2.0.CO;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1603/0013-8746(2000)093[0075:CDOTHF]2.0.CO;2)

651 Vera MT, Rodriguez R, Segura DF, Cladera JL, Sutherst RW (2002) Potential geographical
 652 distribution of the Mediterranean fruit fly, *Ceratitis capitata* (Diptera: Tephritidae), with
 653 emphasis on Argentina and Australia. *Environ Entomol* 31(6):1009–1022.
 654 <https://doi.org/10.1603/0046-225X-31.6.1009>
 655 Ward NL, Masters GJ (2007) Linking climate change and species invasion: An illustration using
 656 insect herbivores. *Glob Change Biol* 13(8):1605–1615. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01399.x)
 657 [2486.2007.01399.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01399.x)
 658 Ward SF, Fei S, Liebhold AM (2019) Spatial patterns of discovery points and invasion hotspots
 659 of non-native forest pests. *Glob Ecol Biogeogr* 28(12):1749–1762.
 660 <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12988>
 661 White IM, Clement SL (1987) Systematic notes on *Urophora* (Diptera, Tephritidae) species
 662 associated with *Centaurea solstitialis* (Asteraceae, Cardueae) and other Palaearctic weeds
 663 adventive in North America. *Proc Entomol Soc Wash* 89(3):571–580.
 664 White IM, Elson–Harris MM (1992) Fruit flies of economic significance: their identification and
 665 bionomics. CAB International. Wallingford.
 666 Wu J, Fan L., & Guangqin L. (2009). Atlas of economic fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae).
 667 Guangdong Scientific and Technological Press. Guangzhou.
 668 Zhao Z, Hui C, Plant RE, Su M, Papadopoulos NT, Carpenter TE, Li Z, Carey JR (2019) The
 669 failure of success: cyclic recurrences of a globally invasive pest. *Ecol Appl* 29(8):p.e01991.
 670 <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.1991>
 671

672 **STATEMENTS & DECLARATIONS**

673 **Funding**

674 This work was supported by grant EVA4.0, No. CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16_019/0000803 financed
675 by OP RDE and by the National Socio-Environmental Synthesis Center (SESYNC) under funding
676 received from the National Science Foundation DBI-1639145.

677 **Competing Interests**

678 The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

679 **Author Contributions**

680 All authors contributed to the study conception and design. Data collection was performed by
681 Jiří Trombik, Allen L. Norrbom and Andrew M. Liebhold. The data analysis was done by Sam
682 Ward and Jiří Trombik. The manuscript was written and edited by all authors. All authors read and
683 approved the final manuscript.

684 **Data Availability**

685 The datasets generated during the current study are available in Supplementary material and
686 can be acquired in digital form from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

687 **Ethics approval**

688 The study did not include research involving human or animal subjects, therefore no ethical
689 approval was required.

690 **Consent to participate**

691 The study did not include research involving human subjects, therefore no consent to participate
692 was needed.

693 **Consent to publish**

694 Manuscript does not contain any individual person's data in any form, therefore no consent to
695 publish was needed.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [TephritidaeSMJPSfinal.pdf](#)