1 # Honeybees collect pollen from the buzz-pollinated invasive *Solanum*

2 *elaeagnifolium* in Northern Greece

4 **Authors:** Kantsa, A.[1]; Kariyat, R.R.[1,2]; Lambert, H.[1]; Nakas, G.[3]; Petanidou, T.[3]; De Moraes,

5 C.M.[1]; Mescher, M.C.[1]*

6 *Corresponding author: mescher@usys.ethz.ch*

7
8

Affiliations:

[1] Department of Environmental Systems Science, ETH Zurich, Switzerland.

[2] Department of Entomology & Plant Pathology, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville AR,

USA.

[3] Department of Geography, University of the Aegean, Greece.

Running title: Honeybees exploit *Solanum elaeagnifolium*

Keywords: Agroecology; *Apis mellifera*; Plant invasions; Pollen deprivation;

Solanaceae; Weed ecology

Manuscript elements: Text; Supplementary material (videos)

Abstract

Around 6% of flowering plants, including most solanaceous species, have flowers specialized for buzz-pollination (sonication). The poricidal anthers of these flowers release pollen in response to frequency-specific vibrations that buzz-pollinating bees, including bumble bees and many solitary bees, generate via rapid oscillation of flight muscles. Honeybees are incapable of sonication and typically avoid buzz-pollinated plants in natural settings. Here, we report a novel interaction in which honeybees consistently visit and extract pollen from flowers of *Solanum elaeagnifolium* (silverleaf nightshade) within a large invasive plant population in Northern Greece. We postulate that honeybee foraging effort on *S. elaeagnifolium* reflects a shortage of alternative floral resources at the peak of the Mediterranean summer, consistent with observations for pollen-starved bees in captivity. This recent behavioral shift may have important implications for plant invasions, particularly under climate change, and suggests a need for further investigation to elucidate its ecological and evolutionary driver

Text

1. Honeybees cannot buzz-pollinate

> *"...the polylectic honeybee does not seem able to learn the process."*
>
> Linsley (1978)

Buzz-pollinated flowers occur in around 20,000 species across various angiosperm clades (~6% of species), including key crops such as tomato, eggplant, blueberry, cranberry, and kiwi (Buchmann 1983; Cooley and Vallejo-Marín 2021; De Luca and Vallejo-Marín 2013; Pritchard and Vallejo-Marín 2020). Owing to their unique floral morphology, the poricidal anthers of these flowers require vibration at specific frequencies (sonication) to release pollen. Buzz pollination is hypothesized to serve as an adaptation for preventing pollen access by relatively inefficient, non-specialist pollinators (Pritchard and Vallejo-Marín 2020), although the morphology of buzz-pollinated flowers may also deter herbivory by making pollen less accessible (Hargreaves et al. 2009). A capacity for sonication via rapid oscillation of the thoracic indirect flight muscles has evolved independently ca. 45 times within bees (Cardinal et al. 2018), enabling approximately 58% of bee species (at least 74 genera) to efficiently extract pollen from buzz-pollinated flowers (Buchmann 1983; De Luca and Vallejo-Marín 2013; Jankauski et al. 2022; Pritchard and Vallejo-Marín 2020). However, honeybees, the most frequent floral visitors in both natural and agricultural systems worldwide (Hung et al. 2018), are incapable of sonication, and their limited interaction with buzz-pollinated plant species

has been widely discussed by pollination biologists (Buchmann 1983; De Luca and

Vallejo-Marín 2013; Linsley 1978).

The proximate mechanisms preventing honeybees from effectively collecting

pollen from buzz-pollinated flowers appear to be based in physiological constraints—

specifically relating to the maximum sustained frequency of thoracic vibrations (King

and Buchmann 2003)—rather than a lack of behavioral flexibility or learning capacity, as

had previously been suggested (Linsley 1978). In any case, honeybees typically avoid

buzz-pollinated flowers in natural settings, and particularly those of species that do not

offer nectar, as in the genus *Solanum* (Buchmann 1983; Buchmann and Cane 1989;

Linsley 1978; Michener 1962; Petanidou et al. 2018; Tayal and Kariyat 2021; Tscheulin

and Petanidou 2013; Tscheulin et al. 2009). On rare occasions in which honeybees have

been observed to visit buzz-pollinated flowers in the wild, they have primarily been

reported to glean leftover pollen from petals following visits by buzz-pollinators

(Buchmann 1983; Buchmann and Cane 1989; Gross and Mackay 1998; Mesquita-Neto et

al. 2018; Petanidou et al. 2018; Rocha et al. 2023; Solís-Montero et al. 2015; Wille

1963), and sometimes to steal already deposited pollen from the stigma, presumably

reducing plant fitness (e.g., Gross and Mackay 1998).

Despite their limited ability to utilize buzz-pollinated flowers, honeybees can be

induced to visit such flowers under conditions of pollen deprivation and are sometimes

utilized for pollination of buzz-pollinated agricultural crops. In the case of buzz-

pollinated flowers that do not offer nectar (e.g., tomato, eggplant, potato, tamarillo),

managed honeybees will visit only when confined into greenhouses or flight cages with

no access to other pollen sources (Cane et al. 1993; Cane and Schiffhauer 2003;

Miyamoto et al. 2006; Neiswander 1956). However, honeybees will spontaneously visit

only the nectar-offering buzz-pollinated crops (e.g., blueberry, cranberry), in which case

they can be used in open environments (Cane et al. 1993; Dogterom and Winston 1999).

The reported pollinating efficiency of honeybees on buzz-pollinated crops ranges from

zero (avoided the flowers, although pollen-deprived; e.g, Amala and Shivalingaswamy

2017; Banda and Paxton 1990; Rijo et al. 2022; Sanford and Hanneman 1981; Zhang et

al. 2020), to inconsistent (Cooley and Vallejo-Marín 2021; Courcelles et al. 2013; Dos

Santos et al. 2009; Higo et al. 2004), or sometimes satisfactory provided that hives are

used in high densities and honeybee workers do not steal nectar (Cane and Schiffhauer

2003; Cooley and Vallejo-Marín 2021; Courcelles et al. 2013; Cribb et al. 1993;

Delaplane and Mayer 2000; MacKenzie 1994; Miyamoto et al. 2006; Neiswander 1956;

Sabara and Winston 2003).

The observation that managed honeybees will visit and attempt to collect pollen

from buzz-pollinated flowers under pollen deprivation, raises the possibility that similar

behaviors may occur in nature, particularly in environments where honeybees have

limited access to other pollen sources or, conversely, where other potential pollinators are

absent or rare. Both conditions might arise in the context of plant invasion (Albrecht et

al. 2016; Davis et al. 2018). Yet, as noted above, reports of honeybee visitation of buzz-

pollinated flowers in nature are rare and generally limited to observations of bees

collecting residual pollen from petals, following visitation by other, buzz-pollinating

species. In the current study, we report the large-scale extraction and utilization by

honeybees of pollen from a buzz-pollinated plant (*Solanum elaeagnifolium*), which forms

large monocultures in its invaded (Mediterranean) range and produces flowers in a

seasonal period when other flowers are scarce. We also provide evidence that this

honeybee behavior has become widespread within the last decade and discuss potential

ecological and evolutionary implications within the context of plant invasion.

2. Honeybees consistently visit the buzz-pollinated flowers of an invasive plant

population

Solanum elaeagnifolium (silverleaf nightshade) is currently among the top-

noxious invasive plants worldwide (Roberts and Florentine 2022; Uludag et al. 2016). A

perennial herbaceous species originating in N Mexico and SW USA, *S. elaeagnifolium*

has been rapidly expanding to almost all continents over the past century, posing serious

threats to native biodiversity and causing significant losses in agricultural and livestock

production in many countries (Roberts and Florentine 2022; Uludag et al. 2016). Its

uncontrollable expansion has severely affected the Mediterranean Basin, making it one of

the most impacted regions (Krigas et al. 2021; Uludag et al. 2016). In croplands and

urban areas of N Greece, this species forms numerous extensive monospecific stands (of

>10,000 individuals) (Petanidou et al. 2018) (Figure 1).

Since 2015, we have observed honeybees to frequently visit *S. elaeagnifolium*

flowers across the entire metropolitan area of the city of Thessaloniki (N Greece) and to

actively extract pollen from the poricidal anthers in three ways: (a) shaking/drumming

the anthers using their forelegs; (b) biting off pieces of anthers with their mandibles; (c)

holding the anthers with their forelegs and inserting their proboscis through the pores of

the anthers (Videos S1-S3). As a result, pollen of silverleaf nightshade adheres on the

bodies of honeybees and is used to fill up the corbiculae (Videos S1-S3) (Figure 2c-d).

These modes of behavior have previously been reported for honeybees trying to exploit

buzz-pollinated flowers in cultivation, and Cane et al. (1993) hypothesized that the

foreleg drumming behavior is a permutation of pollen-grooming movements that bees

perform to transfer pollen grains from their upper body parts to the corbiculae.

As documented in agricultural settings, honeybees spend more time on visitation

of buzz-pollinated flowers than they usually do on other types of flowers, presumably

due to the low efficiency of pollen extraction (Kendall et al. 2022). However, honeybee

interactions with *S. elaeagnifolium* entail a high level of settings, physical effort and an

exceptionally long-duration of floral visits. Indeed, in Thessaloniki, we recorded visits on

single flowers lasting as long as 224 s (Video S1), whereas known maximum visitation

times of honeybees on buzz-pollinated species are 100 s, observed on blueberry flowers

(Kendall et al. 2022). Instead, for non-buzz-pollinated species, handling times are

considerably shorter, typically ranging from 2.6 s per flower (oregano) and 4 s (lavender)

(Hennessy et al. 2021) to 40 s (melon) (Ribeiro et al. 2017).

Furthermore, especially during the latter part of the flowering season (August),

honeybees in Thessaloniki regularly visited *S. elaeagnifolium* flowers that were in poor

condition, (e.g., heavily damaged by florivores, wilting, or deformed), which otherwise is

known to reduce attractiveness to pollinators (e.g., Sõber et al. 2010; Vega-Polanco et al.

2020). Finally, it should be noted that honeybees are now by far the most frequent

visitors of these flowers, outnumbering buzz-pollinating bees in the area (i.e., *Bombus,*

Pseudapis, Xylocopa, and *Amegilla*) (RRK and GN personal observations). To our

knowledge, this is the first report of honeybees consistently extracting pollen from a

buzz-pollinated plant in a natural community.

3. An extraordinary consequence of plant invasion?

The striking similarity of the behavior reported here with that previously reported

for pollen-starved honeybees in confined agricultural settings (see above), suggests that it

might be linked to severe limitation of other pollen sources. This is highly plausible

given the magnitude of the invasion of silverleaf nightshade in the study area (Petanidou

et al. 2018). It has been estimated that *S. elaeagnifolium* reached current population sizes

in and around Thessaloniki city within 50 years after its first unintentional introduction

(most probably from Texas) in the 1930s, forming one of the most heavily invaded areas

in Europe (Krigas and Kokkini 2004; Roberts and Florentine 2022; Uludag et al. 2016).

While we cannot be certain about when the widespread utilization of *S. elaeagnifolium*

flowers by honeybees in Thessaloniki began, we can be confident that it started later than

2007, based on previous extensive surveys of pollinator activity in this area (Petanidou et

al. 2012; Petanidou et al. 2018). While these surveys reported that other wild bees were

scarce (Petanidou et al. 2018), honeybee interactions with *S. elaeagnifolium* were also

rare, and restricted to gleaning leftover pollen from petals, presumably following visits

by other pollinators (Petanidou et al. 2012; Petanidou et al. 2018). Similar behavior has

been repeatedly reported for silverleaf nightshade both in Greece (Tscheulin and

Petanidou 2013; Tscheulin et al. 2009) and in its native range, i.e., Texas and Arizona

(Buchmann and Cane 1989; Tayal and Kariyat 2021). Besides, this fits the typical

interaction of honeybees with *Solanum*-type flowers in the wild, where they have been

reported to either avoid (*S. wedlandii*) (Michener 1962), or glean pollen leftovers (*S.*

rostratum) (Solís-Montero et al. 2015) from flowers of *Solanum* species.

Since the successful establishment of silverleaf nightshade in Thessaloniki, local

honeybee populations have presumably been exposed to a novel "operative environment"

(Agosta and Klemens 2008; Spomer 1973), including a super-abundant pollen source,

which, despite being challenging to exploit, is available during the most adverse time of

year. Given the relative scarcity of other insect-pollinated species in flower in the

lowlands of the Mediterranean at the peak of the dry summer (Kantsa et al. 2023b),

silverleaf nightshade is by far the dominant pollen source in the invaded habitats.

Therefore, we assume that the observed utilization of *S. elaeagnifolium* is a consequence

of plant invasion in an area with limited alternative pollen sources, although it remains

unclear why the behavior appears to have become widespread only in recent years.

The well-known aversion of honeybees towards buzz-pollinated flowers suggests

that the utilization of nectarless, buzz-pollinated flowers is not adaptive in typical

environments, likely because the ratio of pollen rewards obtained to effort expended is

unattractive, relative to that provided by other flower types (Buchmann and Cane 1989).

If utilization of *S. elaeagnifolium* flowers has been adaptive under the novel conditions in

Thessaloniki, a question is whether this arises due to pre-existing behavioral flexibility or

entails genetic adaptation. The apparently similar exploitation of buzz-pollinated flowers

by pollen-starved honeybees in agricultural settings suggests that the former is plausible;

the employment of different techniques by the honeybees (viz., drumming, "milking", or

biting; Videos S1-S3) is consistent with ecological fitting (Agosta and Klemens 2008;

Janzen 1985), suggesting that the eventual mode of action depends on individual

decision-making ability, agility, or both. These behaviors may thus represent a notable

example of behavioral plasticity of the honeybees, facilitating exploration of novel areas

of fitness space created by the massive invasive populations of *S. elaeagnifolium* in

Northern Greece.

Regarding why the reported behavior was not observed prior to 2015, it may be

useful to explore the potential preference of relevant colony-level heritable traits (e.g.,

pollen hoarding) in the local beekeeping market. For instance, Cane and Schiffhauer

(2001; 2003) suggested that when honeybee queens are genetically predisposed for

pollen hoarding (Rueppell 2014) pollen-foraging trips on buzz-pollinating flowers are

significantly more frequent. Furthermore, the previously mentioned hypothesis by Cane

et al. (1993) that the movement of foreleg drumming in honeybees is a permutation of

pollen-grooming movements that bees perform to transfer pollen grains from their upper

body parts to the corbiculae, suggests the possibility of an existing pre-adaptation. This

could indicate a case of exaptation, where a trait originally evolved for one function

(pollen grooming) has been co-opted for another (buzz-pollination). A similar example is

the woodpecker finches (*Camarhynchus pallidus*, Thraupidae) at the Galápagos Islands,

in which beak morphology originally suited for cracking seeds or eating insects has been

co-opted for tool utilization, a behavior which varies according to habitat type (i.e.,

operative environment), is not acquired with social learning (but possibly with trial-and-

error learning at a young age), and is believed to be based on genetic predisposition

(Tebbich et al. 2001). In any case, whether honeybees have established a novel

interaction circumventing adaptive processes (through phenotypic plasticity), or we are

witnessing the real-time establishment of an exapted behavior, possibly conveying a

more subtle and complex genetic background (e.g., pleiotropic traits), this phenomenon

requires in-depth investigation.

Honeybees are globally abundant, frequently utilized in agriculture, and highly

competitive with wild bees, often with adverse effects on native bee faunae (Goulson

2003; Lázaro et al. 2021). Given that they are generally among the first pollinators to

interact with newly introduced plants in natural communities (Kantsa et al. 2023a), these

behavioral shifts can be directly linked with invasion status and dynamics, with *S.*

elaeagnifolium providing a characteristic example. In general, the rapid geographical

expansion of this species is thought to be promoted largely by its ability to propagate

vegetatively with root fragments (Roberts and Florentine 2022). The invasive populations

of silverleaf nightshade are known to be self-incompatible, and (at least until 2007)

pollen-limited (Petanidou et al. 2012; Petanidou et al. 2018). Based on these

observations, it had been suggested that sexual reproduction was less important for the

expansion of this plant in the invaded area. Yet, if this condition is overturned, and

honeybee visitation can now convey the advantages of outcrossing, the genetic

robustness of this vast invasive population is expected to be even further enhanced, with

potentially even more disastrous effects on the native wildlife and landscape. For

example, in the genus *Solanum,* outcrossing maintains high chemodiversity of volatile

emissions, and it relates to better performance in chemically repelling herbivores and in

recruiting predators (Kariyat et al. 2012a; Kariyat et al. 2013; Kariyat et al. 2012b).

4. Outlook

Here we report a new foraging behavior in honeybees, which has emerged during

the past decade, probably owing to the substantial expansion of *S. elaeagnifolium*,

resulting in an overabundance of pollen during the most adverse period of the year in the

Mediterranean in terms of floral resources. We have argued that our observation, likely

involving a complex interplay of honeybee biology and floral ecology, has important

implications both for the invasion status of silverleaf nightshade and for honeybee

biology.

The enormous invasive populations of silverleaf nightshade in Northern Greece

(and probably elsewhere) in fact represent large-scale natural experiments, which can

reveal fascinating aspects of the evolution of plant–pollinator interactions. For instance,

we know that buzz-pollination is not a dead-end, and novel floral forms (that do not even

require bees) can evolve from bee-buzz-pollinated flowers (Dellinger et al. 2019). In the

system examined here, we see the archetypical buzz-pollinated flower form (the

Solanum-type) potentially experiencing a pollinator shift with apparently no phenotypic

transition. Further investigation is needed to determine if this indeed represents a

functional transition, the extent floral phenotype has been modified, and the drivers (e.g.,

floral abundance, abiotic conditions, honeybee plasticity, etc.) of these transitions.

Beyond basic research questions, it should also be kept in mind that silverleaf

nightshade is a top-noxious weed that is adversely affecting natural, agricultural-, and

urban ecosystems across the world. Moreover, its invasive potential remains high,

especially in the context of global change: spatial models simulating climatic suitability

for this plant indicate numerous currently invadable regions in all continents, with

poleward expansions predicted in a warmer atmosphere (Kriticos et al. 2010). Given that

honeybees occur with generally high population densities in almost all continents, their

impact on the realized fitness of invasive populations of *S. elaeagnifolium*, and the

broader implications for natural communities should be explored.

Conflict of interest statement

261 The Authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Agosta, S. J., and J. A. Klemens. 2008. Ecological fitting by phenotypically flexible genotypes:
implications for species associations, community assembly and evolution. Ecology
Letters 11:1123-1134.
Albrecht, M., M. R. Ramis, and A. Traveset. 2016. Pollinator-mediated impacts of alien invasive
plants on the pollination of native plants: the role of spatial scale and distinct behaviour
among pollinator guilds. Biological Invasions 18:1801-1812.

Amala, U., and T. Shivalingaswamy. 2017. Role of native buzz pollinator bees in enhancing fruit
and seed set in tomatoes under open field conditions. Journal of Entomology and
Zoology Studies 5:1742-1744.

Banda, H., and R. Paxton. 1990, Pollination of greenhouse tomatoes by bees VI International
Symposium on Pollination 288:194-198.

Buchmann, S. L. 1983. Buzz pollination in angiosperms, Pages 73-113. New York, NY, Van
Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Buchmann, S. L., and J. H. Cane. 1989. Bees assess pollen returns while sonicating *Solanum*
flowers. Oecologia 81:289-294.

Cane, J. H., K. Mackenzie, and D. Schiffhauer. 1993. Honey bees harvest pollen from the porose
anthers of cranberries (*Vaccinium macrocarpon*) (Ericaceae). American Bee Journal
133:293-295.

Cane, J. H., and D. Schiffhauer. 2001. Pollinator genetics and pollination: do honey bee colonies
selected for pollen-hoarding field better pollinators of cranberry *Vaccinium*
macrocarpon? Ecological Entomology 26:117-123.

Cane, J. H., and D. Schiffhauer. 2003. Dose-response relationships between pollination and
fruiting refine pollinator comparisons for cranberry (*Vaccinium macrocarpon*
[Ericaceae]). American Journal of Botany 90:1425-1432.

Cardinal, S., S. L. Buchmann, and A. L. Russell. 2018. The evolution of floral sonication, a
pollen foraging behavior used by bees (Anthophila). Evolution 72:590-600.

Cooley, H., and M. Vallejo-Marín. 2021. Buzz-Pollinated Crops: A Global Review and Meta-
analysis of the Effects of Supplemental Bee Pollination in Tomato. Journal of Economic
Entomology 114:505-519.

Courcelles, D. M. M., L. Button, and E. Elle. 2013. Bee visit rates vary with floral morphology
among highbush blueberry cultivars (*Vaccinium corymbosum* L.). Journal of Applied
Entomology 137:693-701.

Cribb, D. M., D. W. Hand, and R. N. Edmondson. 1993. A comparative study of the effects of
using the honeybee as a pollinating agent of glasshouse tomato. Journal of Horticultural
Science 68:79-88.

Davis, E. S., R. Kelly, C. A. Maggs, and J. C. Stout. 2018. Contrasting impacts of highly invasive
plant species on flower-visiting insect communities. Biodiversity and Conservation
27:2069-2085.

De Luca, P. A., and M. Vallejo-Marín. 2013. What's the 'buzz' about? The ecology and
evolutionary significance of buzz-pollination. Current Opinion in Plant Biology 16:429-
435.

Delaplane, K. S., and D. F. Mayer. 2000, Crop pollination by bees, CABI publishing.

Dellinger, A. S., M. Chartier, D. Fernández-Fernández, D. S. Penneys, M. Alvear, F. Almeda, F.
A. Michelangeli et al. 2019. Beyond buzz-pollination – departures from an adaptive
plateau lead to new pollination syndromes. New Phytologist 221:1136-1149.

Dogterom, M. H., and M. L. Winston. 1999. Pollen storage and foraging by honey bees
(Hymenoptera: Apidae) in highbush blueberries (Ericaceae), cultivar Bluecrop. The
Canadian Entomologist 131:757-768.

Dos Santos, S., A. Roselino, M. Hrncir, and L. Bego. 2009. Pollination of tomatoes by the
stingless bee *Melipona quadrifasciata* and the honey bee *Apis mellifera* (Hymenoptera,
Apidae). Genet. Mol. Res 8:751-757.

Goulson, D. 2003. Effects of Introduced Bees on Native Ecosystems. Annual Review of Ecology,
Evolution, and Systematics 34:1-26.

Gross, C. L., and D. Mackay. 1998. Honeybees reduce fitness in the pioneer shrub *Melastoma*
affine (Melastomataceae). Biological Conservation 86:169-178.

Hargreaves, A. L., L. D. Harder, and S. D. Johnson. 2009. Consumptive emasculation: the
ecological and evolutionary consequences of pollen theft. Biological Reviews 84:259-
276.

Hennessy, G., C. Harris, L. Pirot, A. Lefter, D. Goulson, and F. L. W. Ratnieks. 2021. Wind slows
play: increasing wind speed reduces flower visiting rate in honey bees. Animal Behaviour
178:87-93.

Higo, H. A., N. D. Rice, M. L. Winston, and B. Lewis. 2004. Honey bee (Hymenoptera: Apidae)
distribution and potential for supplementary pollination in commercial tomato
greenhouses during winter. Journal of economic entomology 97:163-170.

Hung, K.-L. J., J. M. Kingston, M. Albrecht, D. A. Holway, and J. R. Kohn. 2018. The worldwide
importance of honey bees as pollinators in natural habitats. Proceedings of the Royal
Society B: Biological Sciences 285:20172140.

Jankauski, M., R. Ferguson, A. Russell, and S. Buchmann. 2022. Structural dynamics of real and
modelled *Solanum* stamens: implications for pollen ejection by buzzing bees. Journal of
The Royal Society Interface 19:20220040.

Janzen, D. H. 1985. On Ecological Fitting. Oikos 45:308-310.

Kantsa, A., C. M. De Moraes, and M. C. Mescher. 2023a. Global change and plant–pollinator
communities in Mediterranean biomes. Global Ecology and Biogeography 32:1893-
1913.

Kantsa, A., J. E. Garcia, R. A. Raguso, A. G. Dyer, R. Steen, T. Tscheulin, and T. Petanidou.
2023b. Intrafloral patterns of color and scent in *Capparis spinosa* L. and the ghosts of its
selection past. American Journal of Botany 110:e16098.

Kariyat, R. R., C. M. De Moraes, A. G. Stephenson, and M. C. Mescher. 2012a. Inbreeding
increases susceptibility to powdery mildew (*Oidium neolycopersici*) infestation in
horsenettle (*Solanum carolinense* L.). Plant Signaling & Behavior 7:803-806.

Kariyat, R. R., K. E. Mauck, C. M. Balogh, A. G. Stephenson, M. C. Mescher, and C. M. De
Moraes. 2013. Inbreeding in horsenettle (*Solanum carolinense*) alters night-time volatile
emissions that guide oviposition by *Manduca sexta* moths. Proc Biol Sci 280:20130020.

Kariyat, R. R., K. E. Mauck, C. M. De Moraes, A. G. Stephenson, and M. C. Mescher. 2012b.
Inbreeding alters volatile signalling phenotypes and influences tri-trophic interactions in
horsenettle (*Solanum carolinense* L.). Ecology Letters 15:301-309.

Kendall, L. K., J. R. Stavert, V. Gagic, M. Hall, and R. Rader. 2022. Initial floral visitor identity
and foraging time strongly influence blueberry reproductive success. Basic and Applied
Ecology 60:114-122.

King, M. J., and S. L. Buchmann. 2003. Floral Sonication by Bees: Mesosomal Vibration by
Bombus and *Xylocopa*, but Not *Apis* (Hymenoptera: Apidae), Ejects Pollen from
Poricidal Anthers. Journal of the Kansas Entomological Society 76:295-305.

Krigas, N., and S. Kokkini. 2004. A Survey of the Alien Vascular Flora of the Urban and
Suburban Area of Thessaloniki, N Greece. Willdenowia 34:81-99.

Krigas, N., M. A. Tsiafouli, G. Katsoulis, N.-E. Votsi, and M. van Kleunen. 2021. Investigating
the Invasion Pattern of the Alien Plant *Solanum elaeagnifolium* Cav. (Silverleaf
Nightshade): Environmental and Human-Induced Drivers. Plants 805.

Kriticos, D. J., N. D. Crossman, N. Ota, and J. K. Scott. 2010, Climate change and invasive
plants in South Australia. Report for the South Australian Department of Water, Land and
Biodiversity Conservation. Canberra, CSIRO Climate Adaptation Flagship.

Lázaro, A., A. Müller, A. W. Ebmer, H. H. Dathe, E. Scheuchl, M. Schwarz, S. Risch et al. 2021.
Impacts of beekeeping on wild bee diversity and pollination networks in the Aegean
Archipelago. Ecography 44:1353-1365.

Linsley, E. G. 1978. Temporal Patterns of Flower Visitation by Solitary Bees, with Particular
Reference to the Southwestern United States. Journal of the Kansas Entomological
Society 51:531-546.

MacKenzie, K., E. 1994. The foraging behaviour of honey bees (*Apis mellifera* L) and bumble
bees (*Bombus* spp) on cranberry (*Vaccinium macrocarpon* Ait). Apidologie 25:375-383.

Mesquita-Neto, J. N., N. Blüthgen, and C. Schlindwein. 2018. Flowers with poricidal anthers and
their complex interaction networks—Disentangling legitimate pollinators and illegitimate
visitors. Functional Ecology 32:2321-2332.

Michener, C. D. 1962. An Interesting Method of Pollen Collecting by Bees from Flowers with
Tubular Anthers. Revista de Biología Tropical 10:167–175.

Miyamoto, M., M. Ono, M. Sasaki, H. Abe, and I. Kenmochi. 2006. Development of Fruiting
Promotion System Using Honeybees in Semi-forced Eggplant Culture I. Effectiveness of
Pollination by the European Honeybee. Japanese Journal of Applied Entomology and
Zoology 50:297-304.

Neiswander, R. 1956. Pollination of greenhouse tomatoes by honey bees. Journal of Economic
Entomology 49:436-437.

Petanidou, T., R. C. Godfree, D. S. Song, A. Kantsa, Y. L. Dupont, and N. M. Waser. 2012. Self-
compatibility and plant invasiveness: Comparing species in native and invasive ranges.
Perspectives in Plant Ecology Evolution and Systematics 14:3-12.

Petanidou, T., M. V. Price, J. L. Bronstein, A. Kantsa, T. Tscheulin, R. Kariyat, N. Krigas et al.
2018. Pollination and reproduction of an invasive plant inside and outside its ancestral
range. Acta Oecologica 89:11-20.

Pritchard, D. J., and M. Vallejo-Marín. 2020. Buzz pollination. Curr Biol 30:R858-R860.

Ribeiro, M. F., E. M. S. Silva, L. H. P. Kiill, K. M. M. Siqueira, M. P. Silva, and M. S. Coelho.
2017. Foraging of Honeybees (*Apis mellifera*) on Flowers of Yellow Melon (*Cucumis
melo*): Duration of Visits. Journal of Agricultural Science 9.

Rijo, G., D. Alameda, and A. Barro. 2022. Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*) specialized
pollination is isolated from neighboring plants and pollinators. Journal of Pollination
Ecology 31:29-38.

Roberts, J., and S. Florentine. 2022. Biology, distribution and management of the globally
invasive weed *Solanum elaeagnifolium* Cav (silverleaf nightshade): A global review of
current and future management challenges. Weed Research 62:393-403.

Rocha, F. H., D. N. Peraza, S. Medina, and J. J. G. Quezada-Euán. 2023. Pollination service
provided by honey bees to buzz-pollinated crops in the Neotropics. PLOS ONE
18:e0280875.

Rueppell, O. 2014. The architecture of the pollen hoarding syndrome in honey bees: implications
for understanding social evolution, behavioral syndromes, and selective breeding.
Apidologie 45:364-374.

Sabara, H. A., and M. L. Winston. 2003. Managing honey bees (Hymenoptera: Apidae) for
greenhouse tomato pollination. Journal of economic entomology 96:547-554.

Sanford, J. C., and R. E. Hanneman. 1981. The use of bees for the purpose of inter-mating in
potato. American Potato Journal 58:481-485.

Sõber, V., M. Moora, and T. Teder. 2010. Florivores decrease pollinator visitation in a self-
incompatible plant. Basic and Applied Ecology 11:669-675.

Solís-Montero, L., C. H. Vergara, and M. Vallejo-Marín. 2015. High incidence of pollen theft in
natural populations of a buzz-pollinated plant. Arthropod-Plant Interactions 9:599-611.

Spomer, G. G. 1973. The Concepts of 'Interaction' and 'Operational Environment' in
Environmental Analyses. Ecology 54:200-204.

Tayal, M., and R. Kariyat. 2021. Examining the Role of Buzzing Time and Acoustics on Pollen
Extraction of *Solanum elaeagnifolium*. Plants 10:2592.

Tebbich, S., M. Taborsky, B. Fessl, and D. Blomqvist. 2001. Do woodpecker finches acquire tool-
use by social learning? Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological
Sciences 268:2189-2193.

Tscheulin, T., and T. Petanidou. 2013. The presence of the invasive plant *Solanum elaeagnifolium*
deters honeybees and increases pollen limitation in the native co-flowering species
Glaucium flavum. Biological Invasions 15:385-393.

Tscheulin, T., T. Petanidou, S. G. Potts, and J. Settele. 2009. The impact of *Solanum*
elaeagnifolium, an invasive plant in the Mediterranean, on the flower visitation and seed
set of the native co-flowering species *Glaucium flavum*. Plant Ecology 205:77-85.

Uludag, A., G. Gbehounou, J. Kashefi, M. Bouhache, M.-C. Bon, C. Bell, and A. L. Lagopodi.
2016. Review of the current situation for *Solanum elaeagnifolium* in the Mediterranean
Basin. EPPO Bulletin 46:139-147.

Vega-Polanco, M., L. A. Rodríguez-Islas, R. Y. Escalona-Domenech, L. Cruz-López, J. C. Rojas,
and L. Solís-Montero. 2020. Does florivory affect the attraction of floral visitors to buzz-
pollinated *Solanum rostratum*? Arthropod-Plant Interactions 14:41-56.

Wille, A. 1963. Behavioral adaptations of bees for pollen collecting from *Cassia* flowers. Revista
de Biología Tropical 11:205–210.

Zhang, H., S. Shan, S. Gu, X. Huang, Z. Li, A. Khashaveh, and Y. Zhang. 2020. Prior Experience
with Food Reward Influences the Behavioral Responses of the Honeybee *Apis mellifera*
and the Bumblebee *Bombus lantschouensis* to Tomato Floral Scent. Insects 11.

Figure captions

Figure 1. Invasive population stands in an agricultural (up) and an urban residential area (down) in the Metropolitan area of Thessaloniki, N Greece (photos: photos: R.R. Kariyat, G. Nakas).

Figure 2. (a-b) Honeybees foraging for pollen on *Solanum elaeagnifolium*; their corbiculae (pollen baskets) are replete with the pollen of the plant (photos: R.R. Kariyat). (c-d) SEM images showing the pollen grains, and how these accumulate among the bristles on the body of the bee (imaging was performed at the Scientific Center for Optical and Electron Microscopy of ETH Zurich).

447   Figures

448   Figure 1

451   Figure 2

Electronic Supplementary Material

Video S1. A honeybee worker attempting to extract pollen from the flowers of silverleaf nightshade by biting the anthers. Videographer: G. Nakas. (https://polybox.ethz.ch/index.php/s/YHb7WMsZNAoJCwY)

Video S2. A honeybee worker attempting to extract pollen from the flowers of silverleaf nightshade by holding the anthers with their forelegs and inserting their proboscis through the pores of the anthers ("milking" behavior). Videographer: G. Nakas. (https://polybox.ethz.ch/index.php/s/YHb7WMsZNAoJCwY)

Video S3. A honeybee worker attempting to extract pollen from the flowers of silverleaf nightshade by shaking the anthers. Videographer: G. Nakas. (https://polybox.ethz.ch/index.php/s/YHb7WMsZNAoJCwY)