Regulation of *Jacobaea vulgaris* by varied cutting and restoration measures

Regulation of *Jacobaea vulgaris*

Henrike Möhler^{*1}, Tim Diekötter¹, Tobias W. Donath¹

¹Department of Landscape Ecology, Institute for Natural Resource Conservation, Kiel University, Kiel, Germany

* corresponding author

E-Mail: hmoehler@ecology.uni-kiel.de

Abstract

The growth of the noxious grassland weed *Jacobaea vulgaris* Gaertn. in pastures is a threat to grazing animals. This is especially true when it dominates vegetation cover, which often occurs on non-intensively used pastures that are managed with the nature-conservation goal to maintain and promote biodiversity. Thus, we wanted to find management techniques to reduce *J. vulgaris* without harming the floral biodiversity on the pastures.

We tested six different mechanical and cultural methods to reduce the presence and spread of *J. vulgaris*. Seven study sites in Northern Germany (Schleswig-Holstein) were treated with various measurements, including: milling and seeding, hay transfer, mowing regimes at different times and frequencies, and combinations of mowing and seeding.

Our results show that cutting within the bloom of the plant at the end of June and again four weeks later, when the plant is in its second bloom was the most effective treatment in reducing *J. vulgaris* abundance. This was the only treatment leading to a significant reduction in population growth rate and density without reducing surrounding plant species richness.

The study reveals that management of *J. vulgaris* in non-intensively used pastures is possible, while preserving species-rich grasslands.

Keywords

grassland restoration, grassland management, weed control, population dynamics, biodiversity conservation, pasture, *Senecio jacobaea*, ragwort

Introduction

Jacobaea vulgaris is a widespread noxious grassland weed native to Eurasia, and invasive in North America, New Zealand, and Australia (1). As the plant's pyrrolizidine alkaloids pose a health risk to cattle when consumed (2), the control of *J. vulgaris* is a primary management goal of many farmers and in some countries even prescribed in their legislation (3). In intensive

grasslands, high fertilizer input, high cutting frequency, and chemical weed management precludes the occurrence of *J. vulgaris*. It's control is challenging, though, in low input grasslands that are managed for high plant and animal diversity, yet prone to massive *J. vulgaris* spread (4). Taking this into account, we tested management strategies that aim at controlling *J. vulgaris* without jeopardizing wild plant diversity.

Several studies have aimed to find ways to manage *J. vulgaris* (3, 6–8). Some of these focused on chemical control measures (3), intensified fertilization (4, 9) or the introduction of antagonists to reduce *J. vulgaris* density (10). While these measures can be very effective, their negative side-effects precludes their widespread application, especially in non-intensively managed species-rich grasslands (4, 11) or are more promising in the weed's non-native range (6). Studies on alternative *J. vulgaris* management measures that are compatible with nature conservation goals, are scarce (12).

Therefore, we tested the effects of cutting regimes at different phenological stages of *J. vulgaris* and restoration measures to increase plant species diversity as well as a combination of both on the development of *J. vulgaris* populations.

Studies of the effectiveness of cutting on *J. vulgaris* populations in grasslands are scarce (12) and so far ambiguous in their findings. While 13 (2008) showed that frequent cutting decreases *J. vulgaris* abundance and fertility, other studies find that the species can re-grow within a few weeks after being damaged or may switch to vegetative reproduction forming multiple rosettes (2, 14). Thus, slashing or mowing per se may not be sufficient for weed control (15).

In order to increase the effectiveness of cutting in suppressing *J. vulgaris*, the frequency and timing of cutting is essential because the proportion of nutrients and energy invested in different plant parts varies among life-stages (16, 17). As *J. vulgaris* grows back quickly after cutting (14), a second cut may be necessary before the second bloom. While this cutting regime may prevent generative reproduction, it may induce vegetative reproduction, clonal growth or a

switch to a perennial life cycle (1). Since *J. vulgaris* usually dies off after seed production (18), cutting before seed dispersal may be another option that may not only prevent vegetative re-growth but also seed dispersal.

In addition to an adapted cutting regime, sowing other species can suppress weeds (19). According to the biotic resistance hypotheses (20), increased plant diversity may also increase plant community resistance against future invasion (21). Several studies showed that the invasion of problematic plant species can be prevented through increasing plant species diversity (e.g. 22, 23).

If species enrichment proves an effective measure in weed control, it could be combined with the re-establishment of species-rich grassland communities, which have declined dramatically (24). Various techniques of species enrichment are commonly applied in restoration (25). While seeding seed mixtures is frequently applied for the re-creation of grasslands (25), transferring freshly cut, seed-containing biomass from species-rich grasslands (green hay) is another effective method to restore grasslands (26). When green hay is transferred, disturbance to an existing sward has been shown to enhance seedling establishment (27). Under high seed pressure from *J. vulgaris*, however, sward disturbance will also enhance the weed's establishment (9); thus, slot drilling and broadcast sowing without sward disturbance may be promising techniques (28) to combine with the adapted cutting regimes to reduce establishment and growth of *J. vulgaris*. Therefore, we also applied a combination of cutting regimes and species-enrichment measures, where the cutting regime is thought to weaken *J. vulgaris* individuals and the increased plant diversity reduces new establishment.

Contrary to deliberate action against *J. vulgaris*, there is indication that waiting for its natural disappearance might be another promising management approach (14, 29, 30). 1 (1957), have observed a hump-shaped population development of *J. vulgaris*, with a population boom followed by sudden decline. In addition, Bezemer et al. (2006a) reported a natural decrease in

J. vulgaris. Nonetheless, management to reduce *J. vulgaris* is essential to avoid threat to domestic animals.

The objective of our study was to find the optimal treatment, timing, and frequency for grassland management on non-intensive pastures that leads to a maximal weed reduction and a minimal loss of co-occurring vegetation. We studied six different management options for five years.

We addressed the following research questions:

1. Which treatment is most effective in reducing the abundance and population growth rate of *J. vulgaris*?
2. What are the effects of the different treatments on the co-occurring grassland vegetation?

Material and Methods

Study species

Jacobaea vulgaris (Asteraceae; syn. *Senecio jacobaea* L.) is native to Eurasia, but invasive in many other countries (1). Despite being regarded as a character species of mesophilic pastures (31) in its native range, its poisonousness leads to its rating as a noxious pasture weed worldwide (3). Its occurrence is common in open disturbed sites, such as ruderal sites, fallow land, and temperate non-intensively managed grasslands (1, 2).

J. vulgaris is a mostly monocarpic perennial herb (Fig. 2). After seed germination in late summer or autumn, the rosette overwinters and flowers the next year, with a flowering peak at the end of July. Flowering can be delayed if site conditions are not optimal or if first flowers are damaged by herbivory or cutting (14).

J. vulgaris has several biological traits supporting its spread and hampering its regulation. It produces thousands of wind-dispersed seeds and grows quickly at suitable sites, making it a typical pioneer species of ruderal or disturbed sites (1). Seeds show a high germination rate

(about 80 %) and are long-term persistent (32). The plant tolerates disturbance during different life stages, e.g. an early cut of the inflorescence does not preclude post-ripening of vital seeds (33) and disturbance or injury to the vegetation bud promotes regrowth through roots and crown buds (3).

Study sites

In 2015, we began management experiments on seven pastures with presence of *J. vulgaris*. Sites were situated in two geographical regions (Moraine, Hill land) in Northern Germany (see Fig. 1, Table S1, Supporting Information) on sandy soils (34).

Fig. 1 – Study area in Schleswig-Holstein, Northern Germany.

At least 5 out of 7 sites were formerly used as arable land. The current nature-conservation grazing scheme applied by the managing nature conservation organization aims at maintaining and promoting biodiversity (35). At all sites, *J. vulgaris* abundance was very high with on average 60 ± 5 *J. vulgaris* plants per square meter (excluding seedlings) at the experiments start.

Study design

Six different grassland management schemes, two measures of mowing and species enrichment, two cutting treatments, and two combinations of seeding (as a measure of species-enrichment) and cutting, against a control with no measures applied (Table 1), were assessed in a randomized block design. On each of the seven study sites, each of the six treatments was applied within an area of 90 m² (block). All study sites were under non-intensive grazing during the study. To minimize edge effects, *J. vulgaris* and the co-occurring vegetation were assessed within three permanently marked nine m² plots in the central part of each block.

Table 1 Treatments

Name	Description
Biodiversity 1	Milling and broadcast-seeding in 2015, then left untouched in following years

Biodiversity 2	Milling and green hay (26) spread over the ground in 2015, then left untouched in following years
Flower cut	Flowers cut before each bloom (end of June and beginning of August) in every year (2015-2019)
Seed cut	Flowers cut before seeds disperse (mid/end of July) in every year (2015-2019)
Combination 1	Mowing and drill-seeding in 2015, then left untouched in following years
Combination 2	Mowing and broadcast-seeding in first two years (2015-2016), mowing for whole study period (2015-2019 mid/end of July)
Control	No treatment, still grazed as all other treatments

137

138 In both *biodiversity* treatments, the plots were milled to a depth of 30 cm prior to seed addition
139 in autumn 2015. For the *biodiversity 1* treatment, 5 g/m² of the “fertile meadow mixture”
140 (Rieger-Hoffmann seed supplier) containing 20 species (30 % forbs 70 % grasses) commonly
141 found and collected in northeast Germany (see Table S2, Supporting Information) were sown
142 and rolled. For the *biodiversity 2* treatment, freshly cut plant material was transferred from
143 species-rich donor-sites nearby. Thereafter, cattle were fenced out of the seed-enriched area
144 some weeks to allow seedling establishment. For the *combination* treatments, 1.5 g/m² of the
145 seed mixture mentioned above (see Table S2, Supporting Information) was sown by slit drill
146 (*combination 1*) or by hand in two subsequent years (2015, 2016; *combination 2*) after mowing
147 the standing vegetation. Sowing took place in September and October 2015 and in October
148 2016 for *combination 2*. At the second sowing date the *combination 2* received some additional
149 seeds of other characteristic grassland species. Cuttings remained on the plots. Mowing took
150 place between June and August every year from 2015 to 2019. The *flower cut* treatment was
151 cut in late June and before the second blooming peaked. The *seed cut* treatment was cut before
152 seed dispersal in mid to late July. Cutting of the *combination 2* treatment in late July was
153 continued annually until the end of the experiment in July 2019.

Data sampling

Within the central one square meter of the permanently marked plots, the position of each *J. vulgaris* individual were recorded every year between 2015 and 2019. Recorded *J. vulgaris* individuals were assigned to one of three life stages: (i) seedling (S), (ii) rosettes (with one single rosette (SR) or multiple rosettes (MR)), and (iii) generative plants (G) with flower stalks. Altogether, 40 466 individuals for one or more transitions were monitored, summing up to 100 199 observations.

The initial species composition of the vegetation was recorded from June to August 2015. In subsequent years, vegetation assessment according to the Braun-Blanquet scale (36) took place between May and August. Red List status of recorded species was noted (37). Target species were defined as character species for species-rich grasslands in Northern Germany according to 38 (2019).

Transition matrix model and population dynamics

Based on the frequency distribution of recorded life stages, a 4x4-transition matrix (based on S, SR, MR, and G) was constructed for each study site, treatment, and year (Fig 2). Each matrix element (a_{ij}) was calculated from the number of individuals in stage j in year t that passed to stage i in year $t + 1$, divided by the column total of stage j (39). Fecundity was determined by dividing the number of generative plants (G) in year t by the number of seedlings (S) in the following year $t + 1$ (40).

Stage at time t					
Stage		S	SR	MR	G
at time	S	0	0	0	F_{14}
$t + 1$	SR	G_{21}	S_{22}	R_{23}	R_{24}
	MR	G_{31}	G_{32}	S_{33}	R_{34}

	G	0	G_{42}	G_{43}	S_{44}
--	----------	---	----------	----------	----------

Fig. 2 – Life cycle graph for *J. vulgaris* and the corresponding transition matrix. Boxes indicate life stages, arrows represent the possible transitions between them, and letters show the connection between each transition and its matrix entry (F, fecundity; G, growth; S, stasis).

The population growth rate was calculated by pooling all plants of the single life stages for all study sites for each treatment and year. A 95 % confidence interval was established by bootstrapping the data (5 000 iterations) for each treatment and year (39) in R (41). For fertility values, we used mean fertilities per treatment and year.

Life-table response experiments (LTREs) were conducted using matrices based on vital rates to analyze the contribution of different vital rates to the difference in the population growth rate ($\Delta\lambda$) between each treatment and the control (39). Each matrix element is a product of the lower-level vital rates: survival (σ_j), stasis ($\gamma_{i=j}$), growth ($\gamma_{i>j}$), retrogression ($\gamma_{i<j}$), and reproduction (Φ_{ij}) (42). All analyses were performed with the program POPTOOLS version 3.2 (43).

Statistical Analysis

Population growth was analyzed using mixed effect models (44, 45). The first model included a pseudo factor as a fixed factor. This pseudo factor consisted of the actual factors *treatment* and *year*. This was necessary because the actual factors *treatment* and *year* are not orthogonal for population growth. The second model included the fixed factors *treatment* and *year* without an interaction effect. The two models were compared to test for significance of the interactive effect. As the interactive effect was not significant, the second model with *study site* as an additional random factor was used for further analyses. Residuals were visually checked for normality and heteroscedasticity. Based on this model, a Pseudo R^2 was calculated (46) and an analysis of variances (ANOVA) conducted, followed by multiple contrast tests (e.g., see 47) in

order to compare the influence of factors levels of *treatment* and *year*, respectively. To test if treatments differed from the control, we used a Dunnett test.

Numbers of plants and their life stages in response to *year* were studied using analysis of variances (ANOVA) for each treatment. For each study site, average numbers of plants per square-meter from the three plots per block were used. To identify differences between the treatments, years, and life stages, Tukey's HSD (honestly significant difference) post hoc test was applied.

To examine species diversity, we calculated species richness and evenness (48). To investigate whether species composition fluctuated more strongly in the treatments compared to the control plots, the temporal species turnover rate for each population and treatment was calculated as $(NR + D)/(n_t + n_{t+1})$ (49). NR denotes the number of species per plot that were newly recorded in year $t + 1$ but did not occur on the plot in year t . D is the number of species that disappeared during the transition from year t to year $t + 1$. n_t and n_{t+1} denote the species numbers in year t and $t + 1$, respectively.

All statistical analyses were calculated using the statistical software R (41).

Results

Population dynamics of *J. vulgaris*

Abundance and life stages

The abundance of *J. vulgaris* individuals did not differ significantly between treatments; however, a trend was identified (ANOVA $F_{6, 204} = 1.955$ $P = 0.073$). Year had a significant effect on *J. vulgaris* abundance ($F_{4, 204} = 6.6478$, $P < 0.0001$).

The seven treatments led to three distinct response patterns (Fig. 3). Both *biodiversity* treatments showed an initial decline in *J. vulgaris* abundance but a rebound after the fourth year. The *combination* treatments, the *seed cut* treatment, and the control showed an oscillating pattern with falling and rising *J. vulgaris* abundance every other year. Under all treatments, *J. vulgaris* abundance was on average lower in the fourth year of the study compared to the first

year. Similarly, the abundance of rosettes and flowering plants was slightly lower at the end of the study in 2019 compared to its start in 2015 under all treatments (52 ± 8 in 2019 vs. 60 ± 5 in 2015). Only the *flower cut* treatment led to a continuous decrease in *J. vulgaris* abundance, while statistically this was only a trend ($F_{4,30} = 2.558$, $P = 0.059$).

Fig. 3 Abundance of *J. vulgaris* plants per one squaremeter according to treatment and year. In the box plots, middle lines represent the median, boxes represent the first and third quartiles, lower and upper bars represent the minimum and the maximum, and points represent outliers (i.e. points above 1.5 SD). There were no significant differences between treatments (TukeyHSD, $P \leq 0.05$).

Fluctuations in *J. vulgaris* abundance in non-milled sites between years were mainly driven by differences in the numbers of vegetative plants, while the number of flowering plants showed an almost continuous decrease during the study period (see Fig. 4; ANOVA $F_{4,65} = 10.46$, $P < 0.0001$). This decrease was significant within *biodiversity* treatments, *seed cut*, and *combination I* treatments.

Fig. 4 Abundance of flowering *J. vulgaris* plants per one squaremeter according to treatment and year. In the box plots, middle lines represent the median, boxes represent the first and third quartiles, lower and upper bars represent the minimum and the maximum, and points represent outliers (i.e. points above 1.5 SD). Different letters indicate significant differences between the years within the treatments (TukeyHSD, $P \leq 0.05$).

Population growth and Life-Table-Response-Experiments

Population growth rates did not differ significantly between treatments ($F_{6,153} = 1.541$, $P = 0.168$). For the *flower cut* treatment, the population growth rate was significantly below one throughout the study period, indicating a constant decline in population size (Fig. 5). All other treatments did not lead to a constant decline in population sizes but showed considerable variation between years. Interestingly, years with relatively high population growth rates were followed by years with lower population growth rates, which led to a significant year effect on λ (ANOVA $F_{3, 158} = 15.35064$, $P < 0.0001$). The substantial population growth setback in 2018 (year 17-18) was prominent.

ANOVA of our mixed model including *treatment* and *year* as main factors and *study site* as a random factor revealed that *year* rather than *treatment*, mainly influenced the survival and population growth rates of *J. vulgaris*. In the dry year of 2018, density and abundance decreased but increased even more in the subsequent moist year 2019. Consequently, there was a positive linear relationship between the amount of rainfall and the abundance of seedlings found in the study plots (regression $y = -55.5360 + 1.0612 \cdot N$, $F_1 = 17.57$, $P < 0.0001$).

Fig. 5 Population growth rates for treatments according to years. Shown are the means $\pm$ 95 % CI. Treatments did not differ significantly. Constant population is marked with the line $\lambda = 1$.

The LTRE analysis showed that differences in the population growth rate ($\Delta\lambda$) between each treatment and the control were mainly the result of differences in generative reproduction and survival (Fig. 6). The analysis also demonstrates that the influence of vital rates on population growth in the *flower cut* treatment is very different from all other treatments. Here stasis and

273 retrogression have a considerable impact on positive population growth, as these vital rates are
274 much higher than in the control.

275

276

277 **Fig. 6.** Contribution of vital rates to the difference in population growth rate ($\Delta\lambda$) between the control and other treatments (bio I, *biodiversity 1*; bio
278 II, *biodiversity 2*; cutflower, *flower cut* treatment; combi I, *combination* treatment 1; combi II, *combination 2*; cutseed, *seed cut* treatment) in the
279 pooled *J. vulgaris* population, as determined by LTRE (life-table response experiment) analysis. Bar sections above zero display the summed positive
280 contributions and bar sections below zero the summed negative contributions.

The elasticity analysis revealed that three main transitions are crucial for population growth: i) the transition from seedling to single rosette (G_{21}), ii) from single rosette to flowering plant (G_{24}), and iii) from flowering plant to seedling (F_{14}). The importance of these transitions did not differ between treatment or year. All transitions contributed equally to population growth.

Changes in vegetation composition

The overall mean number of vascular plants per one square meter was 23 ± 1 in 2015 and 29 ± 1 in 2019. Species richness differed between treatments (ANOVA $F_{6,210} = 3.204$, $P < 0.005$). The seed addition in *biodiversity* and *combination* treatments led to species enrichment. About five more plant species were found on plots with seed addition (*biodiversity* and *combination*) compared to control plots. In the last year of the experiment only species richness in the *combination* treatments was significantly higher than in the control treatment. All management measures but the control enhanced species richness (Fig. 7).

Fig. 7 Species richness according to year and treatment. For explanation of the boxplot, refer to Figure 3. Different letters indicate significant differences ($P \leq 0.05$; Tukey HSD) between years within one treatment. Dashed lines indicate mean species richness in 2015 (lower line) and 2019 (upper line).

Richness patterns varied over the study period (Fig. 7) and were significantly different between treatments and years (ANOVA treatment $F_{6,168} = 3.893$, $P < 0.005$; year $F_{3,168} = 3.813$, $P < 0.05$). While in the first and second years after seed addition, the *biodiversity* treatments resulted in the highest species richness, in 2018 and 2019 the *combination* treatments were the most species rich. During all study years, the control treatment resulted in the lowest species richness, also only significantly different from the *biodiversity* treatments. Both cutting regimes had slightly but not significantly higher species richness compared to the control. Throughout the

study period, species evenness was highest under treatments that included mowing (*flower* and *seed cut, combination 2*).

The number of red-listed plant species differed significantly between treatments (ANOVA $F_{6, 189} = 31.08$, $P < 0.0001$). Most endangered plants occurred in the *biodiversity 1* treatment (mean: three endangered species per one square meter vs. zero or one species in the control). Plants categorized as characteristic grassland species were most numerous in the *biodiversity 1* treatment, followed by hay transfer (*biodiversity 2*) and *combination* treatments with mowing and sowing (Fig. 8). *Biodiversity* treatments and the *combination 2* treatment led to significantly higher numbers of endangered plants than in the control.

Fig. 8 Percentage of value species per year and treatment. For explanation of the boxplot, refer to Figure 3. Different letters indicate significant differences ($P \leq 0.05$; Tukey HSD) between years within one treatment.

Turnover rates of the vegetation differed significantly between treatments (ANOVA $F_{6, 140} = 16.74$, $P < 0.0001$) and were significantly highest under treatments with mowing in combination with seeding or plant material transfer, i.e. *biodiversity 1* and 2, followed by *combination 2*, which combined to sowing impulses and mowing (Fig. S3, Supporting Information). Turnover rates of pure cutting treatments, *combination 1*, and the control were significantly lower and did not differ from each other. The percentage of target species contributing to the turnover rate was highest for *biodiversity 1* (37 ± 0.02 %) and *combination 2* (35 ± 0.03 %) and lower for *combination 1* (29 ± 0.02 %) even though these differences were not significant.

Discussion

Effects of regulation measures on *J. vulgaris*

The *biodiversity* treatments led to a drastic decrease in *J. vulgaris* abundance in the first two to three years (Fig. 3). The decrease was especially pronounced, significant, and lasting in the *biodiversity 1* treatment for the flowering stage (Fig. 4). Although the general abundance decline in the *biodiversity* treatments after the first years was not significant, the results concur with previous findings that *J. vulgaris* densities decline as a result of sowing grassland species into the sward after soil disturbance (50, 51).

Declines in *J. vulgaris* abundance following milling, seem counterintuitive since establishment of *J. vulgaris* is favored by soil disturbance (9). Consequently, soil disturbance was combined with sowing grassland species. Lawson et al. (2004) revealed a reduction in *J. vulgaris* densities in the first year after ploughing and sowing grassland species. Similarly, 50 (2006) reported reduced *J. vulgaris* abundance on those plots that were sown with grassland species compared to control plots without seed addition over a period of eight years.

According to the biotic resistance theory (Levine et al. 2004), invasibility in species-rich systems should be lower than in species poor ones. While this might be true in the long run, at shorter temporal scales, species-rich plant communities may also be invaded if open soil patches remain that favor the establishment of light-demanding pioneers such as *J. vulgaris* (14). Thus, we cannot confirm the results of Bezemer et al. (2006) and Lawson et al. (2004) that *J. vulgaris* density declines after ploughing and sowing as we did not find lower *J. vulgaris* numbers in sown plots compared to untreated plots in the four years after milling and sowing took place. We assume that this is due to differences in the initial setting of the study by Bezemer et al. (2006) and our study. While in our study, grazed grassland was the control baseline, i.e. cattle caused continuous small-scale disturbances throughout the study, Bezemer et al. (2006) began with an un-vegetated control, which was mown once a year. Repopulation of the early successional *J. vulgaris* might not have been prevented as around 33% higher bare ground cover

compared to control plots (Fig. S4, Supporting Information) offered enough establishment opportunities for the weed.

The LTRE analysis showed that the population growth on milled sites was due to an increased generative reproduction (Fig. 5). The increase in *J. vulgaris* might also have occurred due to changes in soil biota after milling. While soil biota are thought to suppress *J. vulgaris* growth over time (50, 52), soil disturbance might set soil biota back to an earlier developmental state, where negative effects on *J. vulgaris* are less pronounced. 53 (2006) reported increased growth of invaders in tilled soil due to changes in the soil community, which supports this assumption.

Besides milling, mowing is a commonly used tool to control noxious weeds (19). It can prevent seed production, reduce carbohydrate reserves, and give advantages to desirable perennial grasses. Our results show that the success of mowing depends on timing and frequency. While mowing once before seed dispersal failed to reduce the population growth rate or abundance of *J. vulgaris*, mowing twice shortly before the bloom resulted in a growth rate significantly and constantly below one and constantly decreased *J. vulgaris* abundance. This concurs with the finding that the optimal time for mowing noxious weeds is the flowering stage before seed development (19). This too is true for *J. vulgaris*, as the highest proportion of nutrients and energy is channeled into aboveground organs during bloom (Otzen 1977).

According to the pattern of population growth in the *flower cut* treatment, the LTRE analysis showed that the lower population growth rate in *flower cut* compared to the *control* treatment was mainly caused by the suppression of generative reproduction, the most important means of mass colonization for pioneer plants (1).

Additionally, repeated mowing leads to a denser sward and thus less open soil patches, which prevents emergence of *J. vulgaris* seedlings. Furthermore, we found that continuous mowing twice a year for more than two years is needed to drive down *J. vulgaris* abundance. Otherwise,

high numbers of plants either remaining in their life stage or becoming rosettes so that prolific blooming will only be postponed.

In accordance with our results, 13 (2008) found that cutting *J. vulgaris* early and at least two times significantly weakens the plant. The LTRE analysis showed that impeding the fertility transition, i.e. the production of seeds, was the decisive property of the *flower cut* treatment causing *J. vulgaris* to decline, particularly in 2017, two years after the treatment began. The need to mow repeatedly over several years for successful weed control is also mirrored in the estimated survival rates in the *flower cut* treatment.

The LTRE-analysis showed that survival of *J. vulgaris* plants in the *flower cut* treatment in 2016/17 was higher than in the control. This is in accordance with findings of 54 (1989), who found that plants defoliated by the butterfly *Tyria jacobaeae* die less than those setting seeds probably due to higher resource investments involved in seed production than in regrowth. Cumulative effects of constant mowing regimes were also found by 55 (2014). Increased retrogression and stasis of plants that are ready to bloom in the next year reflects this mechanism in our LTRE analysis.

Finding the optimal cutting date after which *J. vulgaris* will not bloom again and produce vital seeds is difficult. Contrary to the effects of repeated cutting (*flower cut*), cutting once before seeds disperse did not influence population dynamics or *J. vulgaris* abundance. Even though more flowering plants completed their lifecycle and died, new seedlings from post-ripened seeds compensated this mortality. In *J. vulgaris*, the first germinable seeds occur with the first withered capitula (33). Eisele suggest cutting *J. vulgaris*, when 10 % of the capitula begin to flower within half of the generative plants. However, under field conditions where the phenology of *J. vulgaris* is not synchronous, this stage is rather difficult to assess and is close to the emergence of the first germinable seeds. If cut too early however, enough resources remain for vegetative reproduction (56).

Rosettes and seedlings constituted the largest proportion of *J. vulgaris* plants, which is in accordance with 13 (2008), who also found that 50% of *J. vulgaris* populations are made up of rosettes. Yet, *J. vulgaris* population structure and growth rates were highly variable across years, such that year had a stronger effect on population growth than management. We observed an oscillating pattern with falling and rising *J. vulgaris* abundance every other year in *seed cut*, *combination*, and *control* treatments (Fig. 3). Extreme weather conditions, such as exceptionally hot or dry summers, affect population growth through immediate effects on vital rates (57, 58). The low rainfall in 2018 caused a decline in the population growth rate from 2017 to 2018 and a density decrease at all sites under all treatments. In accordance with our general observation of increased seedling numbers when rainfall was higher, we found that the population growth rate from 2018 to 2019 increased again after increased precipitation in 2019 (Fig. 5). *J. vulgaris* populations probably profited from more light on the ground from 2018 to 2019 because the sward was less dense after the drought of 2018. 54 (1989) found that plant recruitment was microsite limited and depended very much on weather and activity of rabbits, boars, and moles, i.e. enough light and water for germination (14). In our experiment, trampling and grazing from cattle can create windows of opportunity for *J. vulgaris* establishment (59). Our analysis showed that all transitions from seedling to rosette, from rosette to flowering plant, and from flowering plant to seedling contribute equally to population growth rate. This is in accordance with 60 (2012), who found that transitions from rosette to flowering plant and from flowering plant to rosette were especially important for population growth.

Development of species richness and vegetation composition

Botanical richness in our study either remained constant or increased. Thus, none of the measures applied to regulate *J. vulgaris* counteracted the goal of preserving species richness. Highest species richness occurred in the combination treatment of seeding and cutting (*combination 2*), where two sowing impulses with slightly different seed mixtures were set and

resident species and newly sown species coexisted, whereas species diversity in *control* treatments stayed lowest. *Combination 2* also reached high evenness-indices, as did the *flower cut* treatment. In general, evenness was significantly higher under mowing regimes (*flower cut*, *seed cut*, and *combination 2*), in which more species were able to establish due to reduced competition by dominant grasses (61). Diversity patterns of the treatments changed over time. *Biodiversity* treatments were most species rich in the first two years after milling and seeding or green hay transfer. However, species numbers and cover of target species in *biodiversity* treatments declined after the third year (Fig. 7 - 8). Other studies also showed that initially high species numbers in sown treatments decreased after some years (50, 62, 63). One reason for this decrease is that ruderal species and former arable weeds occur initially after milling and vanish later on (27, 64). Therefore, species turnover was highest in mill-sow treatments (*biodiversity* treatments 1 and 2) and seed-addition treatments (*combination* treatments 1 and 2), whereas turnover in the pure cutting treatments (*flower* and *seed cut*) did not differ from the control.

Species turnover in *biodiversity* and *combination* treatments led to a higher share of characteristic grassland species. Percentage of characteristic grassland species was highest in *biodiversity* and *combination* treatments (Fig. 8). As numerous other studies showed, without bridging dispersal limitation by actively introducing seeds, it is rather unlikely that species-rich grasslands will develop on former arable land (65; 66). This is due to the disappearance of characteristic grassland species in intensively used agricultural landscapes (67). This is especially problematic within modern agricultural landscapes in Northern Germany, which are characterized by severe habitat fragmentation and biodiversity losses in grasslands (68).

The percentage of characteristic grassland species in *biodiversity* treatments was approximately 40%, which was 10 % higher than in treatments without seed addition. While the number of species in the *biodiversity* treatments decreased again, the number of species in the *combination*

2 treatment increased constantly over the study period and exceeded the number of species in the *biodiversity* treatments. This increase in species richness may have been supported by sowing different grassland species twice, which lowers the risk that establishment fails due to unfavorable germination conditions when plants are sown in one year only. Besides the positive effect of two sowing applications, the establishment of higher species numbers in the *combination 2* treatment might have been supported by the yearly cut, which is known to favor the occurrence of forbs over grasses (69). In the *control*, dominance of grasses and occurrence of ruderal species was higher than in all other treatments. This suggests that residual soil fertility on ex-arable land may reduce the survival of characteristic grassland species (70).

Most promising in promoting threatened plants is milling and sowing (*biodiversity 1*), probably because germination conditions for seeds in milled plots are better than in non-milled plots. In the latter, the accumulation of living and dead biomass and the encroachment of competitor species can hinder germination and establishment (64, 71). However, there is also a noticeable effect of seed addition by hand – probably because trampling of cattle can result in relatively large bare patches, potentially increasing establishment opportunities for sown seeds (72). Various studies (73, 74) showed that gap size in the sward is an important element of successive seed introduction.

Conclusion

Slight *J. vulgaris* decline occurred under all treatments and consequently we found no significant differences in *J. vulgaris* abundance between the applied treatments and the control. Even the most effective treatment, the *flower cut* treatment, which was significant by trend and the only treatment resulting in a population growth rate below one during the complete study period, did not lead to a complete disappearance of *J. vulgaris* but allowed on average five

J. vulgaris plants per square meter to occur. Therefore, *J. vulgaris* management in nature conservation grasslands needs patience and will not eradicate the weed.

We probably did not find clear differences between the treatments as *J. vulgaris* is a successional plant adapted to disturbance and quickly reacts to windows of opportunity being continuously created by grazing animals or because of drought. Moreover, as our treatments were designed to minimize unwanted harmful impacts on grassland ecosystems, we refrained from drastic measures. Nonetheless, our results reveal some promising approaches for *J. vulgaris* regulation that do not jeopardize nature conservation efforts.

The *flower cut* treatment, which led to a constant decline in *J. vulgaris* resembles a traditional non-intensive meadow management technique, which supports high plant species and animal species richness. Still, the two cuts that were employed for this treatment may harm invertebrates. These drawbacks must be weighed against the treatment's regulating effect on *J. vulgaris*. This might restrict the application of this measure to sites with high conflict potential.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge Diethart Matthies for his help with the bootstrap analyses and Mario Hasler for statistical advice. Furthermore, we thank Hollyn Hartlep for her valuable help in proofreading. The research in this thesis was funded by the Stiftung-Naturschutz Schleswig-Holstein.

Literature Cited

1. Harper JL, Wood WA. Biological Flora of the British Isles: *Senecio jacobaea*. Journal of Ecology 1957; 45(2):617–37.
2. Wardle DA. The ecology of ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea* L.): A review. New Zealand Journal of Ecology 1987 [cited 2016 Feb 25]; 10:67–76.

3. Leiss KA. Management practices for control of ragwort species. *Phytochemistry Reviews* 2011; 10(1):153–63.
4. Augustin B, Oehme S, Mattern G, Roth W. Maßnahmen gegen Jakobskreuzkraut *Senecio jacobaea* - langfristige Aspekte auf Wirksamkeit und biologische Vielfalt. In: 28. Deutsche Arbeitsbesprechung über Fragen der Unkrautbiologie und -bekämpfung, 27.02. – 01.03.2018 in Braunschweig. p. 47–53 [cited 2021 Feb 15].
5. Huckauf A, Rabe I, Aboling S, Böhling J, Böttner E, Ehlers B et al. Umgang mit dem Jakobs-Kreuzkraut: Meiden - dulden - bekämpfen. 4., überarbeitete Auflage, August 2017. Flintbek, Molfsee: Landesamt für Landwirtschaft Umwelt und ländliche Räume des Landes Schleswig-Holstein (LLUR); Stiftung Naturschutz Schleswig-Holstein; 2017. (Schriftenreihe LLUR SH Natur; vol 25) [cited 2020 Nov 3].
6. McEvoy PB, Cox C, Coombs E. Successful biological control of ragwort, *Senecio jacobaea*, by introduced insects in Oregon. *Ecological Applications* 1991; 1(4):430–42.
7. Suter M, Lüscher A. Measures for the control of *Senecio aquaticus* in managed grassland. *Weed Research* 2011 [cited 2016 Apr 27]; 51(6):601–11.
8. Jacobs J, Sing S. Ecology and management of tansy ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea* L.). Montana: Natural Resources Conservation Service; 2009.
9. Suter M, Siegrist-Maag S, Connolly J, Lüscher A. Can the occurrence of *Senecio jacobaea* be influenced by management practice? *Weed Research* 2007 [cited 2016 May 31]; 47(47):262–9.
10. James RR, McEvoy PB, Cox CS. Combining the cinnabar moth (*Tyria jacobaeae*) and the ragwort flea beetle (*Longitarsus jacobaeae*) for control of ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea*): An experimental analysis. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 1992 [cited 2020 Aug 21]; 29(3):589–96.
11. Schmitz J, Hahn M, Brühl CA. Agrochemicals in field margins – An experimental field study to assess the impacts of pesticides and fertilizers on a natural plant community. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 2014 [cited 2020 Oct 5]; 193:60–9.
12. Roberts PD, Pullin AS. The effectiveness of management interventions used to control ragwort species. *Environ Manage* 2007; 39(5):691–706.
13. Siegrist-Maag S, Lüscher A, Suter M. Reaktion von Jakobs-Kreuzkraut auf Schnitt. *Agrarforschung* (Switzerland) 2008; 15(7):338–43.
14. van der Meijden E, van der Waals-Kooi RE. The population ecology of *Senecio jacobaea* in a sand dune system: I. Reproductive strategy and the biennial habit. *Journal of Ecology* 1979; 67(1):131–53.
15. McLaren D, Faithfull I. Landcare notes: Ragwort - Management: Departement of sustainability and environment; 2004 LC0382 [cited 2016 Oct 24]. Available from: URL: http://www.sgln.net.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Ragwort_Management.pdf.
16. Carvalho S, Macel M, Mulder PPJ, Skidmore A, van der Putten WH. Chemical variation in *Jacobaea vulgaris* is influenced by the interaction of season and vegetation successional stage. *Phytochemistry* 2014 [cited 2016 Apr 11]; 99:86–94.
17. Jung LS, Eckstein RL, Otte A, Donath TW. Above- and below-ground nutrient and alkaloid dynamics in *Colchicum autumnale*: Optimal mowing dates for population control or low hay toxicity. *Weed Research* 2012; 52(4):348–57. Available from: URL: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1365-3180.2012.00923.x?casa_token=LVTkIkP_FQ8AAAAA:sl8eC4052xWa6Am-TIKJTxYQZR9JIKXmrTLQt1b8iXDitQUnry81rHmEUF3l1h3bFy3gP9G53uATdw8.

18. Cameron E. A study of the natural control of ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea* L.). *Journal of Ecology* 1935; 23(2):265–322.
19. DiTomaso JM. Invasive weeds in rangelands: Species, impacts, and management. *Weed Science* 2000; 48(2):255–65.
20. Levine JM, Adler PB, Yelenik SG. A meta-analysis of biotic resistance to exotic plant invasions. *Ecology Letters* 2004; 7(10):975–89. Available from: URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2004.00657.x>.
21. Funk JL, Cleland EE, Suding KN, Zavaleta ES. Restoration through reassembly: Plant traits and invasion resistance. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 2008; 23(12):695–703. Available from: URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169534708003017>.
22. Baasch A, Kirmer A, Tischew S. Nine years of vegetation development in a postmining site: Effects of spontaneous and assisted site recovery. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 2012 [cited 2020 Aug 20]; 49(1):251–60.
23. Oakley CA, Knox JS, Symstad A. Plant species richness increases resistance to invasion by non-resident plant species during grassland restoration. *Appl Veg Sci* 2013 [cited 2020 Oct 7]; 16(1):21–8.
24. Peeters A. Past and future of European grasslands.: The challenge of the CAP towards 2020. In: Goliński P, Warda M, Stypiński P, editors. *Grassland - a European Resource?: Proceedings of the 24th General Meeting of the European Grassland Federation, Lublin, Poland, 03 - 07 June 2012*. Poznań: Garmond Oficyna Wydawnicza; 2012. p. 17–32 (Grassland science in Europe; vol. 17).
25. Kiehl K, Kirmer A, Shaw NL, Tischew S, editors. *Guidelines for native seed production and grassland restoration*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing; 2014. Available from: URL: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=801117>.
26. Kiehl K, Kirmer A, Donath TW, Rasran L, Hölzel N. Species introduction in restoration projects: Evaluation of different techniques for the establishment of semi-natural grasslands in Central and Northwestern Europe. *Basic and Applied Ecology* 2010 [cited 2016 Sep 21]; 11(4):285–99.
27. Donath TW, Hölzel N, Otte A. Influence of competition by sown grass, disturbance and litter on recruitment of rare flood-meadow species. *Biological Conservation* 2006 [cited 2020 Aug 24]; 130(3):315–23.
28. Foster BL, Murphy CA, Keller KR, Aschenbach TA, Questad EJ, Kindscher K. Restoration of prairie community structure and ecosystem function in an abandoned hayfield: A sowing experiment. *Restoration Ecology* 2007; 15(4):652–61. Available from: URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1526-100X.2007.00277.x>.
29. Bezemer TM, van der Putten WH, Rienks F. Niets doen loont bij Jakobskruidplaag. *De Levende Natuur* 2006 [cited 2020 Jun 5]; 107(5):214–6.
30. van de Voorde TFJ, Ruijten M, van der Putten WH, Bezemer TM. Can the negative plant–soil feedback of *Jacobaea vulgaris* be explained by autotoxicity? *Basic and Applied Ecology* 2012 [cited 2020 Apr 28]; 13(6):533–41.
31. Oberdorfer E. *Pflanzensoziologische Exkursionsflora*. 6th ed. Stuttgart: E. Ulmer; 1990.
32. Crawley M, Nachapong M. The establishment of seedlings from primary and regrowth seeds of ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea*). *Journal of Ecology* 1985; 73(1):255–61.

33. Eisele N, Tonn B., Pekrun C., Elsaesser M. Influence of different cutting dates on regrowth and achene germination capacity of *Senecio jacobaea*. In: Pötsch, E. M., Krautzer, B. & Hopkins, A. (Eds.): Grassland Science in Europe; 2011. p. 196–8 [cited 2017 Jan 3].
34. Heydemann B. Neuer biologischer Atlas: Ökologie für Schleswig-Holstein und Hamburg. Neumünster: Wachholtz Verlag; 1997.
35. Ssymank A, Ellwanger G, Rath U. Beweidung als Management in NATURA-2000 Gebieten. In: Heinz Sielmann Stiftung D, editor. Naturnahe Beweidung und NATURA 2000: Ganzjahresbeweidung im Management von Lebensraumtypen und Arten im europäischen Schutzgebietssystem NATURA 2000. 1st ed. Duderstadt, Germany; 2015.
36. Braun-Blanquet J. Plant Sociology: The Study of Plant Communities. New York: McGraw-Hill; 1932.
37. Mierwald U. Die Farn- und Blütenpflanzen Schleswig-Holsteins. Rote Liste. 4. Fassung, Datenstand Dez. 2005. Flintbek; 2006. (LANU SH - Natur / RL; vol 18,1).
38. Schmidt, Jürgen, Petersen W. Kartieranleitung und Biotoptypenschlüssel für die Biotopkartierung Schleswig-Holstein: mit Hinweisen zu den gesetzlich geschützten Biotopen sowie den Lebensraumtypen gemäß Anhang I der FFH-Richtlinie. 5th ed. Flintbek; 2019 [cited 2020 Jun 5].
39. Caswell H. Matrix Population Models: Construction, Analysis, and Interpretation. Second Edition. Massachusetts: Inc. Publishers; 2001.
40. Jung LS, Winter S, Kriechbaum M, Eckstein RL, Donath TW, Otte A. Regulation of meadow saffron (*Colchicum autumnale* L.) in extensively managed grasslands. Grassland Science in Europe 2010 [cited 2018 Mar 15]; (15):660–2.
41. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2019. Available from: URL: <https://www.R-project.org/>.
42. Franco M, Silvertown J. A comparative demography of plants based upon elasticities of vital rates. Ecology 2004; 85(2):531–8. Available from: URL: https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1890/02-0651?casa_token=L8l0BfoRxXIAAAAA:okrEVxdn-4fNYD_D4s9YEJQjvp7WtJay_SgCuUe0chdxy6aNmAneyKIYKJSsHw4xSiUbyuxmSi_S7j8.
43. POPTOOLS. Canberra; 2011. Available from: URL: <http://www.poptools.org>.
44. Laird NM, Ware JH. Random-effects models for longitudinal data. Biometrics 1982; 38(4):963–74.
45. Verbeke G, Molenberghs G. Linear mixed models for longitudinal data: Springer; 2000.
46. Nakagawa S, Schielzeth H. A general and simple method for obtaining R² from generalized linear mixed-effects models. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 2013; 4(2):133–42. Available from: URL: <https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.2041-210x.2012.00261.x%4010.1111/%28ISSN%292041-210X.TOPMETHODS>.
47. Bretz F, Hothorn T, Westfall P. Multiple comparisons using R. London: Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2011.
48. McCune B, Grace JB, Urban DL. Analysis of Ecological Communities. Gleneden Beach: MjM Software Design; 2002.
49. Mühlenberg M. Freilandökologie. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer; 1989.

50. Bezemer TM, Harvey JA, Kowalchuk GA, Kopershoek H, van der Putten WH. Interplay between *Senecio jacobaea* and plant, soil, and aboveground insect community composition. *Ecology* 2006; 87(8):2002–13.
51. Lawson CS, Ford MA, Mitchley J. The influence of seed addition and cutting regime on the success of grassland restoration on former arable land. *Applied Vegetation Science* 2004; 7(2):259–66.
52. van de Voorde TFJ, van der Putten WH, Martijn Bezemer T. Intra- and interspecific plant-soil interactions, soil legacies and priority effects during old-field succession. *Journal of Ecology* 2011; 99(4):945–53.
53. Kulmatiski A, Beard KH, Stark JM. Soil history as a primary control on plant invasion in abandoned agricultural fields. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 2006 [cited 2020 Oct 7]; 43(5):868–76.
54. Crawley MJ, Gillman MP. Population dynamics of cinnabar moth and ragwort in grassland. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 1989 [cited 2020 Jul 3]; 58(3):1035–50.
55. Winter S, Jung LS, Eckstein RL, Otte A, Donath TW, Kriechbaum M et al. Control of the toxic plant *Colchicum autumnale* in semi-natural grasslands: Effects of cutting treatments on demography and diversity. *J Appl Ecol* 2014 [cited 2020 Jun 9]; 51(2):524–33.
56. Otzen D. Life forms of three *Senecio* species in relation to accumulation and utilization of nonstructural carbohydrates. *Acta Bot. Neerl.* 1977 [cited 2020 Aug 21]; 26(5):401–9.
57. Hüls J, Otte A, Eckstein RL. Population life-cycle and stand structure in dense and open stands of the introduced tall herb *Heracleum mantegazzianum*. *Biol Invasions* 2007 [cited 2020 Jul 14]; 9(7):799–811.
58. Lennartsson T, Oostermeijer JGB. Demographic variation and population viability in *Gentianella campestris*: Effects of grassland management and environmental stochasticity. *Journal of Ecology* 2001 [cited 2020 Jul 14]; 89(3):451–63.
59. Eichberg C, Donath TW. Sheep trampling on surface-lying seeds improves seedling recruitment in open sand ecosystems. *Restoration Ecology* 2017; 26:S211–S219. Available from: URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/rec.12650>.
60. Dauer JT, McEvoy PB, van Sickle J. Controlling a plant invader by targeted disruption of its life cycle. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 2012; 49(2):322–30.
61. Smith AL, Barrett RL, Milner RNC. Annual mowing maintains plant diversity in threatened temperate grasslands. *Applied Vegetation Science* 2018; 21(2):207–18.
62. Jongepierová I, Mitchley J, Tzanopoulos J. A field experiment to recreate species rich hay meadows using regional seed mixtures. *Biological Conservation* 2007 [cited 2020 Jun 29]; 139(3-4):297–305.
63. Fritch RA, Sheridan H, Finn JA, Kirwan L, hUallacháin DÓ. Methods of enhancing botanical diversity within field margins of intensively managed grassland: A 7-year field experiment. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 2011 [cited 2020 Jun 29]; 48(3):551–60.
64. Schmiede R, Otte A, Donath TW. Enhancing plant biodiversity in species-poor grassland through plant material transfer – the impact of sward disturbance. *Applied Vegetation Science* 2012; 15(2):290–8. Available from: URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1654-109X.2011.01168.x>.
65. Pywell RF, Bullock JM, Hopkins A, Walker KJ, Sparks TH, Burke MJW et al. Restoration of species-rich grassland on arable land: Assessing the limiting processes using a multi-site experiment.

674 Journal of Applied Ecology 2002; 39(2):294–309. Available from: URL:
675 <https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1046/j.1365-2664.2002.00718.x>.

676 66. Hölzel N, Otte A. Restoration of a species-rich flood meadow by topsoil removal and diaspore
677 transfer with plant material. Applied Vegetation Science 2003; 6(2):131–40. Available from: URL:
678 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1654-109X.2003.tb00573.x>.

679 67. Leuschner C, Wesche K, Meyer S, Krause B, Steffen K, Becker T et al. Veränderungen und
680 Verarmung in der Offenlandvegetation Norddeutschlands seit den 1950er Jahren:
681 Wiederholungsaufnahmen in Äckern, Grünland und Fließgewässern. Berichte der Rheinhold-Tüxen-
682 Gesellschaft 2013 [cited 2016 Feb 26]; 25:166–82.

683 68. Kollmann J, Kirmer A, Tischew S, Hölzel N, Kiehl K. Renaturierungsökologie. Berlin: Springer
684 Spektrum; 2019 [cited 2020 Jul 14].

685 69. Briemle G. Empfehlungen zu Erhalt und Management von Extensiv- und Biotopgrünland. landinfo
686 2007 [cited 2020 Jul 1]; 2:16–22.

687 70. Marrs RH. Soil Fertility and Nature Conservation in Europe: Theoretical Considerations and
688 Practical Management Solutions. In: Begon M, Fitter AH, editors. Advances in Ecological Research:
689 Academic Press; 1993. p. 241–300.

690 71. Valkó O, Deák B, Török P, Kirmer A, Tischew S, Kelemen A et al. High-diversity sowing in
691 establishment gaps: a promising new tool for enhancing grassland biodiversity. Tuexenia 2016 [cited
692 2020 Jul 8]; 36:359–78.

693 72. Faust C, Eichberg C, Storm C, Schwabe A. Post-dispersal impact on seed fate by livestock
694 trampling – A gap of knowledge. Basic and Applied Ecology 2011; 12(3):215–26. Available from: URL:
695 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1439179111000247>.

696 73. Janicka M, Pawluśkiewicz B. The increasing in the floristic diversity of the abandoned
697 Arrhenatherion elatioris meadows by dicotyledonous species oversowing. J. Ecol. Eng. 2020 [cited
698 2020 Jun 29]; 21(1):168–79.

699 74. Eckstein RL, Ruch D, Otte A, Donath TW. Invasibility of a nutrient-poor pasture through resident
700 and non-resident herbs is controlled by litter, gap size and propagule pressure. PLoS ONE 2012 [cited
701 2020 Sep 9]; 7(7):e41887.

702

703

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure