

Case Study

Cite this article: Luoma MO, Tamayo M, Sigurðsson S (2025) Mapping wild chervil (*Anthriscus sylvestris*) and anise (*Myrrhis odorata*) in urban green spaces: a subarctic case study. *Invasive plant sci. manag.* **18**(e3), 1–13. doi: [10.1017/inp.2024.39](https://doi.org/10.1017/inp.2024.39)

Received: 28 June 2024

Revised: 7 October 2024

Accepted: 6 December 2024

Associate Editor: Catherine Jarnevich, US Geological Survey

Keywords:

Alien plants; distribution; high latitude; invasive species; urban biodiversity

Corresponding author:

Mervi Orvokki Luoma; Email: mol5@hi.is

Mapping wild chervil (*Anthriscus sylvestris*) and anise (*Myrrhis odorata*) in urban green spaces: a subarctic case study

Mervi Orvokki Luoma¹ , Mariana Tamayo²  and Snorri Sigurðsson³

¹Master's Student, Environment and Natural Resources, University of Iceland, Reykjavík, Iceland; ²Associate Professor, Environment and Natural Resources, University of Iceland, Reykjavík, Iceland and ³Director of Nature Conservation, Icelandic Institute of Natural History, Garðabær, Iceland

Abstract

Urban areas are increasingly recognized as important centers of biodiversity. Nonetheless, invasive species can reduce this biodiversity, and cities can be hubs for alien plant invasions, highlighting the need to monitor urban biodiversity and problematic alien species. The goal of our study was to assess the distribution of wild chervil [*Anthriscus sylvestris* (L.) Hoffm.] and anise [*Myrrhis odorata* (L.) Scop.] in green spaces of Reykjavík, Iceland. This information is necessary to implement the city's biodiversity strategy regarding invasive species. Both of these alien plants are spreading throughout Iceland, and Reykjavík's high-latitude location ($\geq 63^\circ\text{N}$) and remoteness make it an ideal case study to assess alien plant introductions and invasions in subarctic urban areas. We surveyed four green spaces (Laugarnes, Vatnsmýri, Elliðaárdalur, and Ægisíða) from May to October 2017 using AllTrailsPro and ArcGIS mobile applications. ANOVA and Bonferroni correction (post hoc test) were used to compare the distribution and patch sizes of *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* among the study sites. We found that *A. sylvestris* covered at least 10% (15.5 ha) of the total area surveyed (158 ha), while *M. odorata* only covered ≤ 1 ha. Both plants were abundant near buildings, pathways, riversides, and streams, and they are expanding their distribution in Reykjavík's green spaces. While *A. sylvestris* is clearly more established and widespread with larger patches ($>100\text{ m}^2$), the distribution of *M. odorata* is more localized, occurring mainly in smaller patches ($<100\text{ m}^2$). We recommend long-term monitoring to further assess *M. odorata*'s invasive potential, as well as testing and adopting integrated weed management strategies via adaptive management to control the distribution of *A. sylvestris* and that of other problematic alien plants. These actions, which are applicable to other subarctic cities, will help foster more proactive management encouraging urban biodiversity.

Introduction

Urban biodiversity conservation is high on the agenda for cities around the globe as alien plant invasions are diminishing local plant diversity (Keller et al. 2011; Nilon et al. 2017; Pimentel et al. 2005). Urban areas tend to be hotspots for introductions and invasions of alien plants, while hosting high plant richness (Gaertner et al. 2017; Shochat et al. 2010). Alien plants are becoming an increasing problem due to global economies, tourism and trade, and the risk of invasions to disturbed ecosystems (Chytrý et al. 2008; Clark and Johnston 2011; EEA 2016; Walker and Steffen 1997). In fact, Target 6 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework aims to reduce and manage the spread and impacts of invasive alien species on biodiversity (UNCBD 2023). Moreover, addressing invasive alien plants is necessary to meet UN Sustainable Development Goal 15 (Life on Land) (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs 2015).

The introduction of alien plants poses multiple threats to ecosystem functions and services, native biodiversity, landscape aesthetics, and agriculture (Pejchar and Mooney 2009; Pimentel et al. 2005; Simberloff et al. 2013). This is worrisome, as the negative effects of invasive alien plants can be gradual but end up having large-scale, long-lasting, and often irreversible consequences (EEA 2016; Luoma 2019; Simberloff et al. 2013). Urban areas can be larger in size and have high habitat heterogeneity, leading to greater plant richness (native and alien) than the neighboring countryside (Kühn et al. 2004; Lososová et al. 2012a; Pyšek, 1998; Wania et al. 2006). The invasibility of habitats varies depending on the fluctuation of available resources, especially nutrients, and the frequency and level of habitat disturbance (Pyšek et al. 2009). Cadotte et al. (2017) generated categories that make alien species thrive in urban areas such as propagule pressure, reduced negative interactions, resource supply, and the combination of altered and unique environmental conditions (Luoma 2019). For example, plant invasions in urban areas can start from the spread of ornamental plantings (propagule pressure) or where

© The Author(s), 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of Weed Science Society of America. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.



Management Implications

Managing *Anthriscus sylvestris* (wild chervil) and *Myrrhis odorata* (anise) in subarctic urban areas will depend on their distribution pattern and preferred habitat type. It is important to first map their distribution, identify hotspots, and prioritize management areas. Adopting a long-term adaptive management approach will help test and determine the best localized actions ranging from eradication to control of further range expansion. Because *M. odorata* is not as widespread in Reykjavík, monitoring and assessing potential negative impacts is recommended. In addition, proactively testing eradication and control methods locally increases the success of managing *M. odorata* if it becomes invasive in the future. In green spaces that are managed by the city with individual *M. odorata* and *A. sylvestris* seedlings, digging them out with their taproots before they bloom is a feasible approach to control their spread. Given that *A. sylvestris* thrives well in nutrient-rich soil, we also recommend monitoring soil nitrogen levels and monoculture stands of *Lupinus nootkatensis* (Nootka lupine), a widespread alien invasive plant in Iceland that fixes nitrogen and facilitates the invasion of *A. sylvestris*. In places with long summer daylight hours, such as Iceland, effective mowing frequency needs to be tested locally. When large monocultures of *A. sylvestris* are present, integrated control strategies are likely needed. For example, mowing frequently (≥ 4 times) in 2-wk intervals, starting before or at peak flowering and continuing throughout the growing season; applying herbicides (e.g., glyphosate) three to four times at least for two consecutive years when feasible; tillage and native grass seeding; and/or controlled grazing. Finally, public outreach through social media and harvest events focusing on the edible uses of *M. odorata*, *A. sylvestris*, and other edible problematic alien plants will increase public participation in management efforts.

suitable habitat conditions exist (resource supply) (Cadotte et al. 2017; Lee et al. 2015; Mayer et al. 2017).

The Arctic provides an interesting area to explore problematic alien plants, because until recently it has experienced relatively limited plant introductions (Lassuy and Lewis 2013). This is due to the remoteness of the region, challenging climatic and growing conditions, low number of inhabitants, and limited trade (Alsos et al. 2007). Researchers have found that alien plant invasions in the Arctic are mostly local, with no invasive plants occurring in multiple Arctic regions (Wasowicz et al. 2019). Furthermore, it seems that Arctic areas with larger human populations and older settlements are impacted more by alien plants. The Arctic is warming three times faster than other areas, and with commerce increasing in the area, it is likely that alien plant distribution and invasions will expand (Rantanen 2024; Rantanen et al. 2022; Wasowicz et al. 2019; Zhou et al. 2024). Warming is also apparent in subarctic areas; for example, in northwestern Iceland, between 1981 and 2020, mean temperatures rose 2.6 times more per decade than the global average (Bannan et al. 2022). Currently, 341 alien vascular plant taxa have been reported in the Arctic (including Iceland), of which 11 are classified as invasive (Wasowicz et al. 2019). Although most alien plants in the Arctic are found in urban areas, there is limited knowledge about their distribution and impact on native plants.

The city of Reykjavík is an ideal location for a case study to research the invasion process of alien plants in cities that are

remote and at a high latitude ($\geq 63^\circ$ N) and where biodiversity and growing season are limited by challenging weather conditions (Gretarsdottir et al. 2004; Luoma 2019). Iceland has only 45% vegetation cover, the lowest in Europe, and $>40\%$ of the land is deserts, making it a priority to conserve native plant communities (Arnalds 2015). Currently, there are 282 casual alien vascular plants (no self-sustaining populations) and 65 naturalized plants, including two that are classified as invasive in Iceland (Wasowicz 2020). Most of these naturalized plants are present in urban areas like Reykjavík. Recently, the total cost of invasive alien species (plants and animals) in Iceland was reported as US\$25.45 million; however, this is likely underestimated (Kourantidou et al. 2022).

Invasive species are recognized as an area of focus in Reykjavík's biodiversity policy (Garðarsson et al. 2016). Its biodiversity strategy includes actions such as mapping and identifying invasive plants, public engagement, and implementing management actions (Garðarsson et al. 2016; Luoma 2019). Moreover, the city has published a strategic plan, the Green Deal, which mentions its vision of maintaining and managing biodiversity and addressing the costs of invasive species (Anonymous 2022). Alien plants, like giant hogweed (*Heracleum mantegazzianum* Sommier and Levier) already threaten public health locally (Anonymous 2016b; Sigurgeirsdóttir and Hilmarisdóttir 2017), and Nootka lupine (*Lupinus nootkatensis* Donn ex Sims) may impact insect pollinators in urban areas (Willow et al. 2017). Other plants of concern are wild chervil [*Anthriscus sylvestris* (L.) Hoffm.] and anise [*Myrrhis odorata* (L.) Scop.], which have been spreading throughout Iceland, but their distribution in Reykjavík's green spaces is not well understood (IINH 2024; Luoma 2019; Magnússon 2011; Wasowicz et al. 2013).

Green spaces can vary in size and shape, ranging from wetlands and narrow coastal grassy pathways to large forested outdoor areas, creating an urban matrix with various green segments (Lepczyk et al. 2017). Data on the distribution patterns of alien plants in Reykjavík's green areas are limited, making it difficult to determine potential impacts, develop management strategies, and meet biodiversity goals. Given these issues, the goal of our study was to assess the distribution of *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* in four popular and diverse green spaces in Reykjavík. We focused on characterizing the growth patterns (scattered plants vs. dense stands), distribution, and habitats (e.g., wetland, riversides, and grasslands) of these two plants. Another goal was to create a baseline for tracking *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* within the city. This baseline helps to generate management recommendations for land planning actions, fostering urban biodiversity, and tracking other emerging problematic plants. Although we focus on Reykjavík, our study provides insight into potential impacts and risks of emerging alien plant invasions to urban green spaces that are applicable to other subarctic and Arctic cities.

Materials and Methods

Target Species

Anthriscus sylvestris

This vascular plant normally grows 0.3- to 1.5-m tall and is either a short-lived perennial or herbaceous biennial plant (Darbyshire et al. 1999; Magnússon 2011); but it can reach 2 m in height in Iceland (MOL, unpublished data). *Anthriscus sylvestris* blooming peaks by mid-June in Iceland, with most seeds produced in early August (Luoma 2019; Magnússon 2011; Figure 1). This plant can reproduce asexually from the root buds, but also sexually by



Figure 1. *Anthriscus sylvestris* blooming in Iceland. Photo by MT.



Figure 2. *Myrrhis odorata* blooming in Iceland. Photo by MOL.

producing $\leq 10,000$ seeds (Darbyshire et al. 1999). Seed dispersal is via human activities (e.g., agriculture), water, and wind (Hansson and Persson 1994; Magnússon 2011). *Anthriscus sylvestris* is native to Eurasia (Magnússon 2011; Wasowicz et al. 2013) but alien to Iceland, Svalbard (Alsos et al. 2015; Gederas et al. 2012), Greenland, the Faroe Islands, the United States (USDA 2024a), Canada (Darbyshire et al. 1999), central and southern Africa, New Zealand, and south Georgia (Magnússon 2011). The first records of *A. sylvestris* in Iceland are from the city of Akureyri in 1927 (Óskarsson 1932), and the plant was not considered invasive in Iceland until the last two decades, when it became evident that its distribution and abundance had increased across the country (Magnússon 2011). Researchers suspect that *A. sylvestris* began spreading in urban areas in Iceland as a garden escape (Magnússon 2011; von Schmalensee and Stefánsson 2009).

Anthriscus sylvestris is forming dense monoculture stands along waterways and roads (Luoma 2019; Magnússon 2011; von Schmalensee and Stefánsson 2009). It spreads rapidly, replaces other plant species, facilitates alien plant invasions, increases soil erosion, degrades cultural landscapes, and is difficult to eradicate once it becomes established (Darbyshire et al. 1999; Førde and Magnussen 2015; Hansson and Persson 1994; Jørgensen et al. 2013; Magnússon 2011). *Anthriscus sylvestris* often spreads in

former pasturelands, but urban areas are also vulnerable to the negative impacts of this plant (Luoma 2019; Magnússon 2011; Piltó 2012).

Myrrhis odorata

Myrrhis odorata is a perennial plant that looks very similar to *A. sylvestris*, but it has several features that differ from *A. sylvestris*, such as a strong anise-like odor, larger seeds, and lighter green leaves (Kristinsson 2013; Luoma 2019; Figure 2). *Myrrhis odorata*'s native range covers central and southern Europe (Kew Science 2024). The alien distribution of *M. odorata* includes the Nordic countries, the Baltic States, northern Russia, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Belgium, the Netherlands, Poland, the Czech Republic, Ukraine, North America, and New Zealand (Biological Records Centre 2018) iNaturalist-NZ 2024; Kew Science 2024; Native Plant Trust 2024). *Myrrhis odorata* is an ornamental plant used for medicinal purposes and food consumption (Penny 2024; Petřík et al. 2019; Rančić et al. 2005), making garden escape a likely dispersal pathway. In Iceland, *M. odorata* is classified as an alien plant and is yet to be evaluated for invasiveness (von Schmalensee 2010). The first known record is from 1936, and this plant has been expanding its distribution in Iceland, especially in urban areas (IINH 2024; Seebens et al. 2017). Reproduction of *M. odorata* is by taproot and seeds, similar to *A. sylvestris* (Penny 2024). *Myrrhis odorata* is present in farms, woodlands, and along streams, as well as in urban gardens throughout Iceland (IINH 2024).

Study Areas

We assessed the distribution of *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* in four green spaces in Reykjavík, located in Laugarnes (64.15°N, 21.88°W), Vatnsmýri (64.14°N, 21.94°W), Elliðaárdalur (64.12°N, 21.85°W), and Ægisíða (64.14°N, 21.96°W) (Figure 3). These areas represent a heterogeneity of green spaces in the city, providing a gradient of urban habitats. Together these four areas include five of the seven urban habitat types described by Lososová et al. (2012a) for central European cities, ranging from densely built residential areas to recently disturbed sites. These sites will also act as a foundation to build a database for local green spaces and their biodiversity.

Laugarnes is a popular outdoor coastal area with a museum and some residential buildings, located in north-central Reykjavík (Figure 3). Many archaeological sites are found in this area, some dating back to the settlement period (ca. 870 to 930), and the area also hosted a military community during World War II and was later used for pastureland (Guðmundsdóttir 2003; Hallgrímsdóttir 1996). Our study area in Laugarnes is grassland habitat, where invasive and other alien plants of concern such as *H. mantegazzianum* and *L. nootkatensis* are also present. Laugarnes fits the urban habitat type 7, a mid-successional site, from Lososová et al. (2012a), with the exception that our study site has been abandoned for more than 15 yr and some sections are mowed by the city.

Vatnsmýri is located next to the University of Iceland and the Reykjavík Airport in the western part of Reykjavík (Figure 3). This wildlife nature reserve is large, approximately 3.7 ha in size, and is mostly wetland habitat. We only surveyed the outer grassland area by the wetland, because the inner part of the nature reserve is closed in the summer during the bird nesting season (Luoma 2019; Pálsson 2003; Sigurðsson 2015). Vatnsmýri hosts 83 vascular plants, 65 of which are native to Iceland (Pálsson 2003). This area has been experiencing major urban development, impacting the reserve (Garðarsson et al. 2016). In 2013 and 2014, improvements



Figure 3. Study areas in Reykjavik are highlighted in red: (1) Laugarnes, (2) Vatnsmýri, (3) Elliðaárdalur, and (4) Ægisíða. Scale 1:24,000.

to the bird nesting habitat were implemented, which included increasing the water level and decreasing the elevation of wetland islands via soil and plant removal to manage alien plants such as *A. sylvestris* (Luoma 2019). Vatnsmýri is an example of an urban habitat type 6, an early successional and recently disturbed site, as described by Lososová et al. (2012a).

Elliðaárdalur, a large green space, is a popular biking, hiking, and fishing area. This area in the eastern part of Reykjavik (Figure 3) was important for forestry and had summer homes and sheep farms (Anonymous 2016a; Luoma 2019). Today, Elliðaárdalur has various landscapes, with a mixture of forest and grasslands habitats, and the Elliðaár River flows in the middle of the area. Elliðaárdalur is home to 25 bird species and at least 315 vascular plant species, of which 179 (57%) are native plants (Anonymous 2016a; Pálsson 2004). Our study area in Elliðaárdalur included Geirsnef (a popular dog park) and its surroundings, as well as Háubakkar (a protected area) (Anonymous 2018). Elliðaárdalur is a very large and heterogenous area, and therefore only Geirsnef can be described as habitat type 5, an urban park that is mowed frequently and has 10% to 20% tree cover of downy birch (*Betula pubescens* Ehrh.) and willow (*Salix* spp.) (Lososová et al. 2012a). In addition, Elliðaárdalur is surrounded by both habitat type 4, a residential area built after the 1960s, with shrubs, trees, and scattered lawns, and habitat type 3, consisting of older family houses with gardens (Lososová et al. 2012a).

The Ægisíða study site is a flat area between a protected shoreline and a residential street in the northwest of Reykjavik (Figure 3). Ægisíða is a grassland habitat with some large monocultures of Norwegian angelica (*Angelica archangelica* L.) and *A. sylvestris* near a residential house. Previously, this area was farmland that became urbanized, and a 1954 aerial photo shows more houses and

industrial buildings than are currently present (Borgarvefsjá 1954). Ægisíða is near to the Reykjavik airport and is popular for cycling, dog walking, and jogging. Overall, this area represents habitat type 3, with a series of older family houses with gardens lining the street across from the shoreline (Lososová et al. 2012a).


Data Collection and Statistical Analyses

AllTrailsPro (2017) and ArcGIS mobile applications were used to survey the study areas between May 31 and October 25, 2017 (Luoma 2019). GPS locations of *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* were recorded in the four study sites (Luoma 2019). ArcGIS was used to draw polygonal shapes of the distribution of *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* and their potential overlap. The SHAPE_Area polygon feature was used to calculate the distribution area of both plants. Plant distribution was classified as either scattered plants or dense plant stands/patches of *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* (Luoma 2019). The classification was either (1) ≥ 3 plants m^{-2} for a dense plant stand/patch or (2) a plant patch $>0.5 m^2$ but with ≤ 2 scattered plants. Typically, a scattered distribution for *M. odorata* was an individual plant in $\leq 1 m^2$. ArcMap 10.4.1. was used to create the distribution maps of *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata*. We used WGS 1984 with a prime meridian set for the Greenwich geographic coordinate system to gather the data, which was projected as WGS 1984 with a metric linear unit. Given that *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* look similar to each other (Figures 1 and 2) and to other plants such as bishop's goutweed (*Aegopodium podagraria* L.), the surveys were conducted on foot rather than using a drone. Guides by Kristinsson (2013), Kristinsson et al. (2018), and Flora of Iceland (2024) were used for plant identification. The data were normally distributed, and there was homogeneity of variance, so we used ANOVA and a Bonferroni correction for the post hoc test

Table 1. Distribution of *Anthriscus sylvestris* (As) and *Myrrhis odorata* (Mo) in open areas of Reykjavík in 2017.^a

Study site	Total area surveyed	Total area with As	Total area with Mo	Mo	As
	ha			%	
Ægisíða	20.72	0.24	0.03	0.1	1.2
Elliðaárdalur	116.19	12.77	0.46	0.4	11
Laugarnes	12.31	0.51	1.01	8.3	4.1
Vatnsmýri	8.73	1.99	0.04	0.5	22.8

^aThe total area (ha = hectares) where *A. sylvestris* or *M. odorata* (Mo) were present is shown, as well as the total area surveyed for each site. In addition, the cover (%) of *Anthriscus sylvestris* and *Myrrhis odorata* for each area is presented.

**Figure 4.** Size and frequency of *Myrrhis odorata* patches in open areas of Reykjavík in 2017.


($\alpha = 0.05$) to compare the distribution and patch size of both plants among the four study sites, running the analyses on SPSS® 24 software (Luoma 2019).

Results and Discussion

Anthriscus sylvestris and *Myrrhis odorata* Distribution Patterns

Overall, 158 ha (all four study areas) were surveyed, of which *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* covered 11% (Luoma 2019). *Anthriscus sylvestris* was more prevalent, encompassing 10% of the total area surveyed and having the greatest cover per area surveyed in Vatnsmýri (23%) (Table 1). *Myrrhis odorata* coverage was low ($\leq 0.5\%$) with the exception of Laugarnes ($> 8\%$), where it was more common than *A. sylvestris*. We found no significant difference in plant cover among the study areas for *A. sylvestris* ($F(3, 16) = 0.119$, $P = 0.947$) (Luoma 2019). Elliðaárdalur had the largest total area with *A. sylvestris*, encompassing 13 ha (Table 1).

We found 98 patches of *M. odorata*, ranging from < 1 m² to a dense stand of 3,875 m² (Luoma 2019; Figure 4). The mean *M. odorata* patch was 158 m² (± 58 SE), but because the number of patches per study site varied from 1 to 83, we were unable to compare their size statically among the study areas. A total of 396 *A. sylvestris* patches (Figure 5) were present in the study sites, including 34 scattered plant patches. *Anthriscus sylvestris* patch sizes varied greatly, ranging from < 1 m² to > 1.2 ha, and were on average 392 m² (± 55 SE) (Luoma 2019; Table 2). We found significant differences between the sites regarding the mean patch size of *A. sylvestris* ($F(3, 392) = 5.584$, $P = 0.001$), with Vatnsmýri

**Figure 5.** Size and frequency of *Anthriscus sylvestris* patches in open areas of Reykjavík in 2017.

($P = 0.041$) and Elliðaárdalur ($P = 0.001$) having significantly larger patches than Laugarnes (Luoma 2019; Table 2). We also found that patch size varied significantly within Elliðaárdalur ($F(5, 239) = 11.948$, $P = 0.000$). For example, the *A. sylvestris* patches in the Háubakkar protected area were significantly smaller ($P < 0.001$; patch size = $106 \text{ m}^2 \pm 57$) than patches to the east of Geirsnef (patch size = $2,425 \text{ m}^2 \pm 780$) (Luoma 2019). Similarly, below Geirsnef, there were significantly smaller *A. sylvestris* patches ($241 \text{ m}^2 \pm 44$) than those in the east ($P < 0.001$) and northeast ($P = 0.017$; patch size = $1,428 \text{ m}^2 \pm 644$) of Geirsnef (Luoma 2019). Moreover, Geirsnef patches were significantly smaller ($P < 0.001$; patch size = $574 \text{ m}^2 \pm 168$) than patches east of Geirsnef.

Study Site Distribution

In Laugarnes, there was minimal overlap between *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata*. *Anthriscus sylvestris* was a mosaic of monoculture stands, scattered plants, and smaller patches around the site (Figure 6) (Luoma 2019). In addition, three very large *M. odorata* stands were present, two of them near a former building site in the western part. A few large *M. odorata* stands were found next to patches of *A. sylvestris* near residential buildings. The majority of the patches (64%) of *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* in Laugarnes were < 10 m² (Figure 6).

Vatnsmýri had a very large *M. odorata* stand mixed with *A. sylvestris* next to the heavily trafficked Hringbraut Street along the northeast pathway (Luoma 2019; Figure 7). The majority of *A. sylvestris* stands (77%) were large (> 100 m²) and dense (Figure 4), scattered along the pathways and water (Figure 7).

In Elliðaárdalur, large, scattered, and dense patches of *A. sylvestris* were present in and around Geirsnef by the Elliðaár River (Figure 8). *Myrrhis odorata* was absent in Geirsnef (Figure 8), but was found by the walking paths in the inner parts of Elliðaárdalur as dense stands (Figure 8) without overlapping with *A. sylvestris* (Luoma 2019). Furthermore, these inner areas in Elliðaárdalur had predominantly dense stands of *A. sylvestris* along the river and pathways. Most stands (75%) of *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* in Elliðaárdalur were ≥ 10 m² (Figures 4 and 5).

Anthriscus sylvestris and *M. odorata* occurred in scattered and dense stands in the south and northwest areas of Ægisíða (Figure 9), and there was no overlap between the species (Luoma 2019). *Anthriscus sylvestris* was more common in Ægisíða than *M. odorata*, and most patches (71%) of both plants were > 10 m² (Figures 4 and 5).

Table 2. Average patch size (m²) of *Anthriscus sylvestris* among open areas of Reykjavik in 2017

Study site	No. of patches ^a	Mean patch size	Smallest patch	Largest patch
		m ² ± SE	m ²	
Ægisíða	11	221.8 ± 117.8	0.57	1,254.4
Elliðaárdalur	245	521.1 ± 85.0	0.001	12,251.5
Laugarnes	109	46.7 ± 10.1	0.02	520.5
Vatnsmýri	31	641.9 ± 136.3	0.88	3,312.2

^aNo. of patches includes both dense plant stands (≥3 plants m⁻²) and scattered plant patches (>0.5 m² but with ≤2 plants).




Figure 6. Distribution of *Anthriscus sylvestris* and *Myrrhis odorata* in Laugarnes, summer 2017. The distribution of *M. odorata* in Laugarnes includes both individual plants and dense patches.

Current Status and Recommended Management Actions

The distribution of *A. sylvestris* was more widespread than expected, totaling 10% of the area surveyed in Reykjavik (Luoma 2019). In contrast, *M. odorata* distribution is more localized, with the plant found in fewer areas as remnants of abandoned gardens

or farmland. Although there is very little overlap between the two species, they both thrive in urban settings, particularly near waterways, buildings, pathways, and roads. Similar distribution patterns have also been recorded in northern and northwestern




Figure 7. Distribution of *Anthriscus sylvestris* and *Myrrhis odorata* in Vatnsmýri, summer 2017.

Iceland, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and North America (Bjarnadóttir 2014; Darbyshire et al. 1999; GBIF 2023; Jónsson and Þórðarson 2018; National Museums Northern Ireland 2023; Nature Conservancy 2010; van Mierlo and van Groenendaal 1991).

Overall, large monoculture stands of *A. sylvestris* are enabling the spread of the species in Reykjavík. However, Ægisíða is an exception, where *A. sylvestris* does not seem to be expanding in large, scattered stands, but rather in smaller patches of one to three plants. Frequent mowing in Ægisíða (four times per summer) may be preventing seed dispersal and the formation of larger stands

from individual plants, as the larger stands of *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* are beyond the grass-cutting range (Luoma 2019). A combination of control actions is needed to manage *A. sylvestris* (ISC 2019). We advise digging out individual seedlings and their taproots before they bloom in areas where the grass is mowed or where small patches of *A. sylvestris* are present (Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture 2003). If feasible, Canadian resource managers recommend herbicide use (e.g., glyphosate) to prevent seeding in large stands of *A. sylvestris*. If herbicides are not an option, then mowing frequently every 2 wk before plants bloom or at peak flowering and thereafter is recommended (ISC 2019; Nova




Figure 8. Distribution of *Anthriscus sylvestris* and *Myrrhis odorata* in Elliðaárdalur, summer 2017.

Scotia Department of Agriculture 2003). Moreover, the most effective control strategy for *A. sylvestris* is a combination of mowing before flowering, application of herbicides, tillage, and native grass seeding (Luoma 2019; Miller and D'Auria 2011). Based on management experiments in north and northwest Iceland, researchers suggest applying glyphosate (e.g., Clinic at a 1:120

concentration) at least three to four times for two consecutive years to eradicate *A. sylvestris* (Bjarnadóttir 2014; Jónsson and Þórðarson 2018). This treatment seems best for eradicating smaller, isolated stands of *A. sylvestris* but not large, well-established communities (Bjarnadóttir 2014). Bjarnadóttir (2014) and Jónsson and Þórðarson (2018) also mention grazing (e.g., sheep) as another



Figure 9. Distribution of *Anthriscus sylvestris* and *Myrrhis odorata* in Aegisdá, summer 2017.

potential tool warranting research. In urban nature reserves such as Vatnsmýri, where access is partly restricted during the summer, a strategy that combines hand pulling seedlings and controlled grazing (e.g., sheep, goats, or pigs) can be tested for *A. sylvestris*. In addition, for open access areas, frequent mowing four or more times before plants bloom and pulling out individual plants with roots seems to be effective to control the spread of both *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* (ISC 2019). Furthermore, monitoring the plant

community in urban nature reserves would help detect changes in species composition and the effects on biodiversity. Urban nature reserves such as Vatnsmýri have high conservation value (Garðarsson et al. 2016), making them a priority to manage invasive and problematic alien plants to prevent the loss of biodiversity (Darbyshire et al. 1999; Hansson and Persson 1994).

Another important management strategy is to identify urban hotspots of invasive and problematic alien plants. In Reykjavík,

Laugarnes seems to be a hub for invasive or problematic alien plants, where *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* grow together with *L. nootkatensis* and *H. mantegazzianum*. The presence of *H. mantegazzianum* is a great concern, because it is a serious health hazard, and it shades native plants with its tall stems (≥ 2 m) and large leaves. In sunny weather, when *H. mantegazzianum* sap is exposed to ultraviolet radiation, it can cause serious skin burns (Nielsen et al. 2005). The lowest native plant cover of all the study sites was in Laugarnes, making the presence of *A. sylvestris* worrisome. Several studies in central Europe have shown that areas with *A. sylvestris* are vulnerable to further alien plant invasions, particularly plants that thrive in nutrient-rich soils (Godefroid and Koedam 2003; Hansson and Persson 1994; Pyšek et al. 2009). Areas like Laugarnes require a management strategy that targets multiple invasive plants. In the past, Reykjavík has implemented eradication efforts for *H. mantegazzianum* in parts of Laugarnes that included mowing, manual cutting, and herbicide treatment. However, an assessment of the effectiveness of these efforts is needed, as well as testing of additional control actions to manage other problematic alien plants. Furthermore, we recommend monitoring the distribution and soil nitrogen levels of green spaces with *L. nootkatensis* such as Elliðaárdalur, as they may be invaded by *A. sylvestris* (Magnússon 2011). In the future, the abundance and distribution of *A. sylvestris* is likely to increase with climate change, emphasizing the need to manage this plant now. Wasowicz et al. (2013) predicted that *A. sylvestris*'s climatic niche in Iceland will increase greatly, enabling it and other alien plants like *M. odorata* to colonize new habitats. Our study shows that foot surveys using AllTrailsPro and ArcGIS Collector applications to record the distribution of alien plants is effective. These mapping actions may potentially be complemented by remote sensing, a method that also requires ground truthing to train and validate the data collection. Currently, researchers at the University of Iceland are exploring drones and satellite imaging as additional tools to distinguish and map *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* in Reykjavík.

Future Research Priorities

Currently, *M. odorata* is less prevalent in green spaces of Reykjavík compared with *A. sylvestris*. The largest total area with *M. odorata* is 1 ha (Laugarnes), likely planted several decades ago. Most of the *M. odorata*'s distribution in Reykjavík is scattered plants and smaller patches (<100 m²). This distribution may be due to *M. odorata* not having spread to all available habitat or to differences in habitat suitability; however, further research is needed to test these hypotheses. For example, studies looking at differences in soil moisture and nutrients, as well as levels of disturbance, among others, will help assess the influence of environmental and anthropogenic factors in alien plant distribution. Although *M. odorata* is not as common as *A. sylvestris*, local eradication and control actions should be implemented to prevent it from spreading and potentially causing negative impacts. The ongoing and increasing alien distribution of *M. odorata* is not limited to Iceland, as it has also been spreading in the United Kingdom and more recently in New Zealand (Braithwaite 2020; GBIF 2023; iNaturalist-NZ 2024; Seebens et al. 2017). Like *A. sylvestris*, *M. odorata* is abundant in roadsides close to residential buildings and is suspected to have escaped from gardens (Gederaas et al. 2012; Luoma 2019; National Museums Northern Ireland 2023; Stroh et al. 2020; USDA 2024b). Pyšek et al. (2012) classify *M. odorata* as a plant escaping cultivation and forming stable populations in the wild. Nonetheless, *M. odorata* is not categorized as an invasive

plant in Iceland or Europe; however, it is classified as having a very high invasion potential in Norway (Gederaas et al. 2012; Solstad et al. 2023). We recommend long-term monitoring and plant community surveys to assess whether *M. odorata* is becoming an invasive plant in Iceland. Regarding proactive management to test and track, areas with single plants and small patches of *M. odorata* can be dug out with relatively low effort in early summer. In contrast, large stands may require multiple mowing treatments before plants bloom, but the frequency of mowing needs to be evaluated locally. In addition, public campaigns focusing on the culinary uses of *M. odorata* would help increase awareness about the plant and foster control efforts in private gardens and green spaces in the future (Hussain et al. 1990; Lim 2016). We have, for example, organized *M. odorata* and *A. sylvestris* harvesting events in various green spaces in Reykjavík and neighboring towns since 2021, which have become popular with the public. Moreover, we have created a social media platform, Borgarnáttúra-Urban Biodiversity Iceland, to further promote awareness and collaboration with multiple stakeholders.

Monitoring both invasion pathways and alien plant distributions, which are expected to accelerate with climate change in the Arctic, will facilitate effective strategies that promote urban biodiversity (Wasowicz et al. 2013, 2019). A single alien plant can have detrimental effects when it increases its distribution and becomes problematic by outcompeting native plants (Vilà et al. 2011). Several central European cities have seen such pattern, showing that some alien plants promote biotic homogenization, thus causing major problems in highly urbanized areas (Lososová et al. 2012b). This is a concern for Reykjavík and other subarctic cities, even though this process can take time. Urban areas can provide suitable habitats for alien plants, as disturbed urban habitats often enable these plants to form large populations (Cadotte et al. 2017). Cadotte et al. (2017) also emphasize that to prevent invasive plants from spreading beyond city limits, it is important to monitor and control them in urban areas.

As a case study, our research establishes a baseline for problematic alien plants in heterogeneous green spaces of a relatively young and remote subarctic city. *Anthriscus sylvestris* and *M. odorata* are spreading in Reykjavík's green spaces, but with different distribution patterns. These species show minimal overlap in distribution; *A. sylvestris* is more widespread, while the invasive potential of *M. odorata* still needs to be assessed. It is crucial to understand the ecology and abundance of alien plants in a city to achieve sustainable urban management and planning of green spaces. For example, large and dense patches of *A. sylvestris* alter landscape aesthetics and may negatively impact native plant habitats for birds, insects, and invertebrates, possibly changing ecosystem functions (Førde and Magnussen 2015; Willow 2017). Our study suggests that various management strategies will be needed given the different patterns of distribution of *A. sylvestris* and *M. odorata* in Reykjavík. Ultimately, an adaptive management strategy that is proactive and long term, involving monitoring, public participation, and various management actions, will increase the success in managing problematic alien plants and fostering biodiversity in subarctic cities like Reykjavík (Zalba and Ziller 2007).

Acknowledgments. We greatly appreciate the input and valuable comments of Borgþór Magnússon from the Icelandic Natural History Institute.

Funding statement. This work was supported in part by the Náttúruverndarsjóður Pálma Jónssonar (2017).

Competing interests. The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- Alsos IG, Eidesen PB, Ehrich D, Skrede I, Westergaard K, Jacobsen GH, Landvik JY, Taberlet P, Brochmann C (2007) Frequent long distance plant colonization in the changing Arctic. *Science* 316:1606–1609
- Alsos IG, Ware C, Elven R (2015) Past Arctic aliens have passed away, current ones may stay. *Biol Invasions* 17:3113–3123
- Anonymous (2016a) Sjálfbær Elliðaárdalur—Stefna Reykjavíkur, 5–7. Final Report of the Working Group. Reykjavík. https://reykjavik.is/sites/default/files/stefna_reykjavikur_um_sjalfbaeran_ellidaardal_-_drog_ad_tillogum_starfshops_-_skyrsla.pdf. Accessed: October 4, 2024
- Anonymous (2016b) Tröllahvannir finnast víða í Reykjavík [Hogweeds can be found in many places in Reykjavík]. <https://reykjavik.is/frettir/trollahvannir-finnast-vida-i-reykjavik>. Accessed: October 4, 2024
- Anonymous (2018) Háubakkar. <https://reykjavik.is/haubakkar>. Accessed: October 4, 2024
- Anonymous (2022) Reykjavík Green Deal—City of Reykjavík Comprehensive Strategy until 2030. https://reykjavik.is/sites/default/files/2023-03/Gr%C3%A6naPlani%C3%B0_EN.pdf. Accessed: October 4, 2024
- Arnalds O (2015) *The Soils of Iceland*. Dordrecht: Springer. 183 p
- Bannan D, Ólafsdóttir R, Hennig BD (2022) Local perspectives on climate change, its impact and adaptation: a case study from the Westfjords region of Iceland. *Climate* 10(11):169
- Biological Records Centre (2018) *Myrrhis odorata*. In Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora. <https://plantatlas2020.org/atlas/2cd4p9h.5ek>. Accessed: October 4, 2024
- Bjarnadóttir B (2014) Eyðing skógarkerfils með vegum. Lokaskýrsla vegna Rannsóknastyrks árið 2013 [Eradication of wild chervil by the roads. Final report for the research grant in 2013]. [https://www.vegagerdin.is/vefur2.nsf/Files/Eyding_skogarkerfils_med_vegum-2/\\$file/Ey%C3%B0ing%20sk%C3%B3garkerfils%20me%C3%B0%20vegum.pdf](https://www.vegagerdin.is/vefur2.nsf/Files/Eyding_skogarkerfils_med_vegum-2/$file/Ey%C3%B0ing%20sk%C3%B3garkerfils%20me%C3%B0%20vegum.pdf). Accessed: October 4, 2024
- Borgarvefsjá (1954) Aerial Photo of Reykjavík in 1954. borgarvefsja.reykjavik.is/borgarvefsja/?x=355754.12991931365&y=406887.9334479747&z=4&map=loftmynd&visibleoldAriallayers=26&fbclid=IwAR1Agt5qZ5DTRveMJ-4wfe5SAbkrsg5hv0zKPAOpzQQ4hk57AFBkAqN60w#. Accessed: October 4, 2024
- Braithwaite ME (2020) Patrolling the Scottish Border—plant migration history. *Br Ir Bot* 2:335–351
- Cadotte M, Yasui S, Livingstone S, MacIvor JS (2017) Are urban systems beneficial, detrimental, or indifferent for biological invasion? *Biol Invasions* 19:3489–3503
- Chytrý M, Jarosík V, Pyšek P, Hájek O, Knollová I, Tichý L, Danihelka J (2008) Separating habitat invasibility by alien plants from the actual level of invasion. *Ecology* 89:1541–1553
- Clark G, Johnston E (2011) Temporal change in the diversity–invasibility relationship in the presence of a disturbance regime. *Ecol Lett* 14:52–57
- Darbyshire S, Hoeg R, Haverkort J (1999) The biology of Canadian weeds. 111. *Anthriscus sylvestris* (L.) Hoffm. *Can J Plant Sci* 79:671–682
- [EEA] European Environment Agency (2016) Invasive Alien Species: A Growing Problem for Environment and Health. www.eea.europa.eu/highlights/invasive-alien-species-a-growing. Accessed: October 4, 2024
- Flora of Iceland (2024) Online guide. <http://www.floraislands.is>. Accessed: October 4, 2024
- Førde A, Magnussen T (2015) Invaded by weeds: contested landscape stories. *Geogr Ann B: Hum Geogr* 97:183–193
- Gaertner M, Wilson JUR, Cadotte MW, MacIvor JS, Zenni RD, Richardson DM (2017) Non-native species in urban environments: patterns, processes, impacts and challenges. *Biol Invasions* 19:3461–3469
- Garðarsson G, Þorvaldsdóttir HA, Guðmundsdóttir M, Jónsson SI, Haradsdóttir SÓ, Hrafnisdóttir H, Sigurðsson S (2016) Reykjavík Biodiversity Policy. Department of Environment and Planning. <https://reykjavik.is/sites/default/files/reykjavikbiodiversitypolicyenglish.pdf>. Accessed: October 4, 2024
- Gederaas L, Moen TL, Skjelseth S, Larsen L-K, eds (2012) Alien species in Norway—with the Norwegian Black List 2012. Pp 28, 82, 97. artsdatabanken.no/Files/13960/Alien_Species_in_Norway_-_with_the_Norwegian_Black_List_2012. Accessed: October 4, 2024
- [GBIF] Global Biodiversity Information Facility Secretariat (2023) *Myrrhis odorata* (L.) Scop. GBIF Backbone Taxonomy. Checklist Dataset. <https://www.gbif.org/species/3034681>. Accessed: October 4, 2024
- Godefroid S, Koedam N (2003) Identifying indicator plant species of habitat quality and invasibility as a guide for peri-urban forest management. *Biodivers Conserv* 12:1699–1713
- Gretarsdóttir J, Aradóttir A, Vandvik V, Heegaard E, Birks H (2004) Long-term effects of reclamation treatments on plant succession in Iceland. *Restor Ecol* 12:268
- Guðmundsdóttir AL (2003) Fornleifaskráning Laugarness vegna mats á Umhverfisáhrifum Sæbrautar [Archaeological registration of Laugarness due to an environmental impact assessment of Sæbraut street]. Minjasafn Reykjavíkur. 31 p https://skraning.minjastofnun.is/Verkefni_2175.pdf. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Hallgrímsdóttir M (1996) Menningarlandslagið Reykjavík og búsetuslandslagið Laugarnes [The cultural landscape of Reykjavík and the residential landscape of Laugarnes]. Yearbook of Icelandic Archeol Soc 93:141–150. <https://timarit.is/gegnir/991005549459706886>. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Hansson M, Persson T (1994) *Anthriscus sylvestris*—a growing conservation problem? *Ann Bot Fennici* 31:205–213
- Hussain RA, Poveda LJ, Pezzuto JM, Soejarto DD, Kinghorn AD (1990) Sweetening agents of plant origin: phenylpropanoid constituents of seven sweet-tasting plants. *Econ Bot* 44:174–182
- [IINH] Icelandic Institute of Natural History (2024) Spánarkerfill (*Myrrhis odorata*). <https://www.ni.is/is/biota/plantae/tracheophyta/magnoliopsida/apiaceae/spanarkerfill-myrrhis-odorata>. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- iNaturalist-NZ (2024) Sweet Cicely (*Myrrhis odorata*). New Zealand Bio-Recording Network Trust. inaturalist.nz/taxa/51618-Myrrhis-odorata. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- [ISC] Invasive Species Council of British Columbia (2019) Factsheet April 2019. https://bcinvasives.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Wild-Chervil_Factsheet_04_22_2019.pdf. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Jónsson B, Þórðarson H (2018) Skógarkerfill á Hvammstanga—Samantekt um stöðu sumarið 2017 [Wild chervil in Hvammstangi—summary of the distribution in the summer of 2017]. Náttúrustofa Norðurlands vestra. 9 p. <https://www.nnv.is/static/research/files/skogarkerfill-a-hvammstanga-samantekt-um-stodu-mala-sumarid-2017-bjarni-jonsson-og-hjalti-thordarsonpdf>. Accessed: November 7, 2024
- Jørgensen M, Tørresen KS, Dyrhaug M, Myrstad I, Svendsen J, Magnussen T, Førde A, DiTommaso A (2013) *Anthriscus sylvestris*—biology, control and people's perception of cultural landscapes. *Grassl Sci Eur* 18:338–334. <https://www.cabdigitalibrary.org/doi/pdf/10.5555/20133335541>. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Keller R, Geist J, Jeschke JM, Kühn I (2011) Invasive species in Europe: ecology, status, and policy. *Environ Sci Eur* 23:23
- Kew Science (2024) *Myrrhis odorata* (L) Scop. Plants of the World Online. powo.science.kew.org/taxon/urn:lsid:ipni.org:names:845120-1. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Kourantidou M, Verbrugge LNH, Haubrock PJ, Cuthbert RN, Angulo E, Ahonen I, Cleary M, Falk-Andersson J, Granhag L, Gíslason S, Kaiser B, Kosenius A-K, Lange H, Lehtiniemi M, Mangussen K, et al. (2022) The economic costs, management and regulation of biological invasions in the Nordic countries. *J Environ Manag* 324:116374
- Kristinsson H (2013) Flowering Plants and Ferns of Iceland. 3rd ed. Reykjavík: Mál og menning. 368 p
- Kristinsson H, Hlíðberg JB, Þórhalldóttir ÞE (2018) Blómplöntur og Byrkingar [Flora of Iceland: flowering plants and trees]. Reykjavík: Vaka-Helgafell. 741 p
- Kühn I, Brandl R, Klotz S (2004) The flora of German cities is naturally species rich. *Evol Ecol* 6:749–764
- Lassuy DR, Lewis PN (2013) Invasive species: human induced. Pages 558–565 in Meltøfte H, Josefson AB, Payer D, eds. Arctic Biodiversity Assessment, Status and Trends in Arctic Biodiversity 2013. Akureyri: Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna
- Lee T, Perkins A, Campbell A, Passero JS, Roe NA, Shaw CM, Congalton RG (2015) Incipient invasion of urban and forest habitats in New Hampshire, USA, by the nonnative tree, *Kalopanax septemlobus*. *Invasive Plant Sci Manag* 8:111–121

- Lepczyk CA, Aronson MF, Evans KL, Goddard MA, Lerman SB, MacIvor JS (2017) Biodiversity in the city: fundamental questions for understanding the ecology of urban green spaces for biodiversity conservation. *BioScience* 67:799–807
- Lim T (2016) *Edible Medicinal and Non-medicinal Plants*. Dordrecht: Springer. 659 p
- Lososová Z, Chytrý M, Tichý L, Danihelka J, Fajmon K, Hájek O, Kintrová K, Kühn I, Láníková D, Otýpková Z, Řehořek V (2012a) Native and alien floras in urban habitats: a comparison across 32 cities of central Europe. *Global Ecol Biogeogr* 21:545–555
- Lososová Z, Chytrý M, Tichý L, Danihelka J, Fajmon K, Hájek O, Kintrová K, Láníková D, Otýpková Z, Řehořek V (2012b) Biotic homogenization of Central European urban floras depends on residence time of alien species and habitat types. *Biol Conserv* 145:179–184
- Luoma M (2019) Distribution of *Anthriscus sylvestris* and *Myrrhis odorata* within Open Areas of Reykjavík, Iceland. Master's thesis. Reykjavík: University of Iceland. 101 p
- Magnússon SH (2011) NOBANIS—Invasive Alien Species Fact Sheet—*Anthriscus sylvestris*. Online Database of the European Network on Invasive Alien Species—NOBANIS. https://www.nobanis.org/globalassets/speciesinfo/a/anthriscus-sylvestris/anthriscus_sylvestris.pdf. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Mayer K, Haeuser E, Dawson W, Essl F, Kreft H, Pergl J, Pyšek P, Weigelt P, Winter M, Lenzner B, van Kleunen M (2017) Naturalization of ornamental plant species in public green spaces and private gardens. *Biol Invasions* 19:3613–3627
- Miller T, D'Auria D (2011) Effects of herbicide, tillage, and grass seeding on wild chervil (*Anthriscus sylvestris*). *Invasive Plant Sci Manag* 4:326–331
- National Museums Northern Ireland (2023) *Myrrhis odorata* (L.) Scop. - Sweet Cicely - Umbelliferae/Apiaceae. Flora of Northern Ireland. www.habitas.org.uk/flora/species.asp?item=3645. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Native Plant Trust (2024) *Myrrhis odorata* – Anise. Go Botany Project. <https://gobotany.nativeplanttrust.org/species/myrrhis/odorata>. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Nature Conservancy (2010) Wild Chervil—Invasive Fact Sheet. Montpelier, VT: Nature Conservancy. vtinvasives.org/sites/default/files/fact-sheets/-factsheet-chervil2010.pdf. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Nielsen C, Ravn HP, Nentwig W, Wade M, eds (2005) The Giant Hogweed Best Practice Manual. Guidelines for the Management and Control of an Invasive Weed in Europe. Hoersholm: Forest & Landscape Denmark. 44 p
- Nilon C, Aronson M, Cilliers S, Dobbs C, Frazee L, Goddard M, O'Neill K, Roberts D, Stander E, Werner P, Winter M, Yocom K (2017) Planning for the future of urban biodiversity: a global review of city-scale initiatives. *BioScience* 67:4:332–342
- Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture (2003) Nova Scotia Noxious Weeds: Wild Chervil. novascotia.ca/agri/documents/NoxiousWeeds-Wild-Chervil.pdf. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Óskarsson I (1932) Some Observations of the Vegetation of Eyjafjörður and Akureyri. Reykjavík: Ríkisprentsmidjan Gutenberg. 46 p
- Pálsson J (2003) Friðlandið í Vatnsmýrinni - Flóra og gróðurfar í friðlandi fyrir fugla í Vatnsmýrinni [Nature Reserve in Vatnsmýri - flora and vegetation]. Pp 6–7, 12. reykjavik.is/sites/default/files/ymis_skjol/skjol_utgefid_efni/fri_dland_i_vatnsmyri_11-2003-6.pdf. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Pálsson J (2004) Flóra Elliðaárdals: uppruni og útbreiðsla tegunda [Flora of Elliðaárdal: origin and distribution of species]. Reykjavík: Umhverfis- og heilbrigðisstofa. 58 p reykjavik.is/sites/default/files/ymis_skjol/skjol_utgefid_efni/floraellidardals.pdf. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Pejchar L, Mooney H (2009) Invasive species, ecosystem services and human well-being. *Trends Ecol* 24:497–504
- Penny J (2024) Oxford University Plants 400: *Myrrhis odorata* (L.) Scop. (Apiaceae) - Sweet Cicely. BRAHMS Online. herbaria.plants.ox.ac.uk/bol/plants400/Profiles/MN/Myrrhis. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Petrík P, Sádlo J, Hejda M, Štajerová K, Pyšek P, Pergl J (2019) Composition patterns of ornamental flora in the Czech Republic. *NeoBiota* 52:87–109
- Pilto J (2012) Koiranputki yleisty rikkakasvina pelloilla [Cow parsley is becoming more common as a weed in the fields]. yle.fi/uutiset/3-6195229. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Pimentel D, Zuniga R, Morrison D (2005) Update on the environmental and economic costs associated with alien-invasive species in the United States. *Ecol Econ* 52:273–288
- Pyšek P (1998) Alien and native species in Central European urban floras. A quantitative comparison. *J Biogeogr* 25:155–163
- Pyšek P, Chytrý M, Jarošík V (2009) Habitats and land use as determinants of plant invasions in the temperate zone of Europe. Pages 66–79 in Perrings C, Mooney H, Williamson M, eds. *Bioinvasion and Globalization. Ecology, Economics, Management and Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Pyšek P, Danihelka J, Sádlo J, Chrtek J Jr, Chytrý M, Jarošík V, Kaplan Z, Krahulec F, Moravcová L, Pergl J, Štajerová K, Tichý L (2012) Catalogue of alien plants of the Czech Republic, second ed. checklist update, taxonomic diversity and invasion patterns. *Preslia* 84:155–255
- Rančić A, Soković M, Vukojević J, Simić A, Marin P, Duletić-Laušević S, Djoković D (2005) Chemical composition and antimicrobial activities of essential oils of *Myrrhis odorata* (L.) Scop, *Hypericum perforatum* L and *Helichrysum arenarium* (L.) Moench. *J Essent Oil Res* 17:341–345
- Rantanen M (2024) Natural variability boosts Arctic warming. *Nat Geosci* 17: 485–486
- Rantanen M, Karpechko AY, Lipponen A, Nordling K, Hyvärinen O, Ruosteenoja K, Vihma T, Laaksonen A (2022) The Arctic has warmed nearly four times faster than the globe since 1979. *Commun Earth Environ* 3:168
- Seebens H, Blackburn TM, Dyer EE, Genovesi P, Hulme PE, Jeschke JM, Pagad S, Pyšek P, Winter M, Arianoutsou M, Bacher S, Blasius B, Brundu G, Capinha C, Celesti-Grapo L, et al. (2017) No saturation in the accumulation of alien species worldwide. *Nat Commun* 8:14435
- Shochat E, Lerman S, Anderies J, Warren PS, Faeth SH, Nilon CH (2010) Invasion, competition, and biodiversity loss in urban ecosystems. *BioScience* 60:199–208
- Sigurðsson S (2015) Birdwatching in Reykjavík. https://reykjavik.is/sites/default/files/fuglabaeklingur_-_enska_1.pdf. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Sigurgeirsdóttir E, Hilmarsdóttir S (2017) Drengur brann illa á höndum eftir tröllahvönn: Reykjavíkurborg berst gegn nýrri plágu. [A boy's hands were badly burned by Giant Hogweed: the city of Reykjavík is fighting a new plague]. Visir. www.visir.is/g/2017170729894. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Simberloff D, Martin JL, Genovesi P, Maris V, Wardle DA, Aronson J, Courchamp F, Galil B, García-Berthou E, Pascal M, Pyšek P, Sousa R, Tabacchi E, Vilá M (2013) Impacts of biological invasions: what's what and the way forward. *Trends Ecol* 28:58–66
- Solstad H, Hegre H, Alm T, Fløistad IS, Pedersen O, Schei FH, Vandvik V, Vøllering J, Westergaard KB, Skarpaas O (2023) Magnoliophyta: assessment of Spanish chervil *Myrrhis odorata* for mainland Norway with marine areas. Alien Species List 2023. Species Data Bank. <http://www.artsdatabanken.no/lister/fremmedartslista/2023/597>. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Stroh PA, Humphrey TA, Burkmar RJ, Pescott OL, Roy DB, Walker KJ, eds (2020) *Myrrhis odorata* (L.) Scop. BSBI Online Plant Atlas. <https://plantatlas2020.org/atlas/2cd4p9h.5ek>. Accessed: October 4, 2024
- [UNCBD] UN Convention on Biological Diversity (2023) Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework: 2030 Targets. <https://www.cbd.int/gbftargets>. Accessed: October 4, 2024
- UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2015) Sustainable Development Goals. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- [USDA] U.S. Department of Agriculture (2024a) Plants Profile for *Anthriscus sylvestris* (L.) Hoffm. (Wild Chervil). <https://plants.usda.gov/home/plantProfile?symbol=ANSY>. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- [USDA] U.S. Department of Agriculture (2024b) Plants Profile for *Myrrhis odorata* (L.) Scop (Anise). <https://plants.usda.gov/core/profile?symbol=MYOD>. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- van Mierlo J, van Groenendael J (1991) A population dynamic approach to the control of *Anthriscus sylvestris* (L.) Hoffm. *J Appl Ecol* 28:128–139
- Vilá M, Espinar J, Hejda M, Hulme PE, Jarošík V, Maron JL, Pergl J, Schaffner U, Sun Y, Pyšek P (2011) Ecological impacts of invasive alien plants: a meta-analysis of their effects on species, communities and ecosystems. *Ecol Lett* 14:702–708
- von Schmalensee M (2010) Vágastir í vistkerfum – Seinni hluti Framandi og ágengar tegundir á Íslandi [Ecosystems in peril, part two: alien and invasive

- species in Iceland—English summary]. Náttúrufræðingurinn 80:84–102. researchgate.net/publication/281560663_Vagestir_i_vistkerfum_-_Seinni_hluti_Framandi_og_agengar_tegundir_a_Islandi_Ecosystems_in_peril_part_two_Alien_and_invasive_species_in_Iceland_-_English_summary. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- von Schmalensee M, Stefánsson R (2009) Ágengar plöntur í Stykkishólmi [Invasive plants in Stykkisholmur]. Stykkisholmur: Náttúrustofu Vesturlands. Pp 4, 9, 13, 14, 16, 25–27. <https://www.stykkisholmur.is/static/files/skrar/skyrslur/agengar-plontur-i-stykkisholmi.pdf>. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Walker B, Steffen W (1997) An overview of the implications of global change for natural and managed terrestrial ecosystems. Conserv Ecol 1. www.consecol.org/vol1/iss2/art2. Accessed: October 5, 2024
- Wania A, Kühn I, Klotz S (2006) Plant richness patterns in agricultural and urban landscapes in central Germany—spatial gradients of species richness. Landsc Urban Plan 75:97–110
- Wasowicz P (2020) Annotated Checklist of Vascular Plants of Iceland. Fjölrit Náttúrufræðistofnunar nr. 57. Garðabær: Náttúrufræðistofnun Íslands. 194 p
- Wasowicz P, Przedpelska-Wasowicz E, Kristinsson H (2013) Alien vascular plants in Iceland: diversity, spatial patterns, temporal trends, and the impact of climate change. Flora 208:648–673
- Wasowicz P, Sennikov AN, Westergaard KB, Spellman K, Carlson M, Gillespie LJ, Saarela JM, Seefeldt SS, Bennett B, Bay C, Ickert-Bond S, Väre H (2019) Non-native vascular flora of the Arctic: taxonomic richness, distribution and pathways. Ambio 49:693–703
- Willow J (2017) Case study on forage plants of the heath bumblebee (*Bombus jonellus*) in southwest Iceland. Iceland Agric Sci 30:39–42
- Willow J, Tamayo M, Jóhannsson M (2017) Potential impact of Nootka lupine (*Lupinus nootkatensis*) invasion on pollinator communities in Iceland. Iceland Agric Sci 30:51–54
- Zalba S, Ziller SR (2007) Adaptive management of alien invasive species: putting the theory into practice. Nat Conserv 5:86–92
- Zhou W, Leung LR, Lu J (2024) Steady threefold Arctic amplification of externally forced warming masked by natural variability. Nat Geosci 17: 508–515