

1 **Livestock excreta facilitate invasive weed establishment and dominance in**
2 **pastures through physical niche creation and nutrient pulses**

3 Qihong Yuan^{1#}, Xincheng Li^{2#}, Cheng Zhang¹, Tingting Tao³, Han Y. H. Chen⁴, David
4 Johnson³, Zhiwei Zhong⁵, Wei Zhang⁶, Shaoli Zhong⁷, Xiao Sun^{1*}

5 ¹ College of Agro-grassland Science, Nanjing Agricultural University, Nanjing, China

6 ² School of Energy and Environmental Science, Yunnan Normal University, Kunming,
7 China

8 ³ Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, The University of Manchester,
9 Manchester, UK

10 ⁴ Faculty of Natural Resources Management, Lakehead University, Canada

11 ⁵ Institute of Grassland Science, Key Laboratory of Vegetation Ecology, Ministry of
12 Education/Jilin Songnen Grassland Ecosystem National Observation and Research
13 Station, Northeast Normal University, Changchun, China

14 ⁶ Centre of Excellence in Transformative Agribusiness, Lincoln University, Lincoln,
15 New Zealand

16 ⁷ Yunnan Academy of Grassland and Animal Science, Kunming, China

17 [#]These authors contributed equally: Qihong Yuan, Xincheng Li

18 ^{*}Corresponding author e-mail: sunxiao1014@njau.edu.cn

19 **Abstract**

20 Globally, invasive weeds jeopardize pasture productivity and biodiversity, prompting
21 extensive control efforts which are often hampered by an incomplete understanding of
22 how livestock activities, particularly excreta deposition, facilitate weed invasion.
23 Focusing on southwest Chinese pastures, we combined field surveys and controlled
24 experiments to investigate how livestock excreta facilitate the establishment and
25 dominance of the global invasive weed *Rumex obtusifolius* L. through physical and
26 nutrient-mediated pathways. Field surveys confirmed a strong positive association
27 between excreta deposition and the distribution of *R. obtusifolius* across diverse
28 pasture landscapes. Experimental manipulations revealed a two-stage facilitation
29 mechanism: (1) Initial physical suppression by dung patches (via light exclusion and
30 anaerobic soil) eliminated intolerant species, substantially reducing local richness
31 (61.6% after 30 days) and creating establishment opportunities; and (2) Subsequent
32 multi-nutrient enrichment from overlapping dung and urine deposition promoted *R.*
33 *obtusifolius* dominance, with dung addition increasing *R. obtusifolius* height ~10-fold
34 and ramet number ~11-fold compared to controls ($p < 0.001$). Combined dung-urine
35 treatments amplified growth by 32.4% ($p = 0.002$) through stoichiometric
36 complementarity, where nitrogen emerged as the primary growth driver (91.3%
37 biomass increase; $p < 0.001$). Crucially, clonal reproduction required concurrent
38 multi-nutrient availability, averaging nearly 4 ramets/plant, compared to less than 1 in
39 nitrogen treatments. These findings directly inform pasture management, highlighting
40 that effective invasive weed control and productivity maintenance in pastoral systems
41 require integrating livestock excretion management. Practical strategies, such as
42 adjusting grazing patterns and targeted excreta removal, limit localized nutrient over-
43 enrichment and help conserve pasture ecosystems in an ecologically sound manner.

44 **Key words:** Dung, Urine, Spread, *Rumex obtusifolius*, Pasture

45 **1. Introduction**

46 Pastures cover approximately 30% of the Earth's terrestrial surface, serving primarily
47 as fodder sources for livestock (Alexandratos and Bruinsma 2012, Bengtsson et al.
48 2019). While the intentional introduction of non-native forage species aims to
49 enhance pasture productivity, this practice frequently results in the unintended
50 introduction of environmental weeds—invader plants that colonize natural
51 ecosystems, displacing native species and degrading ecological integrity (Neldner et
52 al. 1997, Driscoll and Catford 2014, Driscoll et al. 2014). These weeds pose dual
53 threats: compromising pasture production and encroaching into adjacent native
54 habitats, threatening biodiversity and compromising ecosystem function, and
55 incurring substantial management costs (Driscoll et al. 2014, Catford et al. 2018). The
56 risk of environmental weed spread is particularly high in pastures since some weeds
57 can escape livestock grazing, a risk further exacerbated by improper pasture
58 management (Parker et al. 2006, Driscoll et al. 2014, Gioria et al. 2023). Notable
59 examples include the docks (*Rumex spp.*) and cat's ear (*Hypochaeris radicata*), which
60 can escape grazing and spread aggressively in mismanaged systems and surrounding
61 native ecosystems (Delimat and Kieltyk 2019, Carlin et al. 2023, Lee et al. 2024).
62 Despite widespread control efforts using mechanical, chemical, and biological
63 measures (Bagavathiannan et al. 2019, MacLaren et al. 2020, Diagne et al. 2021), key
64 mechanisms by which livestock behavior facilitates weed invasion remain
65 insufficiently explored, limiting the effectiveness of management strategies.

66 Livestock, like other large herbivores, exert significant top-down control on non-
67 native plants through grazing and trampling (Guyton et al. 2020, Mungi et al. 2023).
68 Beyond these direct effects, their excreta including dung and urine also play a critical
69 role in shaping vegetation dynamics (Sitters and Venterink 2021a, 2021b) (Figure

70 1A). Daily excretion rates are substantial, with a high proportion concentrating in
71 high-use zones, such as resting areas (Saggar et al. 1988, Haynes and Williams 1993,
72 Karn 2001). The physical effects of excreta, particularly pronounced for dung pats,
73 which can block light and form a dry, hard, and nonporous crust, leading to anaerobic
74 soil conditions that smother vegetation (Humphreys et al. 1997, Gillet et al. 2010).
75 Nutrient partitioning further differentiates the roles of dung and urine. Generally,
76 urine supplies rapidly available high concentrations of nitrogen (N) and potassium (K)
77 but low phosphorus (P), while dung slowly releases P, calcium (Ca), and magnesium
78 (Mg) because it decomposes slowly (Haynes and Williams 1993, Karn 2001). The
79 dung and urine deposition and divergence creates heterogeneous nutrient hotspots—
80 analogous to ephemeral resource patches (Sitters and Venterink 2021b, Butterworth et
81 al. 2023) (Figure 1A), potentially contributing to the proliferation of nutrient-loving
82 environmental weeds (Qiu et al. 2023, Shan et al. 2024, Tao et al. 2024). While
83 grazing pressure and seed dispersal through endozoochory have been well
84 documented (Campbell and Gibson 2001, Constible et al. 2005, Sullivan and Shaw
85 2023), the dual mechanisms of excreta—physical stress and multi-nutrient
86 enrichment—remain poorly understood.

87 *Rumex obtusifolius* L. native to Europe, has been introduced to multiple regions
88 worldwide including southern China, and became an environmental weed (Figure
89 1B). This species epitomizes the multifaceted nature of plant invasions in agricultural
90 landscapes, thriving in disturbed habitats and agroecosystems such as roadsides,
91 croplands and pastures with inadequate management practices (Costan et al. 2022,
92 Carlin et al. 2023, Kloetzli et al. 2024). Its invasion success stems from a suite of
93 adaptive traits, including rapid growth, tolerance to anaerobic stress, large stature (40–
94 150 cm), prolific seed output, and clonal reproduction (Gilgen et al. 2010, Hartman et

95 al. 2021, Kloetzli et al. 2024). Notably, its high oxalic acid content poses toxicity risks
96 to livestock, compounding ecological impacts with economic losses (Zaller 2004).
97 Despite its broad dispersal capacity, *R. obtusifolius* exhibits patchy dominance within
98 pastures, showing a strong association with livestock activity hotspots (e.g., resting
99 areas) where excreta deposition is concentrated (Figure 1B). This pattern suggests that
100 factors beyond grazing pressure and trampling are crucial, pointing towards the
101 influence of excreta (Theoharides and Dukes 2007).

102 We hypothesized that the physical suppression and nutrient enrichment caused by
103 livestock excreta deposition drive the establishment and dominance of *R. obtusifolius*
104 in pastures (Figure 1C). Specifically, we employed a hierarchical methodology,
105 combining field observations and controlled experiments, structured around three
106 predictions: (1) spatial patterns of excreta deposition correlate positively with *R.*
107 *obtusifolius* abundance and distribution; (2) *R. obtusifolius* will outperform other
108 pasture species (including both native and introduced plants) in establishment success
109 under excreta-induced physical stress; and (3) cattle dung and urine will enhance *R.*
110 *obtusifolius* growth and clonal reproduction through multi-nutrient synergies. To test
111 these predictions, first, we conducted field surveys in two typical pastures to quantify
112 the relationship between *R. obtusifolius* distribution and excreta deposition patterns.
113 Second, we performed two excreta addition experiments: one in a grazed area to
114 confirm the overall effects of excreta amid other livestock activities, and another in a
115 fenced area to isolate the physical and nutrient impacts of excreta and distinguish the
116 individual and interactive effects of dung and urine. These experiments allowed
117 comparison between grazed versus fenced conditions. Finally, we conducted
118 laboratory pot experiments to identify the key nutrients in excreta that promote *R.*
119 *obtusifolius* growth and clonal reproduction.

120 **2. METHODS**

121 **2.1 Field survey 1**

122 To investigate the relationships between *R. obtusifolius* spread and the distribution of
123 livestock excreta, we conducted field surveys at two typical pastures invaded by *R.*
124 *obtusifolius* in September 2023: Dushan pasture (in Guizhou province) and Nanshan
125 pasture (in Hunan province) (Figures 1D and S1). The two pastures were exploited
126 and utilized from the 1980s. The plant community in Dushan pasture is dominated by
127 annual plants, such as ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum Lamk.*) and oat (*Avena sativa L.*).
128 Nanshan pastures are dominated by perennial plants, such as Yorkshire fog (*Holcus*
129 *lanatus L.*) and white clover (*Trifolium repens L.*). The study sites exhibited
130 contrasting topographies: Dushan pasture is characterized by gentle terrain (slopes <
131 10°) with rotational grazing management, while Nanshan pasture comprises rolling to
132 steep terrain (slopes 15-45°) under free continuous grazing (Figures S1A, B). The two
133 pastures also have different grazing regime and intensities (Table S1) as well as soil
134 properties. The Nanshan pasture exhibited acidic topsoil (pH approx. 5) with high
135 organic carbon (52.81 g kg⁻¹) and mineralizable N (58.95 g kg⁻¹), while the Dushan
136 pasture featured near-neutral soils (pH approx. 6.2) containing substantially low
137 organic carbon (24.36 g kg⁻¹) and mineralizable N (43.98 g kg⁻¹). These contrasting
138 conditions provided a robust background for confirming the observed association
139 between *R. obtusifolius* spread and excreta distribution.

140 We conducted a detailed survey of *R. obtusifolius* spread using systematic
141 transect sampling (McGarvey et al. 2016). Transects (1–2 km in length, approx. 0.5
142 km in width) were established extending outward from cattle milking shed (Figures
143 1D, S1B). Along each transect, we documented *R. obtusifolius* distribution in relation
144 to livestock movement routes. We established sixty 2 m × 3 m plots at stratified

145 random locations within each transect to measure *R. obtusifolius* density and height.

146 Additionally, we surveyed four feeding sites in Nanshan pastures, and one site in

147 Dushan pasture because of smaller area compared to Nanshan pastures.

148 **2.2 Field survey 2**

149 To further explore the relationship between *R. obtusifolius* distribution and cattle
150 excreta, we conducted a paired-plot survey on the Nanshan pasture, focusing on areas
151 already subject to cattle grazing and trampling. We randomly selected eight hillocks
152 with high *R. obtusifolius* density (Figure S1B). At each hillock, we established three
153 paired plots (1 m × 0.25 m). Each pair consisted of one plot with visible cattle dung
154 and one immediately adjacent plot without visible dung. Within dung-present and
155 dung-absent plots, we assessed *R. obtusifolius* abundance, density, and height (Figure
156 1E). To understand the broader community context in which *R. obtusifolius* occurred,
157 we also quantified plant community composition and biomass. Specifically, we
158 identified and recorded the presence and abundance of each plant species to determine
159 community composition, and measured total aboveground shoot biomass for each
160 species by clipping, drying, and weighing the harvested material. Average plant height
161 was determined for all species by measuring five randomly selected individuals, or all
162 if fewer than five were present.

163 **2.3 Experiment 1**

164 To directly test the effect of cattle dung on *R. obtusifolius* spread, we conducted a
165 dung addition experiment in a grazed area at the Nanshan site (Figure 1F). In June
166 2023, five hillocks were selected, where *R. obtusifolius* was colonized but had not
167 established despite ongoing cattle grazing and trampling (Theoharides and Dukes
168 2007). This initial condition suggests that grazing and trampling alone were
169 insufficient for *R. obtusifolius* establishment and dominance at these locations. At

170 each hillock, three pairs of plots (1×0.5 m) were established (six plots total per
171 hillock): within each pair, one plot received an application of cattle dung (~ 4 kg dry
172 matter), approximating the average mass of naturally deposited pats, and the other
173 served as an untreated control.

174 To assess the impact of dung addition, we conducted weekly visual monitoring of
175 the plant community to track dynamic changes, and measured selected parameters at
176 day 0 (pre-treatment), 30, and 120 days (post-treatment). For *R. obtusifolius*, we
177 measured height and the number of clonal individuals (ramets, counted directly within
178 each plot). For the recipient community response, we determined species richness by
179 identifying and counting all plant species present within each plot. We also measured
180 overall plant height (excluding *R. obtusifolius*) and calculated it by a weighted
181 average based on the height and abundance of each species.

182 **2.4 Experiment 2**

183 To determine the individual and combined effects of dung and urine on *R. obtusifolius*
184 invasion, distinguishing between physical and nutrient impacts, we conducted a
185 controlled field experiment in a fenced pasture, excluding livestock grazing and
186 trampling effects (Figure 1G). In early May 2023, we established a randomized block
187 experiment with five replicates on a flat, *R. obtusifolius*-colonized area at the bottom
188 of a hillock on Nanshan pasture. Each block contained five 1×1 m plots separated by
189 1 m buffers. To standardize initial conditions, four similarly-sized *R. obtusifolius*
190 plants were transplanted into each plot from adjacent grassland. After successful
191 colonization (mid-July), two plants of similar height were retained diagonally within
192 each plot. Plant community characteristics were measured before treatment
193 application.

194 Treatments were then randomly assigned to each plot within the blocks,

195 consisting of an untreated control and four cattle excreta treatments: dung, urine, dung
196 and urine combined, and a water-diluted dung solution (to isolate the nutrient effects
197 of dung by minimizing its physical impacts) (Figure 1G). The dry mass of dung
198 applied was approx. 0.55 kg across all dung-containing treatments. For all dung
199 applications, it was applied evenly as a simulated cattle pat to each *R. obtusifolius*
200 plant. For the dung solution treatment, the same mass of dung was mixed with approx.
201 0.55 L water and applied evenly. Post-treatment, plant community was monitored as
202 described in Experiment 1. Finally, plant species within the recipient community were
203 classified as either 'tolerant' (present after dung addition) or 'intolerant' (absent after
204 dung addition) to analyze changes in community composition.

205 **2.5 Pot experiment**

206 To determine which nutrient in excreta plays a crucial role in promoting the spread of
207 *R. obtusifolius*, we conducted a pot experiment with different nutrient addition
208 treatments (Table 1 and Figure 1H). Pots (24 cm diameter, 20 cm depth) were filled
209 with soil collected from the study pasture. Seeds of *R. obtusifolius* were planted in the
210 pots at a density of 1 seedling per pot, approximating the observed field density.
211 Plants were grown for approximately two weeks under regular watering and ambient
212 outdoor conditions. Nutrient addition treatments (detailed in Table 1) were initiated
213 once the seedlings reached approx. 10 cm in height. The nutrient addition rates were
214 based on our previous analysis of cattle excreta samples from the study site. Each
215 treatment had five replicates, and the pots were arranged randomly within a field
216 block. Plant height and the ramet number of *R. obtusifolius* were measured every two
217 months post-fertilization to assess growth and clonal reproduction.

218 **2.6 Statistical analysis**

219 To explore the relationships of livestock activity with *R. obtusifolius* invasion in field

220 survey 1, we applied segmented regression (using the ‘segmented’ package in R)
221 (Muggeo 2017). We expected a non-linear relationship, potentially exhibiting a
222 threshold effect, between distance from the milking shed and *R. obtusifolius* invaded
223 area, density, and height. In field survey 2, paired t-tests were employed to compare
224 biomass and density of *R. obtusifolius* and of all other species combined between
225 dung and non-dung plots. Separate t-tests were conducted for each variable.

226 In experiment 1, paired t-tests were used to compare between dung addition and
227 control treatments for *R. obtusifolius* height, ramet number, and overall plant height
228 (excluding *R. obtusifolius*). Additionally, within both the dung addition and control
229 treatments, paired t-tests compared the height of *R. obtusifolius* to the overall plant
230 height. One-way ANOVAs followed by post-hoc Tukey’s HSD tests were conducted
231 to examine the effect of time (0 day, 30 days, and 120 days) on the relative abundance
232 of *R. obtusifolius* (calculated as the species’ abundance divided by the total abundance
233 of all species within a plot) and on species richness within the dung addition
234 treatment.

235 We applied linear mixed-effects models (LMMs) to analyze the data from both
236 experiment 2 and the pot nutrient addition experiment. In the respective LMMs, the
237 specific treatments for each experiment (excreta or nutrient additions) were treated as
238 fixed factors, and plot identity (for experiment 2) or pot identity (for the pot
239 experiment) was treated as a random factor. For experiment 2, the response variables
240 included measures of *R. obtusifolius* performance (height, biomass, and clonal
241 reproduction) and the height of other plants. To account for initial variation in plant
242 traits and community composition among plots, change ratios of measured parameters
243 were calculated as $(X_{t2} - X_{t1})/ X_{t1}$, where X_{t2} and X_{t1} represent the values after and
244 before treatment, respectively. For the pot experiment, the response variables were

245 measures of *R. obtusifolius* growth and development. In Experiment 2, we analyzed
246 the response of *R. obtusifolius* and other plants (as either ‘tolerant’ or ‘intolerant’) to
247 different dung and urine treatments. We calculated the relative change rate of height
248 for *R. obtusifolius*, tolerant plants and intolerant plants (calculated as a weighted
249 average based on the height of each species). Linear mixed effects models, followed
250 by post-hoc Tukey's HSD tests, were used to compare these relative change rates
251 across the different treatments. Post-hoc Tukey tests were also used for pairwise
252 comparisons among the nutrient treatments. Model assumptions were checked by
253 inspecting the residuals and no apparent violations were found. All statistical analyses
254 were performed in R (v4.4.1), with the significance level set at 0.05.

255 **3. RESULTS**

256 **3.1 Relationships between the spread of *R. obtusifolius* and cattle excreta**

257 Consistent with field observations showing higher *R. obtusifolius* presence near sheds
258 (associated with higher excreta), segmented regression analysis confirmed significant
259 linear decreases in infested area and density with increasing distance (Figure 2)
260 (Nanshan pastures: $p = 0.001 - 0.03$, $R^2 = 0.17 - 0.59$; Dushan pastures: $p = 0.03$ for
261 both area and density, $R^2 = 0.99$ for area, $R^2 = 0.95$ for density). Plant height showed a
262 similar linear decrease pattern (Figure S2), though not statistically significant across
263 all locations. Moreover, the paired plots survey further demonstrated that the excreta
264 deposition plots with higher concentrations of N, P, Ca, K, and Mg had significantly
265 higher biomass, height, and density of *R. obtusifolius* compared to the adjacent plots
266 without excreta (Figures 3, S3 and S4). On the contrary, these deposition plots had
267 significantly lower plant diversity than plots without excreta (Figure 3).

268 **3.2 Effect of experimental excreta**

269 Our dung addition experiments also showed that dung addition had larger positive

270 effects on the height and density of *R. obtusifolius* than on those of the other species
271 in the recipient community in both grazed and fenced area (indicated by relative
272 change rate of height) (Figures 4A, 5A and S5). The addition of water-diluted dung
273 had similar effects on the growth of *R. obtusifolius* and tolerant species compared to
274 dung addition alone (Figure 5A). However, intolerant species exhibited a contrasting
275 response: water-diluted dung promoted their relative height growth, whereas dung
276 addition alone suppressed it (Figure 5A). The dung addition also significantly
277 increased the ramet number of *R. obtusifolius*, and the proportion of *R. obtusifolius* in
278 the community, particularly after 30 days of treatment (Figures 4B, C). However, the
279 number of other plants in the recipient community decreased significantly after 30
280 days of dung addition and partially recovered after 120 days, but still remained lower
281 than pre-treatment levels (Figures 4D, S5A).

282 The growth of *R. obtusifolius* and other plants in recipient community responded
283 differently to the additions of dung, urine, dung and urine (Figure 5A). There were
284 significant positive effects of dung, rather than urine, on *R. obtusifolius* growth, and
285 the simultaneous addition of cattle dung and urine had the largest effects (Figure 5A).
286 In contrast, the growth of intolerant species was significantly inhibited by the addition
287 of dung, while urine had no significant impact on their growth (Figure 5A). However,
288 while the positive effects on tolerant species were similar between the two treatments,
289 the negative effects of dung addition on intolerant species were significantly
290 moderated by the simultaneous addition of urine (Figure 5A).

291 Additions of both NH_4^+ -N and NO_3^- -N exerted similar significant and positive
292 effects on the growth of *R. obtusifolius*, while combined additions of P, K, Ca, and Mg
293 alone had no effect (Figures 5B and S6). The combined addition of N with Ca, Mg, K,
294 and P further enhanced the growth of *R. obtusifolius* by 17.8% to 66.1% compared to

295 N addition alone (Figure 5B). Although NH_4^+ -N and NO_3^- -N additions did not
296 significantly affect *R. obtusifolius* clonality, the combined addition of NH_4^+ -N with
297 Ca, Mg, K, and P had the strongest effects, resulting in an average of four ramets
298 compared to only two or no ramet in other treatments and control plots, respectively
299 (Figure 5C).

300 **4. DISCUSSION**

301 Moving beyond traditional views focusing on direct grazing, trampling, and seed
302 dispersal, our study uncovers the critical role of livestock excreta in facilitating *R.*
303 *obtusifolius* invasion within pastures. We identify a novel two-stage mechanism:
304 initial physical effects create an establishment window which the weed exploits due to
305 its anaerobic tolerance, while subsequent multi-nutrient enrichment (especially from
306 the overlapping deposits of dung and urine) fuels its rapid growth and clonal spread.
307 This demonstration of invasion driven by the synergy between the sequential impacts
308 of excreta and the weed's specific adaptations underscores a significant and
309 potentially underestimated pathway in landscape management (Figure 6A).

310 **4.1 Excreta distribution as a key mechanism driving livestock-mediated weed
311 spread**

312 Field surveys across diverse pasture landscapes revealed a strong association between
313 *R. obtusifolius* abundance and proximity to milking sheds, independent of
314 environmental variables. This spatial correlation indicates that areas with higher
315 excreta deposition are more vulnerable to invasion. This finding was further
316 confirmed by manipulative experiments, which also demonstrated that dung, rather
317 than urine, plays a key role in *R. obtusifolius* establishment. Integrated with results
318 from the water-diluted dung solution and nutrient addition experiments, these findings
319 underscore the dual role of livestock-induced physical disturbance and nutrient

320 enrichment in shaping plant community dynamics and facilitating invasion processes.
321 Livestock, through their movement and natural excretion behaviors, create localized
322 "hotspots" of dung and urine enrichment (Ahmed et al. 2018, Koch et al. 2018),
323 providing a mechanistic explanation for our findings. Consequently, our study
324 provides compelling evidence that livestock-mediated excretion patterns are crucial in
325 facilitating *R. obtusifolius* invasion within grazed pastures. This finding therefore
326 highlights the necessity of targeted livestock excreta management strategies in these
327 areas to effectively mitigate invasive species spread.

328 In the context of hilly pastures, this mechanism of excretion accumulation is
329 likely to be amplified due to livestock behavioral preferences. Livestocks
330 preferentially graze slopes while congregating and excreting disproportionately in flat
331 terrain such as valley tops or bottoms (Haynes and Williams 1993, Aarons et al. 2017,
332 Koch et al. 2018), creating hyper-enriched zones that favor nutrient-demanding
333 weeds. For example, a study in New Zealand upland grasslands found that 60% of
334 dung and 55% of urine accumulated in areas constituting only 15% of the total land
335 area (Saggar et al. 1988). While our results strongly suggest that excreta influence *R.*
336 *obtusifolius* distribution through deposition patterns, we acknowledge that the impact
337 of these excretion patches on plant invasion dynamics may be further modulated by
338 excretion deposition activities (e.g., repeated deposition events), which adds layers of
339 complexity to the spatial heterogeneity and repeated disturbance of dung and urine
340 enrichment.

341 **4.2 Synergistic physical and nutrient pathways in excreta-facilitated invasion**

342 Building on the spatial patterns identified above, our findings demonstrate that
343 livestock dung and urine synergistically drive *R. obtusifolius* invasion through
344 coupled physical and nutrient mechanisms (Figure 6B). Dung pats initiate

345 establishment windows by forming a hard crust that smothers existing vegetation and
346 creates anaerobic soil conditions, while urine can scorch grass blades (Humphreys et
347 al. 1997, Gillet et al. 2010). These physical disturbances act as environmental filters,
348 eliminating intolerant species while providing establishment opportunities for stress-
349 tolerant species such as *R. obtusifolius* (Gillet et al. 2010, Gallien et al. 2014, Kraft et
350 al. 2015). *R. obtusifolius* exhibits remarkable anaerobic tolerance likely through
351 ethylene-mediated adaptive mechanisms, emerging as the dominant species in
352 colonization after one month of dung deposition, while other plant species remain
353 virtually absent (Hartman et al. 2021).

354 The nutrient pathway, particularly N enrichment, amplifies invasion success. As a
355 fast-growing and nitrophilic invasive weed, *R. obtusifolius* efficiently exploits these
356 nutrient pulses (Stilmant et al. 2012). This is demonstrated by markedly increased
357 biomass and clonal expansion of *R. obtusifolius* in dung-enriched areas and of other
358 similar invaders in nutrient-enriched areas (Seabloom et al. 2015, Liu and van
359 Kleunen 2017, Tao et al. 2024). The high nutrient exploitation efficiency further
360 enhances the competitive advantage of the invader over resident species. This
361 advantage is further amplified through a positive feedback loop: the decomposition of
362 smothered vegetation releases additional nutrients, creating optimal conditions for
363 establishment (MacDiarmid and Watkin 1971). Moreover, the spatial overlap of
364 nutrient-rich dung (rich in P, Ca, and Mg) and urine (rich in N and K) creates balanced
365 nutrient profiles that maximize *R. obtusifolius* establishment (Haynes and Williams
366 1993, Agren and Weih 2012). These findings are supported by results from our pot
367 experiment, where N was identified as the primary driver, increasing growth by
368 91.3% and triggering clonal reproduction when combined with other nutrients.
369 Although urinary N emerged as the primary growth driver, weaker effects from

370 isolated urine treatments emphasize the primacy of dung-mediated physical
371 modification during initial establishment. These physical and nutrient mechanisms
372 work synergistically, as concentrated livestock activity intensifies both physical
373 disturbance and nutrient enrichment effects, accelerating the invasion process.

374 **4.3 Managing excreta distribution to control invasive weeds in pastoral systems**

375 The excretion-invasion mechanism identified here provides a foundation for
376 developing targeted excretion management strategies in pastoral systems. First, we
377 recommend implementing intensive rotational grazing with shortened grazing periods,
378 particularly in mountainous terrain, as this approach can promote uniform excreta
379 distribution while maintaining pasture productivity and diversity. Second, building on
380 evidence that prolonged overnight grazing exacerbates dung/urine deposition and
381 induces spatial overlap of dung and urine in resting areas (Aarons et al. 2017, Ahmed
382 et al. 2018, Koch et al. 2018). Our findings further suggest that reducing nocturnal
383 pasturing duration could minimize concentrated nutrient enrichment and spatial
384 overlap in resting areas. Finally, given persistent excreta accumulation observed even
385 under reduced grazing durations (particularly nocturnal regimes), the precision
386 removal or strategic dispersion of highly enriched excretion patches is also needed to
387 break the invasion feedback loop while maintaining pastoral productivity.

388 Our findings also provide broader implications for invasion ecology and policy
389 development. The demonstrated role of concentrated nutrient pulses in facilitating
390 invasion of *R. obtusifolius* suggests that similar mechanisms may operate in other
391 contexts, such as manure fertilization practices and wild animal carcasses (Loydi and
392 Martin Zalba 2009, Barton et al. 2016, Blumenthal et al. 2017). This understanding
393 calls for an integrated approach to invasion management that considers both grazing
394 intensity and nutrient redistribution patterns. We advocate integrating excretion

395 management into environmental protection frameworks and developing policies
396 addressing animal-mediated invasion risks, thereby enhancing both the effectiveness
397 of environmental weed control and the sustainability of ecosystems.

398 **4.4 Study limitations**

399 We acknowledge several key limitations. First, the short experimental timeframe
400 restricted our analysis to initial responses, precluding insights into longer-term
401 ecological dynamics and potentially overlooking slower adaptations within the native
402 plant community. Second, our focus on cattle excretion limits direct generalization to
403 systems with other small ruminants (e.g., sheep/goats), which exhibit higher N
404 excretion rates per metabolic body weight and different morphological characteristics
405 of dung (Haynes and Williams 1993, le Roux et al. 2020, Sitters and Venterink
406 2021c). Third, by concentrating on the target species, *R. obtusifolius*, we did not
407 comprehensively analyze the responses of residual species, thus missing finer details
408 of community interaction under treatments. Finally, the minimal herbivory pressure
409 on *R. obtusifolius* in our invasive-range system shaped our focus on the physical and
410 nutrient effects on excreta-mediated facilitation. This context is crucial, as our
411 findings on facilitation mechanisms are most applicable where consumption pressure
412 is low and may differ significantly from scenarios where herbivory provides
413 substantial *R. obtusifolius* control (e.g., Zaller 2006). Addressing these points requires
414 future studies employing longer durations, incorporating diverse livestock and plant
415 community analyses, and examining outcomes across varying herbivory regimes.

416 **4.5 Conclusions**

417 Our study demonstrates how livestock excreta create critical invasion opportunities
418 enabling invasive weed establishment and dominance in pastures through dual
419 mechanisms: initial physical suppression and subsequent multi-nutrient enrichment.

420 These findings advance pasture management by shifting focus beyond traditional
421 grazing-centric models and dung-mediated seed dispersal to highlight the critical role
422 of excreta-mediated invasion pathways driving pasture degradation. We demonstrate
423 that managing excretion distribution patterns is just as crucial as controlling grazing
424 intensity for preventing weed spread in pastures and even the adjacent roadside
425 ecosystem. The mechanistic understanding gained from this study advances the theory
426 of weed invasion while providing evidence-based strategies for sustainable pasture
427 management.

428 **Acknowledgments**

429 We thank Zhangyuan Chen, Weichun Yang and Wu Liu for their assistance in the
430 field. This work was financially supported by the National Natural Science
431 Foundation of China (NSFC 32271768).

432 **Author contributions**

433 Conceptualization: X.S. Investigation: H.W., T.T., Y.L., Y.G., and X.S. Formal
434 Analysis: Q.Y., H.W., X.L. and X.S. Visualization: Q.Y., H.W., X.L. S.Z., and X.S.
435 Writing (original draft): X.L. and X.S. Writing (review and editing): H.C., X.L., D.J.,
436 Z.Z., W.Z., S.Z., and X.S..

437 **References**

438 Aarons, S. R., C. J. P. Gourley, and M. C. Hannah. 2017. Measuring spatial and
439 temporal variation in lactating dairy cow placement on diverse grazing system
440 farms. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* **248**:175-189.

441 Agren, G. I., and M. Weih. 2012. Plant stoichiometry at different scales: element
442 concentration patterns reflect environment more than genotype. *New
443 Phytologist* **194**:944-952.

444 Ahmed, A., R. Sohi, R. Roohi, M. Jois, P. Raedts, and S. R. Aarons. 2018. Spatially
445 and temporally variable urinary N loads deposited by lactating cows on a
446 grazing system dairy farm. *Journal of Environmental Management* **215**:166-
447 176.

448 Alexandratos, N., and J. J. E. W. P. Bruinsma. 2012. World agriculture towards
449 2030/2050.

450 Bagavathiannan, M. V., S. Graham, Z. Ma, J. N. Barney, S. R. Coutts, A. L. Caicedo,
451 R. De Clerck-Floate, N. M. West, L. Blank, A. L. Metcalf, M. Lacoste, C. R.
452 Moreno, J. A. Evans, I. Burke, and H. Beckie. 2019. Considering weed
453 management as a social dilemma bridges individual and collective interests.
454 *Nature Plants* **5**:343-351.

455 Barton, P. S., S. McIntyre, M. J. Evans, J. K. Bump, S. A. Cunningham, and A. D.
456 Manning. 2016. Substantial long-term effects of carcass addition on soil and
457 plants in a grassy eucalypt woodland. *Ecosphere* **7**:e01537.

458 Bengtsson, J., J. M. Bullock, B. Egoh, C. Everson, T. Everson, T. O'Connor, P. J.
459 O'Farrell, H. G. Smith, and R. Lindborg. 2019. Grasslands-more important for
460 ecosystem services than you might think. *Ecosphere* **10**:e02582.

461 Blumenthal, D. M., D. R. LeCain, and D. J. Augustine. 2017. Composted manure

462 application promotes long-term invasion of semi-arid rangeland by *Bromus*
463 *tectorum*. *Ecosphere* **8**:e01960.

464 Butterworth, N. J., M. E. Benbow, and P. S. Barton. 2023. The ephemeral resource
465 patch concept. *Biological Reviews* **98**:697-726.

466 Campbell, J. E., and D. J. Gibson. 2001. The effect of seeds of exotic species
467 transported via horse dung on vegetation along trail corridors. *Plant Ecology*
468 **157**:23-35.

469 Carlin, T. F., J. L. Bufford, P. E. Hulme, and W. K. Godsoe. 2023. Global assessment
470 of three *Rumex* species reveals inconsistent climatic niche shifts across
471 multiple introduced ranges. *Biological Invasions* **25**:79-96.

472 Catford, J. A., M. Bode, and D. Tilman. 2018. Introduced species that overcome life
473 history tradeoffs can cause native extinctions. *Nature Communications* **9**:
474 2131.

475 Constible, J. M., R. A. Sweitzer, D. H. Van Vuren, P. T. Schuyler, and D. A. Knapp.
476 2005. Dispersal of non-native plants by introduced bison in an island
477 ecosystem. *Biological Invasions* **7**:699-709.

478 Costan, C.-A., W. K. Godsoe, J. L. Bufford, J. W. M. Marrs, and P. E. Hulme. 2022.
479 Can the enemy release hypothesis explain the success of *Rumex*
480 (Polygonaceae) species in an introduced range? *Biological Invasions* **24**:2665-
481 2677.

482 Delimat, A., and P. Kieltyk. 2019. Impact of troublesome expansive weed *Rumex*
483 *alpinus* on species diversity of mountain pastures in Tatra National Park,
484 Poland. *Biologia* **74**:15-24.

485 Diagne, C., B. Leroy, A. C. Vaissiere, R. E. Gozlan, D. Roiz, I. Jaric, J. M. Salles, C.
486 J. A. Bradshaw, and F. Courchamp. 2021. High and rising economic costs of

487 biological invasions worldwide. *Nature* **592**:571-576.

488 Driscoll, D., and J. Catford. 2014. New pasture plants pose weed risk. *Nature* **516**:37-

489 37.

490 Driscoll, D. A., J. A. Catford, J. N. Barney, P. E. Hulme, Inderjit, T. G. Martin, A.

491 Pauchard, P. Pysek, D. M. Richardson, S. Riley, and V. Visser. 2014. New

492 pasture plants intensify invasive species risk. *Proceedings of the National*

493 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **111**:16622-16627.

494 Gallien, L., M. Carboni, and T. Muenkemueller. 2014. Identifying the signal of

495 environmental filtering and competition in invasion patterns - a contest of

496 approaches from community ecology. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*

497 **5**:1002-1011.

498 Gilgen, A. K., C. Signarbieux, U. Feller, and N. Buchmann. 2010. Competitive

499 advantage of *Rumex obtusifolius* L. might increase in intensively managed

500 temperate grasslands under drier climate. *Agriculture Ecosystems &*

501 *Environment* **135**:15-23.

502 Gillet, F., F. Kohler, C. Vandenberghe, and A. Buttler. 2010. Effect of dung deposition

503 on small-scale patch structure and seasonal vegetation dynamics in mountain

504 pastures. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* **135**:34-41.

505 Gioria, M., P. E. Hulme, D. M. Richardson, and P. Pysek. 2023. Why are invasive

506 plants successful? *Annual Review of Plant Biology* **74**:635-670.

507 Guyton, J. A., J. Pansu, M. C. Hutchinson, T. R. Kartzinel, A. B. Potter, T. C.

508 Coverdale, J. H. Daskin, A. G. da Conceicao, M. J. S. Peel, M. E. Stalmans,

509 and R. M. Pringle. 2020. Trophic rewilding revives biotic resistance to shrub

510 invasion. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **4**:712-724.

511 Hartman, S., R. Sasidharan, and L. A. C. J. Voesenek. 2021. The role of ethylene in

512 metabolic acclimations to low oxygen. *New Phytologist* **229**:64-70.

513 Haynes, R. J., and P. H. Williams. 1993. Nutrient cycling and soil fertility in the
514 grazed pasture ecosystem. Pages 119-199 in D. L. Sparks, editor. *Advances in
515 Agronomy*, Vol 49.

516 Humphreys, J., N. Culleton, T. Jansen, E. G. Oriordan, and T. Storey. 1997. Aspects of
517 the role of cattle slurry in dispersal and seedling establishment of *Rumex*
518 *obtusifolius* seed in grassland. *Irish Journal of Agricultural and Food Research*
519 **36**:39-49.

520 Karn, J. F. 2001. Phosphorus nutrition of grazing cattle: a review. *Animal Feed
521 Science and Technology* **89**:133-153.

522 Kloetzli, J., M. Suter, D. Beaumont, A. Kolmanic, R. Leskovsek, U. Schaffner, J.
523 Storkey, and A. Luescher. 2024. Key management practices to reduce the risk
524 of the occurrence of *Rumex obtusifolius* in productive grasslands. *Weed
525 Research* **64**:76-88.

526 Koch, B., H. Homburger, P. J. Edwards, and M. K. Schneider. 2018. Phosphorus
527 redistribution by dairy cattle on a heterogeneous subalpine pasture, quantified
528 using GPS tracking. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* **257**:183-192.

529 Kraft, N. J. B., P. B. Adler, O. Godoy, E. C. James, S. Fuller, and J. M. Levine. 2015.
530 Community assembly, coexistence and the environmental filtering metaphor.
531 *Functional Ecology* **29**:592-599.

532 le Roux, E., L. S. van Veenhuisen, G. I. H. Kerley, and J. P. G. M. Cromsigt. 2020.
533 Animal body size distribution influences the ratios of nutrients supplied to
534 plants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States
535 of America* **117**:22256-22263.

536 Lee, S.-R., T.-Y. Choi, and D.-C. Son. 2024. Multiple introductions of divergent

537 lineages and admixture conferred the high invasiveness in a widespread weed

538 (*Hypochaeris radicata*). *Evolutionary Applications* **17**:e13740.

539 Liu, Y., and M. van Kleunen. 2017. Responses of common and rare aliens and natives

540 to nutrient availability and fluctuations. *Journal of Ecology* **105**:1111-1122.

541 Loydi, A., and S. Martin Zalba. 2009. Feral horses dung piles as potential invasion

542 windows for alien plant species in natural grasslands. *Plant Ecology* **201**:471-

543 480.

544 MacDiarmid, B., and B. Watkin. 1971. Cattle dung patch. 1. Effect of dung patches on

545 yield and botanical composition of surrounding and underlying pasture.

546 *Journal of the British Grassland Society* **26**:238-245.

547 MacLaren, C., J. Storkey, A. Menegat, H. Metcalfe, and K. Dehnen-Schmutz. 2020.

548 An ecological future for weed science to sustain crop production and the

549 environment. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* **40**.

550 McGarvey, R., P. Burch, and J. M. Matthews. 2016. Precision of systematic and

551 random sampling in clustered populations: habitat patches and aggregating

552 organisms. *Ecological Applications* **26**:233-248.

553 Muggeo, V. M. R. 2017. Interval estimation for the breakpoint in segmented

554 regression: a smoothed score-based approach. *Australian & New Zealand*

555 *Journal of Statistics* **59**:311-322.

556 Mungi, N. A., Y. V. Jhala, Q. Qureshi, E. le Roux, and J. C. Svenning. 2023.

557 Megaherbivores provide biotic resistance against alien plant dominance.

558 *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **7**:1645-1653 .

559 Neldner, V. J., R. J. Fensham, J. R. Clarkson, and J. P. Stanton. 1997. The natural

560 grasslands of Cape York Peninsula, Australia. Description, distribution and

561 conservation status. *Biological Conservation* **81**:121-136.

562 Parker, J. D., D. E. Burkepile, and M. E. Hay. 2006. Opposing effects of native and
563 exotic herbivores on plant invasions. *Science* **311**:1459-1461.

564 Qiu, S., Q. Zhang, X. Xu, X. Li, C. Zhou, J. Yang, W. Zhou, and B. Li. 2023. Nutrient
565 enrichment triggers contrasting sexual reproductive responses in native and
566 invasive plants in a saltmarsh. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **419**:138319.

567 Saggar, S., A. D. MacKay, M. J. Hedley, M. G. Lambert, and P. A. Clark. 1988. In
568 "Towards the More Efficient Use of Soil and Fertiliser Sulphur" (R. E. White
569 and L. D. Currie, eds.), Proc. Workshop, Massey Univ., pp 262-278. Massey
570 University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

571 Seabloom, E. W., E. T. Borer, Y. M. Buckley, E. E. Cleland, K. F. Davies, J. Firn, W.
572 S. Harpole, Y. Hautier, E. M. Lind, A. S. MacDougall, J. L. Orrock, S. M.
573 Prober, P. B. Adler, T. M. Anderson, J. D. Bakker, L. A. Biederman, D. M.
574 Blumenthal, C. S. Brown, L. A. Brudvig, M. Cadotte, C. Chu, K. L.
575 Cottingham, M. J. Crawley, E. I. Damschen, C. M. Dantonio, N. M.
576 DeCrappeo, G. Du, P. A. Fay, P. Frater, D. S. Gruner, N. Hagenah, A. Hector,
577 H. Hillebrand, K. S. Hofmockel, H. C. Humphries, V. L. Jin, A. Kay, K. P.
578 Kirkman, J. A. Klein, J. M. H. Knops, K. J. La Pierre, L. Ladwig, J. G.
579 Lambrinos, Q. Li, W. Li, R. Marushia, R. L. McCulley, B. A. Melbourne, C. E.
580 Mitchell, J. L. Moore, J. Morgan, B. Mortensen, L. R. O'Halloran, D. A. Pyke,
581 A. C. Risch, M. Sankaran, M. Schuetz, A. Simonsen, M. D. Smith, C. J.
582 Stevens, L. Sullivan, E. Wolkovich, P. D. Wragg, J. Wright, and L. Yang. 2015.
583 Plant species' origin predicts dominance and response to nutrient enrichment
584 and herbivores in global grasslands. *Nature Communications* **6**:7710.

585 Shan, L. P., A. M. O. Oduor, W. Huang, and Y. J. Liu. 2024. Nutrient enrichment
586 promotes invasion success of alien plants via increased growth and

587 suppression of chemical defenses. *Ecological Applications* **34**:e2791.

588 589 590 Sitters, J., and H. O. Venterink. 2021a. Herbivore dung stoichiometry drives competition between savanna trees and grasses. *Journal of Ecology* **109**:2095-2106.

591 592 Sitters, J., and H. O. Venterink. 2021b. Stoichiometric impact of herbivore dung versus urine on soils and plants. *Plant and Soil* **462**:59-65.

593 594 595 Sitters, J., and H. O. Venterink. 2021c. Body size-fecal nutrient patterns of mammalian herbivores. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **118**:e2020137118.

596 597 598 599 Stilmant, D., B. Bodson, and C. Losseau. 2012. Impact of sowing density and nitrogen fertilization on *Rumex obtusifolius* L. development in organic winter cereal crops. *Biotechnologie Agronomie Societe Et Environnement* **16**:337-343.

600 601 Sullivan, L. L., and A. K. Shaw. 2023. Take me for a ride: Herbivores can facilitate plant reinvasions. *Ecology* **104**:e4132.

602 603 604 Tao, Z., C. Shen, W. Qin, B. Nie, P. Chen, J. Wan, K. Zhang, W. Huang, and E. Siemann. 2024. Fluctuations in resource availability shape the competitive balance among non-native plant species. *Ecological Applications* **34**:e2795.

605 606 607 Theoharides, K. A., and J. S. Dukes. 2007. Plant invasion across space and time: factors affecting nonindigenous species success during four stages of invasion. *New Phytologist* **176**:256-273.

608 609 Zaller, J. G. 2004. Ecology and non-chemical control of *Rumex crispus* and *R. obtusifolius* (Polygonaceae): a review. *Weed Research* **44**:414-432.

610 611 Zaller, J. G. 2006. Sheep grazing vs. cutting: regeneration and soil nutrient exploitation of the grassland weed *Rumex obtusifolius*. *Biocontrol* **51**:837-850.

613 Table 1. Treatments applied in the pot experiment investigating nutrient effects on
614 *Rumex obtusifolius* growth, showing the different combinations and amounts of
615 nutrients (g m⁻²) (nitrogen [N], phosphorus [P], potassium [K], calcium [Ca],
616 magnesium [Mg]) and nitrification inhibitor (3,4-dimethylpyrazole phosphate
617 [DMPP]) were added.

Treatments	N	P	K	Ca	Mg	DMPP
Control						
NH ₄ ⁺ +	15					0.45
DMPP						
NH ₄ ⁺ +	15	8				0.45
DMPP + P						
NH ₄ ⁺ +	15	8	10	57.1	28.6	0.45
DMPP + P +						
K + Ca + Mg						
P + K + Ca +		8	10	57.1	28.6	
Mg						

618

619 **Figure captions**

620 **Figure 1** Conceptual framework, experimental hypotheses tested, experimental
621 design. (A) the possible effects of livestock excreta on invasion dynamics by
622 regulating the invasion of environmental weeds and the invasibility of native plants.
623 (B) Global distribution of *Rumex obtusifolius* (source: powo.science.kew.org), and the
624 spread of *R. obtusifolius* related to cattle activities in Nanshan pasture. (C) The
625 hypotheses of the effects of cattle excreta on the invasiveness of *R. obtusifolius* and
626 resistance of the recipient community. Line thickness and arrows represent their
627 relative strength and direction. (D) Survey and experimental designs for testing the
628 mechanism of livestock excreta facilitating the spread of *R. obtusifolius* in pasture.
629 See Methods for details.

630 **Figure 2** The variation patterns of spread of *Rumex obtusifolius* in relation to
631 livestock excreta in pastures. (A, B) Variation in spread area and density of *R.*
632 *obtusifolius* in four breeding sites, respectively, with distance from shed in Nanshan
633 pastures (JZP, Jizhuaping, SWA, Siwenao, WJWC, Wangjiawochang, XJA,
634 Xinjianao). (C, D) Variation in spread area and density of *R. obtusifolius*, respectively,
635 with distance from shed in Dushan pasture. The asterisks denote significance: * = $p <$
636 0.05; ** = $p < 0.01$, *** = $p < 0.001$.

637 **Figure 3** Biomass and density differences of *Rumex obtusifolius* and other species, as
638 well as plant diversity between grazing area without dung and congregating area with
639 dung. The asterisks denote significance: * = $p < 0.05$; ** = $p < 0.01$, *** = $p < 0.001$.

640 **Figure 4** (A, B) Differences in height and ramet number of *Rumex obtusifolius*
641 between control and cattle dung addition. (C, D) Changes in relative abundance of *R.*
642 *obtusifolius* and species richness within the dung addition treatment. Bars sharing the
643 same letter are not significantly different ($p > 0.05$).

644 **Figure 5** Effects of livestock excreta additions on *Rumex obtusifolius*, tolerant plants
645 and intolerant plants in recipient ecosystems. (A) Changes in height of *R. obtusifolius*,
646 tolerant, and intolerant plants after 30 days of treatment with different excreta
647 additions compared to control. (B, C) Differences in height and ramet number of *R.*
648 *obtusifolius* among different nutrient addition treatments. Bars sharing the same letter
649 are not significantly different ($p > 0.05$).

650 **Figure 6** Conceptual framework illustrating the mechanisms of livestock influence on
651 *Rumex obtusifolius* invasion. (A) The magnitude and pathways of cattle effects on
652 native species and invasive species. Line thickness and arrows represent their relative
653 strength and direction of grazing and excreta effects, respectively. (B) Nutrient and
654 physical effects of cattle excreta on *R. obtusifolius* along the two periods of dung
655 decomposition.