DOI: 10.1111/1365-2664.14016

RESEARCH ARTICLE

An innovative approach combining metabarcoding and ecological interaction networks for selecting candidate biological control agents

Mélodie Ollivier¹ | Vincent Lesieur^{1,2} | Johannes Tavoillot³ | Fanny Bénetière¹ | Marie-Stéphane Tixier¹ | Jean-François Martin¹

¹CBGP, Montpellier SupAgro, INRAE, CIRAD, IRD, Univ Montpellier, Montpellier, France

²CSIRO Health and Biosecurity, European Laboratory, Montferrier sur Lez, France

³CBGP, IRD, CIRAD, INRAE, Montpellier SupAgro, Univ Montpellier, Montpellier, France

Correspondence

Mélodie Ollivier Email: melodie.ollivier@wanadoo.fr

Funding information

Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources; Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation, Grant/Award Number: PRJ-010527

Handling Editor: Steven Vamosi

Abstract

- 1. Classical biological control (CBC) can be used to decrease the density of invasive species to below an acceptable ecological and economic threshold. Natural enemies specific to the invasive species are selected from its native range and released into the invaded range. This approach has drawbacks, despite the performance of specificity tests to ensure its safety, because the fundamental host range defined under controlled conditions does not represent the actual host range *in natura*, and these tests omit indirect interactions within community.
- 2. We focus on *Sonchus oleraceus* (Asteraceae), a weed species originating from Western Palearctic that is invasive in many countries and notably in Australia. We explore how analyses of interaction network within its native range can be used to (a) inventory herbivores associated to the target plant, (b) characterize their ecological host ranges and (c) guide the selection of candidate biocontrol agents considering interactions with species from higher trophic levels. Arthropods were collected from plant community sympatric to *S. oleraceus*, in three bioclimatic regions, and interactions were inferred by a combination of molecular and morphological approaches.
- 3. The networks reconstructed were structured in several trophic levels from basal species (plant community), to intermediate and top species (herbivorous arthropods and their natural enemies). The sub-network centred on *S. oleraceus*-related interactions contained 116 taxa and 213 interactions. We identified 47 herbivores feeding on *S. oleraceus*, 15 of which were specific to the target species. Some discrepancies with respect to published findings or conventional specificity tests suggested possible insufficient sampling effort for the recording of interactions or the existence of cryptic species. Among potential candidate agents, six exhibited interactions with natural enemies.
- 4. Synthesis and applications. Adopting a network approach as prerequisite step of the classical biological control programme can provide a rapid screening of potential agents to be tested in priority. Once ecological host range defined, we suggest that priority should be given to agent used by a minimum species, and, when they

exist, to agents that possess enemies from the most distant taxonomical group from those occurring in the range of introduction.

KEYWORDS

common sowthistle, food web, high-throughput sequencing, host specificity, importation biological control, non-target impacts, risk prediction, weed biocontrol

1 | INTRODUCTION

Biological invasions are currently threatening biodiversity to an unprecedented extent (Bellard et al., 2016; Seebens et al., 2015; Vitousek et al., 1997). When invasive species disrupt the ecological or economic balance, action is required to control their negative impact. Over a wide range of methods (e.g. mechanical, cultural), chemical control is today privileged as cost-effective and easy-toimplement strategy (Clout & Williams, 2009), but classical biological control (CBC) constitutes a possible alternative. CBC involves the release of natural enemies, specific to the target organism and originating from its native range, to keep the density of the invasive species below an economically and ecologically acceptable threshold (Keane & Crawley, 2002; McFadyen, 1998; Van Driesche et al., 2010). From an economical and environmental point of view, CBC is considered more sustainable than mechanical and chemical control (Peterson et al., 2020), although the introduction of biocontrol agents (BCA) into a new territory may itself represents a risk for the recipient communities (Barratt et al., 2018; Hinz et al., 2019; Suckling & Sforza, 2014). Once introduced, the BCA may affect non-target species, especially if it lacks specificity (Müller-Schärer & Schaffner, 2008). Assessing the host range of a candidate BCA is, thus, crucial, to anticipate such risks. Most of the host specificity tests performed to assess this risk are conducted under standardized conditions, through choice/no-choice experiments over a range of targets selected according to the centrifugal phylogeny approach (Briese, 2005; Wapshere et al., 1989).

Recent reviews recognized the success of such experiments for limiting the undesirable unintentional effects of the CBC of weeds (Hinz et al., 2019, 2020). However, the cumbersome nature of these tests reduces the range of species that can be screened. The candidate BCA are selected through preliminary field monitoring that may miss a species of interest. Furthermore, as the fundamental host range of a species (defined under controlled conditions) is thought to be broader than the host range actually observed in the field (known as the realized host range; Louda et al., 2003; Schoonhoven et al., 1998; Sheppard & Harwood, 2005), these tests tend to overestimate the risk and lead to the rejection of candidate BCA based on interactions that would not occur in the field (false positives; e.g. Groenteman et al., 2011). Most CBC programmes use specificity tests under controlled conditions as proxies for field conditions due to the complexity of trophic interaction assessments in the field but this leaves room for improvement.

The characterization of ecological interactions among communities of plants and arthropods in natura is challenging, as it traditionally requires direct observations, the rearing of specimens and considerable taxonomic expertise, rendering the process impractical for large-scale studies. Recent advances in molecular approaches, such as the combination of DNA metabarcoding on gut content or faeces and high-throughput next-generation sequencing (NGS), have opened up new opportunities to track the host range of arthropods in natura with both a high taxonomic resolution and high sensitivity (Derocles et al., 2018; Frei et al., 2019; Wirta et al., 2014; Zhu et al., 2019). Even interactions that are very difficult to observe, such as host-parasitoid associations, can be detected by such methods (Gariepy et al., 2014; Hrček & Godfray, 2015). This approach can be used to reconstruct networks of trophic interactions directly from studies in the field, and provides an analytical framework particularly relevant to studies of complex species assemblages. Network ecology do not only depicts species interactions, but provides elements for the understanding of recurrent patterns of antagonistic interactions between plants and herbivores, such as specialization or compartmentation (Lewinsohn et al., 2006; Thébault & Fontaine, 2010). In CBC against invasive weeds, analyses of ecological networks have been used to assess the extent to which a BCA fits into a recipient community. Such methods provided a way to quantify the direct impact of biological control on non-target plants (Memmott, 2000), and its indirect impact on other species at higher trophic levels (Carvalheiro et al., 2008; Louda et al., 1997; Pearson & Callaway, 2003). Such studies have highlighted the usefulness of network ecology for evaluating the impact of BCA after their introduction (Memmott, 2009; Willis & Memmott, 2005), but interaction network analysis can also be used for the upstream assessment of potential candidate BCA, in a more systematic process (Ollivier et al., 2020). Adopting a network approach as prerequisite step of the CBC programme can provide a rapid screening of the ecological host range of potential agents to be tested in priority. Indeed, the choice of BCA should also take into account indirect effects on the recipient community due to interactions with higher trophic levels in the network, that is, natural enemies (Hinz et al., 2019; Memmott, 2000). Taxonomical identification of species composing native and invasive range can be informative at some point to predict interactions. If comparable enemies (at family level) as those identified in the native range are present in the range of introduction, new interactions might be created with BCA, resulting in disturbances in the ecological network through indirect interactions,

OLLIVIER ET AL.

for example, apparent competition (Carvalheiro et al., 2008; López-Núñez et al., 2017). Nevertheless, network analyses can also inform about species functional properties through the position and connexions the species have in the network, independently of its strict taxonomic identification; conferring to network analysis a strong predictive power of the interactions possibly occurring in a novel bioclimatic region (Frost et al., 2019; Todd et al., 2020).

The objective of this study was to determine how the analysis of interaction networks could be used to support the selection of candidate BCA for the common sowthistle, Sonchus oleraceus L. (Asteraceae). This plant is native to Western Europe and Northern Africa (Boulos, 1974; Hutchinson et al., 1984) and is the most widely naturalized terrestrial plant worldwide (Pyšek et al., 2017). In Australia, it has become a weed of major concern in cropping systems (Llewellyn et al., 2016; Widderick et al., 2010). Aside the development of resistance to multiple herbicides (Adkins et al., 1997; Jalaludin et al., 2018; Meulen et al., 2016), the control of this weed is complex as it is extremely prolific, and seed viability is about 2-3 years in the soil (Chauhan et al., 2006). Seeds can germinate all year round when sufficient rainfalls occur. Sonchus oleraceus thus uses soil's water reserve to develop and rapidly dominates crops, reducing yield and contaminating harvested grain (Llewellyn et al., 2016). A CBC programme was therefore initiated in 2017, to identify candidate BCA. In this context, an analysis of ecological networks, based on direct field observations and high-throughput DNA metabarcoding, was performed. Our objectives were to (a) establish an inventory of arthropods feeding on S. oleraceus, and assess the contribution of the approach relatively to classical procedures, (b) delineate the ecological host range for herbivores feeding on S. oleraceus and point out candidate BCA and (c) identify the trophic interactions of the candidate BCA with natural enemies, and consider their implications for the CBC programme.

2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 | Sampling design

We maximized the species diversity and associated interactions, through a maximum variation design with three bioclimatic regions in France (semi-oceanic, Mediterranean and continental climates; Ceglar et al., 2019) and three successive sampling dates (April, May and June 2018). Sampling was carried by varying climatic conditions. These variations did not affect our ability to capture arthropods. For each bioclimatic region and date, we employed an opportunistic sampling strategy adapted to the biology of this pioneer species. We collected plants from several ruderal and agricultural sites, covering the diversity of habitats (open and disturbed) colonized by *S. oleraceus* (Table S1). At each site, on each date, we sampled three quadrats (1 m²) along a 20 m linear transect. Quadrats were placed to contain at least one *S. oleraceus* plant. Within each quadrat, arthropods were collected from plants with a forceps or brush, and stored individually in sterile 2-ml Eppendorf tubes filled with a protective buffer

solution. This solution is used to prevent oxidation of polyphenols and polyamines (PCR inhibitors; see Cruaud et al., 2018 for more details). This procedure was repeated for each plant of every plant species present in the quadrat over a period of 1 hour, to standardize the sampling effort. This period was deemed adapted to represent the biodiversity of the sampled unit, and to allow vagrant insects, potentially disturbed by our arrival, to settle back on their resource plant before sampling. We collected individual specimens except for colonies of aphids, thrips and egg masses, for which at least five specimens were required to obtain sufficient DNA for analysis. We did not consider pollinators or the soil fauna in this study. Following the collection of each specimen, tools were thoroughly cleaned by successive immersions in 2.5% bleach solution, water and 96% ethanol. to prevent cross-contamination. At the end of the 1-hr insect sampling period, all the plants within the guadrat were collected individually, for further dissection. Back in the laboratory, the plants were identified morphologically, and their organs (stems, leaves and flowers) were dissected to collect endophagous arthropods, which were transferred into tubes as described for the arthropods collected in the field. For each arthropod specimen collected, we identified the plant species from which arthropods were sampled, and recorded the specimen stage and condition (degraded, parasitized), and putative identification (at least taxonomic group, with identification to species level if straightforward). All arthropod samples were frozen at -20°C until DNA analysis. Thus, while plants were identified morphologically, arthropods were identified via molecular technologies. Each plant was transferred to a paper bag and oven-dried at 70°C for 72 hr, for the determination of above-ground dry biomass (g) as an estimate of plant abundance per quadrat. Arthropod abundances were determined based on the number of individuals collected per quadrat for each taxon. Sampling was performed for 57 quadrats, over the three sampling dates.

2.2 | High-throughput DNA metabarcoding

We characterized the interaction network by directly observing plant-arthropod interactions (recording only interactions for which an observation of feeding was verified) while arthropod-arthropod interactions were revealed by molecular analysis. We first isolated total DNA from each arthropod individual (Cruaud et al., 2018). As presented in Figure S1, we then performed metabarcoding on each arthropod sample, with a two-step DNA amplification and high-throughput sequencing method adapted from the procedure described by Galan et al. (2017). We sequenced three short COI fragments, with primer combinations and PCR protocols developed elsewhere (HCO forward: Leray et al., 2013, HCO reverse: Folmer et al., 1994, LEP F. and R.: Brandon-Mong et al., 2015, HEX F. and R.: Marquina et al., 2019), to overcome the problem of the lack of primer universality among arthropods. Error-proof indices for individual sample identification were developed with the high-throughput sequencing process described by Martin (2019). The libraries were sequenced with Illumina technology, using a Miseq 2×250 run for

date 1 (April), and one lane of Hiseq 3000 each for dates 2 (May) and 3 (June).

The markers for each sample were demultiplexed with CutAdapt v2.3, and all paired-end reads were filtered for minimal length (280 bp), corrected for sequencing errors, and pairs of overlapping reads were merged with the DADA2 v1.12 R package (Callahan et al., 2016). A matrix was thus obtained, containing samples as variables and amplicon variant sequences (ASVS) as observations. A variant is a set of identical corrected and merged paired-end reads. We used Qiime2 (Bolyen et al., 2018) with a 2% divergence threshold, to merge ASVS, to decrease their number without the loss of taxonomic information. The summed number of reads for each merged variant for a given arthropod sample was reported as the intersection of samples and ASVS.

Each ASVS was assigned, by BLAST, to a barcoding reference database of cvtochrome oxidase subunit I (COI) nucleotide sequences (658 bp) compiled from three different sources and curated by expert analysis. These reference barcodes were retrieved from BOLDSYSTEM (Ratnasingham & Hebert, 2007), the CBGP-Continental Arthropod collection (Centre de Biologie pour la Gestion des Population, 2019) and a local database specifically designed for this study. Our database contained barcodes of the most frequently encountered species during this sampling campaign (extra-specimens collected) and field surveys (2017-2020) conducted through Europe and North Africa for the search of S. oleraceus natural enemies (see below). In total, these three sources compiled 1,699,995 sequences from 119,299 species available for ASVS assignation. We retained successful assignments to the ranks of species, genus and family, but not those to higher taxonomic levels because arthropod biology is too variable at higher taxonomic ranks to be informative for our purpose. The assignments obtained for each marker were grouped together in a single table and the numbers of reads were summed by assigned taxon. The resulting file was therefore an interaction matrix in BIOM file format, in which the assigned taxa replaced ASVS. The matrix was curated and manually transformed to obtain an adjacency matrix (in which the observations are sources and the variables are consumers) usable for further network analyses. For each pair of consumer/prey species, occurrence frequencies of interaction were calculated (Appendix S1, Figure S2).

2.3 | Assessment of sampling robustness and global network description

We first evaluated the completeness of sampling over the entire sampling campaign, and generated taxon accumulation curves (the 57 quadrats were added in a random order, with 1,000 permutations) for plants and arthropods, using the *specaccum* function of the R package VEGAN (Oksanen et al., 2020). We estimated the extrapolated taxonomic richness by calculating the Chao 1 index (Chao, 1984) with the *specpool* function. Likewise, the robustness of sampling for the characterization of interactions was assessed by

generating accumulation curves for pairwise interactions. We first generated an accumulation curve including all the types of direct interactions (e.g. plant-herbivores, herbivores-natural enemies, etc.) present in the meta-network (i.e. pooling interactions from all sites). The 57 quadrats were added in a random order, with 1,000 permutations. We finally generated a curve focusing on interactions involving *S. oleraceus* as a source, to evaluate the performance of the sampling design for addressing our objective of establishing an inventory of the arthropods feeding on *S. oleraceus*, corresponding to candidate BCA. For both curves, we estimated the extrapolated interaction richness with the Chao 1 index (Chao, 1984), using the *specpool* function.

Prior to interaction analyses, a global description of the metanetwork (pooling interactions data from all sites) and sub-network (centred on *S. oleraceus*-related interactions) was performed. Several metrics were calculated: the number of links (*L*), the number of nodes (*S*) (connected and isolated), connectance (*C*) and link density (LD) (Bersier et al., 2002; Warren, 1994). Connectance is the proportion of the possible trophic links actually realized; here cannibalism is not permitted, so C = L/S(S - 1). Link density is the mean number of links per taxon, calculated as LD = *L*/*S*. We also characterized the taxon assemblage by determining taxonomic richness (i.e. number of taxa) for each trophic level (plants, herbivores and natural enemies).

2.4 | Selection of candidate biocontrol agents

The selection of candidate BCA was decided according two criteria: a restricted ecological host range and limited interactions with natural enemies. Thus, based on the interactions retrieved from the meta-network, we selected a sub-network considering only the arthropods having S. oleraceus as a source plant, as well as all their complementary plant resources. We also included natural enemies associated with these herbivores (i.e. parasitoids and predators). We assessed and visualized the specificity of these herbivores, by plotting interactions between herbivores encountered on S. oleraceus and all their complementary resource plants as a grid matrix, in which plants were ordered by their degree of phylogenetic relatedness to S. oleraceus, as defined by the current classification of angiosperms (Chase et al., 2016). Arthropods were ordered by the increasing generality values (i.e. the number of resources per taxon) characterizing ecological host range. To assess and visualize the dependence of natural enemies on these herbivores, we constructed a second level grid matrix in connexion with the previous, and calculated arthropod vulnerability values (i.e. the number of consumer per taxon). To reconstruct the multipartite networks, we first constructed a bipartite network between plants and herbivores keeping plant nodes ordered by centrifugal phylogeny and chose the method 'cca' of the function plotweb of the BIPARTITE R package, which leads to as few crossings of interactions as possible. Then, we retrieve nodes coordinates for basal and second level and assembled all trophic levels under IGRAPH R package. Grid matrices were constructed with the function visweb of the BIPARTITE R package.

2.5 | Assessing the contribution of the approach for the biocontrol programme

To discuss the contribution of the method herein proposed, we used, as a point of reference, a survey performed following classical procedures (sampling, rearing and identification of specimens exclusively collected from *S. oleraceus*) in the frame of this CBC programme (Lesieur et al., 2021). However, we acknowledge that this classical survey covered a longer period of sampling (2017–2020) and a much larger geographical area was prospected (10 countries through Europe and North Africa).

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Summary of the molecular results

In total, 2,834 arthropod specimens were collected and analysed by metabarcoding, to reconstruct the interaction network at a global scale. We obtained DNA sequences and taxonomic assignments for 1,803 of the 2,834 arthropods initially collected (63.6%). This proportion of exploitable information reached 71% (2,011 specimens) after manual validation of the matrix. The molecular analysis provided a total of 107,483,410 reads, 19.2% of which were retained after screening with quality filters; we obtained a final dataset of 2,014 COI variant sequences (Table S2). Before, manual validation, we observed that a large proportion of the diversity (33% of the families and 40% of the species) was recovered by the use of all markers, the rest being recovered by a combination of two markers, or specifically found with only one marker (Figure S3). LEP increased identification rates by 20% for families and 25% for total species, consistent with its widespread use in the research

community (Brandon-Mong et al., 2015). The other two markers also provided original information, albeit to a lesser extent, at least as far as the number of taxa recovered was concerned, as 15% of the families and 16% of the species would not have been recovered with LEP alone. After data validation, 269 taxa were identified for arthropods, with 84% identified to species level (17 orders, 90 families and 189 genera). While plant taxonomic diversity (relying on morphological identifications) accounted for 132 taxa, 80% of which were classified to species level (25 orders, 29 families and 87 genera; Figure S4).

3.2 | Sampling robustness

The Chao 1 index indicated an extrapolated taxonomic richness value for plants of 164 taxa (±12), with 132 taxa actually sampled (Figure 1). By contrast, for arthropods, the extrapolated taxonomic richness value was 442 taxa (\pm 39), but only 269 taxa were actually sampled. Sampling robustness was high over the entire sampling scheme for plants but sampling efficiency was lower for arthropods. Likewise, we assessed the completeness of pairwise interactions detected over the whole network. We observed a linear increase associated with a Chao1 index of $1,245 (\pm 183)$ expected interactions, where 350 links were actually reconstructed (Figure 1). However, this is less of an issue for the recovery of the interactions involving S. oleraceus, the focus of the analysis for which this sampling was designed. The accumulation curve in question tended towards an asymptote, with a Chao 1 index of 63 (± 10) expected interactions and 47 interactions sampled. Overall, these results suggest that the sampling effort was adequate for the reconstruction of a unique interaction network maximizing of the proportion of links observed (Jordano, 2016).



FIGURE 1 Accumulation curves representing (a) species richness in plants and arthropods and (b) pairwise interactions from the metanetwork and focusing on interactions involving *Sonchus oleraceus*. Curves were constructed with 1,000 random resampling events over the 57 quadrats analysed along the sampling campaign (Spring 2018)

3.3 | Meta-network and sub-network analyses

As presented in Table 1, the complete interaction network (metanetwork) consisted of 401 nodes, 241 of which were connected to another node (60%), resulting in 350 links (Figure S5). Linkage density and connectance calculated were 1.45 and 0.006, respectively. The meta-network included 60 plants in interaction (46% of the plants collected), 136 herbivores in interaction (74% of the herbivores collected), 35 natural enemies in interaction (49% of the natural enemies collected) comprising 19 parasitoid and 16 predator taxa, and 10 omnivores (feeding at more than one trophic level). The sub-network consisted of 116 nodes and 213 links, and resulting linkage density and connectance were 1.84 and 0.008, respectively (Figure 2). A more detailed description of taxon assemblage composing *S. oleraceus* sub-network is provided in the following section.

3.4 | Identifying candidate biocontrol agents: Considering host range and regulation by enemies

Analysing S. oleraceus sub-network, we found 47 herbivorous taxa feeding on the target, including 37 taxa identified to species level. They belonged to five different orders, that is, Hemiptera (45%), Diptera (25%), Coleoptera (19%), Lepidoptera (0.06%) and Hymenoptera (0.04%), and were distributed in nine different trophic guilds, with the flower bud sucking-piercing guild being the most represented (23%) while the less represented guild corresponded to the chewing guild (2%; Table 2). In all, 15 taxa were collected exclusively from S. oleraceus (Figure 2), and another two taxa were collected from S. oleraceus and Sonchus asper (Figure 3). These taxa are potential BCA (host range apparently restricted to the genus Sonchus, subtribe Sonchinae). Six additional species were detected only on members of the tribe Chicorieae (Aphis craccivora Koch, Ophiomyia cunctata Hendel, Phytomyza lateralis Fallén, Campiglosa producta Loew, L. punctiventris and T. formosa). We identified 38 other plant species as complementary resource plants for the herbivore species collected from S. oleraceus. The generality of these herbivore species ranged from 1 to 18, with Philaenus spumarius L. the most polyphagous of the 47 herbivores species found on S. oleraceus (Figure 3).

The analysis of the sub-network also indicated that the herbivores collected on *S. oleraceus* were a resource for diverse natural enemies. In particular, 19 of the 47 herbivorous taxa collected were attacked by several species of parasitoid (12 species from the family Braconidae, 1 from Figitidae and 1 from Ichneumonidae) and predators (6 Arachnida species, 1 from Cantharidae, 2 from Coccinnellidae, 3 from Syrphidae and 1 from Orthoptera). Moreover, among the 17 arthropods identified as candidate BCA for their restricted ecological host range, we detected interactions with natural enemies for six of them, one exhibiting interactions with eight taxa from higher trophic levels (Figure 3).

Eventually, molecular analyses revealed particular patterns of omnivory involving several species from Heteroptera. We distinguished between intermediate omnivores (species feeding on both plants and TABLE 1 Global description of the meta-network and subnetwork centred on *Sonchus oleraceus*. Metrics measured are the total number of nodes (in brackets is the number of nodes connected in the network), the number of links, the linkage density and the connectance of the network. For each network is also presented the number of species per trophic level (in brackets is the number of species in interaction with another species). Omnivorous species are regarded as natural enemies

	Meta-network	Sub-network*
Global metrics		
No. of nodes (connected)	401 (241)	116
No. of links	350	213
Linkage density	1.45	1.84
Connectance	0.006	0.008
Taxon assemblage		
No. of plant species (in interaction)	132 (60)	39
No. of herbivore species (in interaction)	184 (136)	47
No. of natural enemies species (in interaction)	85 (45)	30

*All nodes are connected.

herbivores, such as members of the Tephritidae and Aphididae), and top omnivores (species feeding on herbivores and natural enemies, such as members of the Syrphidae). The list of the taxa included in the sub-network and of all the trophic interactions (i.e. the edge list) used to generate Figure 3 are provided in Tables S3 and S4, respectively.

3.5 | Assessing the contribution of the approach for the biocontrol programme

The analysis of trophic interactions identified 47 taxa feeding on *S. oleraceus*, 37 of which were identified to species level. In all, 19 of these 37 species had already been sampled in classical field surveys, the other 18 species being newly reported as herbivores of *S. oleraceus* in this CBC programme (Table 2).

4 | DISCUSSION

4.1 | The combination of observation and molecular data performs well for the characterization of interactions

The metabarcoding approach used made it possible to target a broad diversity of taxa (90 arthropod families, with identification to species level of 84% of the variants), as expected with the use of multiple markers (Alberdi et al., 2018; Creedy et al., 2019; Marquina et al., 2019). The combination of taxonomic assignments with subsequent observational data and information available in the literature was essential (a) to validate the trophic links



FIGURE 2 Multitrophic network reconstructed from *Sonchus oleraceus* (dark green node) and 38 other plants (light green nodes) used by *S. oleraceus* herbivores (red nodes represent putative specialist herbivores, and pink nodes correspond to herbivores feeding on other species in addition to *S. oleraceus*). Plants are ordered by their phylogenetic relatedness to *S. oleraceus*. Natural enemies of herbivore species are represented by dark blue nodes. Nodes at intermediate levels (beige and light blue) correspond to omnivorous species identified by molecular analyses. The width of edges reflects frequencies of interactions between pairs of species and edges coloured in red emphasize interactions involving potential specialist herbivores. The list of taxa corresponding to each node and the edge list are provided in Tables S3 and S4, respectively

(predation and parasitism) and (b) to complement the identification in cases of failed amplification or taxonomic assignment, as advocated in other contexts (Derocles et al., 2018; Wirta et al., 2014). In the meta-network, 60% of the taxa interacted, suggesting that our methods performed very well for the reconstruction of interactions. More specifically, interaction detection rates obtained for plantherbivores and herbivores-natural showed higher values than those usually reported in comparable contexts (Braukmann et al., 2017; Clare, 2014; Erickson et al., 2017; García-Robledo et al., 2013; Roslin & Majaneva, 2016). The high rate of interaction reported here for herbivorous arthropods can be explained by our decision to focus on intensive plant dissection and morphological determination. Retaining feeding interactions only after verification reduced the risk of false positives, over-estimating species interactions, related to the use of co-occurrence data (i.e. tourist insects on plants rather than actual trophic links; Zhu et al., 2019). For arthropods, the rather low rate of natural enemies positive for preys can be multifactorial; for example, mismatch between the primer pairs used and the prey species, low sequencing depth given the DNA yield ratio between

consumer and prey, and degradation of DNA from consumed preys (Hosseini et al., 2008; Macías-Hernández et al., 2018; Sheppard & Harwood, 2005; Sheppard et al., 2004).

4.2 | A complementary inventory of herbivores feeding on *S. oleraceus*

The 47 taxa collected from *S. oleraceus* covered a wide range of trophic guilds. This evidenced that the method herein employed did not bias the selection towards a particular trophic guild but allows the detection of herbivores exhibited diversified feeding habits. The selection of one or several BCA from these trophic guilds could offer a good complementarity of actions (Buccellato et al., 2019). *Sonchus oleraceus* is a pioneer species, and a very prolific seed producer. Interesting agents against this plant could be found in the different species attacking flower heads (such as sucking-piercing Heteroptera species and bud galling Diptera species). However, a good strategy of regulation could also be offered by species attacking main stem

TABLE 2 Herbivores from *Sonchus oleraceus* (SO) collected and identified through intense field sampling in three bioclimatic regions (Semi-oceanic, Mediterranean and Continental) in France in spring 2018. The field host range of these herbivores was defined by network analysis (S–SO, Specific to SO; S–S, Specific to the genus *Sonchus*; S–C, Specific to the tribe Cichorieae; G, Generalist; _, Unknown host range). The column 3-year surveys refers to the species collected following classical procedures of biocontrol programme (see Section 2)

Order/family	Species	Trophic guild	3-year survey	Field host range	Literature host range (Reference)
Coleoptera					
Cerambicydae	Agapanthia cardui (Linnaeus, 1767)	Stem boring	No	G	
Cerambicydae	Agapanthia pannonica (Kratochvil, 1985)	Stem boring	No	S-SO	Polyphagous (Wang, 2017)
Curculionidae	sp.	Crown/stem boring	-	G	
Curculionidae	Lixus punctiventris (Boheman, 1835)	Stem boring	Yes	S-C	
Dasytidae	Dasytes tristiculus (Mulsant & Rey, 1868)	Flower/pollen chewing	No	S-SO	Polyphagous (Diputacio Barcelona, 2019)
Dasytidae	Psilothrix viridicoeruleus (Geoffroy, 1785)	Flower/pollen chewing	No	G	
Oedemeridae	Oedemera crassipes (Ganglbauer, 1881)	Flower/pollen chewing	No	S-SO	Polyphagous (Vázquez Albalate, 2002)
Oedemeridae	Oedemera flavipes (Fabricius, 1792)	Flower/pollen chewing	No	G	
Nitidulidae	Brassicogethes aeneus (Fabricius, 1775)	Flower/pollen chewing	Yes	G	
Diptera					
Agromyzidae	sp.	Leaf mining	-	G	
Agromyzidae	Liriomyza sonchi (Hendel, 1931)	Leaf mining	Yes	S-S	Oligophagous (Benavent- Corai, 2005)
Agromyzidae	Ophiomyia cunctata (Hendel, 1920)	Leaf mining	Yes	S-C	
Agromyzidae	Phytomyza horticola (Goureau, 1851)	Leaf mining	Yes	G	
Agromyzidae	Phytomyza lateralis (Fallén, 1823)	Leaf mining	Yes	S-C	
Tephritidae	sp.	Flower bud galling/seed feeding	-	S-SO	Oligophagous (White, 1988)
Tephritidae	Campiglossa producta (Loew, 1844)	Flower bud galling/seed feeding	Yes	S-C	
Tephritidae	Ensina sonchi (Linnaeus, 1767)	Flower bud galling/seed feeding	Yes	S-S	Oligophagous (White, 1988)
Tephritidae	Tephritis sp.	Flower bud galling/seed feeding	-	G	
Tephritidae	Tephritis cometa (Loew, 1840)	Flower bud galling/seed feeding	No	S-SO	Oligophagous (Bladmineerders Online Database, 2020)
Tephritidae	Tephritis formosa (Loew, 1844)	Flower bud galling/seed feeding	Yes	S-C	
Tephritidae	Tephritis vespertina (Loew, 1844)	Flower bud galling/seed feeding	No	S-SO	Oligophagous (Bladmineerders Online Database, 2020)
Hemiptera					
Aphididae	sp.	Systemic sucking piercing	-	S-SO	Polyphagous (Aphids on the Wolrd's Plants Database, 2020)
Aphididae	Aphis craccivora (Koch, 1854)	Systemic sucking piercing	No	S-C	
Aphididae	Aphis fabae (Scopoli, 1763)	Systemic sucking piercing	No	G	

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Order/family	Species	Trophic guild	3-year survey	Field host range	Literature host range (Reference)
Aphididae	Hyalopterus pruni (Geoffroy, 1762)	Systemic sucking piercing	No	S-SO	Oligophagous (Aphids on the Wolrd's Plants Database, 2020)
Aphididae	Hyperomyzus lactucae (Linnaeus, 1758)	Systemic sucking piercing	Yes	G	
Aphididae	Macrosiphum rosae (Linnaeus, 1758)	Systemic sucking piercing	No	S-SO	Polyphagous (Aphids on the Wolrd's Plants Database, 2020)
Aphididae	Uroleucon sonchi (Linnaeus, 1767)	Systemic sucking piercing	Yes	G	
Anthocoridae	Orius sp.	Flower head sucking piercing	No	G	
Aphrophoridae	Philaenus sp.	Leaf sucking piercing	No	G	
Aphrophoridae	Philaenus spumarius (Linnaeus, 1758)	Leaf sucking piercing	Yes	G	
Cicadellidae	Cicadella viridis (Linnaeus, 1758)	Leaf sucking piercing	No	S-SO	Polyphagous (Tay, 1972)
Coreidae	Coreus marginatus (Linnaeus, 1758)	Flower head sucking piercing	Yes	G	
Lygaeidae	Lygaeus equestris (Linnaeus, 1758)	Flower head sucking piercing	Yes	G	
Miridae	sp.	Flower head sucking piercing	-	G	
Miridae	Closterotomus norvegicus (Gmelin, 1790)	Flower head sucking piercing	No	S-SO	Polyphagous (Haye et al., 2006)
Miridae	Lepidargyrus ancorifer (Fieber, 1858)	Flower head sucking piercing	No	G	
Orsillidae	Nysius cymoides (Spinola, 1837)	Flower head sucking piercing	Yes	G	
Pentatomidae	Dolycoris baccarum (Linnaeus, 1758)	Flower head sucking piercing	Yes	G	
Pentatomidae	Nezara viridula (Linnaeus, 1758)	Flower head sucking piercing	No	G	
Rhopalidae	Liorhyssus hyalinus (Fabricius, 1794)	Flower head sucking piercing	Yes	G	
Rhopalidae	Stictopleurus punctatonervosus (Goeze, 1778)	Flower head sucking piercing	Yes	G	
Hymenoptera					
Cynipidae	sp.	Stem boring	Yes	G	
Tenthredinidae	Cephaledo bifasciata (Müller, 1766)	Leaf chewing	No	S-SO	
Lepidoptera					
Noctuidae	Hecatera dysodea (Denis & Schiffermüller, 1775)	Flower bud chewing	Yes	S-SO	Oliphagous (Landolt et al., 2010)
Tortricidae	sp.	Leaf mining/chewing	-	S-SO	Polyphagous (Bladmineerders Online Database, 2020)
Tortricidae	Cnephasia stephensiana (Doubleday, 1849)	Leaf mining/chewing	No	S-SO	Polyphagous (Bladmineerders Online Database, 2020)

of the plan at early stage of development (actions provided by stem borer species). Lastly, the guild of flower head sucker-piercer was the richest, offering a larger choice of potential BCA. Further dedicated experiments would be necessary to assess which of these candidate agents (individually or in combination) actually provide the best regulation action of *S. oleraceus* (Morin et al., 2009).



FIGURE 3 Interaction matrix between herbivores sampled on *Sonchus oleraceus* and their resource plants, indicating the ecological host range of the herbivores, as defined by intense field sampling in France, during spring 2018. Plants are ordered by their phylogenetic relatedness to *S. oleraceus* and arthropods are ordered by increasing generality values (i.e. the number of resources per species). Red rectangle highlights the 17 species considered as candidate BCA for their restricted eclogical host range. The second level matrix diplays interactions between candidate BCA and their natural enemies. Interaction are represented as semi-quantitative information, via occurences frequencies of interactions culculated for each species pair

Several elements indicated that our approach is a good complement of the classical survey. For example, we provided a more detailed description of pollen chewers (only *Brassicogethes aeneus* (Fabricius, 1775) was recorded in the classical survey). For Diptera, the Tephritidae flies, *Tephritis cometa* Loew and *T. vespertina* Loew are newly recorded. A phylogeny of this taxa based on the CO1 barcode showed that those species are closely related to *T. formosa* Loew (Smit et al., 2013), and we cannot, therefore, rule out possible molecular misidentification due to the short CO1 barcode used or host race differentiation, as frequently observed in this group (Diegisser et al., 2006). Despite a reduced area prospected and a limited time frame, some species rarely sampled with classical survey, were collected and their ecological host range described. Indeed, few specimens of the Tephritidae species, *Campiglossa producta*, were collected in the continental bioclimatic region in France. We acknowledge we missed some species occurring later in the season or out of the sampled area. For example, *Cystiphora sonchi* Vallot (Diptera: Cecidomyiidae) was collected in the classical surveys and passed specificity tests (Lesieur et al., 2020), but was not sampled from *S. oleraceus* in the three bioclimatic regions from April to June. This lack of detection in our sampling campaign was expected, as rates of infestation with this species peak in summer (Rizzo & Massa, 1998). Hence, this study should be regarded as a complement of usual procedures. However, with the rapid development of molecular technologies and associated drop in price (Kennedy et al., 2020), we believe that this approach will be soon applicable at larger sampling scales.

4.3 | Selection of BCA

4.3.1 | First criterion: A restricted ecological host range

Based on the present results, 15 of the 47 herbivores feeding on S. oleraceus seemed to have an ecological host range restricted to S. oleraceus, and another two taxa appeared to be restricted to the genus Sonchus, thus being of particular interest as candidate BCA. However, contradictions were observed between the ecological host range described by network analysis and published findings or specificity test results (Lesieur et al., 2021). These discrepancies may be due to insufficient sampling for the recording of species interactions (as shown by accumulation curve on total interactions) or to the presence of cryptic host races or cryptic species that have yet to be deciphered. In particular, two species, Liriomyza sonchi Hendel and Ensina sonchi L., were found associated with S. oleraceus and S. asper and were, therefore, considered to be candidate BCA because these plants are both invasive weeds in Australia (Cullen et al., 2012; Peerzada et al., 2019). However, a wider range of resources has been reported for these two species (Table 2). Conversely, the promising galling insect T. formosa passed specificity tests and demonstrated to be restricted to the genus Sonchus, contrary to the results reported here (where T. formosa was found on Crepis vesicaria L.). This plant was not indented to be tested as a potential food plant for T. formosa, and these results therefore highlight the complementarity of the ecological network approach for clarifying herbivore host range.

Moreover, we identified *C. producta* (previously considered a promising BCA) on three different plant species from the Chicorieae tribe, potentially leading to its exclusion from the list of candidate BCA. This example shows how the network developed here is complementary to classical procedures, making it possible to narrow down the list of candidate BCA to be tested. The same applies to *Cheilosia latifrons* Zetterstedt, a species collected in the classical survey (Lesieur et al., 2021). The meta-network indicated it was collected from *S. asper* and *Picris echioides* (L.), revealing its oligophagous dietary behaviour. Little is known about the biology of *C. latifrons* (Schmid & Grossmann, 1996) and its taxonomy seems to be unsolved, calling into question the existence of a species complex based on the host plant use (Speight, 2014). We also observed discrepancies for specimens from Cynipidae that appeared to be generalist herbivores,

whereas subsequent analysis of the variants assigned to Cynipidae indicated a genetic structure more consistent with multiple cryptic species potentially specializing on the host plant. One species from Cynipidae is a known stem galler of *S. oleraceus: Aulacidea follioti* Barbotin (Bladmineerders Online Database, 2020). However, this species is not yet present in any of the barcoding databases and could therefore only be assigned to family level. Further prospections to collect other Cynipidae specimens and rear them to adulthood would be required to confirm this identification.

4.3.2 | Second criterion: Limited interactions with natural enemies

Using metabarcoding to reconstruct interactions between arthropods, we were able to detect a wide range of parasitoids from their herbivore hosts, and some predators. We detected omnivorous dietary behaviour in several groups from Heteroptera. Opportunistic predation through carnivory is common in Lygaeidae (Burdfield-Steel & Shuker, 2014). Carnivory has also been reported in Miridae (Wheeler, 2001) and sometimes leads to intraguild predation interactions. We found that both Syrphidae (Diptera) and Miridae (Heteroptera) fed on aphid species, but we also revealed that mirids could prey upon syrphids, as already demonstrated (Fréchette et al., 2006). Members of the Lygaeidae and Miridae were also found to be able to access and feed on larval stages of several Tephritidae species while inside the flower heads of S. oleraceus. This interaction does not seem to have been observed before and provides insight useful not only for the CBC programme against S. oleraceus, but also with direct implications for other biological control programmes, particularly those involving the conservation biological control of insect pests.

More specifically, among candidate BCA exhibiting a restricted ecological host range, some were associated with an important diversity of natural enemies, and should be considered of lower priority for testing (i.e. *Ensina sonchi*). We suggest that priority should be given to agent predated by a minimum parasitoid and predator species, and, when they exist, to an agent that possesses enemies from the most distant taxonomical group from those occurring in the range of introduction (Ollivier et al., 2020). It has been shown that newly created interactions between hosts and parasitoids in the introduced range are predictable based on the realized interactions in native range (Paynter et al., 2018; Veldtman et al., 2011). Further steps in this programme would consist in investigating the diversity of natural enemies occurring in the range of invasion to anticipate new potential interactions and refine BCA choice.

4.3.3 | Considering abundance and distribution of species for BCA choice

The innovative approach herein presented eventually presents the advantage of characterizing species abundance and distribution

throughout south of France, additional key features that could help prioritize candidates BCA (Figure S4). Candidate BCA that are found to be abundant and widespread in the native range would most likely be successful BCA (Paynter et al., 2018). With respect to specificity, maintaining a high genetic diversity within the BCA population is essential for a better establishment and spread throughout the introduced range. Reaching this level of diversity in rearing condition will be most easily achieved if agents are collected from as many populations as possible (Sheppard et al., 2003). Such approach would help meet these needs, providing species abundance and distribution.

5 | CONCLUSIONS

We demonstrate here the potential of network ecology for characterizing candidate BCA and their ecological interactions in the field. This characterization clearly benefited from the use of complementary approaches (morphological and molecular analyses) to identify plant/arthropod and arthropod/arthropod interactions and provided a solid framework for the establishment of an inventory of herbivores feeding on the target weed, their realized host range and interactions with natural enemies. Avenues for further investigation have been identified and in-depth studies are now required. The strength of this approach also lies in its capacity to screen field host ranges for multiple herbivore species simultaneously, without the need for as many tests as species. This potential to narrow down the list of candidate BCA for testing should help to save both time and money. Finally, in addition to the potential value of ecological network analysis to the CBC targeting Common Sowthistle in Australia, the data reported here are potentially useful for other future programmes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are particularly grateful to A Coeur d'acier, G Delvare, B Derepas, J Harran, B Michel, A Migeon, E Pierre, JM Ramel and JC Streito for providing their taxonomic expertise for arthropod identification for construction of the local database. We also thank G Fried for assistance with the identification of some plant specimens. We also warmly thank all our coworkers involved in field sampling: P Audiot, M Corbin, R Guilhot, A Loiseau, L Olazcuaga, T Thomann and N Vieira. This project is supported by funding from the Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, as part of its Rural R&D for Profit programme, through AgriFutures Australia (Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation; PRJ-010527).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

M.O., V.L., J.T., M.-S.T. and J.-F.M. conceived the ideas and designed the methodology; M.O., V.L., J.T., F.B. and J.-F.M. collected the data; M.O. analysed the data and led the writing of the manuscript. All authors contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval for publication.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data available via the Dryad Digital Repository https://doi. org/10.5061/dryad.47d7wm3dp (Ollivier et al., 2021).

ORCID

Mélodie Ollivier Dhttps://orcid.org/0000-0002-8379-5771 Vincent Lesieur https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3374-6004 Jean-François Martin https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9176-4476

REFERENCES

- Adkins, S. W., Wills, D., Boersma, M., Walker, S. R., Robinson, G., Mcleod, R. J., & Einam, J. P. (1997). Weeds resistant to chlorsulfuron and atrazine from the north-east grain region of Australia. Weed Research, 37, 343–349. https://doi.org/10.1046/ j.1365-3180.1997.d01-56.x
- Alberdi, A., Aizpurua, O., Gilbert, M. T. P., & Bohmann, K. (2018). Scrutinizing key steps for reliable metabarcoding of environmental samples. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 9, 134–147. https://doi. org/10.1111/2041-210X.12849
- Aphids on the Wolrd's Plants Database. (2020). Aphids on the wolrd's plants Database – An online identification and information guide.
- Barratt, B. I. P., Moran, V. C., Bigler, F., & van Lenteren, J. C. (2018). The status of biological control and recommendations for improving uptake for the future. *BioControl*, 63, 155–167. https://doi. org/10.1007/s10526-017-9831-y
- Bellard, C., Genovesi, P., & Craine, J. M. (2016). Global patterns in threats to vertebrates by biological invasions. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 283, 20152454.
- Benavent-Corai, J. (2005). Catalogue of the hosts-plants of the World Agromyzidae (Diptera). Università degli Studi di Milano.
- Bersier, L.-F., Banašek-Richter, C., & Cattin, M.-F. (2002). Quantitative descriptors of food-web matrices. *Ecology*, 83, 2394–2407. https:// doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2002)083[2394:QDOFWM]2.0.CO;2
- Bladmineerders Online Database. (2020). Plant parasites of Europe Leafminers, galls and fungi.
- Bolyen, E., Rideout, J. R., Dillon, M. R., Bokulich, N. A., Abnet, C., Al-Ghalith, G. A., Alexander, H., Alm, E. J., Arumugam, M., Asnicar, F., Bai, Y., Bisanz, J. E., Bittinger, K., Brejnrod, A., Brislawn, C. J., Titus Brown, C., Callahan, B. J., Caraballo-Rodríguez, A. M., Chase, J., ... Gregory Caporaso, J. (2018). QIIME 2: Reproducible, interactive, scalable, and extensible microbiome data science. PeerJ Inc.
- Boulos, L. (1974). Revision systematique du genre Sonchus L. s.l. VI. Sous-genre. 3. origosonchus. genres Embergeria, Babcockia et -Taeckholmia. species exclusae et dubiae. index. Botaniska notiser.
- Brandon-Mong, G.-J., Gan, H.-M., Sing, K.-W., Lee, P.-S., Lim, P.-E., & Wilson, J.-J. (2015). DNA metabarcoding of insects and allies: An evaluation of primers and pipelines. *Bulletin of Entomological Research*, 105, 717–727. https://doi.org/10.1017/S000748531 5000681
- Braukmann, T. W. A., Kuzmina, M. L., Sills, J., Zakharov, E. V., & Hebert, P. D. N. (2017). Testing the efficacy of DNA barcodes for identifying the vascular plants of Canada. *PLoS ONE*, 12(1), e0169515. https:// doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0169515
- Briese, D. T. (2005). Translating host-specificity test results into the real world: The need to harmonize the yin and yang of current testing procedures. *Biological Control*, 35, 208–214. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2005.02.001
- Buccellato, L., Byrne, M. J., Fisher, J. T., Witkowski, E. T. F., & Witkowski, E. T. F. (2019). Post-release evaluation of a combination of biocontrol

agents on Crofton weed: Testing extrapolation of greenhouse results to field conditions. *BioControl*, 64(4), 457–468. https://doi. org/10.1007/s10526-019-09946-0

- Burdfield-Steel, E. R., & Shuker, D. M. (2014). The evolutionary ecology of the Lygaeidae. *Ecology and Evolution*, 4, 2278–2301. https://doi. org/10.1002/ece3.1093
- Callahan, B. J., McMurdie, P. J., Rosen, M. J., Han, A. W., Johnson, A. J. A., & Holmes, S. P. (2016). DADA2: High resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. *Nature Methods*, 13, 581–583. https:// doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3869
- Carvalheiro, L. G., Buckley, Y. M., Ventim, R., Fowler, S. V., & Memmott, J. (2008). Apparent competition can compromise the safety of highly specific biocontrol agents. *Ecology Letters*, 11, 690–700. https://doi. org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01184.x
- Ceglar, A., Zampieri, M., Toreti, A., & Dentener, F. (2019). Observed northward migration of agro-climate zones in Europe will further accelerate under climate change. *Earth's Future*, 7, 1088–1101. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019EF001178
- Centre de Biologie pour la Gestion des Population. (2019). CBGP -Continental Arthropod Collection. Portail Data INRAE.
- Chao, A. (1984). Nonparametric estimation of the number of classes in a population. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 11, 265–270.
- Chase, M. W., Christenhusz, M. J. M., Fay, M. F., Byng, J. W., Judd, W. S., Soltis, D. E., Mabberley, D. J., Sennikov, A. N., Soltis, P. S., & Stevens, P. F. (2016). An update of the Angiosperm Phylogeny Group classification for the orders and families of flowering plants: APG IV. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society*, 181, 1–20.
- Chauhan, B. S., Gill, G., & Preston, C. (2006). Factors affecting seed germination of annual sowthistle (Sonchus oleraceus) in southern Australia. Weed Science, 54, 854–860.
- Clare, E. L. (2014). Molecular detection of trophic interactions: Emerging trends, distinct advantages, significant considerations and conservation applications. *Evolutionary Applications*, 7, 1144–1157. https:// doi.org/10.1111/eva.12225
- Clout, M. N., & Williams, P. A. (2009). Invasive species management: A handbook of principles and techniques. Oxford University Press.
- Creedy, T. J., Ng, W. S., & Vogler, A. P. (2019). Toward accurate specieslevel metabarcoding of arthropod communities from the tropical forest canopy. *Ecology and Evolution*, *9*, 3105–3116. https://doi. org/10.1002/ece3.4839
- Cruaud, A., Gonzalez, A.-A., Godefroid, M., Nidelet, S., Streito, J.-C., Thuillier, J.-M., Rossi, J.-P., Santoni, S., & Rasplus, J.-Y. (2018). Using insects to detect, monitor and predict the distribution of *Xylella fastidiosa*: A case study in Corsica. *Scientific Reports*, 8, 1–13.
- Cullen, J., Julien, M., & McFadyen, R. (2012). Biological control of weeds in Australia. CSIRO Publishing.
- Derocles, S. A. P., Bohan, D. A., Dumbrell, A. J., Kitson, J. J. N., Massol,
 F., Pauvert, C., Plantegenest, M., Vacher, C., & Evans, D. M. (2018).
 Chapter One Biomonitoring for the 21st century: Integrating next-generation sequencing into ecological network analysis. In
 D. A. Bohan, A. J. Dumbrell, G. Woodward, & M. Jackson (Eds.),
 Advances in ecological research (pp. 1–62). Academic Press.
- Diegisser, T., Seitz, A., & Johannesen, J. (2006). Phylogeographic patterns of host-race evolution in *Tephritis conura* (Diptera: Tephritidae). *Molecular Ecology*, 15, 681-694. https://doi. org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2006.02792.x
- Diputacio Barcelona. (2019). Trobada d'Estudiosos de Sant Llorenç del Munt i l'Obac – Comunicacions presentades el 21 i 22 de novembre de 2017 a Castellar del Vallès.
- Erickson, D. L., Reed, E., Ramachandran, P., Bourg, N. A., McShea, W. J., & Ottesen, A. (2017). Reconstructing a herbivore's diet using a novel rbcL DNA mini-barcode for plants. *AoB PLANTS*, *9*, plx015. https:// doi.org/10.1093/aobpla/plx015
- Folmer, O., Black, M., Hoeh, W., Lutz, R., & Vrijenhoek, R. (1994). DNA primers for amplification of mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase

subunit I from diverse metazoan invertebrates. *Molecular Marine Biology and Biotechnology*, *3*, 294–299.

- Fréchette, B., Rojo, S., Alomar, O., & Lucas, É. (2006). Intraguild predation between syrphids and mirids: Who is the prey? Who is the predator? *BioControl*, 52, 175. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10526-006-9028-2
- Frei, B., Guenay, Y., Bohan, D. A., Traugott, M., & Wallinger, C. (2019). Molecular analysis indicates high levels of carabid weed seed consumption in cereal fields across Central Europe. *Journal of Pest Science*, 92, 935–942. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-019-01109 -5
- Frost, C. M., Allen, W. J., Courchamp, F., Jeschke, J. M., Saul, W.-C., & Wardle, D. A. (2019). Using network theory to understand and predict biological invasions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 34, 831–843. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2019.04.012
- Galan, M., Pons, J.-B., Tournayre, O., Pierre, É., Leuchtmann, M., Pontier, D., & Charbonnel, N. (2017). Metabarcoding for the parallel identification of several hundred predators and their prey: Application to bat species diet analysis. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 18, 474–489. https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12749
- García-Robledo, C., Erickson, D. L., Staines, C. L., Erwin, T. L., & Kress, W. J. (2013). Tropical plant-herbivore networks: Reconstructing species interactions using DNA barcodes. *PLoS ONE*, 8, e52967. https:// doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0052967
- Gariepy, T. D., Haye, T., & Zhang, J. (2014). A molecular diagnostic tool for the preliminary assessment of host-parasitoid associations in biological control programmes for a new invasive pest. *Molecular Ecology*, 23, 3912–3924. https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12515
- Groenteman, R., Fowler, S. V., & Sullivan, J. J. (2011). St. John's wort beetles would not have been introduced to New Zealand now: A retrospective host range test of New Zealand's most successful weed biocontrol agents. *Biological Control*, 57, 50–58. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2011.01.005
- Haye, T., van Achterberg, C., Goulet, H., Barratt, B. I. P., & Kuhlmann, U. (2006). Potential for classical biological control of the potato bug Closterotomus norwegicus (Hemiptera: Miridae): Description, parasitism and host specificity of Peristenus closterotomae sp. n. (Hymenoptera: Braconidae). Bulletin of Entomological Research, 96, 421-431.
- Hinz, H. L., Winston, R. L., & Schwarzländer, M. (2019). How safe is weed biological control? A global review of direct nontarget attack. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 94, 1–27. https://doi. org/10.1086/702340
- Hinz, H. L., Winston, R. L., & Schwarzländer, M. (2020). A global review of target impact and direct nontarget effects of classical weed biological control. *Current Opinion in Insect Science*, 38, 48–54. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2019.11.006
- Hosseini, R., Schmidt, O., & Keller, M. A. (2008). Factors affecting detectability of prey DNA in the gut contents of invertebrate predators: A polymerase chain reaction-based method. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, 126, 194–202. https://doi. org/10.1111/j.1570-7458.2007.00657.x
- Hrček, J., & Godfray, H. C. J. (2015). What do molecular methods bring to host-parasitoid food webs? *Trends in Parasitology*, 31, 30–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2014.10.008
- Hutchinson, I., Colosi, J., & Lewin, R. A. (1984). The biology of Canadian weeds: 63. Sonchus asper (L.) Hill and S. oleraceus L. Canadian Journal of Plant Science, 64, 731–744.
- Jalaludin, A., Widderick, M. J., Broster, J., & Walsh, M. J. (2018). Glyphosate and 2,4-D amine resistance in common sowthistle (Sonchus oleraceus) and fleabane (Conyza bonariensis) in the northern grain growing region of Australia. Proceedings of 21st Australasian Weeds Conference Sydney, NSW.
- Jordano, P. (2016). Sampling networks of ecological interactions. Functional Ecology, 30, 1883–1893. https://doi. org/10.1111/1365-2435.12763

- Keane, R. M., & Crawley, M. J. (2002). Exotic plant invasions and the enemy release hypothesis. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 17, 164– 170. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(02)02499-0
- Kennedy, S. R., Prost, S., Overcast, I., Rominger, A. J., Gillespie, R. G., & Krehenwinkel, H. (2020). High-throughput sequencing for community analysis: The promise of DNA barcoding to uncover diversity, relatedness, abundances and interactions in spider communities. Development Genes and Evolution, 230, 185–201. https://doi. org/10.1007/s00427-020-00652-x
- Landolt, P. J., Worth, R. A., & Zack, R. S. (2010). First report of *Hecatera dysodea* (Denis and Schiffermüller) (Noctuidae) in the Pacific Northwest of the United States. *Journal of the Lepidopterists' Society*, 64, 192–196.
- Leray, M., Yang, J. Y., Meyer, C. P., Mills, S. C., Agudelo, N., Ranwez, V., Boehm, J. T., & Machida, R. J. (2013). A new versatile primer set targeting a short fragment of the mitochondrial COI region for metabarcoding metazoan diversity: Application for characterizing coral reef fish gut contents. *Frontiers in Zoology*, 10, 34. https://doi. org/10.1186/1742-9994-10-34
- Lesieur, V., Jourdan, M., Thomann, T., Ollivier, M., Tavoillot, J., Morin, L., & Raghu, S. (2021). Feasibility of classical biological control of *Sonchus oleraceus* in Australia. *Biocontrol Science and Technology*, 1– 30. https://doi.org/10.1080/09583157.2021.1936451
- Lesieur, V., Thomann, T., Ollivier, M., & Raghu, S. (2020). Making host specificity testing more efficient: Exploring the use of abridged test plant lists. *Journal of Applied Entomology*, 144, 546–551. https://doi. org/10.1111/jen.12760
- Lewinsohn, T. M., Prado, P. I., Jordano, P., Bascompte, J., & Olesen, J. M. (2006). Structure in plant-animal interaction assemblages. *Oikos*, 113, 174-184. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0030-1299.2006.14583.x
- Llewellyn, R., Ronning, D., Ouzman, J., Walker, S., Mayfield, A., & Clarke, M. (2016). Impact of weeds on Australian grain production: The cost of weeds to Australian grain growers and the adoption of weed management and tillage practices. GRDC.
- López-Núñez, F. A., Heleno, R. H., Ribeiro, S., Marchante, H., & Marchante, E. (2017). Four-trophic level food webs reveal the cascading impacts of an invasive plant targeted for biocontrol. *Ecology*, 98, 782–793. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.1701
- Louda, S. M., Kendall, D., Connor, J., & Simberloff, D. (1997). Ecological effects of an insect introduced for the biological control of weeds. *Science*, 277, 1088–1090. https://doi.org/10.1126/scien ce.277.5329.1088
- Louda, S. M., Pemberton, R. W., Johnson, M. T., & Follett, P. A. (2003). Nontarget effects-the Achilles' heel of biological control? Retrospective analyses to reduce risk associated with biocontrol introductions. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 48, 365–396.
- Macías-Hernández, N., Athey, K., Tonzo, V., Wangensteen, O. S., Arnedo, M., & Harwood, J. D. (2018). Molecular gut content analysis of different spider body parts. *PLoS ONE*, 13, e0196589. https://doi. org/10.1371/journal.pone.0196589
- Marquina, D., Andersson, A. F., & Ronquist, F. (2019). New mitochondrial primers for metabarcoding of insects, designed and evaluated using in silico methods. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 19, 90–104. https:// doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12942
- Martin, J.-F. (2019). error-proof_indexes v1.0. Zenodo.
- McFadyen, R. E. (1998). Biological control of weeds. Annual Review of Entomology, 43, 369–393. https://doi.org/10.1146/annur ev.ento.43.1.369
- Memmott, J. (2000). Food webs as a tool for studying nontarget effects in biological control. In P. A. Follett & J. J. Duan (Eds.), Nontarget effects of biological control (pp. 147–163). Springer US.
- Memmott, J. (2009). Food webs: A ladder for picking strawberries or a practical tool for practical problems? Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences, 364, 1693– 1699. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0255

- Morin, L., Reid, A. M., Sims-Chilton, N. M., Buckley, Y. M., Dhileepan, K., Hastwell, G. T., Nordblom, T. L., & Raghu, S. (2009). Review of approaches to evaluate the effectiveness of weed biological control agents. *Biological Control*, *51*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bioco ntrol.2009.05.017
- Müller-Schärer, H., & Schaffner, U. (2008). Classical biological control: Exploiting enemy escape to manage plant invasions. *Biological Invasions*, 10, 859–874. https://doi.org/10.1007/s1053 0-008-9238-x
- Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., Minchin, P. R., O'Hara, R. B., Simpson, G. L., Solymos, P., Stevens, M. H. H., Szoecs, E., & Wagner, H. (2020). vegan: Community ecology package. R package version 2.5-7. Retrieved from https://CRAN.Rproject.org/package=vegan
- Ollivier, M., Lesieur, V., Raghu, S., & Martin, J.-F. (2020). Characterizing ecological interaction networks to support risk assessment in classical biological control of weeds. *Current Opinion in Insect Science*, 38, 40–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2019.12.002
- Ollivier, M., Lesieur, V., Tavoillot, J., Bénetière, F., Tixier, M.-S., & Martin, J.-F. (2021). Data from: An innovative approach combining metabarcoding and ecological interaction networks for selecting candidate biological control agents. *Dryad Digital Repository*, https:// doi.org/10.5061/dryad.47d7wm3dp
- Paynter, Q., Fowler, S. V., & Groenteman, R. (2018). Making weed biological control predictable, safer and more effective: Perspectives from New Zealand. *BioControl*, 63(3), 427–436. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10526-017-9837-5
- Pearson, D. E., & Callaway, R. M. (2003). Indirect effects of host-specific biological control agents. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 18, 456– 461. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(03)00188-5
- Peerzada, A. M., O'Donnell, C., & Adkins, S. (2019). Biology, impact, and management of common sowthistle (Sonchus oleraceus L.). Acta Physiologiae Plantarum, 41, 136. https://doi.org/10.1007/s1173 8-019-2920-z
- Peterson, P. G., Merrett, M. F., Fowler, S. V., Barrett, D. P., & Paynter, Q. (2020). Comparing biocontrol and herbicide for managing an invasive non-native plant species: Efficacy, non-target effects and secondary invasion. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *57*, 1876–1884. https:// doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13691
- Pyšek, P., Pergl, J., Essl, F., Lenzner, B., Dawson, W., Kreft, H., Weigelt, P., Winter, M., Kartesz, J., Nishino, M., Antonova, L. A., Barcelona, J. F., Cabesaz, F. J., Cárdenas, D., Cárdenas-Toro, J., Castaño, N., Chacón, E., Chatelain, C., Dullinger, S., ... Kleunen, M. V. (2017). Naturalized alien flora of the world: Species diversity, taxonomic and phylogenetic patterns, geographic distribution and global hotspots of plant invasion. *Preslia*, *89*, 203–274. https://doi.org/10.23855/presl ia.2017.203
- Ratnasingham, S., & Hebert, P. D. N. (2007). bold: The barcode of life data system (http://www.barcodinglife.org). *Molecular Ecology Notes*, 7, 355–364.
- Rizzo, M. C., & Massa, B. (1998). On two Italian gall midges (Diptera Cecidomyiidae) and their parasitoids. *Entomologica*, 32, 121–131.
- Roslin, T., & Majaneva, S. (2016). The use of DNA barcodes in food web construction-terrestrial and aquatic ecologists unite! *Genome*, 59, 603–628. https://doi.org/10.1139/gen-2015-0229
- Schmid, U., & Grossmann, A. (1996). Eiablage von Cheilosia latifrons (Zetterstedt, 1843) (Díptera, Syrphidae) an Leontodón autumnalis L. Volucella, 2, 86–87.
- Schoonhoven, L. M., Jermy, T., & van Loon, J. J. A. (1998). Insect-plant biology: From physiology to evolution. Chapman and Hall.
- Seebens, H., Essl, F., Dawson, W., Fuentes, N., Moser, D., Pergl, J., Pyšek, P., van Kleunen, M., Weber, E., Winter, M., & Blasius, B. (2015). Global trade will accelerate plant invasions in emerging economies under climate change. *Global Change Biology*, 21, 4128–4140. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13021

- Sheppard, S. K., & Harwood, J. D. (2005). Advances in molecular ecology: Tracking trophic links through predator-prey food-webs. *Functional Ecology*, 19, 751–762. https://doi. org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2005.01041.x
- Sheppard, A. W., Heard, T. A., & Briese, D. T. (2003). What is needed to improve the selection, testing and evaluation of weed biological control agents: workshop synthesis and recommendations. In *Technical Series - CRC for Australian Weed Management*, pp. 87–98.
- Sheppard, S. K., Henneman, M. L., Memmott, J., & Symondson, W. O. C. (2004). Infiltration by alien predators into invertebrate food webs in Hawaii: A molecular approach. *Molecular Ecology*, 13, 2077–2088. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2004.02216.x
- Smit, J., Reijnen, B., & Stokvis, F. (2013). Half of the European fruit fly species barcoded (Diptera, Tephritidae); a feasibility test for molecular identification. ZooKeys, 365, 279–305. https://doi.org/10.3897/ zookeys.365.5819
- Speight, M. C. D. (2014). Species accounts of European Syrphidae (Diptera), 2014, Vol. 78. SYRPH THE NET: The Database of European Syrphidae (Diptera).
- Suckling, D. M., & Sforza, R. F. H. (2014). What magnitude are observed non-target impacts from weed biocontrol? *PLoS ONE*, 9, e84847. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0084847
- Tay, E. B. (1972). Population ecology of Cicadella viridis (L.) and bionomics of Graphocephala coccinea (Forster) (Homoptera, Cicadellidae). University of London (Imperial College of Science and Technology).
- Thébault, E., & Fontaine, C. (2010). Stability of Ecological Communities and the Architecture of Mutualistic and Trophic Networks. *Science*, 329, 853–856. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1188321
- Todd, J. H., Pearce, B. M., & Barratt, B. I. P. (2020). Using qualitative food webs to predict species at risk of indirect effects from a proposed biological control agent. *BioControl*, 66(1), 45–58. https://doi. org/10.1007/s10526-020-10038-7
- van der Meulen, A. W., Widderick, M., Cook, T., Chauhan, B. S., & Bell, K. (2016). Survey of glyphosate resistance in common sowthistle (Sonchus oleraceus) across the Australian Northern Grains Region. 20th Australasian Weeds Conference, .
- Van Driesche, R. G., Carruthers, R. I., Center, T., Hoddle, M. S., Hough-Goldstein, J., Morin, L., Smith, L., Wagner, D. L., Blossey, B., Brancatini, V., Casagrande, R., Causton, C. E., Coetzee, J. A., Cuda, J., Ding, J., Fowler, S. V., Frank, J. H., Fuester, R., Goolsby, J., ... van Klinken, R. D. (2010). Classical biological control for the protection of natural ecosystems. *Biological Control*, *54*, S2–S33. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2010.03.003
- Vázquez Albalate, X. (2002). European fauna of Oedemeridae: Coleoptera. Argania Editio.
- Veldtman, R., Lado, T. F., Botes, A., Procheş, Ş., Timm, A. E., Geertsema, H., & Chown, S. L. (2011). Creating novel food webs on introduced Australian acacias: Indirect effects of galling biological control agents. *Diversity and Distributions*, 17, 958–967. https://doi. org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2011.00781.x

- Vitousek, P. M., Mooney, H. A., Lubchenco, J., & Melillo, J. M. (1997). Human domination of earth's ecosystems. *Science*, 277, 494–499. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.277.5325.494
- Wang, Q. (2017). Cerambycidae of the world: Biology and pest management. CRC Press.
- Wapshere, A. J., Delfosse, E. S., & Cullen, J. M. (1989). Recent developments in biological control of weeds. *Crop Protection*, *8*, 227–250. https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-2194(89)90009-4
- Warren, P. H. (1994). Making connections in food webs. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 9, 136–141. https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347(94)90178 -3
- Wheeler, A. G. (2001). Biology of the plant bugs (Hemiptera: Miridae): Pests, predators, opportunists. Cornell University Press.
- White, I. M. (1988). Tephritid flies (Diptera: Tephritidae). In Royal Entomological Society (Ed.), *Handbooks for identification of British insects* (Vol. 10). Royal Entomological Society of London.
- Widderick, M. J., Walker, S. R., Sindel, B. M., & Bell, K. L. (2010). Germination, emergence, and persistence of Sonchus oleraceus, a major crop weed in subtropical Australia. Weed Biology and Management, 10, 102–112. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1445-6664.2010.00370.x
- Willis, A. J., & Memmott, J. (2005). The potential for indirect effects between a weed, one of its biocontrol agents and native herbivores: A food web approach. *Biological Control*, 35, 299–306. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2005.07.013
- Wirta, H. K., Hebert, P. D. N., Kaartinen, R., Prosser, S. W., Várkonyi, G., & Roslin, T. (2014). Complementary molecular information changes our perception of food web structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111, 1885–1890. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1316990111
- Zhu, C., Gravel, D., & He, F. (2019). Seeing is believing? Comparing plantherbivore networks constructed by field co-occurrence and DNA barcoding methods for gaining insights into network structures. *Ecology and Evolution*, *9*, 1764–1776. https://doi.org/10.1002/ ece3.4860

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of the article at the publisher's website.

How to cite this article: Ollivier, M., Lesieur, V., Tavoillot, J., Bénetière, F., Tixier, M.-S., & Martin, J.-F. (2021). An innovative approach combining metabarcoding and ecological interaction networks for selecting candidate biological control agents. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 58, 2866–2880. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14016