EPPO Datasheet: *Salvinia molesta*

Last updated: 2020-04-23

IDENTITY

Preferred name: *Salvinia molesta*
Authority: Mitchell
Taxonomic position: Plantae: Pteridophyta: Pteridopsida: Salviniales: Salviniaceae: Salvinioideae
Other scientific names: *Salvinia adnata* Desvaux
Common names: African payal, African pyle, Australian azolla, Kariba weed, aquarium watermoss, giant azolla, giant salvinia, salvinia moss, water fern, water spangles
view more common names online...
EPPO Categorization: A2 list
view more categorizations online...
EU Categorization: IAS of Union concern
EPPO Code: SAVMO

more photos...

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

History of introduction and spread

Salvinia molesta is native to Brazil in the subtropical zone (between latitudes 24°05' S and 32°05' S) at elevations up to 900 m (McFarland *et al*., 2004). Its status in other countries of South America appears less certain (e.g. compare Holm *et al.*, 1979; CABI, 2016; EPPO, 2016).

Salvinia molesta has spread widely throughout the world, becoming an invasive alien species in many regions. The species is widespread in Africa (occurring in over 20 countries), the Indian subcontinent, Southeast Asia, Australia, New Zealand, the Southern USA and some Paci?c islands (Thomas & Room, 1986).

The ?rst population established outside the native range was in Sri Lanka in 1939 where it was introduced via the Botanical Department of the University of Colombo (Oliver, 1993). *Salvinia molesta* was introduced into Papua New Guinea in 1972, where a few plants were introduced into the Sepik River ?oodplain. Eight years later, the infestation had reached over 250 km2 (Oliver, 1993). Sundaresan & Reddy (1979) reported on two large infestations in Fiji (the Rewa Delta and the Waidalice River), noting impacts on rice ?elds. In Australia, *S. molesta* was ?rst recorded in 1952. By 1976 the species had spread to many rivers and lakes, overtaking the occurrence of other aquatic plant pests such as *Eichhornia crassipes* (Cronk & Fuller, 2001).

Major infestations of *S. molesta* have occurred in lake/ riparian systems in Africa, including the Chobe–Linyata–Kwando River systems, Lake Naivasha and Lake Kariba on the Zambezi. In the case of the latter, in 1962 at the peak occurrence of the species, over a quarter of the lake was covered by the plant (McFarland *et al.*, 2004).

Salvinia molesta was ?rst observed in the wild in the USA in South Carolina in 1995 (Jacono & Pitman, 2001). In 1998, the species was identi?ed in Texas and Louisiana; both states are still dealing with new infestations of this weed. Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Hawaii, Arizona, California and Georgia all reported initial infestations of S. molesta in 1999. North Carolina ?rst reported a population of *S. molesta* in 2000. The latest state to report the presence of *S. molesta* was Virginia in 2004. In Florida, before the species had been recorded in the wild it had been intercepted at two aquatic plant nurseries as a contaminant of aquatic plant shipments from Sri Lanka (Oliver, 1993).

In the EPPO region, *S. molesta* has been found in Austria, Belgium, France (Corsica), Germany, Italy, Israel, the Netherlands and Portugal, but it is not clear if reports represent established populations. In France, the species was ?rst found in Corsica in 2010, in a water reservoir (Paradis & Miniconi, 2011). In 2013, it was also found in a small

ditch near the Salagou Lake, 40 km northwest of Montpellier where a few plants were observed together with *Myriophyllum aquaticum*. Following identi?cation, the plants were immediately removed (G Fried, pers. comm., 2016). In Italy, the species was found in the Fosso del Acqua Calda canal near Pisa in 2000 (Garbari *et al.*, 2000), and in the Rome area (the Pozzo del Merro lake, Lazio) in 2003 (Buccomimo *et al.*, 2010; Giardini, 2004). *Salvinia molesta* was eradicated from Rome in 2012 (CABI, 2016). In Portugal the species is found in Odemira, in the Algarve (EPPO, 2016). In Germany, it is reported as a casual from the Rhineland-Palatinate (GEFD, 2016). It is not clear whether this species remains present in older localities, such as that noted by Margot (1983) in Belgium (Verloove, 2006). In Israel, *S. molesta* is classi?ed as a casual species (Dufour-Dror, 2012).

Distribution



EPPO Region: Austria, Belgium, France (mainland, Corse, Mainland France), Germany, Israel, Italy (mainland, Mainland Italy), Netherlands, Portugal (mainland), Spain (Islas Canárias), Switzerland, Türkiye
Africa: Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Congo, Congo, Democratic republic of the, Eswatini, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe
Asia: India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Malaysia, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand
North America: Mexico, United States of America (Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, Washington)
Central America and Caribbean: Cuba, Guadeloupe, Guatemala, Martinique, Trinidad and Tobago
South America: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Guyana
Oceania: Australia (Queensland), Fiji, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea

MORPHOLOGY

Plant type

Perennial ?oating aquatic fern.

Description

Salvinia molesta is a free-?oating fern with three growth stages (primary, secondary and tertiary) (Julien *et al.*,

2009). The small-leaved primary stage is typical of plants invading open water. The secondary form is slightly larger with leaves slightly folded, and the tertiary stage is typical of mature stands with larger deeply folded and densely packed leaves. Misidenti?cation may occur between *Salvinia natans* and the primary and secondary stage of *S. molesta* given that *S. natans* will be the *Salvinia* species that is most familiar to botanists in the EPPO region. According to Kasselmann (1995), *S. molesta* is especially misidenti?ed as *Salvinia auriculata*.

The species' fronds are positioned in whorls of three along a rhizome, with individual plants growing up to 30 cm. One of the fronds is submerged and is root-like in appearance. The two ?oating fronds have oblong to obovate or orbicular lamina, a rounded or cordate base and emarginate apex; these fronds typically measure around 2.5 x (2.4–3) cm (length x width; Lin *et al*., 2013), although the ?oating fronds of some forms can be considerably smaller, and larger forms (up to 5 cm, rarelylarger) have also been reported (Harley & Mitchell, 1981). The ?oating fronds are oppositely positioned, and are either ?at or infolded along the costa; when infolded their appearance has been compared to the wings of a butter?y. Egg-beater-shaped hairs on the upper (adaxial) surface of the ?oating leaves are a notable feature of *S. molesta*, and serve to distinguish it from the European native *S. natans*, in which the ends of the 'beater' are not joined together (Booy *et al*., 2015); *S. natans* is also a smaller species. As plants develop lateral branches in crowded conditions they can become interlocked, producing a mat; additional growth can lead to plants overgrowing each over, resulting in mats that are 3–4 plants thick (Harley & Mitchell, 1981). Mats as thick as 1 m have also been reported as a result of the overgrowing and interweaving of dead and living plants (Harley & Mitchell, 1981; Thomas & Room, 1986). Sporocarps are in long chains of up to 55, around 1 mm in diameter; however, the plant is sterile, and the sporocarps contain only empty sporangia or deformed spores.

BIOLOGY AND ECOLOGY

General

Mats of *S. molesta* can cause similar problems to those caused by excessive growth of other ?oating plants; for example, they can reduce access to the water for recreation; interfere with various engineering structures such as weirs, ?oodgates or locks; block drains and cause ?ooding; stop livestock reaching water; prevent photosynthesis in the water below the mat; degrade potable water; have negative impacts on native animals and plants more generally by signi?cantly altering aquatic ecosystems; reduce the aesthetic appeal of water bodies; and favour the spread of certain diseases by mosquitoes and snails (Mitchell, 1978; Oliver, 1993).

Habitats

Salvinia molesta is most often found in stagnant or slow?owing waters such as lakes, slow-?owing rivers or streams, wetlands, rice paddies, irrigation channels, ditches, ponds and canals (EPPO, 2016).

Environmental requirements

Salvinia molesta grows best in sheltered, still, tropical waters, but in temperate climates the plant can withstand occasional frosts and freezing of the water surface (Harley & Mitchell, 1981). However, the plant is killed if very low temperatures persist (Harley & Mitchell, 1981). Owens *et al.* (2004) report that plants can withstand short (48 h) air frosts of -3°C in experimental ponds, and that complete freezing of the water layers occupied by *S. molesta* was required to completely destroy the plant. Note that the mats often formed by this species can increase its resistance to frosts above the level that would be expected from its intrinsic physiological tolerance; however, below 10°C growth rates are markedly reduced, and dense mats have apparently not been observed (Harley & Mitchell, 1981).

In the USA, thick mats of the plant (up to 30 cm) can withstand temperatures of -10°C for periods of 48–72 h (M Netherland, US Army Engineer Research and Development Center, pers. comm., 2016). Other work using growth chambers has indicated that *S. molesta* is killed when its buds are exposed to temperatures of ?-3 or >43°C for more than 2–3 h (Whiteman & Room, 1991).

Salvinia molesta will tolerate a wide range of variation in water nutrient content, but its rate of growth is most rapid in nutrient-rich conditions. Plants can survive in waters with a salinity of around 20% of that of sea water, although rates of growth are decreased under these conditions (Harley & Mitchell, 1981). With respect to the above

information, it is worth noting that experiments and observations relating to the environmental requirements of *S. molesta* may not necessarily cover the entire range of its niche, particularly if invasive populations around the world represent different genotypes or independent hybridization events. In some waters the species can alter the water chemistry from a more alkaline to an acidic habitat, which favours its growth (Owens *et al.*, 2004). The optimum growth rate is in waters around pH 6–7 (Cary & Weerts, 1984; McFarland et al., 2004; Owens et al., 2004). *Salvinia molesta* is capable of high relative growth rates: reported doubling times for leaves are 2.2 days in mid-summer and 40–60 days in winter for Queensland, Australia (Farrell, 1979).

Natural enemies

There are no known natural enemies for *S. molesta* within the EPPO region. According to McFarland *et al.* (2004), the weevil *Cyrtobagus salviniae* Calder and Sands is recognized throughout the world as the method of choice for management of *S. molesta.* The insect has been released in 22 countries around the world including Australia, Fiji, India, Kenya, Namibia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the USA, Zambia and Zimbabwe (Doeleman, 1990).

Uses and bene?ts

Salvinia molesta is widely sold as an ornamental species within the EPPO region. The species is also sold/exchanged between aquarists. The species regularly features on aquatic plant websites.

Harley & Mitchell (1981) state that the dense growth of the plant could be used for removing excess nutrients or pollutants from water bodies, with the removed biomass being a ‘satisfactory’ mulch. However, this methodology is rarely practised due to it being generally found to be uneconomical (McFarland *et al.*, 2004). Vandecasteele *et al.* (2005) and Henry-Silva & Camargo (2006) argued that the plant was ef?cient in the removal of nutrients (mainly total nitrogen and total phosphorus). In addition, Vandecasteele *et al.* (2005) highlight that the potential of using the biomass as plant compost, in biogas production and for animal feed should be considered.

PATHWAYS FOR MOVEMENT

The pathway plants for planting is considered the main entry pathway into the EPPO region (EPPO, 2017). From this pathway, individuals may transfer to suitable habitats through either intentional introduction into the environment or unintentionally through the disposal of aquarium material. In addition to the aforementioned pathways, there is the potential that the species may enter the EPPO region as a contaminant of leisure equipment, for example ?shing or canoeing gear (EPPO, 2017). Although this is not likely to be a signi?cant pathway, awareness-raising campaigns on the movement of invasive alien plants by this pathway may help to reduce its entry along this pathway. For example, the ‘Check, Clean and Dry’ campaign in Great Britain highlights the need to inspect and treat recreational material following use.

IMPACTS

Effects on plants

Mats of *S. molesta* can cause similar problems to those caused by excessive growth of other ?oating plants; for example, mats will prevent photosynthesis in the water below the mat (the impact in any given situation will depend on the thickness of the mat). *Salvinia molesta* can increase sedimentation by slowing the water ?ow, especially in shallow water bodies. Mat formation can have negative impacts on native animals and plants more generally by signi?cantly altering aquatic habitats, this can result in the creation of ?oating ‘sudd’ islands in larger water bodies, or succession to terrestrial habitat for smaller areas (Cook & Gut, 1971; Thomas, 1981). In general, dense monospeci?c growth of any aquatic plant species can incur impacts on native plant communities (Carpenter & Lodge, 1986). This can completely transform and alter trophic dynamics, resulting in long-term changes.

Environmental and social impact

The presence of a mat of *S. molesta* is likely to degrade the water quality beneath it by blocking sunlight, resulting in

decreases in dissolved oxygen and pH, and increases in concentrations of CO2 and H2S (Mitchell, 1969; McFarland *et al.*, 2004). Decomposition may further decrease oxygen levels, affecting ?sh and other organisms (Hattingh, 1961). The combination of a high growth rate with slow decomposition is likely to signi?cantly affect water body nutrient dynamics, with likely impacts on all trophic levels (Oliver, 1993). The accumulation of *S. molesta* litter at the bottom of a water body may also reduce habitat suitability for breeding ?sh (Sculthorpe, 1985). McFarland *et al.* (2004) note the impacts of *S. molesta* on three endangered Hawaiian waterbirds.

Recorded economic impacts include interference with engineering structures such as weirs, ?oodgates or locks; *S. molesta* mats blocking drains and causing ?ooding; mats stopping livestock reaching water; and the degradation of potable water through decomposition processes (Oliver, 1993; McFarland *et al.*, 2004). *Salvinia molesta* has also been reported as a serious pest of rice paddy ?elds in Sri Lanka, Fiji, India and Borneo (Sundaresan & Reddy, 1979; Thomas & Room, 1986; GISP, 2007). However, it is not clear if these impacts can occur in intensive agricultural systems.

Salvinia molesta mats can reduce access to the water for recreation (e.g. swimming, ?shing, boating or canoeing) and reduce the aesthetic appeal of water bodies; in addition, water bodies altered by *Salvinia* mats may favour the spread of diseases such as elephantiasis, encephalitis, malaria and dengue fever (Oliver, 1993) by providing habitat for the mosquito vectors. This may also apply to the snail-mediated disease bilharzia (M Hill, Department of Zoology and Entomology, Rhodes University, ZA, pers. comm., 2016).

CONTROL

Manual control has been successful in reducing infestations, but annual repetition has been required to maintain control (Cook, 1976; Murphy, 1988). Hand removal and giant nets have been used in Australia (Miller & Pickering, 1980). Oliver (1993) concludes that mechanical harvesting is not economically competitive compared to chemical control, and that the large biomass associated with severe infestations can make the use of both harvesting machines and hand removal impractical.

Physical removal using booms to accumulate or control the location of mats and machines to collect and remove the weed have been used in many instances, though rarely with great success and always at great expense, for example on the Hawkebury River, Australia (Coventry, 2006).

Chemical control would require repeated application where all plants need to be treated otherwise re-infestation is likely to occur. Oliver (1993) reviewed chemical control, noting that glyphosate (Mitchell, 1979), diquat (Kam-Wing & Furtado, 1977) and 2,4-D have all been successfully used to control, or to contribute to the control of, *S. molesta* in different parts of the world. Detergents and mixtures of detergents with other agents have also been used (Oliver, 1993). Surfactants are normally used to increase plant penetration of chemical agents. Emierine et al. (2010) showed that *S. molesta* was not controlled by imazamox under a controlled experiment. Control of *S. molesta* did not exceed 39% with imazamox or imazapyr but was 89% with glyphosate. It should be highlighted that the availability of products containing these active substances will vary nationally and other products may be available and effective. Indications of the approved uses for each active substance may be incomplete. Products should be used following the instructions on the label and in line with the relevant plant protection product regulations.

Apart from the weevil *C. salviniae*, other species considered as biological control agents include the aquatic grasshopper *Paulinia acuminata* De Geer, the pyralid moth *Samea multiplicalis* Guenee, the weevil *Cyrtobagus singularis* Hustache and the grass carp *Ctenopharyngodon idella* Val., although none of these has been found to be as effective as *C. salviniae* (Oliver, 1993). A thorough review of the topic is provided by Julien *et al.* (2009).

REGULATORY STATUS

(Europe overall): *S. molesta* has been on the EPPO List of Alien Invasive Plants since 2012; prior to that it was on the EPPO Alert List from 2007. In 2016, *S. molesta* was identi?ed as a priority for risk assessment within the requirements of Regulation 1143/2014 (Branquart *et al.*, 2016; Tanner *et al.*, 2017). A subsequent pest risk analysis concluded that *S. molesta* had a high phytosanitary risk to the endangered area (EPPO, 2017) and was added to the EPPO A2 List of pests recommended for regulation. In 2019, *S. molesta* was included on the (EU) list of Union concern (EU Regulation 1143/2014).

In the Netherlands, a Code of conduct agreed to by organizations representing the horticultural trade means that *S. molesta* should be sold with a warning label. This warning label informs customers about the risks associated with plant invasiveness, and provides instructions for ownership designed to reduce the risk of release of the plant to the environment (Verbrugge *et al.*, 2014). In Spain, the species is included in the list of the prohibited species of the Real Decreto 630/2013; http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/08/03/ pdfs/BOE-A-2013-8565.pdf).

In New Zealand, *S. molesta* is listed on the National Plant Pest Accord prohibiting it from sale and commercial propagation and distribution. The species has been included on many other weed lists in New Zealand (see Howell, 2008, for an overview), but was excluded from a consolidated list by Howell (2008) due to its absence from conservation land. In Australia, *S. molesta* is a Weed of National Signi?cance (Australian Weeds Committee, 2016) and is on the national list of Noxious weeds, with some form of noti?cation or control process listed for every state (Australian Weeds Committee, 2016).

Control of the species in South Africa is enabled by the Conservation of Agricultural Resources (CARA) Act 43 of 1983, as amended, in conjunction with the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity (NEMBA) Act 10 of 2004. *Salvinia molesta* was speci?cally de?ned as a Category 1b 'invader species' on the NEMBA mandated list of 2014. Category 1b means that the invasive species 'must be controlled and wherever possible, removed and destroyed. Any form of trade or planting is strictly prohibited' (http:// www.environment.gov.za). *Salvinia molesta* is included on the Federal Noxious Weeds List (making it illegal in the US to import or transport the plant between states without a permit). State governments listing the species as an invasive species or noxious weed include Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North and South Carolina, and Texas (http://www.invasivespeciesinfo.gov/ aquatics/salvinia.shtml#cit; McFarland *et al.*, 2004).

REFERENCES

Australian Weeds Committee (2016) Noxious Weeds List. http://www.weeds.org.au/noxious.htm [accessed on 17 April 2016]

Booy O, Wade M & Roy H (2015) *Field Guide to Invasive Plants and Animals in Britain*. Bloomsbury Publishing, London, UK.

Branquart E, Brundu G, Buholzer S, Ehret P, Fried G, Star?nger U *et al.* (2016) A prioritization process for invasive alien plant species compliant with Regulation (EU) No. 1143/2014. *EPPO Bulletin* **46**, 603–617.

Buccomino G, Buon?glio V & Vinci M, (2010) *Salvinia molest*a D.S. Mitch.: considerazioni sulle misure di controllo e gestione della specie aliena invasiva nel Pozzo del Merro (Sant'Angelo Romano – Roma). Annali del Museo Civico di Rovereto 26. (in stampa) http://www.actaplantarum.org/?ora/?ora.php

Index Plantarum Flora Italicae - Indice dei nomi delle specie botaniche presenti in Italia

CABI (2016) *Salvinia molesta* (Kariba weed). http://www.cabi.org/ isc/datasheet/48447 [accessed on 15 April 2016]

Carpenter SR & Lodge DM (1986) Effects of submersed macrophytes on ecosystem processes. *Aquatic Botany* **26**, 341–370.

Cary PR & Weerts PGJ (1984) Growth of *Salvinia molesta* as affected by water temperature and nutrition. III. Nitrogen-phosphorus interactions and effect of pH. *Aquatic Botany* **19**, 171-182.

Cook C (1976) *Salvinia* in Kerala, S. India and its control. In *Aquatic Weeds in Southeast Asia* (Eds Varshney CK & Rzoska J), pp. 241-243. W. Junk, The Hague (NL).

Cook CD & Gut BJ (1971) *Salvinia* in the state of Kerala, India. *PANS Pest Articles & News Summaries* **17**, 438–447.

Coventry R (2006). Hawkesbury River: managing salvinia on the Hawkesbury - a $1.8 million cooperative effort. In: *Salvinia* (*Salvinia molesta*) in Australia (Ed. van Oosterhout E), pp. 64–69. NSW Department of Primary Industries,

Orange, Australia.

Cronk QCB & Fuller JL (2001) *Plant invaders: the threat to natural ecosystems*. Earthscan Publications, (London, UK).

Doeleman JA (1990) *Biological control of salvinia in Sri Lanka: an assessment of cost and bene?ts. Economic Assessment Series*. Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research, Canberra, ACT (AU).

Dufour-Dror JM (2012) *Alien Invasive Plants in Israel. Israel Nature and Parks Authority*. Ahva, Jerusalem (IL).

Emierine SE, Richardson RJ, True SL, West AM & Roten RL (2010) Greenhouse response of six aquatic invasive weeds to Imazamox. *Journal of Aquatic Plant Management* **48**, 105–111.

EPPO (2016) *Salvinia molesta* (Salviniaceae). https://www.eppo.int/INVASIVE_PLANTS/iap_list/Salvinia_molesta.htm. [accessed on 14 April 2016]

EPPO (2017) Pest Risk Analysis Salvinia molesta. EPPO, Paris (FR). https://www.eppo.int/INVASIVE_PLANTS/ias_plants.htm [accessed on 29 September 2017]

Farrell TP (1979) Control of *Salvinia molesta* and *Hydrilla verticillata* in Lake Moondarra, North-West Queensland," Management of Aquatic Weeds. Australian Water Resources Council, Department of Natural Resources, Canberra, 57-71.

Garbari F, Giovannini A & Marchetti D (2000) [*Salvinia molesta* D.S. Mitchell (Salviniaceae) new for the Flora of Italy]. *Archivio Geobotanico* **6**, 73-78 (in Italian).

GEFD (2016) Florenlist von Deutschland – Gefäßp?anzen. Version 7 (August 2015). http://www.kp-buttler.de/?orenliste/index.htm [accessed on 04 May 2016]

Giardini M (2004) *Salvinia molesta* DS Mitchell (Salviniaceae): the second record for Italy (Latium) and consideration about the control of this invasive species. *Webbia* **59**, 457–467.

GISP (2007) Development of case studies on the economic impact of invasive weeds in Africa: Salvinia molesta. Psi-Delta, Melbourne Victoria.

Harley KLS & Mitchell DS (1981) The biology of Australian weeds, 6: *Salvinia molesta* DS Mitchell. *Journal of the Australian Institute of Agricultural Sciences* (Australia) **47**, 67 –76.

Hattingh ER (1961) Problem of *Salvinia auriculata* Aubl. and associated aquatic weeds on Kariba Lake. *Weed Research* **1**, 303–306.

Henry-Silva GG & Camargo FM (2006) Ef?ciency of aquatic macrophytes to threat Nile Tilapia ponds ef?uents. *Science and Agriculture* **63**, 433–438.

Holm LG, Pancho JV, Herberger JP & Plucknett DL (1979) *A Geographical Atlas of World Weeds*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, NY (US).

Howell CJ (2008) *Consolidated list of environmental weeds in New Zealand*. Science & Technical Pub., Department of Conservation.

Jacono CC & Pitman B (2001) *Salvinia molesta*: around the world in 70 years. *Aquatic Nuisance Species Digest* **4**, 14 –16.

Julien MH, Hill MP & Tipping PW (2009) *Salvinia molesta DS Mitchell (Salviniaceae). Weed Biological Control with Arthropods in the Tropics*, pp. 378–407. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (UK).

Kam-Wing L & Furtado JI (1977) The chemical control of *Salvinia molesta* (Mitchell) and some related toxicological studies. *Hydrobiologia* **56**, 49 –61.

Kasselmann C (1995) *Aquarienp?anzen*, 472 pp. Egen Ulmer GMBH & Co., Stuttgart (DE).

Lin YX, Shi L, Funston AM & Gilbert MG (2013) Salviniaceae. In *Flora of China*, Vol. 2–3 (*Pteridophytes*) (Eds Wu ZY, Raven PH & Hong DY), pp. 125–127. Science Press, Beijing (CN); Missouri Botanical Garden Press, St. Louis, Mo (USA).

Margot J (1983) Vegetation aquatique des Springputten en foret de Meerdael. Evolution et presences ?oristiques. *Les Naturalistes belges* **64**, 199–221.

McFarland Nelson DGLS, Grodowitz MJ, Smart RM & Owens CS (2004) *Salvinia molesta D. Mitchell (Giant Salvinia) in the United States: A Review of Species Ecology and Approaches to Management*. Final Report, 35 pp. US Army Corps of Engineers Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS (US).

Miller IL & Pickering SE (1980) *Salvinia*, a noxious weed. Department of Primary Production, Div. Ag. Stock, Northern Territory, Australia, Agnote Ref. No. 80/35.

Mitchell DS (1969) The ecology of vascular hydrophytes on Lake Kariba. *Hydrobiologia* **34**, 448–464.

Mitchell DS (1978) *Aquatic Weeds in Australian Inland Waters*. AGPS, Canberra, ACT (AU).

Mitchell DS (1979) *The Incidence and Management of Salvinia molesta in Papua New Guinea*, 51 pp. Of?ce of Environment and Conservation, Waigani, Port Moresby (PG).

Murphy KJ (1988) Aquatic weed problems and their management: a review. II. Physical control measures. *Crop Protection* **7**, 283-302.

Oliver JD (1993) A review of the biology of Giant Salvinia *(Salvinia molesta* Mitchell). *Journal of Aquatic Plant Management* **31**, 227-231.

Owens CS, Smart RM & Stewart RM (2004) Low temperature limits of giant Salvinia. *Journal of Aquatic Plant Management* **42**, 91-94.

Paradis G & Miniconi R (2011) A new invasive aquatic species discovered in Corsica, south of the Gulf of Ajaccio: *Salvinia molesta* D. Mitch (Salviniaceae, Pteridophyta). (Une nouvelle espèce aquatique invasive découverte en Corse, au sud du golfe d'Ajaccio: *Salvinia molesta* D.Mitch (Salviniaceae, Pteridophyta).). *Le Journal de Botanique de la Société botanique de France* **54**, 45-48.

Sculthorpe CD (1985) *The Biology of Aquatic Vascular Plants*. Edward Arnold, London (UK).

Sundaresan A & Reddy N (1979) *Salvinia molesta* (Mitchell)-a serious water weed in Fiji. *Fiji Agricultural Journal* **41**, 103–107.

Tanner R, Branquart E, Brundu G, Buholzer S, Chapman D, Ehret P *et al.* (2017) The prioritisation of a short list of alien plants for risk analysis within the framework of the Regulation (EU) No. 1143/ 2014. *NeoBiota* **35**, 87-118.

Thomas KJ (1981) The role of aquatic weeds in changing the pattern of ecosystems in Kerala. *Environmental Conservation* **8**, 63 –66.

Thomas PA & Room PM (1986) Taxonomy and control of *Salvinia molesta. Nature* **320**, 581–584.

Vandecasteele B, Quataert P & Tack FMG (2005) Effect of hydrological regime on the metal bioavailability for wetland plant species *Salix cinerea. Environmental Pollution* **135**, 303–312.

Verbrugge LN, Leuven RSEW, Van Valkenburg JLCH & van den Born RJ (2014) Evaluating stakeholder awareness and involvement in risk prevention of aquatic invasive plant species by a national code of conduct. *Aquatic Invasions* **9**, 369–381.

Verloove F (2006) *Catalogue of neophytes in Belgium* (1800-2005), 89 pp. National Botanic Garden of Belgium, Meise (BE). (Scripta Botanica Belgica, vol. 39).

Whiteman JB & Room PM (1991) Temperatures lethal to *Salvinia molesta* Mitchell. *Aquatic Botany* **40**, 27 –35.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This datasheet is an output of a DG Environment, LIFE funding, under the project LIFE15 PRE-FR 001: Mitigating the threat of invasive alien plants in the EU through pest risk analysis to support the EU Regulation 1143/2014. The datasheet was produced following an expert working group that risk analysed *Salvinia molesta* for the EPPO region in October 2016. The composition of the expert working group was: D Chapman (Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, UK), J Coetzee (Rhodes University, ZA), M Hill (Rhodes University, ZA), A Hussner (University of Dusseldorf, DE), M Netherlands (US Army Engineer Research and Development Center, US), J Newman (Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, UK), O Pescott (Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, UK), I Stiers (Vrije Universiteit BE), J van Valkenburg (National Plant Protection Organization, NL) and R Tanner (EPPO).

How to cite this datasheet?

EPPO (2024) *Salvinia molesta*. EPPO datasheets on pests recommended for regulation. Available online. https://gd.eppo.int

Datasheet history

This datasheet was first published in the EPPO Bulletin in 2017 and is now maintained in an electronic format in the EPPO Global Database. The sections on 'Identity' and 'Geographical distribution' are automatically updated from the database. For other sections, the date of last revision is indicated on the right.

EPPO (2017) *Salvinia molesta* D.S. Mitch. Datasheets on pests recommended for regulation. *EPPO Bulletin* **47**(3), 531-536. https://doi.org/10.1111/epp.12428