



Individual and interactive effects of white-tailed deer and woody invasive plants on native tree seedlings in an early successional forest

Abby E. Hay^{1,2} · David L. Gorchov²

Received: 6 August 2025 / Accepted: 21 January 2026 / Published online: 28 January 2026
© The Author(s) 2026

Abstract

Regeneration failure is a pressing issue endangering the health of many forests in North America. Invasive plants and *Odocoileus virginianus* (white-tailed deer) contribute to regeneration failure by impacting tree seedling survival and growth. This study investigated the individual and interactive effects of deer and woody invasive plants on seedlings in an early successional forest. In a stand of *Juniperus virginiana* near Oxford, OH, we initiated a factorial experiment with each combination of deer access/exclosure and invasive woody plants removed/not removed. Deer were excluded with 2.13 m tall fences using four trees as corner posts. We planted native tree seedlings and monitored natural regeneration (tree seedlings 0.3–2 m) in each plot. Survival was low for planted seedlings and growth differed across species but, in general, change in height was significantly impacted by deer and the interaction: excluding deer resulted in less height loss and this effect was greater where invasives were present. Change in height of natural regeneration (mostly *Fraxinus americana*) was significantly affected by deer; seedlings grew taller in deer exclosures. The total number of seedlings recruiting per plot did not differ among treatments. However, the number of recruits excluding *F. americana* seedlings showed a marginally significant interaction: number of recruits was greatest where deer and invasives were removed. Overall, deer had a greater impact than invasives on natural regeneration and planted seedlings. These small exclosures required minimal cost, installation time, and maintenance. These findings lead us to recommend this method to land managers.

Keywords Regeneration failure · Herbivory · Non-native plants · Recruitment · *Odocoileus virginianus* · White ash

✉ Abby E. Hay
ah4259@nau.edu

David L. Gorchov
gorchodl@MiamiOH.edu

¹ Department of Biology, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ, USA

² Department of Biology, Miami University, Oxford, OH, USA

Introduction

Many stressors threaten the composition, structure, and long-term health of forests in eastern North America (Dey et al. 2019). One of the greatest threats to forest health is regeneration failure, a widespread issue throughout the region (Dey et al. 2019; Miller and McGill 2019; Miller et al. 2023). Canopy trees provide structure, habitat, and food sources, so their lack of regeneration poses serious, likely cascading effects (Kreiger 2001, Pearce 2001). Tree regeneration is also crucial to combating global climate change, as trees capture and sequester vast amounts of carbon (Harris et al. 2021). One factor driving regeneration failure in the deciduous forests of eastern North America is high density of *Odocoileus virginianus* (white-tailed deer, hereafter ‘deer’). In many areas, densities are much greater than pre-European settlement (Rooney 2001). Deer impact tree establishment and persistence through their browsing patterns, selectively feeding upon seedlings of palatable woody species (Rooney and Waller 2003; Cote et al. 2004, Bradshaw and Waller 2016). This selective browsing results in widespread shifts in composition from palatable to unpalatable plant species (Bradshaw and Waller 2016).

Invasive non-native plant species also contribute to regeneration failure, as these have increased in eastern forests since the early to mid-1800s (Conover and Bergstein 2022, Webster et al. 2006). Certain invasive species suppress the growth of tree seedlings both directly and indirectly (Boyce 2009). Forests invaded by the non-native shrub, *Lonicera maackii*, have seedling and sapling layers with lower densities and species richness than uninvaded forests (Hartman and McCarthy 2008). Stinson et al. (2006) found *Alliaria petiolata* suppressed growth of native tree seedlings by disrupting mutualisms between the native trees and arbuscular mycorrhizae. Younger forests are generally more susceptible to invasion (Mosher et al. 2009, Kuhman and Pearson 2010) and have been shown to have significantly more invasive species than older forests (Trammell et al. 2020), potentially due to greater light availability (Davis et al. 2000; Trammell et al. 2020).

While the individual negative effects of abundant deer and invasive plant species on native tree regeneration are well known, their interactive effects are not as well understood. Owings et al. (2017) found that both deer and *L. maackii* individually had negative impacts on the survival of underplanted seedlings, but they did not find many interactive effects. Donoso et al. (2024) found that deer, but not *L. maackii*, reduced density and species richness of tree seedlings. However, a literature review identified several cases of synergistic effects of deer and invasive plants: removal of both enhanced native plant responses, but there was no benefit to only removing invasives or only excluding deer (Gorchov et al. 2021). Removal of just invasive shrubs increases deer browse on some native tree seedlings (Peebles-Spencer and Gorchov 2017) and may trigger invasion of other plants (Kuebbing and Nuñez 2014). Conversely, deer feed on some invasives such as *L. maackii*, so their exclusion increases the negative impacts of these species (Peebles-Spencer et al. 2018). Indeed, Jenkins and Howard (2021) found that reducing deer populations increased the density of nonnative (as well as native) woody plants due to reduced browse pressure.

Artificial regeneration methods such as enrichment planting may be necessary to restore degraded forests and promote the establishment of desired tree species (Dey et al. 2012). Successful artificial regeneration requires selecting species that can persist in the future climate of the site (Löf et al. 2019; Davis and Pinto 2021). Seedlings typically escape deer

browse and shrub effects as they grow > 2 m (Walters et al. 2020). Therefore, we selected tree species based on two criteria: fast growth and ability to withstand the future climate.

However, enrichment plantings and forest restoration projects may be challenged by the same issues affecting regeneration, such as deer browse and competition with invasive plant species (Löf et al. 2019; Thyroff et al. 2019). Measures can be taken to combat these ecological factors (e.g. fencing or caging of planted seedlings and removal of invasive plants), but the need for both is not as well understood and may not be necessary (Redick and Jacobs 2020). Land managers are often faced with limited resources, so understanding the cost (time, labor) and efficacy of deer exclosure and invasive removal is of utmost importance for decision making.

In this study, we aim to understand the impact of deer and invasive plant species on both natural tree regeneration and planted seedlings in an early successional forest. We hypothesize that the exclusion of deer and the removal of invasive woody species will yield the greatest survival and growth of tree seedlings, while the removal of just deer or just invasives will have a smaller positive effect on the seedlings. We also aim to assess the practicality and cost of creating small exclosures that use large trees as the corner posts. This information can be utilized by land managers to promote tree establishment and persistence in early successional forests, by modifying the management of both invasive plants and deer.

Materials and methods

Study site and design

This study was conducted in an early successional forest in the Bachelor Preserve, in Miami University's Natural Areas system in Oxford, Ohio, USA (39° 31' 13.6"N 84° 42' 14.9"W). This area was livestock pasture until about 1950 and began transitioning to forest around 1975 (Lash 2018). The study site is bordered on the east by agricultural fields, on the west by older deciduous forest, and to the north and south by early successional forest. Soil type ranged from silt loam to clay loam and silty clay loam. Average pH of the soil samples was 6.5 and organic matter ranged from 2.89% to 4.82% (Hay 2023). The study site is a stand of early successional *Juniperus virginiana* forest with only a few other species represented in the canopy, including *Maclura pomifera*, *Fagus grandifolia*, and *Juglans nigra* (Hay 2023). The understory tree (5–10 cm diameter at breast height (DBH) density was 225/ha and mainly (78%) composed of *J. virginiana*, while the sapling (2.5–5 cm DBH) layer was almost nonexistent (50 trees/ha) (Hay 2023). Seedling (0.3–1.5 m) density was 12,000 stems/ha, but 96% were *Fraxinus* spp. (Hay 2023), which will not grow beyond 2.5 cm DBH due to Emerald Ash Borer (Herms et al. 2010).

The site was heavily invaded (3.23 m²/ha) by non-native shrubs, particularly *L. maackii* (1.23 m²/ha) and *Ligustrum obtusifolium* (0.75 m²/ha), and the invasive vine *Celastrus orbiculatus* (0.38 m²/ha) (Hay 2023); most of this invasive cover was in the 0.1–2.5 m height range. In 2014, deer density in Bachelor Preserve was estimated at 13 deer/km² in summer and 13.7 deer/km² in winter (Barrett 2014). Density was later measured as 18.2 deer/km² in spring 2017 and 9.5 deer/km² in summer 2017 (Peterson 2018). Archery-based deer management was initiated in winter 2022/23, and in summer 2023 density was 4.4–7.5

deer/km² (Cooper 2024). We note that these estimates were for the entire Bachelor Preserve, not the smaller, early successional stand used in this study. Densities greater than 8 deer/km² have been shown to cause dramatic shifts in vegetation (Horsley et al. 2003). Similarly, Tilghman (1989) suggested maintaining deer populations at 7 deer/km² to ensure tree regeneration.

To examine the individual and interactive effects of deer and invasive plants, we used a factorial experimental design with 10 plots of each combination of deer exclosure/access and invasive woody plants removed/not removed, for a total of 40 plots. Plots were randomly assigned to treatments and treatments were applied in June 2022. Plots were created so that four trees > 10 cm DBH served as the corners of each plot, resulting in plots approximately 3.5 m x 3.5 m (Fig. 1). These dimensions allowed seedlings to be planted at least 1 m away from one another and 1 m away from the edge of the plots (Fig. 1). No plot had a side less than 2 m in length. Plots were ≥ 20 m from trails and ≥ 8 m from one another. Plot locations were selected to avoid inclusion of any tree > 20 cm DBH to prevent shading and competition from the canopy tree.

Exclosure plots had fences constructed around them, with the four corner trees serving as the fence posts. The exclosures were constructed by combining 1.22 m and 0.91 m tall 20-gauge galvanized steel poultry wire with 25.4 mm mesh to create 2.13 m tall fences (Fig. 2), within the height range recommended to prevent deer from jumping over the fence (Curtis et al. 1994; Redick and Jacobs 2020). This material was selected due to its relatively low cost and maintenance as well as its high efficacy (VerCauteren et al. 2006; Redick and Jacobs 2020). Redick and Jacobs (2020) found that wire and mesh fencing were both more effective at reducing browse than other materials, including electric fences. Flagging was applied to the fences to enhance visibility and deter deer from running into and potentially breaking the fence (Redick and Jacobs 2020). Twelve-inch heavy duty tent pegs were used to anchor the bottom of the poultry wire where needed on some exclosures. Construction of all 20 fences took three people approximately 25–30 h total, so a team of three could be expected to construct about six fences per 8-hour day. Fences were checked monthly during the summers and after major storms in other seasons to check for damage and repair when necessary.

Plots designated for invasive removal had all woody invasive shrubs and vines removed in June 2022 via cutting and stump application of 41% glyphosate herbicide (Compare-N-Save Grass and Weed Killer 41% Glyphosate Concentrate), which is appropriate for all invasive shrub and tree species observed at this site. Regardless of the dimensions of the plot, all invasives were removed from a uniform 3.5 m x 3.5 m square. Cut stems were placed a short distance outside plots. Invasive removal plots were re-treated in September 2022 when all invasive resprouts were cut and treated with herbicide. In June 2023, all invasive resprouts greater than 0.3 m in height were identified, measured, and treated. However, there was minimal resprouting, with an average of 3.5 stems per plot. *Celastrus orbiculatus* accounted for the majority (71.4%) of these resprouts requiring treatment.

Estimates of canopy cover were made with the ‘modified canopy cover index’ of the mobile app GLAMA (Gap Light Analysis Mobile Application) as recommended by Tichý (2016). The GLAMA program estimates canopy cover from hemispherical photographs taken on an Android phone (Tichý 2014). Two photographs were taken from the center of each plot, one 0.3 m and one 2 m above the ground. The 0.3 m photo is used to quantify the effects of deer and invasive treatments on light availability at the seedling level, while

the 2 m photos provided an estimate of tree canopy cover of the site. To ensure photos were taken completely horizontal to the ground, the Samsung phone was placed on a clipboard with an Apple iPhone. The iPhone application called “Measure” was used because it has a “Level” function that tells if an object is level. All photos were taken on the same day in August 2022 within a two-hour time frame, and analyzed using the recommended settings on the app.


Tree species for underplanting

Tree species were selected based on two criteria: fast growth (to escape 2 m deer-shrub effects) and ability to withstand the future climate. To determine species that are relatively fast-growing, we used Burns and Honkala (1990). To determine which species could persist in future climate conditions, we used the 1×1 degree grid summary (N39 E84) from the USFS Climate Change Atlas (USFS 2018). We restricted the list of fast-growing species to those that had ratings of Fair or better in the capabil45 category. This is an estimate of the capability of the species to cope with the changing climate at RCP 4.5 (moderate emissions scenario) and is based on its current abundance in the area, change class (potential change in habitat suitability by 2100), and adaptability (based on disturbance and biological characteristics of the species) (USFS 2018).

Based on these requirements, *Quercus rubra* (northern red oak), *Liriodendron tulipifera* (yellow-poplar), *Juglans nigra* (black walnut), and *Carya cordiformis* (bitternut hickory) were selected for planting in June 2022. Few *C. cordiformis* survived and are therefore excluded from analysis. *Juglans nigra* seeds were collected and grown as containerized seedlings (Supplementary methods) while 50 bareroot seedlings of the other tree species were purchased from Cold Stream Farm (Free Soil, MI, USA). *Quercus rubra* seedlings were 0.6–0.9 m in height and estimated to be 1 year old, possibly 2 (Cold Stream Farm, personal communication). *Liriodendron tulipifera* seedlings were also 0.6–0.9 m in height and likely 2 years old. *Juglans nigra* seedlings were 0.06–0.41 m in height (Table S1).

One seedling of each species was planted by hand using trowels in each plot in June 2022; seedlings were planted ≥ 1 m apart (Fig. 1). Seedlings were checked approximately five days after planting and any uprooted seedlings were replanted. Due to uprooting of planted seedlings, trail cameras were placed in four of the plots to determine the cause of uprooting. Several images and videos showed raccoons digging in the plots, so they were likely responsible for uprooting the seedlings. The extra *L. tulipifera* and *Q. rubra* seedlings were planted in selected plots to balance sample size across treatments.

Due to low survival of planted seedlings (Hay 2023), additional seedlings were planted in October 2022 (*L. tulipifera*), May 2023 (*J. nigra*), and November 2024 (*Liquidambar styraciflua*) (Table S1). These seedlings were generally planted in similar spots as previous seedlings and were placed to avoid planting very close to existing trees, tree seedlings, and shrubs. *Juglans nigra* were grown from seed as above (Supplementary methods), and the other species were planted as bare-root seedlings purchased from Cold Stream Farm. *Liquidambar styraciflua* seedlings were 0.7–1.1 m in height and likely 2 years old, possibly 3 (Table S1, Cold Stream Farm personal communication). To prevent uprooting by raccoons, cages were placed around all seedlings, regardless of treatment. Cages were 20-gauge galvanized steel poultry wire with 25.4 mm mesh and were approximately 0.5 m tall with a



diameter of 0.2 m. Cages were anchored into the ground using four landscape staples and were removed from seedlings 3–4 weeks after planting.

In June 2022, natural regeneration in the plots was censused by tagging, identifying, and measuring the height and basal diameter of each tree seedling between 0.3 m and 2.5 m in height. We tagged, identified, and measured new recruitment (i.e. any untagged seedlings that had passed the 0.3 m threshold) in May 2023, June 2024, and June 2025.

Height and basal diameter of each planted tree seedling was measured at planting. For each natural regeneration stem, these were measured when first tagged. Survival and height were recorded monthly through October 2022 and annually thereafter (June 2023, May 2024, June 2025). However, we analyzed only final measures (survival and height in June 2025).

All analyses were done using Rstudio 2025.05.1 + 513 (R Core Team 2025). We confirmed the appropriateness of ANOVA and all other linear models (below) by testing normality of residuals using the Shapiro-Wilks test. Homogeneity of variance was tested using Levene's test (car package in R, Fox 2019).

For modified canopy cover at 0.3 m and 2 m heights, we tested effects of deer, invasive plants, and their interaction using two-way generalized linear model (GLMs, using `glm` in



Fig. 2 One of the deer enclosure plots in an early successional stand in the Miami University Natural Areas near Oxford, Ohio. The enclosures were constructed by combining 1.22 m and 0.91 m tall 20-gauge galvanized steel poultry wire with 25.4 mm mesh to create 2.13 m tall fences. Four naturally occurring trees were used as the corner posts for each enclosure. Flagging was applied to the fences to enhance visibility and deter deer from running into the fence

R). Two-way ANOVA was not used, as variances were not homogenous even after transformation (Levene's test $p \leq 0.05$).

For survival of planted seedlings, we tested the effects of deer, invasive plants, and their interaction using a binomial regression with glm. For change in height from time of planting to 2025 for those surviving, planted seedlings, we again tested the effects of deer, invasive plants, and their interaction using two-way generalized linear models (GLMs, using glm in R) but with "species" (*Q. rubra*, *L. styraciflua*, *J. nigra*, and *L. tulipifera*) as a fixed effect.

For plot-level survival of natural regeneration (percent of seedlings tagged in 2022 that were alive in 2025), we tested the effects of deer, invasive plants, and their interaction using ANOVA on ranks (ARTool package in R, Kay et al. 2025) because residuals from aov failed the Shapiro-Wilks test for normality. For height change from 2022 to 2025 for surviving natural regeneration seedlings, we used a two-way mixed effects model (lme, using nlme in R, Pinheiro and Bates 2025) with "Plot" as a random factor. Since we expect only about one seedling per plot would recruit to the canopy, and this would tend to be the fastest growing, we also singled out the seedling with the greatest height gain (from 2022 to 2025) in each plot and tested the effects on height change using two-way ANOVA with aov.

For recruitment (number of recruits per plot), we tested the effects of deer, invasive plants, and their interaction with Poisson regression with a log link function in glm. After analyzing all recruitment data together, we excluded *F. americana* seedlings, since they will

not grow beyond 2.5 cm DBH due to Emerald Ash Borer (Herms et al. 2010). For the non-*Fraxinus* recruits per plot and plot-level seedling species richness (number of tree species with at least 1 stem 0.3–1.5 m in 2025), we again used Poisson regression with glm to test the effects of deer, invasive plants, and their interaction.

Results

Canopy cover

Average canopy cover across plots at 2 m was 78.4%, with no effect of deer or invasives, as well as no interaction (Table 1). However, at 0.3 m above ground level, invasive removal resulted in significantly lower canopy cover ($p=0.013$). Average canopy cover with invasives present was 80.6%, while average canopy cover without invasives was 76.9% (Fig. 3).

Planted seedlings

Survival of planted seedlings was not significantly affected by deer, invasives, or their interaction. This was true of each species of planted seedling (*Q. rubra*, *L. styraciflua*, *J. nigra*, and *L. tulipifera*) (Table S2). Change in height from 2022 to 2025 for planted seedlings was significantly impacted by species ($p<0.0001$), deer ($p<0.0001$) and the interaction of deer and invasives ($p=0.042$) (Table 1, Fig. S1). Excluding deer resulted in less height loss in planted seedlings. This effect of deer exclosure was greater where invasives were present.

Natural regeneration

Nearly all (>96%) of naturally regenerating seedlings were *F. americana*. Percent survival of natural regeneration from 2022 to 2025 tended to be greater where invasive plants were present ($p=0.075$) but was not affected by deer exclusion (Table 2; Fig. 4). Change in height of natural regeneration was significantly affected by deer ($p=0.004$), but not invasives or the interaction (Table 2). Seedlings grew taller where deer were excluded (Fig. 5). Where deer were excluded, seedlings grew on average 7.7 cm (deer excluded, invasives present) to 12 cm (deer excluded, invasives removed) taller than seedlings in deer access plots. For

Table 1 F and p values for two-way generalized linear models (GLM) for change in height for planted seedlings and canopy cover. Degrees of freedom for F were (1, 36) for canopy cover. All significant values are bolded ($p\leq 0.05$)

Response	Deer treatment		Invasive treatment		Interaction		Species	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
Change in ht, planted seedlings	$F_{1,50}=23.459$	<0.001	$F_{1,49}=0.432$	0.515	$F_{1,44}=4.365$	0.043	$F_{4,45}=22.212$	<0.001
Modified canopy cover, 2.0 m	0.010	0.921	0.261	0.613	0.780	0.383	n/a	n/a
Modified canopy cover, 0.3 m	0.204	0.655	6.758	0.013	0.445	0.509	n/a	n/a




Fig. 3 Boxplot of Modified Canopy Cover index values at 0.3 m by deer and invasive treatment. Canopy photographs were taken in the center of each plot at 0.3 m above ground and analyzed in the GLAMA app

Table 2 F and p values for two-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) of maximum Height change of natural regeneration, linear mixed effects model (lme) for Height change for all natural regeneration, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) on ranks for survival of natural regeneration. Maximum Height change is the change in Height, from 2022 to 2025, of the natural regeneration seedling with the greatest growth in each plot. Degrees of freedom for F were (1, 35) for Max. Height change and natural regeneration survival and (1, 34) for Height change all natural regeneration. All significant values are bolded ($p \leq 0.05$)

Statistical test	Response	Deer treatment		Invasive treatment		Interaction	
		F	p	F	p	F	p
ANOVA on ranks	Survival, natural regen	1.533	0.224	3.356	0.075	0.247	0.622
Two-way ANOVA	Max. height change, natural regen	23.459	<0.001	0.432	0.515	4.365	0.043
lme	Ht change all natural regen	9.61	0.004	1.879	0.179	0.158	0.693

the seedling in each plot with the greatest height growth, change in height was significantly affected by deer ($p=0.017$), but not invasives or the interaction (Table 2; Fig. 6).

The number of all recruits per plot was not affected by deer, invasive plants, or the interaction (Table 3). However, when *F. americana* seedlings were removed from analysis, the number of recruits showed a marginally significant interaction ($p=0.066$): where deer were excluded and invasives removed, the average number of recruits was greatest (Table 3; Fig. 7). Species richness of seedlings per plot was not significantly affected by deer, invasives, or their interaction (Table 3), but richness was slightly greater where both deer and invasives were removed (2.6 seedling species per plot compared to 1.8 where deer only were excluded, 1.6 where invasives only were removed, and 1.9 in control plots).




Fig. 4 Boxplot of percent survival of all natural regeneration. Percent survival is the percent of naturally occurring seedlings tagged in June 2022 in a plot that were still living by June 2025




Fig. 5 Boxplot of change in height of natural regeneration by deer and invasive treatment between June 2022 and June 2025. Heights analyzed for each native tree seedling $30\text{ cm} < \text{ht} < 2.5\text{ m}$ still alive in 2025




Fig. 6 Boxplot of change in height (2022–2025) for the natural regeneration seedling in each plot with the greatest height growth

Table 3 Z and p values for Poisson regressions (using GLM) for per plot numbers of tree seedling recruits, number of seedling recruits excluding *F. americana* (FRAM), and species richness of tree seedlings

Response	Deer treatment		Invasive treatment		Interaction	
	z	p	z	p	z	p
All recruitment	1.235	0.217	0.919	0.358	1.307	0.191
non-FRAM recruitment	0.242	0.809	−0.533	0.594	1.835	0.066
Species richness	−0.143	0.887	−0.477	0.634	1.150	0.250

Discussion

Planted seedlings

One major cause of mortality of planted seedlings was uprooting by raccoons (for seedlings planted in 2022, discussed later). In addition, many of the bareroot seedlings were found dead within a month of planting; *J. nigra*, the only species of containerized seedlings, had the highest survival.

Deer access resulted in seedlings having greater decreases in height over time, likely due to browse of apical shoots. We note that high mortality rates of planted seedlings resulted in low sample sizes for each species, reducing statistical power. Other studies have similarly found deer access to decrease growth of planted seedlings (Owings et al. 2017; Truax et al. 2018; Redick et al. 2020). Removal of woody invasives reduced growth in exclosures, but mitigated height loss in deer access plots, contrary to previous studies that found invasives facilitate seedling growth under high deer pressure (Peebles-Spencer and Gorchov 2017).




Fig. 7 Boxplot of recruitment of native seedlings per plot by 2025, excluding *F. americana*, by deer and invasive treatments. New recruits were native seedlings that passed the 0.3 m height threshold in each plot after June 2022

This reason for the difference in the effect of invasives on tree seedlings between that study and ours is not known; it could be due to methodological differences between the studies.

Although we selected relatively fast-growing species, none of our planted seedlings surpassed the 2 m height threshold (Walters et al. 2020) by the end of the study; the tallest seedling in 2025 was a 1.13 m *L. styraciflua*. Seedlings will continue to be monitored: if they grow 8 cm per year (largest *L. styraciflua* height increase seen in this study) in deer exclosures, the tallest will reach 2 m in about 12 years.

Natural regeneration and recruitment

The greater height growth of natural regeneration stems where deer were excluded is attributable to the absence of browse. Since most stems were *F. americana*, this treatment effect is largely the effect on this species. Many seedlings in deer access plots had apical browse damage, often with multiple browse events over the 3-year study (AE Hay pers. observation).

Recruitment of native seedlings excluding *Fraxinus* spp. was greater where both deer and invasives were removed, although only marginally. This indicates that both exclusion of deer and invasive removal are important for recruitment. Other studies have reported correlations between density of natural regeneration (seedlings and saplings) and deer browse impacts/deer density (Russell et al. 2017; Miller and McGill 2019; Miller et al. 2023), but excluding only deer could release woody invasive plants from deer browse, thereby increasing abundance of these invasives (Jenkins and Howard 2021; Donoso et al. 2024) and their suppression of tree regeneration.

We investigated recruitment of seedlings other than *Fraxinus* spp. because *Fraxinus* will not grow beyond 2.5 cm DBH due to the Emerald Ash Borer (*Agrilus planipennis*) (Herms et al. 2010). The scarcity of species other than *Fraxinus* spp. in the seedling layer therefore poses a serious threat to forest health. Our findings that non-*Fraxinus* recruitment, and species richness of recruitment, tended to be greatest where deer were excluded and invasive woody plants removed suggest management of both deer and invasives is necessary to overcome regeneration failure in these sorts of early successional stands. The low diversity in naturally occurring seedlings may be due to preferential browsing by deer. Selective browsing by deer often results in species composition shifts from preferred to non-preferred species, where preferred species can be virtually eliminated from the seedling layer (Rooney and Waller 2003; Cote et al. 2004, Bradshaw and Waller 2016; Miller and McGill 2019). The recruited seedlings in this study have preference rankings ranging from ‘highly selected’ [e.g. *Acer saccharum*; rankings from Sample et al. (2023)] to ‘neutral’ (e.g. *Acer negundo*, *Ulmus americana*) and we may expect to see more of these deer preferred species appear in deer exclosures.

Indeed, changes in the naturally occurring vegetation (e.g. changes in species composition) may need multiple years to manifest. The impacts of deer exclosure and/or reduction of deer densities on native vegetation often take many years to manifest due to legacy effects of deer (Tanentzap et al. 2012; Nuttle et al. 2014). Similarly, invasive plants can have long lasting impacts after they have been removed, especially on the soil (e.g. nutrient cycling, microbial composition) (Corbin and D’Antonio 2012; Afzal et al. 2023). While we did see differences of deer exclusion and invasive removal after just three years, the forest stand still lacks the diversity of seedlings and saplings that are needed for canopy replacement (Miller et al. 2023).

The positive, marginally significant, effect of invasives on survival of natural regeneration was unexpected because removal of invasive plants increased light availability (i.e. lower modified canopy cover) and invasive shrubs directly negatively affect forest regeneration by shading out native seedlings (Boyce 2009). Notably, average survival was lowest where deer had access and invasives were removed. Invasives may provide protection to native tree seedlings by decreasing deer access, as reported for *A. saccharum* seedlings under the canopy of *L. maackii* (Peebles-Spencer and Gorchov 2017). Thyroff et al. (2019) also found removal of competing vegetation improved seedling performance, but only in fenced plots. This facilitation effect of invasive shrubs is expected only where deer browse impact is high (e.g., deer are overabundant).

Exclosures and cages

This was the first study to our knowledge that created small deer exclosures that utilized naturally occurring large trees as fence posts. An objective of our study was to determine the efficacy, practicality, and cost of this exclosure method. Land managers often have limited resources (money, time, labor); therefore, finding an inexpensive material and method for building exclosures is crucial.

The galvanized mesh fencing used to construct our exclosures was selected due to its relatively low cost and maintenance. To make 20 exclosures, we spent approximately \$1,670, which equates to about \$83.50 per exclosure. The galvanized mesh fencing we used cost about \$4.60/m (\$5.60/m when including labor costs), which is less than many other types

of fencing as well as other reports of wire fencing, likely due to using canopy trees as posts (Curtis et al. 1994; VerCauteren et al. 2006). For example, woven wire fencing costs \$10–\$15/m (VerCauteren et al. 2006). We found our fencing technique to be easily achievable with only 2–3 people and were able to construct about six exclosures per day. Further, other studies have found wire fencing to have relatively high efficacy (90–99%) and longevity (30–40 years) compared to other fencing types (Redick and Jacobs 2020; VerCauteren et al. 2006).

Over the course of three years, we made 17 repairs on exclosures (so about 0.3 repairs per exclosure per year). Most commonly, one side sagged (e.g. due to branch fall) and the repair involved adding a top line of ¼-inch twisted nylon rope and securing the poultry wire to it with zip-ties. Had we added this top line to each exclosure, this would have added about 30 min and \$10 (for 16 m of rope). Based on the frequency and magnitude of repairs, we believe these fences could last the 12 years required for seedlings to escape deer browse/shrub effects, although they will need to be checked annually/semi-annually or after large storm events.

Since these exclosures did not require much assembly time and cost and required minimal repairs over the course of three years, we recommend this method to land managers. These exclosures could be disassembled after tree seedlings have surpassed the 2 m “shrub-deer bottleneck” and reassembled in other locations, using trees as posts in the same stand, a type of “rotational fencing”. Growth models indicated that rotational fencing for 10 years would be sufficient to restore densities of tall shrubs in deciduous woodland in Wyoming with high deer impacts (Merrill et al. 2003). Based on the 8 cm/year growth of our fastest growing species, we estimate 12 years would be needed before exclosures were moved.

However, survival was extremely low across all treatments for seedlings planted in June 2022. Most seedlings (51%) were uprooted three to five days after they were first planted, and trail cameras at different plots revealed that raccoons were uprooting the seedlings. This uprooting occurred even in fenced plots, revealing that exclosures did not keep out raccoons (and likely other small mammals). In contrast, survival of *L. styraciflua* seedlings planted in November 2024 with cages was much greater, with 65% surviving by June 2025 across treatments. The cages for the planted seedlings did not take much time to assemble (approximately 5 h total for 40 cages), were made of leftover fencing material (hence low cost), and were able to be reused in other plantings. Similar cages have been found to be effective at deterring small-medium sized mammals (Marsh et al. 1990). We recommend pairing the exclosures with protective cages or some other additional protective measures (e.g. stronger ground anchors to prevent access under fences) to increase survival of planting seedlings. We found leaving cages in place for 3–4 weeks to be effective.

Conclusions

Overall, deer had the greatest impact on planted seedlings and natural regeneration. Deer exclosure increased recruitment of native seedlings, with greatest recruitment in deer and invasive removed plots, and increased height growth in natural regeneration. Removal of invasive shrubs and vines is not needed to enhance seedling growth and recruitment.

These small exclosures that utilized trees as corner posts required minimal cost (about \$83.50/exclosure), installation time (6 exclosures/day with 2–3 people), and maintenance

(about 0.3 repairs/exclosure/year). These findings, in conjunction with the positive effects on native tree seedlings, lead us to recommend this method to land managers. Our fencing method could also be easily used for rotational fencing, especially for relatively small natural area restoration projects. However, due to predation by small/medium mammals, we recommend these exclosures be paired with other protective measures (e.g. caging) when conducting underplanting. In comparable early-successional forests, we suggest that land managers focus efforts on alleviating deer pressure as opposed to focusing on invasive plant species removal. We expect that with a longer time frame, more pronounced treatment effects would arise. We also expect the facilitative effect of invasive shrubs protecting tree seedlings from deer browse may be erased with the alleviation of deer pressure, which may then warrant invasive removal.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11056-026-10165-6>.

Acknowledgements This article is based on an MS in biology thesis by AH at Miami University. Funding was provided by a grant from the Ohio Invasive Plant Council. No competing interests have been declared. We thank Melany Fisk and Jonathan Bauer for valuable comments on the thesis and two anonymous reviewers for valuable comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.

Author contributions AH and DG wrote and reviewed the manuscript and completed all data analysis and creation of figures.

Data availability No datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare no competing interests.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

- Afzal MR, Naz M, Ashraf W, Du D (2023) The legacy of plant invasion: impacts on soil nitrification and management implications. *Plants* 12(16):2980. <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants12162980>
- Barrett ML (2014) Comparison of estimates of white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*). Population densities over two different seasonal periods in Miami university's natural areas. A practicum report, Institute for environment and sustainability. Miami University, Oxford (OH)
- Boyce RL (2009) Invasive shrubs and forest tree regeneration. *J Sustainable Forestry* 28(1–2):152–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10549810802626449>
- Bradshaw L, Waller DM (2016) Impacts of white-tailed deer on regional patterns of forest tree recruitment. *For Ecol Manage* 375:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2016.05.019>
- Burns RM, Honkala BH (1990) *Silvics of North America: volume 2. Hardwoods*. Agriculture handbook. United States Department of Agriculture, Washington

- Conover DG, Bergstein RD (2022) The rise of non-native invasive plants in wooded natural areas in south-western Ohio. *Ecol Restor* 40(2):94–97. <https://doi.org/10.3368/er.40.2.94>
- Cooper EK, (2024) A Comparison Of two methods to estimate deer density : trail camera capture-recapture and distance sampling of fecal pellet piles. M.En. thesis, Miami University
- Corbin JD, D'Antonio CM (2012) Gone but not forgotten? Invasive plants' legacies on community and ecosystem properties. *Invasive Plant Sci Manage* 5(1):117–124. <https://doi.org/10.1614/IPSM-D-11-00005.1>
- Côté SD, Rooney TP, Tremblay JP, Dussault C, Waller DM (2004) Ecological impacts of deer overabundance. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst* 35:113–147. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.35.021103.105725>
- Curtis PD, Fargione MJ, Richmond ME (1994) Preventing Deer Damage with Barrier, Electrical, and Behavioral Fencing Systems. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Vertebrate Pest Conference*, Santa Clara, CA, USA, 28 February–3 March 1994
- Davis MA, Grime JP, Thompson K (2000) Fluctuating resources in plant communities: a general theory of invasibility. *J Ecol* 88:528–524. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2745.2000.00473.x>
- Davis AS, Pinto, JR (2021) The scientific basis of the target plant concept: An overview. *Forests* 12:1293. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f12091293>
- Dey DC, Gardiner ES, Schweitzer CJ, Kabrick JM, Jacobs DF (2012) Underplanting to sustain future stocking of oak (*Quercus*) in temperate deciduous forests. *New Forest* 43:955–978. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11056-012-9330-z>
- Dey DC, Knapp BO, Battaglia MA et al (2019) Barriers to natural regeneration in temperate forests across the USA. *New Forest* 50:11–40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11056-018-09694-6>
- Donoso MU, Leonard H, Gorchov DL (2024) Long-term interactive impacts of the invasive shrub *Lonicera maackii* and white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) on a deciduous forest understory. *Invasive Plant Sci Manage* 17(1):25–36. <https://doi.org/10.1017/imp.2024.2>
- Fox J, Weisberg S (2019) *An R Companion to Applied Regression*, Third edition. Sage, Thousand Oaks CA
- Gorchov DL, Blossley B, Averill KM, Andrea Davalos AJ, Heberling M, Jenkins MA, Kalisz S, McShea WJ, Morrison JA, Nuzzo V, Webster M, Waller DM (2021) Differential and interacting impacts of invasive plants and white-tailed deer in Eastern U.S. Forests. *Biol Invasion* 23:2711–2727.
- Harris NL, Gibbs DA, Baccini A et al (2021) Global maps of twenty-first century forest carbon fluxes. *Nat Clim Chang* 11:234–240. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-00976-6>
- Hartman KM, McCarthy BC (2008) Changes in forest structure and species composition following invasion by a non-indigenous shrub, Amur honeysuckle (*Lonicera maackii*). *J Torrey Bot Soc* 135:245–259. <https://doi.org/10.3159/07-RA-036.1>
- Hay A (2023) Individual and interactive effects of white-tailed deer and woody invasive plants on native tree seedlings in an early-successional forest. Miami University, Oxford (OH)
- Herms DA, Klooster W, Knight KS, Gandhi KJK, Herms CP, Smith A, McCullough DG, Cardina J (2010) Ash regeneration in the wake of emerald ash borer: Will it restore ash or sustain the outbreak? In: Lance, D.; Buck, J.; Binion, D.; Reardon, R.; Mastro, V., comps. *Proceedings of the emerald ash borer research and technology development meeting*; 2009 October 20–21; Pittsburgh, PA. FHTET-2010-01. Morgantown, WV: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team: 18–19
- Horsley SB, Stout SL, DeCalesta DS (2003) White-tailed deer impact on the vegetation dynamics of a Northern hardwood forest. *Ecol Appl* 13:98–118
- Jenkins MA, Howard BS (2021) Forest vegetation response to white-tailed deer population reductions in a large urban park. *Nat Areas J* 41:114–124. <https://doi.org/10.3375/043.041.0206>
- Kay M, Elkin L, Higgins J, Wobbrock J (2025) ARTool: Aligned Rank Transform for Nonparametric Factorial ANOVAs. doi:10.5281/zenodo.594511, R package version 0.11.2. <https://github.com/mjskay/ARTool>
- Krieger DJ (2001) *The Economic Value of Forest Ecosystem Services: A Review*. The Wilderness Society, Washington, DC
- Kuebbing SE, Nuñez MA (2014) Negative, neutral, and positive interactions among nonnative plants: patterns, processes, and management implications. *Glob Change Biol* 21:926–934. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12711>
- Kuhman TR, Pearson SM (2010) Effects of land-use history and the contemporary landscape on non-native plant invasion at local and regional scales in the forest-dominated Southern Appalachians. *Landscape Ecol* 25:1433–1445. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-010-9500-3>
- Lash KD (2018) Facilitative effects of dead Amur honeysuckle (*Lonicera maackii*) shrubs on native tree seedling growth and survival. Miami University, Oxford (OH)
- Löf M, Madsen P, Metslaid M et al (2019) Restoring forests: regeneration and ecosystem function for the future. *New Forests* 50:139–151. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11056-019-09713-0>

- Marsh RE, Koehler AE, Salmon TP (1990) Exclusionary methods and materials to protect plants from pest mammals—a review. *Proceedings of the Vertebrate Pest Conference*, 14. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9766f2h9>
- Merrill EH, Beyer HL, Jones GP, McDaniel GW (2003) Deciduous woodland conservation under heavy deer browsing on Devils Tower National monument, USA. *J Nat Conserv* 10:221–232. <https://doi.org/10.1078/1617-1381-00022>
- Miller KM, McGill BJ (2019) Compounding human stressors cause major regeneration debt in over half of Eastern US forests. *J Appl Ecol* 56:1355–1366. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13375>
- Miller KM, Perles SJ, Schmit JP, Matthews ER, Weed AS, Comiskey JA, Marshall MR, Nelson P, Fisichelli NA (2023) Overabundant deer and invasive plants drive widespread regeneration debt in eastern United States national parks. *Ecol Appl* e2837. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2837>
- Mosher ES, Silander JA, Latimer AM (2009) The role of land-use history in major invasions by woody plant species in the Northeastern North American landscape. *Biol Invasions* 11:2317–2328. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-008-9418-8>
-
-
- Nuttle T, Ristau TE, Royo AA (2014) Long-term biological legacies of herbivore density in a landscape-scale experiment: forest understoreys reflect past deer density treatments for at least 20 years. *J Ecol* 102:221–228. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.12175>
- Owings CF, Jacobs DF, Shields JM, Saunders MR, Jenkins MA (2017) Individual and interactive effects of white-tailed deer and an exotic shrub on artificial and natural regeneration in mixed hardwood forests. *AoB Plants*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aobpla/plx024>
- Pearce DW (2001) The economic value of forest ecosystems. *Ecosyst Health* 7:284–296. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1526-0992.2001.01037.x>
- Peebles-Spencer JR, Gorchov DL (2017) Are native tree seedlings facilitated by an invasive shrub where white-tailed are abundant? *Natural Areas* 37:540–548. <https://doi.org/10.3375/043.037.0410>
- Peebles-Spencer JR, Haffey CM, Gorchov DJ (2018) Browse by white-tailed deer decreases cover and growth of the invasive shrub, *Lonicera maackii*. *Am Midl Nat* 179:68–77. <https://doi.org/10.1674/0003-0031-179.1.68>
- Peterson TE (2018) Factors affecting densities of white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) in eastern deciduous forest: the roles of and surrounding land use, forest habitat edge, and invasive shrubs. Miami University, Oxford (OH)
- Pinheiro J, Bates D, Core Team R (2025) *_nlme: linear and nonlinear mixed effects Models_*. R Package Version 3:1–168.
- R Core Team (2025) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Redick CH, Jacobs DF (2020) Mitigation of deer herbivory in temperate hardwood forest regeneration: a meta-analysis of research literature. *Forests* 11:1220. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f11111220>
- Redick CH, McKenna JR, Carlson DE, Jenkins MA, Jacobs DF (2020) Silviculture at establishment of hardwood plantations is relatively ineffective in the presence of deer browsing. *For Ecol Manag* 474:118339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2020.118339>
- Rooney TP (2001) Deer impacts on forest ecosystems: a North American perspective. *Forestry* 74:201–208. <https://doi.org/10.1093/forestry/74.3.201>
- Rooney TP, Waller DM (2003) Direct and indirect effects of white-tailed deer in forest ecosystems. *For Ecol Manage* 181:165–176. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127\(03\)00130-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127(03)00130-0)
- Russell MB, Woodall CW, Potter KM, Walters BF, Domke GM, Oswalt CM (2017) Interactions between white-tailed deer density and the composition of forest understoreys in the Northern United States. *Forest Ecol Manage* 384:26–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2016.10.038>
- Sample RD, Delisle ZJ, Pierce JM, Swihart RK, Caudell JN, Jenkins MA (2023) Selection rankings of woody species for white-tailed deer vary with browse intensity and landscape context within the Central Hardwood Forest Region. *Forest Ecol Manage* 537:120969. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2023.120969>
- Stinson KA, Campbell SA, Powell JR, Wolfe BE, Callaway RM, Thelen GC et al (2006) Invasive plant suppresses the growth of native tree seedlings by disrupting belowground mutualisms. *PLoS Biol* 4(5):e140. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0040140>
- Tanentzap AJ, Kirby KJ, Goldberg E (2012) Slow responses of ecosystems to reductions in deer (Cervidae) populations and strategies for achieving recovery. *Ecol Manage* 264:159–166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2011.10.005>
- Thyroff EC, Burney OT, Jacobs DF (2019) Herbivory and competing vegetation interact as site limiting factors in maritime forest restoration. *Forests* 10:950. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f10110950>
- Tichý L (2014) GLAMA – Gap light analysis mobile app. User’s manual

- Tichý L (2016) Field test of canopy cover estimation by hemispherical photographs taken with a smartphone. *J Veg Sci* 27:427–435. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12350>
- Tilghman NG (1989) Impacts of white-tailed deer on forest regeneration in Northwestern Pennsylvania. *J Wildl Manage* 53:524–532. <https://doi.org/10.2307/380917>
- Trammell TLE, D'Amico IIIV, Avolio ML, Mitchell JC, Moore E (2020) Temperate deciduous forests embedded across developed landscapes: younger forests harbor invasive plants and urban forests maintain native plants. *J Ecol* 108:2366–2375. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13400>
- Truax B, Gagnon D, Forteir J, Lambert F, Pétrin M (2018) Ecological factors affecting white pine, red oak, bitternut hickory, and black walnut underplanting success in a northern temperate post-agricultural forest. *Forests* 9:499. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f9080499>
- USFS, United States Forest Service (2018) Northern Research Station (NRS), Climate Change Atlas Tree Atlas, version 4. <https://www.fs.fed.us/nrs/atlas/>
- VerCauteren KC, Lavelle MJ, Hygnstrom S (2006) Fences and deer management: a review of designs and efficacy. *Wildlife Soc Bull* 34(1):191–200. [https://doi.org/10.2193/0091-7648\(2006\)34\[191:FADMAR\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.2193/0091-7648(2006)34[191:FADMAR]2.0.CO;2)
- Walters MB, Farinosi EJ, Willis JL (2020) Deer browsing and shrub competition set sapling recruitment height and interact with light to shape recruitment niches for temperate forest tree species. *For Ecol Manage* 467:118134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2020.118134>
- Webster CR, Jenkins MA, Jose S (2006) Woody invaders and the challenges they pose to forest ecosystems in the Eastern United States. *J Forest* 104(7):366–374. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jof/104.7.366>
- Williams RD (1990) *Silvics of North America Vol 2: Hardwoods Juglans nigra L. Black Walnut*. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Agriculture Handbook 654: 391–398

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.