Transactions of the Illinois State Academy of Science
(2004), Volume 97, #2, pp. 95-102

received 2/19/04
accepted 6/17/04

Breeding Systems of Plants Used for Prairie Restorations: A Review

Brenda Molano-Flores
Illinois Natural History Survey
Center for Wildlife and Plant Ecology
607 East Peabody Drive, Champaign, IL 61820.
molano@inhs.uiuc.edu
217-265-8167 (Work)
217-265-5110 (Fax)

ABSTRACT

Compatibility systems (i.e., self-compatible vs. self-incompatible) and types of individuals (e.g., heteromorphic, dioecious, etc.) in prairie plant species are usually ignored in prairie flower publications. Lack of knowledge regarding this information can hinder the success of prairie restoration. In this paper, I provide an explanation for why those involved in restoration should be concerned about the compatibility system and types of individuals of prairie plants. In addition, a list of the compatibility systems and types of individuals for some of the most common species used in prairie restorations is provided.

Prairie restoration is becoming a big business for landscapers and a major effort undertaken by many state (e.g., Departments of Natural Resources) and federal agencies (e.g., United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service, United States Fish and Wildlife Service). However, in most cases it is local environmental groups, local park districts, and some individuals doing prairie restorations. Most people doing prairie restorations are very knowledgeable about the biology of prairie plant species, such as their habitat and seed germination requirements and the best propagation techniques. However, many are unaware of additional factors affecting the reintroduction, establishment, and persistence of a species in a restoration, such as patch dynamics, pollinator guilds, and reproductive biology including plant compatibility systems (i.e., self-compatible vs. self-incompatible), and that some prairie species have different individual types (e.g., heteromorphic, dioecious, etc.). This oversight is understandable because many guides and other books on prairie plants fail to provide this basic information and explain how these factors influence the success and persistence of a species in a restoration. Making this information accessible will ensure a higher level of public awareness.

One aspect of plant biology that is rarely reported is the species' compatibility system. The compatibility system of a plant species is concerned with which pollen is accepted or rejected. In general, plants fall into two categories: self-compatible and self-incompatible. Self-compatible means that both self and outcross pollen will be accepted by a flower (stigma). In the case of self-incompatiblility, only cross pollen will be accepted by the flower (stigma). For example, most members of the Carrot Family (Apiaceae) and plants

with both chasmogamous and cleistogamous flowers (see Appendix for definition) are self-compatible. Published data indicates that 49 percent of prairie species are known to be self-compatible (Table 1). Members of the Sunflower (Asteraceae) and Milkweed (Asclepiadaceae) families generally are considered to be self-incompatible (Wyatt and Broyles 1994; Richards 1997; Schlessman and Graceffa 2002). Published data indicates that 39 percent of prairie species are known to be self-incompatible (Table 1). For the remaining 12 percent of prairie species, either data was not available or the species has a mixed compatibility system (i.e., self-compatible/self-incompatible; Table 1).

For species that are propagated by cuttings or are clonal (i.e., vegetative reproduction), self-incompatibility may limit reproduction if only one or a few genotypes are used in the restoration. One example of such a situation is the self-incompatible *Filipendula rubra* (Queen-of-the-prairie). If all the plants in a restoration are cloned from a single plant, fruit set will be hindered (i.e., no fruit set) because only self pollen will be transferred (Aspinwall and Christian 1992). To avoid such reproductive problems, particular emphasis should be placed on seed or cutting origin. Collection of seeds or cuttings from multiple nearby populations (sites) may decrease this reproductive problem, because more genotypes will be available.

Regardless of compatibility system, collecting seeds from a single population or from widely separated populations might result in either inbreeding or outbreeding depression, which can reduce reproductive success and fitness. Inbreeding depression is when genetically similar (i.e., closely related) individuals cross with each other resulting in the reduction in fitness of the offspring. Outbreeding depression is when very genetically different (i.e., distantly related) individuals cross with each other resulting in the reduction of the fitness of the offspring. Both inbreeding and outbreeding depression can hinder species persistence in a restoration.

Another usually overlooked aspect of reproductive biology is that some prairie species have different types of individuals (e.g., heteromorphic (pin/thrum), monoecious, dioecious, gynodioecious; see Appendix for definitions). Published data indicates that 24 percent of prairie species have different types of individuals (Table 1). Most prairie plants produce only one type of plant, hermaphroditic. However, some prairie species produce plants of different sexes. An example of a prairie species with different types of individuals is *Lobelia siphilitica* (Blue lobelia). This species has two breeding types in natural populations: hermaphroditic and female (i.e., gynodioecious). If a restoration project with this species includes hermaphroditic individuals, reproduction may succeed, however, if a high proportion of females are re-planted, reproduction will be negatively affected.

A more subtle situation is heterostyly, in which different plants bear their stigmas and anthers at different levels in different plants. An excellent example is *Lithospermum canescens* (Hoary puccoon). This species has two types of individuals, pin and thrum. Individuals that are thrum have flowers with the style half way down the corolla tube and the anthers visible at the top of the corolla tube. Pin individuals are the opposite. Both types of individuals have to be present for successful reproduction. Populations that depart from equal numbers of pin and thrum individuals suffer reduced reproduction. In addition, plant species with pin and thrum flowers are usually self-incompatible (Richards 1997, Proctor et al. 1996).

Table 1 lists the compatibility system and types of individuals, when applicable, for some of the more common species used in restorations. A total of 67 species were chosen either because they are commercially available or easy to establish. Also, the species were chosen because information about compatibility systems and types of individuals was found in peer-reviewed publications. An appendix has been included defining terminology presented in this paper or that the readers may encounter in the literature cited. Hopefully this data will provide an additional tool to improve prairie restorations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Geoffrey Levin, Christopher Ivey, Mary Ann Feist, and anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments to improve the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Ashman, T.L. 2000. Pollinator selectivity and its implications for the evolution of dioecy and sexual dimorphism. Ecology 81: 2577-2591.

Aspinwall, N. and T. Christian. 1992. Pollination biology, seed production, and population structure in queen-of-the-prairie, *Filipendula rubra* (Rosaceae) at Botkin Fen, Missouri. American Journal of Botanical 79: 488-494.

Becker, W. A. and L. C. Ewart. 1990. Pollination, seed set, and pollen tube growth investigations in *Viola pedata* L. Acta Horticulturae 272: 33-36.

Bertin, R.I. and G.M. Gwisc. 2002. Floral sex ratios and gynomonoecy in *Solidago* (Asteraceae). Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 77: 413-422.

Boe, A. and K. Fluharty, 1993. Reproductive biology of a Canada milk-vetch population from eastern South Dakota. Prairie Naturalist 25: 65-72.

Byers, D.L. 1995. Pollen quantity and quality as explanations for low seed set in small populations exemplified by *Eupatorium* (Asteraceae). American Journal of Botany 82: 1000-1006.

Chambers, H.L. 1961. Chromosome survey and analysis of artificial hybrids in *Pycnanthemum* (Labiatae). Brittonia 13: 116-128.

Clinebell R. R. and P. Bernhardt. 1998. The pollination ecology of five species of *Penstemon* (Scrophulariaceae) in the tallgrass prairie. Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden 85: 126-136.

Cole, C.T. and D.D. Biesboer. 1992. Monomorphism, reduced gene flow, and cleistogamy in rare and common species of *Lespedeza* (Fabaceae). American Journal of Botany 79: 567-575.

Costelloe, B.H. 1988. Pollination ecology of *Gentiana andrewsii*. Ohio Journal of Science 88: 132-138.

Cruden, R.W. 1973. Reproductive biology of weedy and cultivated *Mirabilis* (Nyctaginaceae) American Journal of Botany 60: 802-809.

Cruden, W.R. 1977. Pollen-ovule ratios: A conservative indicator of breeding systems in flowering plants. Evolution 31:32-46.

Cruden, R.W., L. Hermanutz, and J. Shuttleworth. 1984. The pollination biology and breeding system of *Monarda fistulosa* (Labiatae). Oecologia 64: 104-110.

Cruden, R.W. and D.L. Lyon. 1989. Facultative xenogamous: Examination of a mixed mating system. *In* J. Bock and Y.B. Linhart [eds.], 171-207, Evolutionary ecology of plants. Westview Press, Boulder, CO.

Cruden, R.W., K.K. Baker, T.E. Cullinan, K.A. Disbrow, K.L. Douglas, J.D. Erb, K.J. Kirsten, M.L. Malik, E.A. Turner. 1990. The mating systems and pollination biology of three species of *Verbena* (Verbenaceae). Journal of the Iowa Academy of Science 97: 178-183.

Delbart, C., B. Bris, A. Nouvelot, and D. Coustaut. 1983. Sulfatides and pollination in *Oenothera missouriensis*. Phytochemistry 22: 869-874.

Dellaporta, S.L. and A. Calderon-Urrea. 1993. Sex determination in flowering plants. The Plant Cell. 5: 1241-1251.

Douglas, K. L., and R. W. Cruden. 1994. The reproductive biology of *Anemone canadensis* (Ranunculaceae): breeding system and facilitation of sexual selection. American Journal of Botany 81:314-321.

Edwards, J. and J.R. Jordan. 1992. Reversible anther opening in *Lilium philadelphicum* (Liliaceae): A possible means of enhancing male fitness. American Journal of Botany 79: 144-148.

Fester, C.B. 1995. Mirror image flowers and their effect on outcrossing rate in *Chamaecrista fasciculata* (Leguminosae). American Journal of Botany 82: 46-50.

Fore, S.A. and S.I. Guttman. 1999. Genetic structure *of Helianthus occidentalis* (Asteraceae) in a preserve with fragmented habitat. American Journal of Botany 86: 988-995.

Gleason, H. G. and A. Cronquist. 1991. Manual of Vascular Plants of Northeastern United States and Adjacent Canada. 2nd edition. New York Botanical Garden, USA.

Hashemi, A., A. Estilai and H.H. Naqvi. 1989. Intersectional hybrids between induced tetraploid guayule (*Parthenium argentatum*) and natural tetraploid *Parthenium integrifolium* (Asteraceae). Botanical Gazette 150: 78-83.

Heywood, J.S. 1993. Biparental inbreeding depression in the self-incompatible annual plant *Gaillardia pulchella* (Asteraceae). American Journal of Botany 80: 545-550.

Huff, D. R., and L. Wu. 1992. Distribution and inheritance of inconstant sex forms in natural populations of dioecious buffalograss (*Buchloe dactyloides*). American Journal of Botany. 79: 207-215.

Imbert, F.M. and J.H. Richards. 1993. Protandry, incompatibility, and secondary pollen presentation in *Cephalanthus occidentalis* (Rubiaceae). American Journal of Botany 80: 395-404.

Johnston, I.M. 1952. Studies in the Boraginaceae, XXIII a survey of the genus *Lithispermum*. Journal of the Arnold Arboretum 33: 299-363.

Johnston, M. 1991. Natural selection on floral traits in two species of *Lobelia* with different pollinators. Evolution 45: 1468-1479.

Kephart, S.R. 1981. Breeding system in *Asclepias incarnata* L., *A. syriaca* L., and *A. verticillata* L. American Journal of Botany 68:226-232.

Kirt, R. R. 1995. Prairie plants of the Midwest: Identification and ecology. Stipes Publishing L.L.L., Champaign, IL.

Leuszler, H.K., V.J. Tepedino, and D.G. Alston. 1996. Reproductive biology of purple coneflower in southwestern North Dakota. Prairie Naturalist 28: 91-102.

Levin, D.A. 1968a. The breeding system of *Lithospermum caroliniense*: adaptation and counteradaptation. The American Naturalist 102: 427-441.

Levin, D.A. 1968b. The structure of a polyspecies hybrid swarm in *Liatris*. Evolution 22: 353-372.

Levin, D.A. and H.W. Kerstern. 1970. Phenotypic dimorphism and populational fitness in *Phlox*. Evolution 24: 128-134.

Lindsay, A.H. 1982. Floral phenology patterns and breeding systems in *Thaspium* and *Zizia* (Apiaceae). Systematic Botany 7: 1-12.

Lipow, S.R. and R. Wyatt. 1999. Floral morphology and late-acting self-incompatibility in *Apocynum cannabinum* (Apocynaceae). Plant Systematics and Evolution 219: 99-109.

Lipow, S.R. and R. Wyatt. 2000. Towards an understanding of the mixed breeding system of swamp milkweed (*Asclepias incarnata*). Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society 127: 193-199.

Long, R.W. 1966. Artificial interspecific hybridization in *Ruellia* (Acanthaceae). American Journal of Botany 53: 917-927.

Menges, E.S. 1995. Factors limiting fecundity and germination in small populations of *Silene regia* (Caryophyllaceae), a rare hummingbird-pollinated prairie forb. American Midland Naturalist 133: 242-255.

McKone, M.J. 1985. Reproductive biology of several bromegrasses (*Bromus*): Breeding system, pattern of fruit maturation, and seed set. American Journal of Botany 72: 1334-1339.

McKone, M.J., C.P. Lund, and J.M. O'Brien. 1998. Reproductive biology of two dominant prairie grasses (*Andropogon gerardii* and *Sorghastrum nutans*, Poaceae): male-biased sex allocation in wind-pollinated plants? American Journal of Botany 85: 776-783.

Molano-Flores, B. 2002. Pollination biology and flower visitors of the gynodioecious species *Lobelia spicata* Lam. (Campanulaceae). The Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society 128: 187-193.

Molano-Flores, B. 2001. The reproductive biology of *Eryngium yuccifolium* Michx. (Apiaceae), a prairie species. The Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society 128: 1-6.

Molano-Flores, B. and S.D. Hendrix. 1999. The effects of population density and population size on the reproductive output of *Anemone canadensis* L. (Ranunculaceae). The International Journal of Plant Sciences 160: 759-766.

Molano-Flores, B., S.D. Hendrix and S.B. Heard. 1999. The effect of population size on stigma pollen load, fruit set, and seed set in *Allium stellatum* Ker. (Liliaceae). The International Journal of Plant Sciences 160: 753-757.

Molano-Flores, B. and S.D. Hendrix. 1998. Reproductive biology of Candle Anemone. The Prairie Naturalist 30:169-179.

Owens, S.J. and S. McGrath. 1984. Self-incompatibility and the pollen-stigma interaction in *Tradescantia ohiensis*. Protoplasma 121: 209-213.

Parrish, J.A.D. and F.A. Bazzaz .1979. Difference in pollination niche relationships in early and late successional plant communities. Ecology 60: 597-610.

Proctor, M., P. Yeo and A. Lack. 1996.The Natural History of Pollination. Timber Press Oregon, USA.

Richards, A. J. 1997. Plant breeding systems. Chapman and Hall, London, UK.

Sanders, T.B. and J.L. Hamrick. 1980. Variation in the breeding system of *Elymus canadensis*. Evolution 34: 117-122.

Schaal, B.A. and D.A. Levin. 1978. Morphological differentiation and neighborhood size in *Liatris cylindracea*. American Journal of Botany 65: 923-928.

Schlessman, M. A. and L.M. Graceffa. 2002. Protogyny, Pollination, and Sex Expression of Andromonoecious *Pseudocymopterus montanus* (Apiaceae, Apioideae). The International Journal of Plant Sciences 163:409-417.

Steiner, E. and D.A. Levin, 1977. Allozyme SI gene cytological and morphological polymorphisms in a population of *Oenothera biennis*. Evolution 31: 127-133.

Straley, G.B. 1977. Systematics of *Oenothera* section Kneiffia (Onagraceae). Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden 64: 381-424.

Wyatt, R. and S.B. Broyles. 1994. Ecology and evolution of reproduction in milkweeds. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 25: 423-441.

Wyatt, R. and R. L. Hellwing. 1979. Factors determining fruit set in heterostylous Bluets, *Houstonia caerulea* (Rubiaceae). Systemantic Botany 4: 103-114.

Wyatt, R. 1976. Pollination and fruit-set in *Asclepias tuberosa*: A reappraisal. American Journal of Botany 63: 845-851.

Table 1. List of the compatibility systems and individual types for some of the most common species used in prairie restorations (SC = self-compatible; SI = self-incompatible; SI/SC = both compatibility systems found; SI/sc = mostly self-incompatible but self-compatibility found occasionally; SC/si = mostly self-compatible but self-incompatibility found occasionally; CH = chasmogamous; CL = cleistogamous; H = Heterostylous; GD = Gynodioecious; GM = Gyno-monoecious; ? = suspected but unconfirmed; * = in Canada).

Genus/species	Common Name	Family	Compatibility system
Allium stellatum	Cliff onion	Liliaceae	SC (Molano-Flores et al., 1999)
Amorpha canescens	Leadplant	Fabaceae	SC (Parrish and Bazzaz, 1979)
Andropogon gerardii	Big bluestem	Poaceae	SI (McKone et al., 1998)
Anemone canadensis	Canada anemone	Ranunculaceae	SI (Douglas and Cruden, 1994)
Anemone cylindrical	Thimbleweed	Ranunculaceae	SC (Molano-Flores and Hendrix, 1998)
Anemone patens	Pasque flower	Ranunculaceae	SC (Cruden, 1977)
Apocynum cannabinum	Hemp dogbane	Apocynaceae	SI (Lipow and Wyatt, 1999)
Asclepias incarnata	Swamp milkweed	Asclepiadaceae	SC/si (Lipow and Wyatt, 2000)
Asclepias sryriaca	Common milkweed	Asclepiadaceae	SI/sc (Kephart, 1981)
Asclepias tuberosa	Butterfly milkweed	Asclepiadaceae	SI/sc (Wyatt, 1976)
Asclepias verticillata	Whorled milkweed	Asclepiadaceae	SI (Kephart, 1981)
Astragalus canadensis	Canada milk-vetch	Fabaceae	SC (Boe and Fluharty, 1993)
Baptisia leucantha	White false indigo	Fabaceae	SC (Haddock and Chaplin 1982)
Baptisia leucophaea	Cream false indigo	Fabaceae	SC (Haddock and Chaplin 1982)
Bromus kalmii	Prairie brome	Poaceae	SC (McKone, 1985)
Buchloe dactyloides	Buffalo grass	Poaceae	Dioecious [SC-monoecious, hermaphrodite] (Huff and Wu, 1992)
Chamaecrista fasciculata	Partridge-pea	Fabaceae	SC (Fenster, 1995)
Cephalanthus occidentalis	Buttonbush	Rubiaceae	SI (Imbert and Richards, 1993)
Coreopsis lanceolata	Sand coreopsis	Asteraceae	SI (Banovetz and Scheiner, 1994)
Dalea purpureum	Purple prairie clover	Fabaceae	SC (Parrish and Bazzaz, 1979)
Echinacea angustifolia	Pale-purple coneflower	Asteraceae	SI/sc (Leuszler, 1996)
Elymus canadensis	Canadian wild rye	Poaceae	SC (Sanders and Hamrick, 1980)
Eryngium yuccifolium	Rattlesnake master	Apiaceae	SC (Molano-Flores, 2001)
Eupatorium perfoliatum	Common boneset	Asteraceae	SI (Byers, 1995)
Fragaria virginiana	Wild strawberry	Rosaceae	SC [GD] (Ashman, 2000)
Filipendula rubra	Queen-of-the-prairie	Rosaceae	SI (Aspinwall and Christian, 1992)
Gaillardia pulchella	Blanket-flower	Asteraceae	SI (Heywood, 1993)
Gentiana andrewsii	Closed gentian	Gentianaceae	SC (Costelloe, 1988)
Gentiana puberula	Downy gentian	Gentianaceae	SC (Parrish and Bazzaz, 1979)
Helianthus occidentalis	Western sunflower	Asteraceae	SI (Fore and Guttman, 1999)
Houstonia caerulea	Bluets	Rubiaceae	SI [H (distyly)] (Wyatt and Hellwing, 1979)
Lespedeza capitata	Round-headed bush clover	Fabaceae	SC [CH/CL] (Cole and Biesboer, 1992)
Liatris aspera	Rough blazing star	Asteraceae	SI (Levin, 1968b)
Liatris cylindrical	Prairie blazing star	Asteraceae	SI (Schaal and Levin, 1978)
Liatris spicata	Dense blazing star	Asteraceae	SI (Levin, 1968b)
Lilium philadelphicum	Wood lily	Liliaceae	SI (Edwards and Jordan, 1992)
Lithospermum canescens	Hoary puccoon	Boraginaceae	SI? H (distyly) (Johnston, 1952)
Lithospermum caroliniense	Hairy puccoon	Boraginaceae	SI/sc [CH/CL, H (distyly), homostylous] (Levin 1968a)
Lithospermum incisum	Yellow puccoon	Boraginaceae	SC [CH/CL] (Johnston, 1952)
Lobelia cardinalis	Cardinal flower	Campanulaceae	SC (Johnston, 1991)
Lobelia siphilitica	Blue lobelia	Campanulaceae	SC [GD] (Johnston, 1991)

Table 1. continued.

Genus/species	Common Name	Family	Compatibility system
Lobelia spicata	Spiked lobelia	Campanulaceae	SC [GD] (Molano-Flores, 2002)
Lythrum alatum	Winged loosestrife	Lythraceae	SI? [H (distyly)] (Brown and Mitchell, 2001)
Mirabilis nyctaginea	Four-o'-clock	Nyctaginaceae	SC [CH (early summer) and CL (late summer)] (Cruden, 1973)
Monarda fistulosa	Wild bergamont	Lamiaceae	SC (Cruden at al., 1984)
Oenothera bienns	Common evening primrose	Onagraceae	SC/si (Steiner and Levin, 1977)
Oenothera missouriensis	Missouri evening primrose	Onagraceae	SI (Delbart et al., 1983)
Oenothera pilosella	Prairie sundrops	Onagraceae	SI (Straley, 1977)
Parthenium integrifolium	Wild quinine	Asteraceae	SI (Hashemi et al., 1989)
Penstemon digitalis	Foxglove beard tongue	Scrophulariaceae	SC (Clinebell and Bernhardt, 1998)
Penstemon pallidus	Pale beard tongue	Scrophulariaceae	SC (Clinebell and Bernhardt, 1998)
Phlox pilosa	Prairie phlox	Polemoniaceae	SI (Levin and Kerster, 1970)
Pycnanthemum virginianum	Mountain mint	Lamiaceae	Apomixis* (Chambers, 1961)
Ruellia humilus	Hairy wild petunia	Acanthaceae	SC [CH/CL] (Long, 1966)
Silene regia	Royal catchfly	Caryophyllaceae	SC (Menges, 1995)
Solidago nemoralis	Field goldenrod	Asteraceae	SI? [GM] (Bertin and Gwisc, 2002)
Solidago speciosa	Showy goldenrod	Asteraceae	SI? [GM] (Bertin and Gwisc, 2002)
Sorghastrum nutans	Indian grass	Poaceae	SI (McKone et al., 1998)
Stipa spartea	Porcupine grass	Poaceae	SC [CH/CL] (Cruden and Lyon, 1989)
Thalictrum dasycarpum	Meadowrue	Ranunculaceae	Dioecious (Gleason and Cronquist, 1991)
Tradescantia ohiensis	Spiderwort	Commeliaceae	SI (Ownes and McGrath, 1984)
Verbena hastata	Blue vervain	Verbenaceae	SC (Cruden et al., 1990)
Verbena stricta	Hoary vervain	Verbenaceae	SC (Cruden et al., 1990)
Viola pedatifida	Prairie violet	Violacea	SC [CH/CL] (Kirt, 1995)
Viola pedata	Birdfoot violet	Violacea	SI (Becker and Ewart, 1990)
Zizia aptera	Heart-leaf meadow parsnip	Apiaceae	SC (Lindsay 1982)
Zizia aurea	Golden alexanders	Apiaceae	SC (Parrish and Bazzaz, 1979)

APPENDIX

Dellaporta and Calderon-Urrea (1993) have listed (with some modifications) and defined a variety of terms used to describe types of individuals at different levels in plants (female = pistil(s); male = stamen(s):

Individual Flowers

- Hermaphrodite - bisexual flower with both female and male
  - ♦ Cleistogamy - Closed flowers that self pollinate
  - ♦ Chasmogamy - Open flowers capable of open pollination
  - ♦ Heterostyly - Modification of flower parts
- Unisexual - flower is either female or male

Individual Plants

- Hermaphrodite - the plant has only hermaphrodite flowers
- Monoecious - unisexual male and female flowers are on the same plant
- Dioecious - unisexual male and female flowers are on different plants
- Gynoecious - only female flowers
- Androecious - only male flowers
- Gynomonoecious - both hermaphrodite and female flowers
- Andromonoecious - both hermaphrodite and male flowers
- Trimonoecious (polygamous) - hermaphrodite, male, and female flowers are all on the same plant

Plant Populations

- Hermaphrodite - only hermaphrodite plants
- Monoecious - only monoecious plants
- Dioecious - only dioecious plants
- Gynodioecious - both female and hermaphrodite plants
- Androdioecious - both male and hermaphrodite plants
- Trioecious (or subdioecious) - hermaphrodite, male, and female plants are all in the same population

ABSTRACT: Habitat restoration is considered critical for maintaining and restoring biodiversity of many species groups. A better understanding of how species respond to the restoration process is imperative to identifying practices that benefit the target organisms.Â restorations based on current literature. Tallgrass prairie, which originally covered over 675,828 km2 (167 million acres) and has been reduced to between 4 and 13% of its original extent, is characterized by high plant and forb diversity (Samson and Knopf 1994; Samson et al.Â Through this survey and review, we hope to identify significant holes in our knowledge for restoration managers and practices that may be more beneficial to maintaining wild bee diversity. Site Characteristics. Age of Restoration. PDF | Compatibility systems (i.e., self-compatible vs. self-incompatible) and types of individu-als (e.g., heteromorphic, dioecious, etc.) in prairie | Find, read and cite all the research you need on ResearchGate.Â Prairie Restorations: A Review. Brenda Molano-Flores. Illinois Natural History Survey.Â success of prairie restoration. In this paper, I provide an explanation for why those. involved in restoration should be concerned about the compatibility system and types of. individuals of prairie plants. In addition, a list of the compatibility systems and types of. individuals for some of the most common species used in prairie restorations is provided. Prairie restoration is becoming a big business for landscapers and a major effort under See more of Prairie Restorations - Restoring and Maintaining Native Plant Landscapes on Facebook. Log In. or. Create New Account. See more of Prairie Restorations - Restoring and Maintaining Native Plant Landscapes on Facebook. Log In.Â Prairie Restorations Inc. owner, Ron Bowen, has a lifetime invested in providing ecological balance, which includes climate stabilization. As a commitment to change, we as a company have signed the Global Climate Pledge. #ClimatePledge. We ask our Clients and Customers to become a part of a global community of like-minded individuals committed to a greener future. -Sign the Pledge https://www.globalclimatepledge.com/ -Share this post and that you signed the Pledge -Comment Below with "I have signed the Pledge". Restoration is used as a tool for reducing the spread of invasive plant species many ways. The first method views restoration primarily as a means to reduce the presence of invasive species and limit their spread.Â As restoration projects have a broad range of implementation strategies and methods used to control invasive species, they can be used by ecologists to test theories about invasion.[46] Restoration projects have been used to understand how the diversity of the species introduced in the restoration affects invasion.