When pets become pests: the role of the exotic pet trade in producing invasive vertebrate animals
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The annual trade in exotic vertebrates as pets is a multi-billion-dollar global business. Thousands of species, and tens of millions of individual animals, are shipped both internationally and within countries to satisfy this demand. Most research on the exotic pet trade has focused on its contribution to native biodiversity loss and disease spread. Here, we synthesize information across taxa and research disciplines to document the exotic pet trade’s contribution to vertebrate biological invasions. We show recent and substantial worldwide growth in the number of non-native animal populations introduced via this invasion pathway, which demonstrates a strong potential to increase the number of invasive animals in the future. Key to addressing the invasion threat of exotic pets is learning more about the socioeconomic forces that drive the massive growth in the exotic pet market and the ecological factors that underlie pet release by owners. These factors likely vary according to cultural pet-keeping traditions across regions and whether purchases were legal or illegal. These gaps in our understanding of the exotic pet trade must be addressed in order to implement effective policy solutions.
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Non-native species are transported and introduced to new geographical regions via numerous pathways, with the influence of each pathway shifting with fluxes in global trade. The worldwide market for exotic pets is large and growing, with implications for both the conservation of native biodiversity and the emergence of invasive species. The exotic pet trade pathway has already led to the establishment of several hundred non-native and invasive vertebrate animal species globally, and is poised to contribute to the establishment of even more in the future. Characterizing and reducing the invasion risk posed by exotic pets requires integrated research on social, economic, and environmental factors.

In a nutshell:
- The worldwide market for exotic pets is large and growing, with implications for both the conservation of native biodiversity and the emergence of invasive species
- The exotic pet trade pathway has already led to the establishment of several hundred non-native and invasive vertebrate animal species globally, and is poised to contribute to the establishment of even more in the future
- Characterizing and reducing the invasion risk posed by exotic pets requires integrated research on social, economic, and environmental factors
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(Hulme 2009; Essl et al. 2011). Most non-native species introductions fall under one of two types of invasion pathways: accidental introductions – for example, species that are spread by “hitchhiking” in or on ships and airplanes transporting commodities and people – and pathways in which the species are themselves a commodity (Hulme 2009). The latter group, exemplified by the exotic pet trade (WebPanel 1; Figure 1), has received increasing attention over the past decade as global markets for live plants and animals have grown, resulting in a concomitant uptick in the number of invasive species arriving via this route (Padilla and Williams 2004; Keller and Lodge 2007). Despite the pet trade producing several high-profile invasive species, such as the red lionfish (Pterois volitans) in the Caribbean Sea and the Burmese python (Python bivittatus) in south Florida, most research has focused on how the pet trade affects wild populations (being collected in the source countries) and introduces disease (being spread in the destination countries) (Lyons and Natusch 2013; Tella and Hiraldo 2014). Yet for some vertebrate groups, such as reptiles and amphibians, the pet trade has contributed the largest number of established non-native species worldwide (Kraus 2009). Research examining the pet trade’s role in producing invasive vertebrate species has remained diffuse and fragmented across disciplines and biological realms. We provide a comprehensive overview of the exotic pet trade as it pertains to vertebrate invasions, offering an understanding of the mechanistic processes while highlighting policy-relevant research gaps.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

Keeping vertebrate animals as household companions is extraordinarily widespread and growing in popularity globally (Ramsay et al. 2007; Carrete and Tella 2008; Bush et al. 2014). In the US, Australia, and the UK, over half of all households have at least one pet (Reaser and Meyers 2007). Although pet ownership per household is lower in China than in Western countries, China now ranks third among countries with the most pets, with a companion animal population of more than 100 million (Deng 2017). In the US, approximately 50% of pets can be considered “exotic” (APPA 2018): that is, pets without a long history of domestication, unlike dogs, cats, or horses (Figure 1; Bush et al. 2014). Exotic pet ownership has grown markedly in recent decades (Rhyne et al. 2012; Vall-llosera and Cassey 2017a). For instance, ownership of reptiles and amphibians in the US has more than doubled in less than two decades, from 2.4 million households in 1994 to 5.6 million in 2012 (APPA 2018). Keeping exotic pets is also geographically widespread. In Indonesia, Jepson and Ladle (2005) found that households were more likely to keep exotic pets, such as birds (22%) and fishes (9.5%), than they were to keep common domesticated pets, such as cats and dogs (3% or less). In some regions, such as Asia and South America, the exotic pet market is expanding rapidly as living standards improve (Ding et al. 2008; McNeely et al. 2009; Alves et al. 2010). Even if the per-capita demand for exotic pets worldwide remains stable, a growing human population and expanding middle class will lead to growing demand for vertebrates as exotic pets (Shepherd et al. 2007).

Keeping exotic pets often strains the common Western definition of household “pet”. For example, Alves et al. (2010) reported that in Brazil “caged birds can be found on bar counters, in grocery stores, in shoe stores and in homes”, and Su et al. (2015) documented the range of bird species kept captive just long enough to be released as part of traditional Asian religious services. A recent trend in Chinese markets is the selling of live-animal keychains, in which live reptiles, amphibians, or fishes are kept in small pouches as jewelry; these animals either die, are removed from the pouches and kept in captivity, or are released from the pouches into the wild (CNN 2011). For all of these examples, we categorize the animals as “exotic pets” because they are kept for non-utilitarian reasons (WebPanel 1) and pose an invasion risk when released into a new geographical locale.

A complex market

The trade in exotic pets can be legal, illegal, or both, as a species’ status may change as it moves across political boundaries within the commodity chain, and this variation in legal status creates a confusing array of terminology that has inhibited comprehensive understanding of market dynamics (WebPanel 1). Published literature documenting the species composition of the pet trade, as well as the network of countries involved in that trade, often focuses exclusively on species listed under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES; Bush et al. 2014). However, species traded under the guidance of CITES are a small fraction of all species sold as exotic pets (Bush et al. 2014). Moreover, most countries do not keep comprehensive records of the species imported as pets, and of those that do, large proportions of imports are often listed as “unidentified” (e.g. marine and freshwater fishes; Smith et al. 2008; Rhyne et al. 2012) or are misidentified and/or mislabeled (Gerson et al. 2008).

Despite these complications, a variety of sources indicate that the market for exotic pets is enormous. For example, Su et al. (2014) reported that 2–5 million individual birds were sold per year as pets worldwide during the 1990s, with one-quarter of all extant bird species being represented, while Robinson et al. (2015) found that, of CITES-listed reptile species, 18.8 million individuals were imported into the European Union (EU) between 1996 and 2012. The importation and keeping of fish species dwarf that of all other vertebrate groups traded as exotic pets. The US is the largest importer of marine aquarium fishes, with annual imports reaching more than 11 million individual fish, representing over 2300 species from 125 families (Rhyne et al. 2012, 2017). The number
of freshwater fishes traded internationally is an order of magnitude greater than marine fishes (Livengood et al. 2014).

In most countries, the domestic exotic pet trade is potentially massive, but remains virtually undocumented. For any vertebrate group, intra-country trade can transport species outside of their native range and into novel regions within a country, potentially resulting in established non-native populations. Although specific statistics are unavailable, there are examples that hint at the potential magnitude of intra-country non-native pet introductions. Over 800 species and varieties of fishes are bred in Florida (FDACS 2018), the majority of which are not native. The red-eared slider (Trachemys scripta elegans), a turtle commonly kept as a pet in the US, is native to the south-central region of the US but has established non-native populations in numerous other parts of the country, including Hawaii (Kraus 2009). Similarly, Barroso de Magalhães and Jacobi (2013) identified 345 ornamental fish species for sale in stores in Minas Gerais, Brazil, 151 of which were not native to the region despite being native to other parts of Brazil.

Selling exotic pets can be a lucrative endeavor and, as with many other markets, there are financial opportunities in introducing new products. Annual revenues from the US reptile industry are estimated to be ~US$1.4 billion (Collis and Fenili 2011). Springborn et al. (2011) estimated that each additional species in the reptile and amphibian trade generated long-term profits to importers of approximately US$90,000, and Springborn et al. (2015) reported a similar value (US$79,300) for birds. These figures, while modest compared to other potential market investments, represent only the average value in a set that includes both highly lucrative species and those with relatively marginal profitability. For this reason, the global exotic pet market is taxonomically dynamic across time, with imports of some species ranging widely in magnitude per year and in the number of years that they persist in the trade (Romagosa 2014).

The rise of trade via non-traditional marketplaces (eg websites, fairs, social media) has vastly expanded direct-to-consumer sales (Figure 2), raising the importance of this pathway for analysis and enforcement. Although this pathway is more often associated with trade in non-living wildlife products (eg ivory, leather, feathers), trade in live species is substantial. Stringham and Lockwood (2018) documented 94,230 unique individual pet listings (representing 652 species) on three popular reptile and amphibian web vendors in the US between 2012 and 2016. Similarly, a survey of Facebook listings in the Philippines uncovered 1623 live birds and reptiles for sale over a 17-day period (Canlas et al. 2017). Grein and Chen (2018) reported that eBay recently removed 45,000 listings over a 12-month period that were not in compliance with their wildlife trade policies.

![Figure 2. Keeping vertebrate species as pets has increased greatly in popularity over the past several decades worldwide. Today’s markets for exotic pets include direct sales through traditional outlets (eg pet stores) but also through sales of animals directly to consumers via online forums and pet fairs (“expos”) as shown here. Some fraction of these purchased animals will escape confinement or be deliberately released and consequently have the opportunity to establish as non-native species.](image)

### Exotic pets becoming exotic pests

Although most animals transported beyond their native range for sale as exotic pets remain in captivity for the duration of their lives and never establish a non-native population, many individuals are released or escape confinement while in the care of importers, wholesalers, retailers, or consumers (Duggan et al. 2006; Strecker et al. 2011; Vall-llosera and Cassey 2017a). Why owners release exotic pets is not widely documented, but reasons include difficulty in providing care for large, old, aggressive, or sick animals (Duggan et al. 2006; Holmberg et al. 2015; Stringham and Lockwood 2018).

Surveys of aquarium owners indicated that 2–10% of consumers deliberately released unwanted fish (Duggan et al. 2006; Chang et al. 2009; Strecker et al. 2011). To the best of our knowledge, there are no published surveys demonstrating the propensity of consumers to release pet amphibians, reptiles, mammals, or birds, but Vall-llosera and Cassey (2017a) suggested that existing data on pet releases or escapes vastly underestimate the number of exotic pets that become free-living, especially highly mobile species like birds. In cases where an animal is purchased explicitly for release as part of a ceremony or competition, or the species is kept for only a brief period (eg as jewelry), the probability of release is quite high (Su et al. 2015).

Existing research indicates that past trade in exotic pets has resulted in the successful establishment of non-native species. Krysko et al. (2011) showed that, of the 140 non-native reptiles and amphibians that have been introduced into Florida, nearly 85% arrived via the pet trade. Rosa et al. (2017) determined that 70% of invasions by mammal species in Brazil over the past 30 years were also due to the pet trade. Hulme et al. (2008)
reported that exotic pet escapes were the primary source of new non-native species establishments of amphibians, reptiles, mammals, and birds in the EU; Rixon et al. (2005) identified at least 100 species of freshwater fishes in the aquarium trade that had been introduced into North American freshwater bodies, with 40 having established populations; and Rhyne et al. (2012) identified 33 marine fish species imported for the pet trade that had been introduced into US coastal waters. Furthermore, it is broadly suspected that the marked rise in the number of established non-native fishes in marine waters in the EU over the past decade is due to the recent rapid growth of the marine aquarium industry (Katsanevakis et al. 2013).

These reports clearly demonstrate that the exotic pet trade has contributed a wide variety of non-native species worldwide. However, evidence from invasion biology suggests that these tallies are only the tip of the iceberg. In a comprehensive evaluation of the link between trade volume and number of non-native species, Essl et al. (2011) showed a decade or more lag between the time when trade activity increases and when populations of non-native species were recorded as introduced. Most of the published statistics reviewed above stem from trade patterns that were manifest several decades ago and therefore do not reflect the current rise in exotic pet ownership worldwide. If current behaviors and policies continue unchanged, many countries will see the establishment of populations of exotic pet species at rates above historical trends over the next several decades.

Which exotic pets will establish non-native populations next?

A fundamental component of biosecurity policy is predicting which exotic pet species will establish new non-native populations – that is, which traded pet species will escape or be released, find suitable habitat, successfully reproduce, and persist to establish self-sustaining populations? This is a challenging question, given that a variety of factors – including the species characteristics, the nature of the pet market, and environmental conditions – will influence overall establishment success.

The ecological “fit” between a species’ life-history requirements and the habitat into which it is introduced plays an important role in the successful establishment of exotic pets, as it does for most non-native species (Hayes and Barry 2008). At a basic level, an introduced exotic pet must be able to physiologically tolerate local environmental conditions; for example, marine fishes released into fresh water are unlikely to survive and establish non-native populations (Weigle et al. 2005), and freshwater fishes predominantly native to tropical or sub-tropical regions are unlikely to establish populations within temperate or boreal habitats (Bradie et al. 2013). Generally, established non-native vertebrate species are characterized by high fecundity and broad environmental tolerance (Springborn et al. 2011, 2015; Capellini et al. 2015; Howeth et al. 2016). Carrete and Tella (2008) also demonstrated that wild-caught bird species traded as exotic pets were more likely to establish non-native populations than captive-bred species.

Another key factor affecting establishment success is the number of individuals released and the number of release events, which together are known as “propagule pressure” (Cassey et al. 2018). For most exotic pet species, we simply do not know the magnitude or spatial extent of their introduction and therefore have no direct way of measuring propagule pressure. However, a consistent pattern in the literature is the relationship between the number of individuals imported into a country for sale as pets, how many years the species was for sale, and establishment success (van Wilgen et al. 2010; Kikillus et al. 2012; Vall-llosera and Cassey 2017a). All else being equal, the larger the number of individuals that are sold in a region, the larger the number that would be accidentally or deliberately introduced, thereby raising propagule pressure and elevating establishment success (e.g. Bradie et al. 2013). At local scales, most exotic pets are released within urban centers or in nearby aquatic ecosystems (van Ham et al. 2013), which is likely a function of the density of pet-owning households in cities and suburbs. As a result, cities tend to be hotspots for non-native animals that likely established after being kept as pets, especially if they are located in tropical and sub-tropical climates (e.g. Krysko et al. 2011).

Research into what makes some exotic pet species more popular than others is central to predicting the risk that trade contributes to biological invasions. The exotic pet trade exhibits similar supply-and-demand characteristics to those of other markets. For instance, Vall-llosera and Cassey (2017b) showed that the price of pet birds increased with reduced availability. The number of pet birds held by any one consumer therefore varies widely, from several individuals of very rare birds to several thousand in the case of very popular species (Vall-llosera and Cassey 2017b). However, exotic pet consumers also exhibit “bandwagon” and “snob” effects, so price is only one factor in the purchase decision (Chen 2016). For bandwagon consumers, the demand for a particular item increases as more people purchase it, whereas snob consumers demand a particular item precisely because few other consumers own it. Bandwagon species tend to be traded at higher volumes and lower prices and are consequently more likely to be released by owners or to escape confinement, especially if they become difficult to maintain in captivity (Rhyne et al. 2012; Holmberg et al. 2015; Stringham and Lockwood 2018).

Perhaps as a result of this dynamic, there is a consistent pattern in pet trade import data where a few species constitute the majority of individuals imported and sold, and these species are also the ones that are commonly introduced and regularly become established (Figure 3). For example, the green iguana (Iguana iguana) accounted for 46% of the total trade in reptiles in the US between 1996 and 2012 and non-native populations are now established across several US states (Figure 4; Robinson et al. 2015). Similarly, Rhyne et al. (2012) found that only 12%
of marine fish species were imported into the US at volumes greater than 1000 individuals, but these species make up a disproportionate number of those that have been recorded as introduced (Figure 3). Livengood et al. (2014) found that the top 23 of 255 ornamental freshwater fish species imported into the US in 2010 accounted for 87% of total fish imports and have consistently topped the list of imports over a 30-year time span, disproportionately contributing to the set of established non-native fishes in the US. Yet there are also a few species that have been introduced or have become established despite being imported in relatively small numbers (Figure 3), suggesting other factors contribute to release (eg difficulty in care) or establishment (eg environmental matching).

## Knowledge gaps

Existing research suggests that the exotic pet trade generates, and will continue to pose, a substantial invasion risk worldwide. The imperative to reduce this risk is growing as the impacts of several invasive species originating from the exotic pet trade become clear, and as this market experiences rapid future growth. We suggest four knowledge gaps that need to be addressed to reduce invasion risk.

First, existing knowledge about market dynamics, supply and demand, and consumer behavior largely originates from – and focuses on – the US, Australia, and the EU. As these regions are major components of the exotic pet trade, the attention is warranted, but this ignores the massive rise in pet-keeping in emerging economies such as Brazil, China, and Southeast Asian countries, where there is every reason to believe the invasion risk is considerable (Alves et al. 2010). Existing evidence suggests that the motivations and practices associated with pet-keeping in these cultures differ substantively from those observed in Western cultures (eg Alves et al. 2010; Su et al. 2015). Indeed, cultural "types" that relate to pet ownership (eg degree of agriculture or predominant religion; Knobel et al. 2008) may serve as useful predictors of invasion risk or management capacity, although this assertion remains unexplored in the context of invasive species policy.

Second, the interplay between market demand, consumer behavior, and species’ traits is key to accurately characterizing invasion risk. If a species’ establishment success is dictated by propagule pressure, which is driven by a high volume of sales to consumers, then a close look at life-history traits that support large numbers for sale is of considerable interest. There is also a need to explore the extent to which the life-history traits that increase establishment success are the same traits that make a species common in the exotic pet trade, and/or more likely to be deliberately released by pet owners and sellers. For example, wild-caught species that are common and widespread in their native range may be more profitable because they are easy to collect and their generalist habits require less specialized (ie cheaper) care. Behavioral and life-history traits associated with large native range sizes are known to correlate with establishment success in birds (Carrete and Tella 2008; Blackburn et al. 2009). Similarly, breeding centers tend to focus on housing highly fecund species that experience low mortality in captivity, either because of a wide environmental tolerance or low handling needs (eg behaviorally docile), both of which are correlated with establishment success. We also

---

**Figure 3.** Cumulative (total) number of individuals across species imported as exotic pets for four taxonomic groups (amphibians, reptiles, birds, and marine fish). “Species rank” indicates the ranked number of imports for a species (ie a lower rank means more individuals were imported). Each black dot represents a single species, and signifies the total cumulative sum (primary y-axis) of the number of individuals for all species imported into the US up to that rank, as derived from US Fish and Wildlife Service records. For each taxonomic group, few species dominate in the number of individuals imported, causing the points on the cumulative import ranking curve to aggregate after the first few species (ie those with the highest number of imported individuals). The numbers of species recorded as introduced (orange bars) or established (red bars) within either 50–species (amphibians) or 100–species (reptiles, birds, marine fish) incremented import volume bins are depicted as overlapping histograms (secondary y-axis). As such, most exotic pets introduced or established were imported at very high volumes (left-hand side of each panel), but a few introduced species have established wild populations despite being imported in relatively small numbers (right-hand side of each panel); note: secondary y-axes differ in scale between taxa (number of species established: amphibians = 3, reptiles = 43, birds = 46, marine fish = 1). See Romagosa (2014; birds, amphibians, reptiles) and Rhyne et al. (2012; marine fishes) for details on time period of import records and data sources for species’ non-native status.
have very limited understanding of why people purchase exotic pets and what motivates them to release these pets. A better understanding of human motivations and behaviors is therefore critical for assessing invasion risks associated with the exotic pet trade. Research addressing this complex interplay of economics, human behavior, and biology is required to fully identify how risk manifests within the exotic pet trade and develop an evidence base for implementing policy solutions.

Third, even though exotic pets can become harmful invaders, such species are still compelling and desirable companion creatures to the general public. This emotional attachment means that public opposition to eradication or control programs can be fierce, making release prevention and rapid removal of released animals key to reducing invasion risk (Reaser and Meyers 2007). Although several such policy options have been implemented in limited geographical locations or trialed under specific contexts (Figure 5), very few have been evaluated within the framework of minimizing invasion risk in the exotic pet trade. Basing policy options on a strong evidence base is vital because the economic interest in maintaining a healthy and growing exotic pet market is strong, and public tolerance of failed eradication programs may be limited (Reaser and Meyers 2007).

Finally, a potentially important and difficult aspect of the exotic pet trade to evaluate is the black market. An economic perspective on black-market trade entails focusing on obscured costs, benefits, and uncertainties. The costs to participants of wildlife crime involve the direct cost of illicit transport, probability of detection by authorities, and legal consequences if caught. To practitioners, the latter two are highly uncertain, and the chances of detection and consequences may vary widely between countries. The benefits of illegal trade involve either sales revenue or personal enjoyment if the species are kept. These values are also highly uncertain given that the species involved are usually rare, preferences for species can change rapidly, and illicit markets usually have few participants and are poorly monitored. An efficient approach to deterrence may entail identifying which one (or combination) of the costs could be increased or how benefits could be decreased to discourage illegal trade. Although it might be tempting to focus additional effort on surveillance and enforcement, resources are already invested in these areas and there may be diminishing returns on additional investment (Challender et al. 2015). Interviewing illegal traders would provide insight into whether the driving factors in decision making are spikes in sale prices or changes in the likelihood of being caught.
Conclusion

The existing body of literature examining the exotic pet trade is spread across disciplines, and much of this research has focused on the exotic pet trade’s contribution to extinction, while its contribution to invasions has largely been ignored. We have highlighted an evident and urgent need to understand, at a much more fundamental level, how the exotic pet trade contributes to invasions. The challenge is complex, given that a thorough understanding will necessarily include social perceptions, market forces, and ecology. Due to the industry’s socioenvironmental scope, concerted interdisciplinary efforts are required to understand these aspects of the exotic pet trade in order to devise and implement strategies that mitigate its potential harmful impacts.
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