

1 **Title:** Non-lethal effects of an invasive species in the marine environment - the
2 importance of early life-history stages

3

4

5 **Authors:** Marc Rius¹, Xavier Turon², Dustin J. Marshall³

6

7 ¹Departament de Biologia Animal, Universitat de Barcelona, Av. Diagonal 645,
8 08028, Barcelona, Spain

9 ²Centre for Advanced Studies of Blanes (CEAB, CSIC), Accés a la Cala S. Francesc
10 14, 17300 Blanes (Girona), Spain

11 ³School of Integrative Biology, University of Queensland, St. Lucia, Queensland
12 4072, Australia

13

14

15 **Corresponding author:** Marc Rius

16 Address: Departament de Biologia Animal, Facultat de Biologia, Universitat de
17 Barcelona, Av. Diagonal 645, 08028, Barcelona, Spain.

18 Telephone: +34-93-4021441.

19 Fax: 34-93-4035740.

20 E-mail: marcriusvil@ub.edu

21

22

23

24

25

26 **Abstract**

27 Studies examining the effects of invasive species have traditionally focused on the
28 direct/lethal effects of the invasive on the native community but there is a growing
29 recognition that invasive species may also have non-lethal effects. In terrestrial
30 systems, non-lethal effects of invasive species can disrupt early life-history phases
31 (such as fertilization, dispersal and subsequent establishment) of native species but in
32 the marine environment, most studies focus on adult rather than early life-history
33 stages. Here, we examine the potential for an introduced sessile marine invertebrate
34 (*Styela plicata*) to exert both lethal and non-lethal effects on a native species
35 (*Microcosmus squamiger*) across multiple early life-history stages. We determined
36 whether sperm from the invasive species interfered with the fertilisation of eggs from
37 the native species and found no effect. However, we did find strong effects of the
38 invasive species on the post-fertilisation performance of the native species. The
39 invasive species inhibited the settlement of native larvae and, in the field, the presence
40 of the invasive species was associated with a 10-fold increase in the post-settlement
41 mortality of the native species, as well as an initial reduction of growth in the native.
42 Our results suggest that the larvae of the native species avoid settling near the
43 invasive species due to reduced post-settlement survival in its presence. Our results
44 also show that invasive species can have complex and pervasive effects (both lethal
45 and non-lethal) across the early life history stages of the native species which are
46 likely to result in its displacement and to facilitate further invasion.

47

48 **Key words:** settlement, invasive species, fertilisation, postmetamorphic performance,
49 trait-mediated effects.

50

51

Introduction

52

53 Invasive species can have a range of effects on native species and lethal effects
54 are most commonly cited as the source of negative impacts on established
55 assemblages (Ruiz et al. 1999; Strayer et al. 2006). For example, invasive species can
56 prey upon native species, cause competitive displacement or modify local disturbance
57 regimes (Mack and D'Antonio 1998; Snyder and Evans 2006). Whilst the impact of
58 lethal effects on native species is becoming clear, the prevalence and role of non-
59 lethal effects in species invasions has only recently started to be considered (e.g.
60 Trussell et al. 2006). This is despite the recent recognition that non-lethal effects can
61 have major impacts on the dynamics of communities (Trussell et al. 2003, Werner and
62 Peacor 2003) and initial indications that introduced species can be a source of non-
63 lethal effects (Nystrom et al. 2001; Pangle and Peacor 2006). In terrestrial plant
64 systems, there is a growing recognition that invasive species can affect every phase of
65 the life-histories of native species. For example, high densities of flowering invasives
66 can disrupt the pollination of native species resulting in lower seed production
67 (Bjerknes et al. 2007). Invasives can also affect the dispersal syndromes of seeds,
68 disrupting frugivore mutualisms that are crucial for the effective dispersal of native
69 species (Christian 2001). Thus, the effects of invasive species can extend beyond
70 simple competitive interactions during the adult phase: non-lethal effects disrupt the
71 production and dispersal of native recruits, seriously exacerbating the effects of the
72 invasive species. This is especially important for marine sessile organisms, for which
73 “supply-side” processes can be important determinants of population dynamics
74 (Underwood and Keough 2001).

75 Many marine benthic organisms have been moved around the world's oceans
76 since ancient times by means of shipping (Carlton 1999), but the last century has seen
77 a dramatic rise in the rate of introductions of alien marine species (Cohen and Carlton
78 1998; Mack et al. 2000). As a result, non-indigenous species have been moving
79 beyond physical boundaries such as those created by ocean currents, and have spread
80 worldwide (Wonham et al. 2001). The invasion of non-indigenous species is now
81 regarded as one of the major threats to marine biodiversity and the number of studies
82 examining the effects of marine invasive species has increased dramatically (Ruiz et
83 al. 1997; Grosholz 2002; Galil 2007). Most studies examining the effects of invasive
84 species in the marine environment have focused on competitive displacement or
85 predation as the major impact of the invasive species and many have been restricted to
86 examinations of the adult phase (but see Byers and Goldwasser 2001; Trussell et al.
87 2006). More recently however, it has been recognised that invasive species in the
88 marine environment can have strong, indirect effects on native communities. For
89 example, introduced species can change trophic cascades in marine foodwebs
90 (Trussell et al. 2002, 2004; Kurle et al. 2008), reduce larval production (Gribben and
91 Wright 2006) and change the behaviour (and hence, distribution) of prey species
92 (Trussell et al. 2003). These studies strongly suggest that marine invasive species
93 have pervasive effects at a range of life-history stages and levels of community
94 organisation in the marine environment.

95 The life-history of marine organisms suggests that any non-lethal effects of
96 invasive species on the early-life-history stages of native species are likely to be
97 important. Most marine organisms are broadcast spawners, releasing eggs and sperm
98 into the water column. Due to the high rate of sperm dilution, the fertilisation of eggs
99 is rarely complete and fertilisation rates can range between 0 and 100% with mean

100 rates of ~50% in many instances (Levitan and Petersen 1995; Yund 2000).
101 Importantly, heterospecific sperm can disrupt fertilisation in broadcast spawners,
102 resulting in lower fertilisation rates (Lambert 2000; Lambert 2001). This raises the
103 possibility that marine invasive species could disrupt/reduce fertilisation success in
104 broadcast spawners analogously to pollination disruption in terrestrial systems,
105 although this possibility has not been explored. Similarly, marine invertebrate larvae
106 sometimes avoid settling near dominant competitors (Grosberg 1981; Stoner 1994;
107 but see Bullard et al. 2004). Given that marine invasive species can be competitively
108 dominant (Reusch and Williams 1999; Piazzini and Ceccherelli 2002) one might expect
109 that the larvae of native species reject settlement sites adjacent to invasive species.
110 This non-lethal effect on the dispersal of native species is analogous to the
111 disruption/reduction of frugivore mediated dispersal by invasive species in plants.
112 This potentially important effect of invasive species in the marine environment has
113 received less attention than other life-history stages. This is surprising given that the
114 supply of new recruits into marine populations can have major influences on
115 subsequent community structure (Underwood and Keough 2001) and the production
116 of zygotes has the potential, at least, to limit population growth in broadcast spawners
117 (Levitan 1995). Finally, mortality immediately following settlement can be intense in
118 sessile marine organisms and can be a major determinant of adult distributions and
119 abundance (Gosselin and Qian 1997). Given the ecological importance of the early
120 post-metamorphic period, any influence that invasive species may have during this
121 stage could have major implications for the population dynamics of native species.

122 Here we examine the effects of an introduced marine species (*Styela plicata*)
123 on a native species (*Microcosmus squamiger*) across the early life-history stages, from
124 fertilisation to larval settlement through to post-metamorphic performance. As both

125 species coexist in the studied area (SE Australia), we wanted to explore the
126 interactions between them. Given the potential for non-lethal and lethal effects to
127 interact synergistically (e.g. Meyer and Byers 2005), we investigated both types of
128 effects across different stages of the life-history. We chose solitary ascidians as our
129 study organism as they are one of the major invasive groups in marine systems
130 (Lambert 2007). We first examined whether the presence of heterospecific sperm
131 from an invasive species reduced the fertilisation success of the eggs of a native
132 species. We then examined the larval settlement responses of each species in the
133 presence and absence of heterospecific and homospecific settlers. Finally, we
134 examined the post-metamorphic survival and growth of both species in the presence
135 and absence of heterospecific recruits in the field. We found strong, non-lethal effects
136 on larval settlement and direct, lethal effects on post-metamorphic survival, as well as
137 an initial reduction in growth, suggesting that this marine invasive species has the
138 potential to dramatically change the population dynamics of native species.

139

Materials and Methods

140

141

Study site and species

142

Microcosmus squamiger is native to Australia (Kott 1985; Rius et al. 2008)

143

and occurs subtidally on artificial and natural substrata in sheltered areas where it can

144

form dense populations (Kott 1985; and pers. obs.). *S. plicata* is considered an alien

145

species in Australian waters (Hewitt 2002; Wyatt et al. 2005) and although there is no

146

available information about when and where exactly this species was introduced, it

147

now successfully colonizes shallow habitats in SE Australia (pers. obs.). Both species

148

are solitary ascidians and they reach similar sizes (ca. 5-10 cm) as adults. At the

149

Manly Marina (27°27'10"S, 153°11'22"E, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia), *S.*

150

plicata is found inside the harbour attached to the floating pontoons while *M.*

151

squamiger can only be found outside the harbour, with a small area at the entrance of

152

the harbour where both species coexist (on the outermost pontoons). Reproductively

153

mature *M. squamiger* and *S. plicata* were collected from these outer pontoons of

154

Manly Marina between October and December 2006. They were then transported in

155

insulated aquaria back to the laboratory (~45 min. journey) and kept in a tank with 20

156

l of constantly aerated seawater at room temperature.

157

General methods - production and settlement of larvae

158

To extract eggs and sperm for our experiments, we used standard protocols as

159

described by Marshall et al. (2000) for strip spawning solitary ascidians. To produce

160

pools of fertilised eggs, we used the sperm of three individuals and the eggs of one

161

individual (both species are simultaneous hermaphrodites with an almost complete

162

block to self fertilisation; Rius unpubl. data). We left the gametes in contact for 45

163

minutes and we then rinsed the sperm with filtered seawater and pooled the eggs from

164

four individuals.

165 To produce larvae, we fertilised eggs as above and then placed the developing
166 embryos into an aerated beaker (containing ~ 500 ml of filtered seawater) in a
167 constant temperature cabinet at 20°C. In both species studied here, larvae hatch within
168 14 hours of fertilisation. Afterwards, the larvae were pipetted out and placed in the
169 experimental Petri dishes. We used pre-roughened 90mm Petri dishes that had been
170 maintained in aquaria with seawater for several days so that they could develop a
171 biofilm which facilitates larval settlement (Wieczorek and Todd 1997). After 24
172 hours, we gently rinsed the Petri dishes in seawater to remove any unattached larvae.

173 *Experiment 1: Does the presence of heterospecific sperm from an invasive reduce*
174 *fertilisation success in a native?*

175 We examined whether the prior exposure of *M. squamiger* eggs to *S. plicata*
176 sperm affected subsequent fertilization success. Eggs from a *M. squamiger* individual
177 were split in 3 groups. The 1st group was a control (i.e. no exposure to *S. plicata*
178 sperm), the 2nd group was exposed to a ‘low’ concentration ($\sim 10^5$ sperm.ml⁻¹) of *S.*
179 *plicata* sperm and the second to a ‘high’ concentration ($\sim 10^7$ sperm.ml⁻¹) of *S. plicata*
180 sperm. Sperm concentrations were estimated using three replicate counts on a
181 modified Fuchs-Rosenthal Haemocytometer. The *M. squamiger* eggs were exposed to
182 *S. plicata* sperm in a final volume of 100 ml for fifteen minutes, a period of time long
183 enough to make sure that, if there was a glycosidase release from *M. squamiger* eggs,
184 this release was completed (Lambert 2000), before being rinsed free of sperm in
185 filtered seawater. The eggs were then placed in new Petri dishes and all the eggs of
186 the 3 treatments (control, low and high) were exposed to *M. squamiger* sperm ($\sim 10^7$
187 sperm.ml⁻¹) pooled from 4 individuals for 45 minutes. We then rinsed the eggs again
188 in filtered seawater, placed them in a constant temperature cabinet at 20°C and
189 allowed the embryos to develop for fourteen hours. We then assessed fertilisation

190 success by counting the proportion of eggs that developed into unhatched embryos or
191 hatched larvae relative to unfertilised eggs. We repeated this experiment for the eggs
192 of three different individuals (i.e. 3 runs). To analyse the data, we first arcsine-square
193 root transformed the data (which was estimated as the proportion of eggs fertilised).
194 We analysed the data as an unreplicated block design where run was a random factor
195 and exposure history was a fixed factor.

196 *Experiment 2: Does the presence of recruits affect settlement?*

197 We were interested in whether the presence of heterospecific and homospecific
198 recruits affected the settlement behaviour of both species. For each species, at the 14
199 hour mark after fertilization, we gently pipetted 40 larvae into new Petri dishes. We
200 allowed them to settle (until 24 hour mark) and then gently washed off any unattached
201 larvae. We then introduced 40 homospecific or heterospecific larvae (depending on
202 the treatment) from a new fertilization event and counted how many of these new
203 larvae had attached after 24 hours. In these experiments, Petri dish was the unit of
204 replication. The experiments using still water were the only reliable way to prevent
205 the larvae to quit the system and to quantify settlement rates of a controlled larval
206 pool.

207 We examined the effect on settlement of pre-established recruits in all possible
208 combinations: the effect of *S. plicata* recruits on *M. squamiger* settlement, of *M.*
209 *squamiger* recruits on *S. plicata* settlement, of *M. squamiger* recruits on *M. squamiger*
210 settlement and, finally, the effect of *S. plicata* recruits on *S. plicata* settlement (Table
211 1). In all of these experiments, we compared settlement in treatments consisting of
212 Petri dishes with recruits to settlement in controls consisting of Petri dishes without
213 pre-established settlers and we used the same number of control and treatment

214 replicates. The number of runs and replicates, as well as the initial recruit densities in
215 the treatment dishes, are listed in Table 1.

216 Because settlement was measured as the proportion of larvae that settled, we
217 first arcsine-square root transformed the data. We analysed the effect of the presence
218 of heterospecific recruits on settlement using a two-way, mixed model ANOVA
219 where the experimental treatment was a fixed factor and experimental Run was a
220 random factor. When we examined the effect of *M. squamiger* recruits on *S. plicata*
221 settlement, we found no interaction between Run and treatment and, given that Run
222 explained little variance and was of no biological interest, it was omitted from the
223 final model (Quinn and Keough 2002). For the effect of homospecific recruits for
224 each species (one run only), we used a t-test to compare the experimental treatment
225 with the control.

226 *Experiment 3: Does the presence of competing recruits affect post-metamorphic*
227 *performance?*

228 We were interested in whether the presence of heterospecific recruits affected
229 the subsequent performance of our two focal species. Thus we settled *M. squamiger* in
230 the presence of *S. plicata* recruits and settled *S. plicata* in the presence of *M.*
231 *squamiger* as described above. Controls consisted of Petri dishes in which larvae were
232 settled in the absence of any pre-established recruits. We used 8 replicates (i.e. Petri
233 dishes) each per treatment and control for each species. The mean initial density of
234 recruits in the *M. squamiger* experiment did not differ among treatments (mixed
235 treatment mean was 16.625 (SD = 2.615) and the control was 19.375 (SD = 3.701); t-
236 test, $t = -1.716$, $n = 8$, $P = 0.108$), and the same was found for the *S. plicata*
237 experiment (mixed treatment mean was 20.375 (SD = 8.105) and the control was 14.5
238 (SD = 4.276); t-test, $t = 1.813$, $n = 8$, $P = 0.098$). We marked all the settler positions in

239 the Petri dishes, numbering them on the surface of the dishes using a pencil. We then
240 drilled an 8 mm hole in the centre of each Petri dish. The dishes were transported to
241 the field within ~45 minutes, in 20 l insulated containers. We attached the Petri dishes
242 to a Perspex backing plate (500 x 500 x 8 mm) using stainless steel screws. The Petri
243 dish positions were randomly assigned. Then, we hung the plates from the most
244 external pontoon of the Manly harbour at a depth of 2 m (the dock floated at water
245 level regardless of tide), facing down to reduce the effects of light and sedimentation
246 (following Marshall et al. 2003a). For the experiment examining the effect of *S.*
247 *plicata* recruits on the post-metamorphic performance of *M. squamiger*, we measured
248 the survival of the *M. squamiger* settlers 1, 2, 5 and 10 weeks after being deployed
249 into the field. We assessed survival as presence/absence of previously marked settlers
250 on the Petri dish, a measure that is likely to reflect survival as reattachment to surfaces
251 following removal is rare in ascidians (but see Edlund and Koehl 1998; Bullard et al.
252 2007). During each census of survival, we brought the Petri dishes back to the
253 laboratory, assessed survival and removed any additional organisms that had settled in
254 the intervening period. We also measured the size of recruits after 2, 5 and 10 weeks
255 in the field by taking digital photographs of the diameter of the settlers with a camera
256 attached to the dissecting microscope and connected to a computer. We subsequently
257 measured the photographs using Image Pro (v. 5.1.0.12, Media Cybernetics) and we
258 calibrated the measurements by taking a photograph using the haemocytometer grid.

259 For the experiment examining the effect of *M. squamiger* recruits on the post-
260 metamorphic performance of *S. plicata*, we assessed survival only 1, 2 and 4 weeks
261 after deploying the settlers in the field. This last experiment had to be halted after 4
262 weeks because the settlement plates were vandalised.

263 To analyse the survival and growth data, we used a repeated measures
264 ANOVA where Petri dish was the unit of replication. Because survival was measured
265 in proportions, we used arcsine- square root transformed data.

For Peer Review

266

Results

267 *Experiment 1: Does the presence of heterospecific sperm from an invasive reduce*
268 *fertilisation success in a native?*

269 Although the random factor Run (= individual) was significant, reflecting
270 differences in fertilization rates among individuals, there was no significant effect of
271 heterospecific sperm on the fertilisation success of the native species at either sperm
272 concentration (Table 2), nor was there any trend for a negative or positive effect.

273 *Experiment 2: Does the presence of recruits affect settlement?*

274 There was a strong effect of *S. plicata* recruits on the settlement of *M.*
275 *squamiger* (Fig. 1a). Table 3 shows that there was a strong interaction between
276 experimental Run and the treatment of interest. Because the denominator for the F
277 ratio to test the main effect is the $MS_{\text{interaction}}$, the P value for the main effect was not
278 statistically significant. However, the direction of the effect of *S. plicata* recruits on
279 *M. squamiger* settlement was consistently negative. The significant interaction was
280 simply due to the size of this effect: in Run 1, *S. plicata* had ~3-fold reduction on *M.*
281 *squamiger* settlement but in Run 2, the effect was only a ~2-fold reduction. In
282 contrast, the presence of conspecific recruits had no effect on the settlement of *M.*
283 *squamiger* (t-test, $t = 0.425$, $n = 24$, $P = 0.675$; Fig. 1a).

284 *S. plicata* settlement was lower in the presence of *M. squamiger* recruits and the
285 size of the effect was more consistent among experimental runs (Table 3; Fig. 1b).
286 The non-significant interaction term allowed us to test a reduced model in which both
287 treatment and Run proved highly significant. Again, we found no effect of
288 homospecific recruits on *S. plicata* settlement (t-test, $t = 0.159$, $n = 8$, $P = 0.879$; Fig.
289 1b).

290 *Experiment 3: Does the presence of heterospecific recruits affect post-*
291 *metamorphic performance?*

292 The proportion of *M. squamiger* recruits surviving in the field decreased over
293 time. The presence of *S. plicata* had a strong negative effect on the subsequent
294 survival of *M. squamiger* in the field (Fig. 2a). After ten weeks in the field, the mean
295 proportion of *M. squamiger* that had survived was ~33% in the absence of *S. plicata*
296 but was <5% in the presence of *S. plicata*. This difference in survival appeared to be
297 driven by the initial responses of the two treatments; there were large differences in
298 survival after the first week and they persisted through time (Table 4).

299 In contrast to the effect of *S. plicata* on *M. squamiger*, the presence of *M.*
300 *squamiger* had no effect on the subsequent survival of *S. plicata* after four weeks in
301 the field (Table 4; Fig. 2b).

302 It was impossible to photograph all *M. squamiger* recruits from the Petri dishes,
303 owing to the fact that some have settled in the corner of the dish and thus reliable
304 measurements with photographs were not possible. However, a large proportion of
305 individuals were successfully photographed (2nd week: mixed - 72.72%, control -
306 50.53%; 5th week: mixed - 66.66%, control - 93.85%; and 10th week: mixed - 100%,
307 control - 83.33%). In the 2nd week of the experiment, the *M. squamiger* recruits in
308 presence of *S. plicata* were significantly smaller than those in the controls but this
309 difference disappeared after 5 weeks (Table 5; Fig. 3). After 10 weeks no statistical
310 comparisons were possible as there was only one remaining *M. squamiger* recruit in
311 the mixed treatment.

312

313

314

Discussion

315 The presence of the invasive ascidian *Styela plicata* affected a number of
316 crucial life-history stages in the native ascidian *Microcosmus squamiger* and, overall,
317 a combination of lethal and non-lethal effects of the invasive may synergise to
318 exclude *M. squamiger* from its native habitat. These results further expand our
319 understanding of how sublethal effects of invasive organisms affect natives, and
320 reaffirm the importance of such effects during early life-history stages.

321 We found no effect of *S. plicata* sperm on the fertilisation success of *M.*
322 *squamiger* eggs. In previous studies (Lambert 2000; Lambert 2001), homologous and
323 heterologous sperm were mixed, while in our experiment we washed the eggs before
324 exposure to homologous (*M. squamiger*) sperm. In this way we excluded the possible
325 negative effects of sperm competition. As a result, we restricted our observation to
326 whether or not exposure to the sperm of the invasive was affecting fertility of the
327 native eggs. In light of our results, we found that *S. plicata* neither activate *M.*
328 *squamiger* eggs nor interfere with subsequent egg activation. The lack of interference
329 of *S. plicata* on fertilisation of *M. squamiger* eggs may be because the two species are
330 not closely related and thus sperm recognition proteins are highly divergent.
331 Alternatively, given that these species live sympatrically, there may have been a
332 strong positive selection on sperm-egg recognition proteins to reduce costly
333 hybridisation (Byrd and Lambert 2000; Veen et al. 2001; Harper and Hart 2005). It
334 would be interesting to repeat our experiments in populations that are not sympatric
335 but in our populations it appears that the invasive species does not interfere with the
336 fertilisation success of the native species. In contrast, the effects of the invasive on the
337 post-fertilisation performance of the native species were more dramatic.

338 Inhibition of settlement by superior competitors has been demonstrated in a
339 number of marine invertebrates (e.g. Grosberg 1981; Young and Svane 1989; Davis et
340 al. 1991) but its prevalence remains in debate (Bullard et al. 2004). In our system,
341 both species avoided settling in the presence of the other but only one species had a
342 significant, negative effect on post-metamorphic performance. The reason for the
343 negative effect of *M. squamiger* on *S. plicata* settlement remains unclear, but may be
344 due to a general avoidance response of ascidian larvae (e.g. Stoner 1994). Regardless,
345 the effect of each species on settlement of the other suggests that species recognition
346 at settlement is acting in these two species, even if *S. plicata* seems to be a relatively
347 recent introduction to Australian waters (Wyatt et al. 2005).

348 The inhibition of settlement of native larvae in the presence of the exotic is
349 analogous to the disruption of dispersal syndromes in plants whereby the presence of
350 an invasive species reduces the effective dispersal of native propagules. However, in
351 our study, the effect of inhibiting settlement may have a number of additional,
352 potentially dramatic consequences (Elkin and Marshall 2007). Inhibiting settlement
353 essentially forces larvae to continue to search for alternative suitable habitat and this
354 increase in searching time carries a number of direct and indirect costs. Mortality
355 while dispersing in the water column can be extremely high and thus any native larvae
356 that are inhibited from settling by invasive recruits may experience higher rates of
357 mortality than they would in the absence of the invasive (Morgan 1995). Furthermore,
358 in species with non-feeding larvae such as the ascidians and other marine organisms,
359 increasing the duration of the larval phase can result in reduced performance after
360 metamorphosis - larval swimming is costly and reduces the level of reserves available
361 for post-metamorphic survival and growth (Wendt 1998, Maldonado and Young
362 1999; Marshall et al. 2003b; Pechenik 2006). Thus, the post-metamorphic

363 performance of native settlers may be lower in places where the invasive species is
364 more common and inhibits settlement. Overall then, the inhibition of native larval
365 settlement by invasive recruits may negatively affect native populations in three ways:
366 decrease settlement directly, increase planktonic mortality and decrease post-
367 metamorphic performance. Previous work has shown that native species change their
368 behaviour (and thus their distribution) in response to invasive predators (Trussell et al.
369 2002, 2003). Our findings suggest that competition from invasive species can also
370 drive changes in the behaviour of native species.

371 The presence of *S. plicata* in the field increased the juvenile mortality of *M.*
372 *squamiger* by 10 fold. In addition, we found a significantly reduced growth of *M.*
373 *squamiger* in mixed treatments compared to the controls in the 2nd week. This trend
374 was not maintained in the following weeks, which is perhaps unsurprising as the
375 densities of *M. squamiger* in the mixed treatments declined dramatically over those
376 first weeks and high levels variation among the few survivors prevented a meaningful
377 comparison. Although the reason for the decreased survival and growth of the native
378 in the presence of invasive needs to be further investigated, we consider that there are
379 three (non-mutually exclusive) mechanisms for the negative effect of invasive species
380 on the survival and growth of the native species: competition for food, allelopathy or
381 indirect effects mediated by third species. We favour the first hypothesis, *S. plicata*
382 may be a better competitor for food than *M. squamiger* and thus *M. squamiger* may
383 have had higher mortality and reduced early growth due to starvation. Conversely, the
384 presence of pre-established *M. squamiger* had no effect on post-metamorphic
385 performance of *S. plicata*. Given that water flow rates were reasonably low at the
386 study site, it is possible that a better competitor could deplete the local abundance of
387 food in the boundary layer above the plates. Competition for space seems unlikely due

388 to the small size of the recruits during the first weeks, and it might have only been
389 important in the last weeks of the experiment when the animals have grown enough to
390 physically interact. However, the most drastic reduction in survival and growth of the
391 mixed treatments in comparison to the control treatments occurred in the in the first
392 few weeks. It is interesting in this sense that, in the experiment in which we analysed
393 the effect of *M. squamiger* recruits on *S. plicata* performance (and found no effect),
394 the pre-established *M. squamiger* themselves experienced high mortalities (similar to
395 those in the experiment with pre-established *S. plicata*, data not shown). In other
396 words, the presence of *S. plicata* affected the survival of *M. squamiger* even if the
397 recruits of the latter arrived before and were already in place.

398 While we believe that the most likely source of the effect of *S. plicata* on *M.*
399 *squamiger* survival in the field was competition, we must also consider other potential
400 explanations. Allelopathic effects of invasive species on natives have been found in
401 some studies (Schenk 2006; Figueredo et al. 2007), and in our study the interaction of
402 the two species might induce the production of waterborne allelopathic metabolites in
403 the introduced species that could reduce both survival and growth of the native. An
404 alternative mechanism for the negative effect of the invasive on the native species in
405 the field is that there are indirect effects via a third organism. For instance, the
406 presence of the invasive may increase predation on the native species but leave the
407 invasive unaffected. While such a scenario does not explain the early differences in
408 growth, it may still explain the differences in survival. In our experiments, the
409 experimental plates were hanging from the pontoon, which excluded benthic
410 predators, but fish could still access the experimental individuals. Although this
411 scenario seems unlikely, carefully designed predator exclusion experiments that do
412 not interfere with food supply would be necessary to rule it out. Regardless of the

413 underlying direct or indirect mechanisms, our study joins a growing list showing that
414 the presence of marine invasive species is likely to result in the reduced abundance of
415 local biota (Bando 2006).

416 The effects of *S. plicata* on the settlement and survival of *M. squamiger* and
417 the reciprocal effects of *M. squamiger* on *S. plicata* settlement have some interesting
418 implications for the dynamics of invasion in this system. We suggest that the presence
419 of the native incumbent inhibits invasion by *S. plicata*. However, if a disturbance
420 clears space for *S. plicata* to settle, then they will outcompete any newly settled *M.*
421 *squamiger* and furthermore will inhibit recolonisation by the native. We also found
422 that the presence of *S. plicata* recruits did not reduce *S. plicata* settlement success
423 suggesting that initial invasion will not interfere with further arrivals. Previous studies
424 have shown that both disturbance and prior invasion facilitate further invasion
425 (Crooks 2002; Rodriguez 2006; Altman and Whitlatch 2007), here we provide one
426 potential mechanism for such an effect. While our results appear to be a classic case
427 of a priority effect (sensu Almany 2003), interestingly, this effect is not mediated by
428 resource limitation: there was ample space for larvae to settle (only ca. 0.01 % of the
429 Petri dish surface is occupied by pre-established settlers), they are simply inhibited
430 from doing so. Whether propagule pressure can reach levels that overwhelm the
431 'biotic resistance' of the community associated to *M. squamiger* (e.g. Hollebne and
432 Hay 2007) remains unclear but at least initially, the presence of the native species
433 appears to inhibit the invasion by the introduced species (Osman and Whitlatch 1995),
434 even at different spatial scales (Stachowicz et al. 2002).

435 Overall, we found a mixture of lethal and non-lethal effect of the invasive
436 species on the native species. These effects may lead to the invasive species
437 outcompeting the native species whenever space becomes available. This study

438 suggests that invasive species can have significant non-lethal and lethal effects on
439 early life-history stages of native species in the marine environment. Further
440 experiments comparing settlement success in presence or absence of invader recruits
441 in water flow devices (see Butman et al. 1988), as well as experiments assessing the
442 interaction during adult phases will provide further understanding of the interactions
443 between invasive and native sessile marine invertebrates.

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465 **Acknowledgements:** We are grateful to B. Galletly and A. Crean for assistance in the
466 field. M.R. was supported by a travel grant from the Spanish “Ministerio de
467 Educación y Ciencia” during his stay at the University of Queensland. This project
468 was funded by projects DPO666147 of the Australian Research Council and
469 CTM2007-66635 of the Spanish Government. This work was carried out in
470 accordance with the laws of Australia.

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

References

- 494
495
496 Almany GR (2003). Priority effects in coral reef fish communities. *Ecology* 84:1920-
497 1935
- 498 Altman S, Whitlatch RB (2007). Effects of small-scale disturbance on invasion
499 success in marine communities. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 342:15-29
- 500 Bando KJ (2006). The roles of competition and disturbance in a marine invasion. *Biol*
501 *Invasions* 8:755-763
- 502 Bjerknes AL, Totland O, Hegland SJ, Nielsen A (2007). Do alien plant invasions
503 really affect pollination success in native plant species? *Biol Conserv* 138:1-12
- 504 Bullard SG, Whitlatch RB, Osman RW (2004). Checking the landing zone: Do
505 invertebrate larvae avoid settling near superior spatial competitors? *Mar Ecol*
506 *Prog Ser* 280:239-247
- 507 Bullard SG, Sedlack B, Reinhardt JF, Litty C, Gareau K, Whitlatch RB (2007).
508 Fragmentation of colonial ascidians: Differences in reattachment capability
509 among species. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 342:166-168
- 510 Butman CA, Grassle JP, Webb CM (1988). Substrate choices made by marine larvae
511 settling in still water and in a flume flow. *Nature* 333:771-773
- 512 Byrd J, Lambert CC (2000). Mechanism of the block to hybridisation and selfing
513 between the sympatric ascidians *Ciona intestinalis* and *Ciona savignyi*. *Mol*
514 *Reprod Dev* 55:109-116
- 515 Byers JE, Goldwasser L (2001). Exposing the mechanism and timing of impact of
516 nonindigenous species on native species. *Ecology* 82:1330-1343
- 517 Carlton JT (1999). The scale and ecological consequences of biological invasions in
518 the world's oceans. In: Sandlund OT (ed) *Invasive Species and Biodiversity*
519 *Management*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Dordrecht, pp 195-212
- 520 Cohen AN, Carlton JT (1998). Accelerating invasion rate in a highly invaded estuary.
521 *Science* 279:555-557
- 522 Crooks JA (2002). Characterizing ecosystem-level consequences of biological
523 invasions: the role of ecosystem engineers. *Oikos* 97:153-166
- 524 Christian CE (2001). Consequences of a biological invasion reveal the importance of
525 mutualism for plant communities. *Nature* 413:635-639
- 526 Davis AR, Butler AJ, van Altena I (1991). Settlement behaviour of ascidian larvae:
527 preliminary evidence for inhibition by sponge allelochemicals. *Mar Ecol Prog*
528 *Ser* 72:117-123
- 529 Edlund AF, Koehl MAR (1998). Adhesion and reattachment of compound ascidians
530 to various substrata: weak glue can prevent tissue damage. *J Exp Biol*
531 201:2397-2402
- 532 Elkin CE, Marshall DJ (2007) Desperate larvae: the influence of deferred costs and
533 habitat requirements on habitat selection. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 335:143-153
- 534 Figueredo CC, Giani A, Bird DF (2007). Does allelopathy contribute to
535 *Cylindrospermopsis raciborskii* (Cyanobacteria) bloom occurrence and
536 geographic expansion? *Journal Phycol* 43:256-265
- 537 Galil BS (2007). Loss or gain? Invasive aliens and biodiversity in the Mediterranean
538 Sea. *Mar Pollut Bull* 55:314-322
- 539 Gosselin LA, Qian PY (1997) Juvenile mortality in benthic marine invertebrates. *Mar*
540 *Ecol Prog Ser* 146:265-282
- 541 Gribben PE, Wright JT (2006) Sublethal effects on reproduction in native fauna: are
542 females more vulnerable to biological invasion? *Oecologia* 149:352-361

- 543 Grosberg RK (1981). Competitive ability influences habitat choice in marine
544 invertebrates. *Nature* 290:700-702
- 545 Grosholz E (2002) Ecological and evolutionary consequences of coastal invasions.
546 *Trends Ecol Evol* 17:22-27
- 547 Harper FM, Hart MW (2005). Gamete compatibility and sperm competition affect
548 paternity and hybridization between sympatric *Asterias* sea stars. *Biol Bull*
549 209:113-126
- 550 Hewitt C.L. (2002) Distribution and biodiversity of Australian tropical marine
551 bioinvasions. *Pac Sci* 56:213-222
- 552 Hollebone AL, Hay ME (2007). Propagule pressure of an invasive crab overwhelms
553 native biotic resistance. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 342:191-196
- 554 Kurle CM, Croll DA, Tershy BR (2008) Introduced rats indirectly change marine
555 rocky intertidal communities from algae- to invertebrate-dominated. *P Natl*
556 *Acad Sci USA* 105:3800-3804
- 557 Kott P (1985). The Australian Ascidiacea, Part 1. Phlebobranchia and
558 Stolidobranchia. *Mem Queensl Mus* 23:1-438
- 559 Lambert C (2000). Germ-cell warfare in ascidians: sperm from one species can
560 interfere with the fertilisation of a second species. *Biol Bull* 198:22-25
- 561 Lambert CC (2001). Fertilization-induced glycosidase release and interspecific sperm
562 competition in ascidians. In: Sawada H, Yokosawa H and Lambert CC (eds).
563 *The Biology of Ascidians*. Springer-Verlag Tokyo, pp 24-29
- 564 Lambert G (2007). Invasive sea squirts: a growing global problem. *J Exp Mar Biol*
565 *Ecol* 342:3-4
- 566 Levitan DR (1995). The ecology of fertilization in free-spawning invertebrates. In:
567 McEdward L (ed) *Ecology of Marine Invertebrate Larvae*. CRC Press, Inc.
568 Boca Raton, pp 124-152
- 569 Levitan DR, Petersen C (1995). Sperm limitation in the sea. *Trends Ecol Evol* 10:228-
570 231
- 571 Mack MC, D'Antonio CM (1998). Impacts of biological invasions on disturbance
572 regimes. *Trends Ecol Evol* 13:195-198
- 573 Mack RP, Simberloff D, Lonsdale WM, Evans H, Clout M, Bazzaz FA (2000). Biotic
574 invasions: causes, epidemiology, global consequences, and control. *Ecol Appl*
575 10:689-710
- 576 Maldonado M, Young CM (1999). Effects of the duration of larval life on post-larval
577 stages of the demosponge *Sigmadocia caerulea*. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 232:9-21
- 578 Marshall DJ, Styan CA, Keough MJ (2000). Intraspecific co-variation between egg
579 and body size affects fertilisation kinetics of free-spawning marine
580 invertebrates. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 195:305-309
- 581 Marshall DJ, Bolton TF, Keough MJ (2003a). Offspring size affects the post-
582 metamorphic performance of a colonial marine invertebrate. *Ecology* 84:3131-
583 3137
- 584 Marshall DJ, Pechenik JA, Keough MJ (2003b). Larval activity levels and delayed
585 metamorphosis affect post-larval performance in the colonial, ascidian
586 *Diplosoma listerianum*. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 246:153-162
- 587 Meyer, JJ; Byers, JE (2005) As good as dead? Sublethal predation facilitates lethal
588 predation on an intertidal clam. *Ecol Lett* 8:160-166
- 589 Morgan S (1995). Life and death in the plankton: larval mortality and adaptation. In:
590 McEdward L (ed) *Ecology of Marine Invertebrate Larvae*. CRC Press, Inc.
591 Boca Raton, pp 279-322

- 592 Nystrom P, Svensson O, Lardner B, Bronmark C, Graneli W (2001). The influence of
593 multiple introduced predators on a littoral pond community. *Ecology* 82:1023-
594 1039
- 595 Osman RW, Whitlatch RB (1995). The influence of resident adults on recruitment: a
596 comparison to settlement. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 190:169-190
- 597 Pangle KL, Peacor SD (2006). Non-lethal effect of the invasive predator *Bythotrephes*
598 *longimanus* on *Daphnia mendotae*. *Freshwater Biol* 51:1070-1078
- 599 Pechenik JA (2006). Larval experience and latent effects - metamorphosis is not a
600 new beginning. *Integr Comp Biol* 46:323-333
- 601 Piazzì L, Ceccherelli G (2002). Effects of competition between two introduced
602 *Caulerpa*. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 225:189-195
- 603 Quinn GP, Keough MJ (2002). *Experimental Design and Data Analysis for*
604 *Biologists*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K.
- 605 Reusch TBH, Williams SL (1999). Macrophyte Canopy Structure and the Success of
606 an Invasive Marine Bivalve. *Oikos* 84:398-416
- 607 Rius M, Pascual M, Turon X (2008) Phylogeography of the widespread marine
608 invader *Microcosmus squamiger* (Ascidiacea) reveals high genetic diversity of
609 introduced populations and non-independent colonizations. *Divers Distrib* 14:
610 818-828
- 611 Rodriguez LF (2006). Can invasive species facilitate native species? Evidence of how,
612 when, and why these impacts occur. *Biol Invasions* 8:927-939
- 613 Ruiz GM, Carlton JT, Grosholz ED, Hines AH (1997). Global invasions of marine
614 and estuarine habitats by non-indigenous species: mechanisms, extent, and
615 consequences. *Am Zool* 37:621-632
- 616 Ruiz GM, Fofonoff P, Hines AH, Grosholz ED (1999) Non-indigenous species as
617 stressors in estuarine and marine communities: Assessing invasion impacts
618 and interactions. *Limnol Oceanogr* 44:950-972
- 619 Schenk HJ (2006). Root competition: beyond resource depletion. *J Ecol* 94:725-739
- 620 Snyder WE, Evans, EW (2006). Ecological effects of invasive arthropod generalist
621 predators. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 37:95-122
- 622 Stachowicz JJ, Fried H, Osman RW, Whitlatch RB (2002) Biodiversity, invasion
623 resistance, and marine ecosystem function: Reconciling pattern and process.
624 *Ecology* 83: 2575-2590
- 625 Stoner DS (1994). Larvae of a colonial ascidian use a non-contact mode of substratum
626 selection on a coral reef. *Mar Biol* 121:319-326
- 627 Strayer DL, Eviner VT, Jeschke JM, Pace ML (2006). Understanding the long-term
628 effects of species invasions. *Trends Ecol Evol* 21:645-651
- 629 Trussell GC, Ewanchuk PJ, Bertness MD (2002). Field evidence of trait-mediated
630 indirect interactions in a rocky intertidal food web. *Ecol Lett* 5:241-245
- 631 Trussell GC, Ewanchuk PJ, Bertness MD (2003). Trait-mediated effects in rocky
632 intertidal food chains: predator risk cues alter prey feeding rates. *Ecology*
633 84:629-640
- 634 Trussell GC, Ewanchuk PJ, Bertness MD, Silliman BR (2004) Trophic cascades in
635 rocky shore tide pools: distinguishing lethal and nonlethal effects. *Oecologia*
636 139:427-432
- 637 Trussell GC, Ewanchuk PJ, Matassa CM (2006). Habitat effects on the relative
638 importance of trait- and density-mediated indirect interactions. *Ecol Lett*
639 9:1245-1252
- 640 Underwood AJ, Keough MJ (2001). Supply-side ecology: the nature and
641 consequences of variations in recruitment of intertidal organisms. In: Bertness

- 642 MD, Gaines SD, Hay ME (eds) Marine Community Ecology. Sinauer Assoc.
643 Sunderland, pp 183-200
- 644 Veen T, Borge T, Griffith SC, Saetre G, Bures S, Gustafsson L, Sheldon BC (2001).
645 Hybridisation and adaptive mate choice in flycatchers. Nature 411:45-50
- 646 Wendt DE (1998). Effect of larval swimming duration on growth and reproduction of
647 *Bugula neritina* (Bryozoa) under field conditions. Biol Bull 195:126-135
- 648 Werner EE, Peacor SD (2003). A review of trait-mediated indirect interactions in
649 ecological communities. Ecology 84:1083-1100
- 650 Wiczorek SK, Todd CD (1997). Inhibition and facilitation of bryozoan and ascidian
651 settlement by natural multi-species biofilms: effects of film age and the roles
652 of active and passive larval attachment. Mar Biol 128:463-473
- 653 Wonham MJ, Walton WC, Ruiz GM, Frese AN, Galil BS (2001). Going to the
654 source: role of the invasion pathway in determining potential invaders. Mar
655 Ecol Prog Ser 215:1-12
- 656 Wyatt ASJ, Hewitt CL, Walker DI, Ward TJ (2005). Marine introductions in the
657 Shark Bay World Heritage Property, Western Australia: a preliminary
658 assessment. Divers Distrib 11:33-44
- 659 Young CM, Svane I (1989). The ecology and behaviour of ascidian larvae. Oceangr
660 Mar Biol Annu Rev 27:45-90
- 661 Yund PO (2000). How severe is sperm limitation in natural populations of marine
662 free-spawners? Trends Ecol Evol 15:10-13
- 663
- 664
- 665
- 666
- 667
- 668
- 669
- 670
- 671
- 672
- 673
- 674
- 675
- 676
- 677
- 678
- 679
- 680
- 681
- 682

683 **Table and figure legends**

684

685 **Table 1.** Experimental treatments used to evaluate the effect on settlement of
686 pre-established recruits using all combinations of *Styela plicata* and *Microcosmus*
687 *squamiger* larvae and settlers. SD, standard deviation.

688 **Table 2.** ANOVA examining the effect on fertilisation success of pre-
689 exposing *Microcosmus squamiger* eggs to *Styela plicata* sperm. Note that the model is
690 reduced after testing for a non-significant interaction between Run and the treatment
691 of interest. Significant p values are shown in **bold**.

692 **Table 3.** ANOVA examining the effect of settled heterospecific recruits on the
693 settlement of a) *Microcosmus squamiger* larvae and b) *Styela plicata* larvae. Note that
694 model in section b is reduced after testing for a non-significant interaction. Significant
695 p values are shown in **bold**.

696 **Table 4.** Repeated measures ANOVA examining the effect of the presence of
697 one species on the survival of the other in the field. Significant p values are shown in
698 **bold**.

699 **Table 5.** Repeated measures ANOVA examining the effect of the presence of
700 *Styela plicata* on the size of the *Microcosmus squamiger* in the field. Significant p
701 values are shown in **bold**.

702 **Figure 1.** Results of experiment 2 testing whether the presence of recruits
703 affected settlement, pooling runs. Shaded bars indicate controls and open bars indicate
704 established recruits: (a) effect of *Styela plicata* and *Microcosmus squamiger* recruits
705 on the settlement of *M. squamiger*; and (b) effect of *M. squamiger* and *S. plicata*
706 recruits on the settlement of *S. plicata*. Vertical bars denote standard error.

707 **Figure 2.** Results of experiment 3 assessing if the presence of heterospecific
708 recruits affected post-metamorphic survival in the field: (a) *Microcosmus squamiger*

709 (b) *Styela plicata*. Dotted lines indicate the treatment in presence of heterospecific
710 recruits and solid lines indicates the treatment with no pre-established recruits.
711 Vertical bars denote standard error.

712 **Figure 3.** Results of experiment 3. Mean size of *Microcosmus squamiger*
713 juveniles after two and five weeks in the field. Dotted lines represent juveniles in the
714 presence of *Styela plicata*, solid lines represent control juveniles. The vertical bars
715 denote standard error and note the log scale on the y-axis.

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734 **Tables & figures**

735

736 Table 1

Treatment	Run	Number of replicates	Mean number of initial recruits	SD
<i>S. plicata</i> on <i>M. squamiger</i>	1	8	10.375	1.179
	2	12	18	1.243
<i>M. squamiger</i> on <i>M. squamiger</i>	1	12	14.667	1.437
<i>M. squamiger</i> on <i>S. plicata</i>	1	8	12.750	2.455
	2	4	13.5	2.255
<i>S. plicata</i> on <i>S. plicata</i>	1	4	20.25	3.351

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751 Table 2

Source	df	MS	F	P
Experimental Run	2	0.083	16.44	0.012
Heterospecific sperm	2	<0.001	0.07	0.931
Error	4	0.005		

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

For Peer Review

772 Table 3

Source	Df	MS	F	P
a) Effect of <i>S. plicata</i> on <i>M. squamiger</i>				
Treatment	1	0.741	6.55	0.237
Experimental Run	1	0.011	1.04	0.313
Treatment x Experimental Run	1	0.113	11.18	0.002
Error	36	0.010		
b) Effect of <i>M. squamiger</i> on <i>S. plicata</i> settlement				
Treatment	1	0.212	17.79	<0.001
Experimental Run	1	0.098	8.25	0.009
Error	21	0.012		

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787 Table 4

788

Source	df	MS	F	P
a) Effect of <i>S. plicata</i> on <i>M. squamiger</i>				
<i>Between Subjects</i>				
Treatment	1	3.683	14.70	0.002
Error	13	0.250		
<i>Within Subjects</i>				
Time	3	1.137	34.69	<0.001
Time x Treatment	3	0.032	0.97	0.417
Error	39	0.033		
b) Effect of <i>M. squamiger</i> on <i>S. plicata</i>				
<i>Between subjects</i>				
Treatment	1	0.005	0.05	0.823
Error	14	0.088		
<i>Within subjects</i>				
Time	2	0.217	20.48	<0.001
Time x Treatment	2	0.001	0.098	0.907
Error	28	0.011		

789

790

791

792

793

794

795 Table 5

Source	df	MS	F	P
Treatment	1	5.65	2.79	0.1336
Error	8	2.03		
<i>Within Subjects</i>				
Time	1	281.31	179.86	<0.0001
Time*Treatment	1	9.57	6.12	0.0385
Error	8	1.56		

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816 Figure 1

817

818

819

820


821

822

823

824

825



826

827

828


829

830

831

832

833



834

835

836

837

838


839

840

841 Figure 2


842

843



850

851



852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866 Figure 3

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

