Co-existence of two mytilids in a heterogeneous environment: mortality, growth and strength of shell and byssus attachment

Jose M.F. Babarro^{1*}, María José Abad²

¹ Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas CSIC, Eduardo Cabello 6, 36208 Vigo, Spain

² Grupo de Polímeros (CIT), Campus de Esteiro, C/Dr Vázquez Cabrera, s/n 15403- Ferrol (A Coruña), Spain

*Corresponding author. Email: jbabarro@iim.csic.es

Tel.: +34 986 231930 Ext. 207; Fax: +34 986 292762

ABSTRACT

The co-existence patterns of two mytilid species were studied, in order to evaluate the performance of the alien mussel *Xenostrobus securis* and the indigenous one *Mytilus galloprovincialis* through independent and mixed co-habiting experiments in the Ría de Vigo (NW Spain). *Mytilus galloprovincialis* was found to be the best performer in all tests. Shell growth was approximately 4-fold greater for the indigenous mussel when deployed independently and regardless of density. Differences in shell growth were found to be similar within mixed populations wherein *M. galloprovincialis* showed greater ability for upward migratory movements on the mixed beds and distanced itself from the mud influence layer. The alien *X. securis* however was found to inhabit underneath the *M. galloprovincialis* layer which resulted in higher mortality rates. Species-specific features like byssus filaments and lifestyle may account for such different behaviour. *Mytilus galloprovincialis* secreted thicker and stronger shells and byssus regardless of their density in both independent and mixed experiments. This might indicate that the indigenous mussel performs better when faced with abiotic stress or biotic pressure. The alien *X. securis* is currently found to establish high-density patches of individuals at the confluence of main rivers that flow into the estuary (highly heterogeneous scenario). Such behaviour favours its settlement far from the native mussel influence area. *Xenostrobus*

26 *securis* also colonises hard substrates that are not-fully occupied by other invertebrates but its range was
27 found to be limited by the presence of the indigenous mussel.

28

29 **Key words:** *Mytilus galloprovincialis*; *Xenostrobus securis*; performance; competition; plasticity;
30 byssus

31

32

33 **INTRODUCTION**

34 Biological invasions have emerged as a major topic in ecological studies and environmental policy issues
35 (Pfeiffer and Voeks 2008). The presence of exotic species may bring significant changes in the recipient
36 community structure as a consequence of inter-specific interactions which may give rise to the variability
37 of species richness, community balance and diversity (Vermeij 1996; Crooks and Khim 1999; Grosholz
38 2002; Fridley et al. 2007). Such interactions between species may lead to competition and eventually the
39 exclusion of the worst performer (Branch and Steffani 2004; Castilla et al. 2004). Nevertheless, this
40 negative consequence for the indigenous inhabitants does not occur in all cases because aspects like habitat
41 heterogeneity may play a significant role and examples of co-existence (Zardi et al. 2008; Rius and
42 McQuaid 2006; Nicastró et al. 2010; Dutton and Hofmann 2008; Bownes and McQuaid 2010 among
43 others) and even facilitation (Rius and McQuaid 2009) have been reported for the specific case of bivalves
44 performance. Sará et al. (2008) found that the potential for invasion can be enhanced through a number of
45 advantageous physiological mechanisms of the exotic species. Although indigenous species may be
46 displaced whenever the alien species show superior competitive abilities and physiological tolerance
47 (Steffani and Branch 2005), the interactions with the environment and native species would nevertheless
48 make such invasion unpredictable. The potential for adhesion by using byssus filaments within a changing
49 abiotic scenario is a key feature for sessile mytilids survival.

50

51 The latter cited surveys have reported co-existence mechanisms in native and exotic bivalves with similar
52 niches based on ecological traits comparison. Examples of certain competitive advantages of the invader
53 species with respect to the indigenous species have been related to their abilities for escaping from natural
54 enemies like predators and parasites (Shea and Chesson 2002). In our case, the alien mussel *Xenostrobus*
55 *securis* has been reported to house fewer parasites than the native mussel (Pascual et al. 2010) and to be
56 less vulnerable to predation by *Carcinus maenas* (Veiga et al. 2011). Therefore, such ecological release
57 from parasites and predators (enemy release hypothesis) would facilitate invasion by *X. securis*. The
58 spatial-temporal resource competition theory furthermore predicts that environmental disturbances in both
59 space and time may produce major and different effects on indigenous and exotic species which would
60 favour one or the other at different locations and times (Shea and Chesson 2002).

61 Interestingly, the indigenous mussel *Mytilus galloprovincialis* involved in the present study is a successful
62 invader in other latitudes e.g. along the South African coastline (Branch and Steffani 2004; Bownes and
63 McQuaid 2010), the Pacific Northwest front (Shinen and Morgan 2009) and many other areas in America,
64 Africa, Australia and Japan (Sanjuan et al. 1997). The presence of *Xenostrobus securis* (black pygmy
65 mussel) in Galician waters was reported by Garci et al. (2007), however the species is endemic to the
66 brackish waters of New Zealand and Australia. The introduced black pygmy mussel is nowadays found in
67 very different areas of Europe (Spain and Italy; Garci et al. 2007; Sabelli and Speranza 1994; Barbieri et al.
68 2011) and Japan (Kimura et al. 1999), and represents a relatively small mytilid whose size may have played
69 a role in its invasion ability. Such a species-specific feature is proposed as a trait that is potentially
70 associated with rapid population growth and high fecundity (Ehrlich 1989). The life-span of *X. securis* is
71 relatively short (about one year) and it usually inhabits high-density populations (Wilson 1969) that might
72 occasionally smother the native infaunal communities (Zenetos et al. 2004). *Xenostrobus securis* is
73 considered to be a serious threat as a bio-invader with negative impact on indigenous ecosystems
74 (Darrigran 2002) and it has been listed among the “100 Worst Invasive Species” in the Mediterranean Sea
75 (Streftaris and Zenetos 2006). The current distribution of *X. securis* in Galicia (NW Spain) is restricted to
76 the mouth of the River Oitavén-Verdugo (Sampaio, SP; 8.700 ± 550 individuals m^{-2} according to Garci et

77 al. 2007) where *M. galloprovincialis* is absent and the adjacent areas in the inner Ría de Vigo (San Simón,
78 SS) (Figure 1) where it co-exists with the indigenous mussel at relatively balanced rates (Gestoso et al.
79 2012). The competition between both mytilids was observed to take place on hard rocks along the intertidal
80 coastline but the invader sometimes colonised muddy soft bottoms in the inner Ría (García et al. 2007;
81 Pascual et al. 2010) by producing a great amount of byssal threads (Babarro and Lassudrie 2011). Such
82 mud (and sand) accumulation in the inner areas of the estuary may eventually affect stability of mussel
83 attachment (Zardi et al. 2008) and would therefore determine any co-existence pattern. Besides its potential
84 to settle on very different substrates, *X. securis* also shows extremely high tolerance to salinity and flow
85 speed variation (Wilson 1968; Babarro and Lassudrie 2011). Although the alien mussel has shown an
86 extraordinary ability for strong attachment in wide abiotic conditions, such strength never exceeded that
87 reported for the native mussel. No studies with mixed populations have been carried out to certify survival
88 and growth performance of the two competing species.

89

90 In Galicia (NW Spain), the cultivation of *M. galloprovincialis* represents a widely diversified industry with
91 a great economic impact (Labarta et al. 2004). The potential expansion of the invader *X. securis* from the
92 inner to the outer areas of the Ría de Vigo may threaten such successful activity and disturb ecological
93 relationships in the Ría ecosystem. Biological interactions between species and their responses to
94 environmental heterogeneity would provide a useful scheme to understand community structure (Nicastro
95 et al. 2010) and any potential future changes. The crucial aspect to research here corresponds to the ability
96 of the alien mussel to expand further from its main concentration site into other inner areas of the Ría de
97 Vigo where *M. galloprovincialis* co-exists on mixed mussel beds. The aim of the study was to test the
98 hypotheses that: (1) *X. securis* excludes *M. galloprovincialis* because of the poor growth rates and high
99 mortality of the indigenous mussel, especially when the mud component becomes significant on mussel
100 beds; and (2) energetic constraints derived from competition processes would distinctly limit energy
101 allocation to protective structures (byssal and shell strength) of both species, in which the alien mussel
102 would take advantage of its better adaptation to the heterogeneous environment. Independent and mixed

co-habiting tests were carried out in two consecutive seasons and on different (soft and hard) substrates in order to cover both spatial and temporal components of inter-specific competition.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Region and general approach

Field survey was conducted at two sites of the inner Ría de Vigo (NW Spain; Figure 1) where *X. securis* is highly and exclusively present (Sampaio, SP) and co-habiting with *M. galloprovincialis* forming mixed balanced mussel beds (San Simón, SS). SP site represents a highly changing environment for salinity and water flow values that depend on the river influence and tidal regime (Babarro and Lassudrie 2011). By contrast, soft muddy bottoms characterise the intertidal coastline of the sheltered and shallow SS waters and these may at times cover hard substrates where mytilids settle.

The competition ability of mytilids was assessed through a) mortality and growth estimates in the natural environment with mud transport influence, and b) the strength of both byssal attachment and shell which are indicative of energy investment into these protective tissues. A common mussel size of 23 mm (± 1.3) shell length was selected at the beginning of the experiments. The surface units were made up of 10 x 10 x 0.5 cm slate tiles with 9 and 3 different treatments at SS and SP sites, respectively, one treatment per tile (Table 1). Slate represents a high-energy surface and is a good substrate for mussel attachment (Young 1985; Babarro and Carrington 2011). Density of mussels per slate tile corresponded to 5, 10 and 20 individuals of each species within independent mussel beds (tiles 1-6 at SS and 1-3 at SP sites; Table 1). For mixed mussel beds at SS site (tiles 7-9; Table 1), a total of 20 mussels were used on each tile to establish a mixed balance (10 *M. galloprovincialis*, Mg / 10 *X. securis*, Xs) or unbalance (5 Mg / 15 Xs and 15 Mg / 5 Xs) rates (Table 1). Two hundred individuals of each species were collected in the field and transported to the laboratory. After cleaning the shell of any biofouling and removal of byssus from the ventral margin, individuals were allowed to establish primary attachment in the laboratory for 2 days prior to their transportation to experimental sites (see Babarro and Fernández Reiriz 2010 for details on animal

129 maintenance). Nylon netting (5 mm mesh size) was used to cover mussels, in order to allow seawater to
130 flow in but prevent any initial predation by macro-invertebrates, especially when attachment was relatively
131 weak. The netting was progressively cut and individuals were allowed to freely attach to slate tiles and
132 move. Mussel death and disappearance from the slate tiles was likewise taken into account for mortality
133 values. Slate tiles were deployed haphazardly in the mesolittoral zone of both sites at approximately 20%
134 of aerial exposure. Three replicates were deployed at each site which gave a sum total of 36 quadrants (27
135 in San Simón and 9 in Sampaio). The first experiment was carried out during autumn 2010 (September-
136 December). This experimental set-up was repeated in winter-spring 2011 (February-April) by including a
137 new factor, i.e. substrate, with the aim of eliminating any mud deposition effect on the mussel beds by
138 placing slate tiles on hard rocks. The animals were maintained in the field for 3 months in both cases.

139
140 **Growth and mortality rates**

141 Shell growth was reported by measuring shell length using Vernier callipers (precision ± 1 mm) at the
142 beginning and end of the experiment. The initial mussel shell length (23 mm) allowed easy differentiation
143 between experimental animals and new recruits. Animals were not marked and mussel growth was
144 measured as the mean shell length value of all survivors on a single tile unit per replicate. As described
145 above, mortality represented dead animals plus any individual that had disappeared from the tiles. Growth
146 and mortality rates were obtained for both autumn and spring-winter experiments.

147
148 **Byssal attachment and shell compressive forces**

149 Before measuring the shell length of the survivors, a representative number of individuals were used for
150 dislodgement and shell compressive force measurements (sub-samples). About a half (lowest density) to a
151 fourth (highest density) of the mussel population on each slate tile was selected to that end. The attachment
152 force of individuals on the substrate or to each other's shells was measured by connecting the mussel to a
153 spring scale (Digital Force Gauge DN431 with peak hold measurement, resolution of 0.01N). The spring
154 scale was pulled perpendicular (normal) to the substrate until dislodgement occurred (Bell and Gosline

1997; Babarro and Carrington 2011). Care was taken to avoid disturbing neighbours when sampling one individual. Therefore, mussels that were immediately adjacent to those selected for dislodgement were not considered when they had interconnected byssus threads. Byssal attachment of mussels was measured in both autumn and spring-winter experiments.

A group of five individuals from those selected for dislodgement measurements were also considered for shell compressive force analyses in the autumn 2010 experiment. The left valve was chosen for all compressive analyses. The compressive force required to crack the shell was measured using an universal testing machine, Instron 5566, with 1 kN load cell and at the rate of 2 mm s⁻¹. Each specimen was placed horizontally with the shell edge on the plane surface. The compressive force was then applied with a 2 mm diameter steel tip placed on the curved surface at the highest point of an isolate dry single valve. Load-displacement curves up to shell break point were obtained. Shell strength was calculated from the maximum force measured in the curves and was then normalized by the shell thickness measured using a micro-calliper (Mitutoyo 0-25 mm, ± 0.01mm, Made in Japan) at the point where the force was applied. Although such data do not provide an absolute value for compression strength of the shells, they can be used to compare the mechanical behaviour of the different shells.

After removing the mussels from slate tiles, any mud accumulated was scraped and collected as a function of mussel density (independent test) and species dominance (mixed test). The sediment was dried separately to constant weight (60°C, 48h).

173

174 **Statistical analysis**

The two-way ANOVA was used for the autumn experiment, in order to estimate the effects of species (fixed, two levels: *X. securis* and *M. galloprovincialis*) and density (fixed, three levels: n = 5, 10, 20 for independent tests) or co-habiting balance (fixed, three levels: Mg / Xs 5 / 10, 10 / 10 and 15 / 5 for mixed tests) on mortality, shell length growth, byssal attachment, shell thickness and compressive force of the mussels deployed for both independent and mixed beds, respectively. The two-way ANOVA was also performed to estimate the effects of site (fixed, two levels: San Simón and Sampaio) and density (fixed,

three levels: n = 5, 10, 20 for independent tests) between the previous response parameters for the alien *X. securis* and the autumn experiment. The latter results for the alien mussel at the two very distinct sites are presented in appendix 1.

The three-way ANOVA was selected to test the effect of species (fixed, two levels: *X. securis* and *M. galloprovincialis*), substrate (fixed, two levels: mud and hard rocks) and density (fixed, three levels: n = 5, 10, 20 for independent tests) or co-habiting balance (fixed, three levels: Mg / Xs 5 / 10, 10 / 10 and 15 / 5) on mortality, shell length growth and byssal attachment force of the mussels, respectively, and deployed either within independent or mixed mussel beds for the winter-spring experiment. Normality and homogeneity of variances were tested by Shapiro-Wilk's W and Levene tests. Homogeneous groups were established *a posteriori* by using Tukey test. Whenever the analysis of variance assumption was violated, rank transformation to create data with a perfect fit to a uniform distribution was followed. All analyses were performed using the STATISTICA 7.0 software.

RESULTS

Mortality and shell growth rates: autumn 2010

Variability of the mortality of mytilids deployed independently at San Simón was clearly dependent on the interaction term (species x density) which is on the basis for the significant effect of both species and density factors (Figure 2A; Table 2A). Mortality was higher for the alien *X. securis* in the species comparison and the highest value (50.0%) was obtained with the lowest density (Figure 2A). By contrast, mortality of *M. galloprovincialis* remained much lower regardless of density (0-2.5%; Figure 2A). Habitat comparison for the alien *X. securis* in the independent experiments showed that mortality was consistently lower in Sampaio at the mouth of the River and similarly to San Simón, high density caused greater mortality rates (Figure 2A; Appendix 1).

Mortality was also higher for the alien mussel in the mixed beds deployed in San Simón but interestingly, its presence caused an increase in the mortality of the indigenous mussel with regard to independent tests

(Figure 2B). This is reflected in the significant incidence of species and co-habiting balance factors (Table 2A) and indicates that mortality in the mixed population as a unit dropped significantly whenever there was abundance of the indigenous mussel (Figure 2B).

Mud accumulation on slate tiles varied within a narrow range for the independent experiment in San Simón, regardless of the mytilid species present (Figure 2C). The only exception was reported for the lowest density of the alien mussel (Figure 2C). Habitat comparison for the alien *X. securis* showed that mud accumulated was much lower in the Sampaio samples regardless of density (Figure 2C). The mud content on the slate tiles within mixed beds represented also a narrow range for the different co-habiting balance rates between mytilids (Figure 2D).

The shell length growth of mussels deployed independently at San Simón was significantly affected by the factor species which accounted for a 4-fold higher growth for the indigenous *M. galloprovincialis* (Figure 2E; Table 2B). By contrast, no effect of density was reported (Table 2B) with mean values of 38.42 and 9.34 $\mu\text{m day}^{-1}$ for *M. galloprovincialis* and *X. securis*, respectively (Figure 2E). Habitat comparison for the alien *X. securis* showed that the shell growth rate was significantly greater in the San Simón (4-fold factor) than in the Sampaio samples (Figure 2E). Just as at the San Simón site, density did not cause any significant change in shell growth in the Sampaio samples (Figure 2E; Appendix 1).

Surprisingly though, the shell growth of the indigenous *M. galloprovincialis* was also significantly higher within mixed beds and regardless of any population balance (Figure 2F; Table 2B). Despite any inter-specific competition on mixed beds, the magnitude of differences between the species was similar than that reported for the independent tests. This result can be linked to mussel behaviour illustrated in Figures 3A-B for mixed experiments in which two differentiated layers were obtained at the end of the experiment, each corresponding to a different mytilid. The indigenous mussel climbed to the upper layers of the bed while the alien mussel was clearly smothered and obliged to attach underneath within the mud influence zone (Figure 3A).

233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258

Mortality and shell growth rates: winter-spring 2011

Mussel mortality within independent tests varied slightly with species factor and more significantly within substrates comparison (Figure 4A; Table 3A). The alien *X. securis* presented higher mortality rates as compared to *M. galloprovincialis* when deployed on hard rocks (Figure 4A). However, mortality increased significantly for both species on soft bottoms (Figure 4A).

In like manner, mussel mortality on mixed beds varied significantly with species and substrate factors (Figure 4B; Table 3A). Significance of interaction terms for co-habiting experiments (Table 3A) indicated that survival of both mytilids benefited again from fixation on hard rocks although the alien mussel still showed higher mortality whenever its balance rate was observed to be favourable (5 / 15 Mg / Xs; Figure 4B). The winter-spring experiment confirmed the differentiation in two layers within mixed beds as presented in Figures 3A-B and regardless of substrate used which indicated the great ability of the indigenous mussel to climb upwards to the top layers not only to escape the mud influence but also to smother the alien mussel.

The mud accumulated on slate tiles deployed independently varied inversely with the density of individuals (Figure 4C). Moreover, mud content accumulated in the winter-spring experiment was much higher than in the autumn experiment, especially at low densities (Figures 2C, 4C). Mud content on the slate tiles used for the mixed co-habiting populations varied within a narrow range (Figure 4D).

The shell growth of mussels sampled within the independent series varied significantly with all fixed factors such as species, density and substrate (Figure 4E; Table 3B). Significance of the density interacting with species and substrate factors (Table 3B) was, at least partially, linked to mud content (Figures 4C, 4E). Growth of *M. galloprovincialis* on soft bottoms was highest when animals were deployed at the highest density and occupied most of the substrate area, which coincided with the lowest mud accumulation. Such benefit of a higher occupation area was not observed when animals were deployed on hard substrates away

from the mud effect (Figure 4E). The growth rate of the alien *X. securis* did not respond to different mud accumulation patterns but also increased when deployed on hard rocks (Figure 4E). As general pattern, shell growth was much higher for the indigenous *M. galloprovincialis* in the species comparison and on hard rocks for substrate comparison (Figure 4E). With regard to the mixed co-habiting experiment, the highest growth rates were also reported for *M. galloprovincialis* (species comparison) and hard rocks (substrate comparison) (Figure 4F; Table 3B). Differences encountered by the co-habiting balance (Table 3B) corresponded to a drop in growth rate of the alien *X. securis* when its abundance on the mixed bed was lower (15 / 5; Figure 4F).

Byssal attachment and shell compressive forces: autumn 2010

Both mytilids exhibited similar byssal attachment force in the independent experiments with the only exception of the lowest density deployed for the indigenous mussels whose force value increased significantly (Figure 5A). The latter value meant that the significance of the species factor would depend on density as illustrated by the interaction term (Table 4A). Habitat comparison for the alien *X. securis* showed no differences for byssal attachment force between sites, regardless of mussel density (Figure 5A; Appendix 1).

With regard to mixed mussel beds, the indigenous mussel showed greater attachment force regardless of the co-habiting balance (Figure 5B; Table 4A). Strength of attachment for the mixed population as a unit dropped with abundance of the indigenous mussel (Figure 5B; Table 4A).

The indigenous mussel *M. galloprovincialis* secreted 15% thicker and stronger shells than the alien *X. securis* deployed independently in San Simón and regardless of the density (Figures 5C, 5E; Tables 4B, 4C). Habitat comparison for the alien *X. securis* showed no significant differences for shell compressive force values despite the slightly thinner shells secreted by this species at the Sampaio site and regardless of density values (Figures 5C, 5E) (Appendix 1).

284 Magnitudes of differences in shell thickness and strength between mytilids were even higher for the mixed
285 beds (Figures 5D, 5F) although incidence of the species factor with higher values for the indigenous mussel
286 depended on the co-habiting density, i.e. equally balanced and more abundant rates for the latter mytilid
287 (see interaction terms; Tables 4B, 4C).

288

289 The shell compressive forces standardized by shell thickness showed no differences between species and
290 densities for the independent experiment (Figure 6A). Habitat comparison for the alien *X. securis* likewise
291 did not report any difference between sites and densities (Figure 6A).

292 By contrast, standardized compressive forces of the shell were significantly higher for the indigenous
293 mussel when deployed on mixed beds, especially for the equal (10 / 10 Mg / Xs) and favourable (15 / 5 Mg
294 / Xs) balance rates with values ranging between 156.4-157.1 and 89.9-117.1 N mm⁻¹ for the indigenous and
295 alien mussels, respectively (Figure 6B; Appendix 1 for statistical analysis).

296

297 **Byssal attachment force: winter-spring 2011**

298 The byssal attachment force of mytilids varied significantly with the factors species, density and substrate
299 (Figure 7A; Table 5). Strength of attachment was the highest in *M. galloprovincialis* for species
300 comparison and on hard rocks for comparison between substrates (Figure 7A). The significant effect of
301 density (as independent and interaction terms; Table 5) in the statistical model was a consequence of the
302 highest attachment strength recorded for *M. galloprovincialis* on soft bottoms with highest density (Figure
303 7A) whereas values for the alien mussel remained unchanged for different densities. The attachment force
304 of both mussel species deployed on hard rocks remained unchanged over densities although values were
305 higher for the indigenous mussel (17.7-17.9 N) as compared to the alien mussel (9.5-12.1 N) (Figure 7A).

306 The attachment force variability of mussels inhabiting mixed beds was significantly affected by species and
307 substrate but not by the co-habiting balance (Figure 7B; Table 5). The attachment values of the indigenous
308 mussel increased from a range of 10.6-16.6 N when deployed on muddy bottoms up to values of 17.4-20.5

N on hard rocks (Figure 7B). By contrast, the alien mussel attached with similar strength values regardless of substrate but constantly weaker when compared to the indigenous mussel (Figure 7B).

DISCUSSION

Successful invasions of bivalve species may be regulated by the competitive ability of the introduced species into the new habitat (Shinen and Morgan 2009; Caro et al. 2011). Nevertheless, co-existence of the two mytilids investigated here as well as prevention of competitive exclusion may occur as consequence of the relatively calm environment i.e. moderate disturbance levels for water hydrodynamics (Erlandsson et al. 2006). Deployment of both mytilids on space-limiting mussel beds revealed that the indigenous mussel *Mytilus galloprovincialis* was an extraordinary competitor and dominant species over the alien *Xenostrobus securis*. Firstly, the alien mussel showed much higher mortality rates within independent and mixed populations (Figures 2A, 2B). Secondly, the indigenous survivors exhibited greater growth (4-fold higher) when deployed independently regardless of density (Figure 2E) and more surprisingly, similar growth differences were reported in the mixed experiments, also regardless of population balance rates (Figure 2F). Reduced growth and high mortality rates represent two basic consequences of competition (Fréchette et al. 2005). Inter-specific competition within mixed beds significantly increased mortality of both mytilids although in a higher magnitude for the alien *X. securis* (autumn experiment). Despite high mortality of the independently deployed *X. securis* coincided with the highest mud accumulation (and lowest density), mortality within mixed beds cannot be accounted for by mud only but rather due to the physical competition for space. Such competition made possible that growth of the indigenous survivors was consistently higher for independent and mixed beds.

These responses of both mytilids highly depended on behavioural patterns. Most mussels deployed within independent experiments maintained their positions (primarily attached to the substrate) while few others (mainly of the indigenous species) were found to attach on shells of other individuals (pers. obs. JMFB). Interestingly, a clear gradient between distinct layers occupied by both mytilids was observed within mixed

335 beds (Figure 3). The alien *X. securis* was clearly smothered and restricted to the mud influence area
336 whereas *M. galloprovincialis* migrated and colonised the upper sites with better access to cleaner seawater.
337 Therefore, the native *M. galloprovincialis* interacted with the alien *X. securis* primarily through physical
338 interference competition (see also Frchette et al. 1992; Alunno-Bruscia et al. 2001) because of its higher
339 ability to move and occupy more advantageous positions outside any mud influence. Other surveys in
340 which *M. galloprovincialis* was an invader also illustrated such potential for aggregation and restriction the
341 mobility of other species e.g. *Mytilus californianus* (Shinen and Morgan 2009). In earlier studies, Paine and
342 Levin (1981) showed how adult mussels can move short distances to establish a dynamic mussel bed
343 structure with constant rearrangement of individuals, which led to significant changes in mortality
344 (Schneider et al. 2005). Consequently, *M. galloprovincialis* as epibenthic mytilid was more vulnerable to
345 the action of mud and escaped from the bottom layer aided by its extensible (and larger) byssus (Brazee
346 and Carrington 2006; Babarro and Carrington 2011) and mobility patterns (Shinen and Morgan 2009;
347 present study). In one hand, mud accumulation may exert a great influence on the competitive dynamics
348 between mytilids (Zardi et al. 2008; Rius and McQuaid 2006) and this is clearly reflected in the higher
349 mortality rates of *M. galloprovincialis* after the winter-spring experiment with regard to autumn most likely
350 linked to higher mud accumulation on experimental substrates (Figures 4C, 2C). On the other hand, such
351 ability of the indigenous mussel to migrate helped by its byssus features would represent a great advantage
352 especially in calmer waters of the present survey in which the hydrodynamic load suffered on top of the
353 mussel patches would not be excessive (Babarro and Carrington 2011).

354 With regard to byssus secretion, the native mussel possesses larger and much thicker (and stronger)
355 filaments than the alien mussel (Babarro and Lassudrie 2011) and this would permit such performance on
356 mixed mussel beds. Shorter byssus would oblige the alien mussel to be attached near the bottom where the
357 mud influence is greater and could occasionally block its valve gaping and thus interfere with particle
358 acquisition (Cheung and Shin (2005) and gas exchange. The latter scenario may include anoxic events with
359 negative consequences for survival. In case the amount of mud becomes significant, the radial byssus
360 disposition adopted by *M. galloprovincialis* (pers. obs. JMFB; see also Brazee and Carrington 2006) and its

larger foot organ (Babarro and Lassudrie 2011) may be crucial to partially remove any accumulated mud for survival purposes (see Figure 2A and 2C for zero mortality of the indigenous mussel at lower density linked to much lower mud accumulation). By contrast, the alien mussel has shown great ability to secrete huge amount of extremely thin byssus filaments (up to thousand; Babarro and Lassudrie 2011) which may favour better attachment on soft bottoms through many anchorage points.

As a general pattern, *Mytilus galloprovincialis* secreted thicker and stronger shells as well as byssus filaments especially within mixed experiments (Figures 5A-F). Better access to natural resources by being at the top of mussel beds and other species-specific features like greater filtration capacity (unpublished results) would permit to allocate more energy to these protective structures, providing better arguments for the indigenous mussel to withstand biotic and abiotic stress and show competitive dominance. Surprisingly, standardized shell compressive force (by shell thickness) showed no differences between species for the independent tests but were significantly higher for the indigenous mussels on mixed mussel beds which indicated that shell thickness alone does not explain strength differences (i.e. energy allocation patterns from available resources). Veiga et al. (2011) observed that *M. galloprovincialis* is greatly consumed by *C. maenas* because of its shorter handling and breaking time values as compared to *X. securis* which in turn might facilitate the invasion of the alien. Our results do not support such hypothesis although other factors like shell morphology especially on the ventral side and umbones curves for predator's access (Veiga et al. 2011) could have played a role. Veiga and co-workers carried out their survey in controlled-laboratory conditions and results may vary significantly in the field where mussels form dense conglomerates firmly attached to the substratum and other congeners with less space available for predator attack. Differences between laboratory and field results on other related eco-physiological responses such as attachment strength of both mytilids were recently highlighted (Babarro and Lassudrie 2011) based on the relatively short and long-term exposure of the mussels, respectively.

Performance of the alien mussel at two very different sites showed that mortality was consistently lower at the mouth of the river although growth rate of survivors was observed to decrease here as compared to San Simón (Figure 2A, 2E). By contrast, no differences were obtained for the byssal attachment and shell compressive forces despite slightly thinner shells obtained in the mouth of the river samples which represent a rather constant energy investment in protective tissues regardless of environment. The alien *X. securis* established densely aggregated assemblages at the river site and most likely benefitted by the lower presence of predators in this highly variable habitat (Babarro and Lassudrie 2011) and by the lower mud content. On the other hand, the alien mytilid would have allocated more energy to shell growth when deployed in the inner Ría site (SS) because of the higher availability of resources in terms of total seston and specially other particulate material fraction of marine origin (Babarro and Carrington 2011).

Competition patterns between species can vary over space and time and consequently, dominance features of one species over the other cannot be fixed (Rius and McQuaid 2006). When mussel responses were extended to another season and new substrate, the differences between species were even larger which ensured *M. galloprovincialis* as the dominant species regardless of any population balance rate and substrate. Surprisingly, despite its infaunal lifestyle, the alien *X. securis* was also able to extract a clear benefit (in terms of survival and growth), from the absence of mud on slate tiles which highlights the negative impact of mud accumulation on population dynamics.

Although theory predicts that a successful invader must have some advantageous features over indigenous species, at least over particular time or space scales (Shea and Chesson 2002), the alien mussel *X. securis* did not perform better than the native *M. galloprovincialis* in any parameter tested for different seasons and substrates. Nevertheless, aspects like fecundity, re-colonisation rates, early recruitment, good dispersal ability and large genetic variations (Erlandsson et al. 2006) may help to complete the actual invasive potential towards other areas. Given the fact that the distribution of mytilids along the sheltered waters of the inner Ría coastline does not follow any clear vertical segregation, factors like tidal movements, salinity and predation pressure would play a significant role for the expansion of the alien species in the near

future. The much lower biotic pressure and extreme salinity variation at the mouth of the river would create optimal conditions for the great prevalence of the alien, outside the native mussel influence area. The larval dispersal of the alien mytilid might potentially reach other areas of the Ría according to the currents regime persistent that exchange surface waters between the inner and outer areas (Álvarez Salgado et al. 2000), even though eggs of the alien might be successfully fertilised in salinities within the range of 8-17.5 ppt (Santacilara et al. 2007). If larval dispersal patterns of the alien mytilid expand far from the highly variable inner Ría, *X. securis* would suffer physical interference by the indigenous mussel even at higher magnitudes than shown here. The displacement of the native species will not take place just by aggression of the alien *X. securis* but rather as a consequence of its worse performance on a large-scale mud influence and extreme salinity exposure that would limit the performance of the indigenous mussel.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank E. Silva Caride for technical assistance in the field and laboratory. This study was funded by the project AGL2010-16464 (Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, Spanish Government). We thank valuable comments of X.A. Álvarez Salgado on specific aspects of the estuarine hydrodynamics of an early version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Álvarez Salgado XA, Gago J, Míguez BM, Gilcoto M, Pérez FF (2000) Surface waters of the NW Iberian Margin: upwelling on the shelf versus outwelling of upwelled waters. *Estuar Coast Shelf S* 51:821–837
- Alunno-Bruscia M, Bourget E, Fréchette M (2001) Shell allometry and length-mass-density relationship for *Mytilus edulis* in a experimental food-regulated situation. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 219:177–188

437 Babarro JMF, Carrington E (2011) Byssus secretion of *Mytilus galloprovincialis*: effect of site at macro-
438 and micro-geographical scales within Ría de Vigo (NW Spain). *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 435:125–140

439 Babarro JMF, Lassudrie M (2011) Ecophysiological responses of invasive and indigenous mytilids in the
440 Ría de Vigo (NW Spain). *Aquat Living Resour* 24:303–315

441 Babarro JMF, Fernández Reiriz MJ (2010) Secretion of byssal threads in *Mytilus galloprovincialis*:
442 quantitative and qualitative values after spawning stress. *J Comp Physiol B* 180:95–104

443 Barbieri M, Maltagliati F, Di Giuseppe G, Cossu P, Lardicci C, Castelli A (2011) New records of the
444 pygmy mussel *Xenostrobus securis* (Bivalvia: Mytilidae) in brackish-water biotopes of the western
445 Mediterranean provide evidence of its invasive potential. *Marine Biodiversity Records* 4:e48 (4
446 pages) doi:10.1017 / S175526721100042X

447 Bell EC, Gosline JM (1997) Strategies for life in flow: tenacity, morphometry, and probability of
448 dislodgement of two *Mytilus* species. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 159:197–208

449 Bownes SJ, McQuaid CD (2010) Mechanisms of habitat segregation between an invasive (*Mytilus*
450 *galloprovincialis*) and an indigenous (*Perna perna*) mussel: adult growth and mortality. *Mar Biol*
451 157:1799–1810

452 Branch GM, Steffani CN (2004) Can we predict the effects of alien species? A case-history of the
453 invasion of South Africa by *Mytilus galloprovincialis* (Lamarck). *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 300:189–215

454 Brazee SL, Carrington E (2006) Interspecific comparison of the mechanical properties of mussel byssus.
455 *Biol Bull* 211:263–274

456 Caro AU, Guíñez R, Ortiz V, Castilla JC (2011) Competition between a native mussel and a non-
457 indigenous invader for primary space on intertidal rocky shores in Chile. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 428:177–
458 185

459 Castilla JC, Guíñez R, Caro AU, Ortiz V (2004) Invasion of a rocky intertidal shore by the tunicate *Pyura*
460 *praeputialis* in the Bay of Antofagasta, Chile. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 101:8517–8524

461 Cheung SG, Shin PKS (2005) Size effects of suspended particles on gill damage in green-lipped mussel
462 *Perna viridis*. *Mar Pollut Bull* 51:801–110

463 Crooks JA, Khim HS (1999) Architectural vs. biological effects of a habitat-altering, exotic mussel,
464 *Musculista senhousia*. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 240:53–75

465 Darrigran G (2002) Potential impact of filter-feeding invaders on temperate inland freshwater
466 environments. Biol Invasions 4:145–156

467 Dutton JM, Hofmann GE (2008) Spatial and temporal variation in distribution and protein ubiquitination
468 for *Mytilus* congeners in the California hybrid zone. Mar Biol 154:1067–1075

469 Ehrlich PR (1989) Attributes of invaders and the invading process. In: Drake JA, Mooney HA, di Castri F,
470 Groves RH, Kruger FJ, Rejmanek M, Williamson M (eds) Biological invasions: a global perspective.
471 Wiley, Chichester, pp 315–328

472 Erlandsson J, Pal P, McQuaid CD (2006) Re-colonisation rate differs between co-existing indigenous and
473 invasive intertidal mussels following major disturbance. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 320:169–176

474 Fréchette M, Aitken AE, Pagé L (1992) Interdependence of food and space limitation of a benthic
475 suspension feeder: consequences for self-thinning relationships. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 83:55–62

476 Fréchette M, Alunno-Bruscia M, Dumais JF, Sirois R, Daigle G (2005) Incompleteness and statistical
477 uncertainty in competition / stocking experiments. Aquaculture 246:209–225

478 Fridley JD, Stachowicz JJ, Naeem S, Sax DF and others (2007) The invasion paradox: reconciling pattern
479 and process in species invasions. Ecology 88:3–17

480 Garci ME, Trigo JE, Pascual S, González AF, Rocha F, Guerra A (2007) *Xenostrobus securis* (Lamarck,
481 1819) (Mollusca: Bivalvia): first report of an introduced species in Galician waters. Aquac Int 15:19–
482 24

483 Gestoso I, Olabarriá C, Arenas F (2012) The invasive mussel *Xenostrobus securis* along the Galician Rias
484 Baixas (NW Spain): status of invasion. Cah Biol Mar 53:391–396

485 Grosholz E (2002) Ecological and evolutionary consequences of coastal invasions. Trends Ecol Evol
486 17:22–27

487 Kimura T, Masaaki T, Yasuhiro S (1999) *Limnoperna fortunei kikuchii* Habe, 1981 (Bivalvia: Mytilidae)
488 is a synonym of *Xenostrobus securis* (Lamarck, 1918): introduction into Japan from Australia and / or
489 New Zealand. Jpn J Malacol 58:101–117

490 Labarta U, Fernández-Reiriz MJ, Pérez-Camacho A, Pérez Corbacho E (2004) Bateeiros, mar, mejillón.
491 Una perspectiva bioeconómica. CIEF. Fundación Caixagalicia, Santiago de Compostela, ISBN 84-
492 95491-69-9

493 Nicastro KR, Zardi GI, Mcquaid CD (2010) Differential reproductive investment, attachment strength
494 and mortality of invasive and indigenous mussels across heterogeneous environments. Biol Invasions
495 12:2165–2177

496 Paine RT, Levin SA (1981) Intertidal landscapes: disturbance and the dynamic of pattern. Ecol Monogr
497 51:145–178

498 Pascual S, Villaba A, Abollo E, Garci M, González AF, Nombela M, Posada D, Guerra A (2010) The
499 mussel *Xenostrobus securis*: a well-established alien invader in the Ria de Vigo (Spain, NE Atlantic).
500 Biol Invasions 12:2091–2103

501 Pfeiffer J, Voeks RA (2008) Biological invasions and biocultural diversity: linking ecological and cultural
502 systems. Environ Conserv 35(4):1-13. Doi:10.1017 / S0376892908005146

503 Rius M, McQuaid CD (2006) Wave action and competitive interaction between the invasive mussel
504 *Mytilus galloprovincialis* and the indigenous *Perna perna* in South Africa. Mar Biol 150(1):69–78

505 Rius M, McQuaid CD (2009) Facilitation and competition between invasive and indigenous mussels over
506 a gradient of physical stress. Basic Appl Ecol 10:607–613

507 Sabelli B, Speranza S (1994) Rinvenimento di *Xenostrobus* sp. (Bivalvia, Mytilidae) nella laguna di
508 Venecia. Bull Malacol 29:311–318

509 Sanjuan A, Zapata C, Alvarez G (1997) Genetic differentiation in *Mytilus galloprovincialis* Lmk.
510 throughout the world. Ophelia 47:13–31

511 Santaclara FJ, Espiñeira M, Vieites JM (2007) Molecular detection of *Xenostrobus securis* and *Mytilus*
512 *galloprovincialis* larvae in Galician coast (Spain). Mar Biotechnol 9:722–732

513 Sará G, Romano C, Widdows J, Staff FJ (2008) Effect of salinity and temperature on feeding physiology
514 and scope for growth of an invasive species (*Brachidontes pharaonis* –Mollusca: Bivalvia) within the
515 Mediterranean sea. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 363:130–136

516 Schneider KR, Wetthey DS, Helmuth BST, Hilbish TJ (2005) Implications of movement behaviour on
517 mussels dislodgement: exogenous selection in a *Mytilus* spp. hybrid zone. Mar Biol 146:333–343

518 Shea K, Chesson P (2002) Community ecology theory as a framework for biological invasions. Trends
519 Ecol Evol 17:170–176

520 Shinen JS, Morgan SG (2009) Mechanisms of invasion resistance: competition among inertial mussels
521 promotes establishment of invasive species and displacement of native species. Mar Ecol Prog Ser
522 383:187–197

523 Steffani CN, Branch GM (2005) Mechanisms and consequences of competition between an alien mussel,
524 *Mytilus galloprovincialis*, and an indigenous limpet, *Scutellastra argenvillei*. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol
525 317:127–142

526 Streftaris N, Zenetos A (2006) Alien Marine Species in the Mediterranean -the 100 ‘Worst Invasives’ and
527 their Impact. Medit. Mar. Sci, 7 / 1:87–118

528 Veiga P, Rubal M, Arenas F, Incera M, Olabarria C, Sousa-Pinto I (2011) Does *Cornus maenas*
529 facilitate the invasion of *Xenostrobus securis*? J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 406:14–20

530 Vermeij GJ (1996) An agenda for invasion biology. Biol Conserv 78:3–9

531 Wilson BR (1968) Survival and reproduction of the mussel *Xenostrobus securis* (Lam.) (Mollusca-
532 Bivalvia-Mytilidae) in a Western Australian estuary. Part I. Salinity tolerance. J Nat Hist 2:307–328

533 Wilson BR (1969) Survival and reproduction of the mussel *Xenostrobus securis* (Lam.) (Mollusca–Bivalvia–
534 Mytilidae) in a Western Australian estuary. Part II. Reproduction, growth and longevity. J Nat Hist
535 3:93–120

536 Young GA (1985) Byssus-thread formation by the mussel *Mytilus edulis*: effects of environmental factors.
537 Mar Ecol Prog Ser 24:261–271

Zardi GI, Nicastro KR, McQuaid CD, Erlandsson J (2008) Sand and wave induced mortality in invasive (*Mytilus galloprovincialis*) and indigenous (*Perna perna*) mussels. Mar Biol 153:853–858

Zenetos A, Gofas S, Russo G, Templado J (2004) CIESM atlas of exotic species in the Mediterranean. In: Briand F (ed) Molluscs. Vol 3. CIESM Publishers, Monaco, 376 pp

Table 1. Experimental design (number of mussels per treatment) followed to study competition patterns between both mytilids *Mytilus galloprovincialis* and *Xenostrobus securis*.
Slate tile unit: 100 cm²

A. San Simón (SS)	SS 1	SS 2	SS 3	SS 4	SS 5	SS 6	SS 7	SS 8	SS 9
<i>Mytilus galloprovincialis</i> (number)	5	10	20	---	---	---	5	10	15
<i>Xenostrobus securis</i> (number)	---	---	---	5	10	20	15	10	5
B. Sampaio (SP)	SP 1	SP 2	SP 3						
<i>Mytilus galloprovincialis</i> (number)	---	---	---						
<i>Xenostrobus securis</i> (number)	5	10	20						

564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575

Table 2. Two-way ANOVA of the mean mortality and shell length growth rates of the mussels as a function of species (fixed: sp *M. galloprovincialis* and *X. securis*) and density (fixed: n 5, 10, 20 for independent experiment or 5 / 15, 10 / 10 and 15 / 5 Mg / Xs for mixed co-habiting experiments). Autumn 2010.

A. Mortality (%)					
Independent experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	sp	1	27.2321	118.4752	<0.001
	n	2	3.1866	13.8635	<0.001
	sp x n	2	2.0377	8.8652	<0.01
	Error	12	0.2299		
Co-habiting experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	co-habiting (n)	2	2.6106	10.9013	<0.01
	sp	1	5.0469	21.0747	<0.001
	co-habiting (n) x sp	2	0.4480	1.8708	0.196
	Error	12	0.2395		
B. Shell growth ($\mu\text{m day}^{-1}$)					
Independent experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	sp	1	9.1784	89.5570	<0.001
	n	2	0.3581	3.4950	0.064
	sp x n	2	0.0166	0.1620	0.853
	Error	11	0.1025		
Co-habiting experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	co-habiting (n)	2	0.7550	3.0352	0.089
	sp	1	10.7308	43.1368	<0.001
	co-habiting (n) x sp	2	0.2344	0.9422	0.419
	Error	11	0.2488		

Table 3. Three-way ANOVA of the mean mortality and shell length growth rate of the mussels as a function of species (fixed: sp *M. galloprovincialis* and *X. securis*), density (fixed: n 5, 10, 20 for independent experiment or 5 / 15, 10 / 10 and 15 / 5 Mg / Xs for mixed co-habiting experiments) and substrate (fixed: su mud and hard rock). Winter-spring 2011

	A. Mortality (%)					B. Shell growth ($\mu\text{m day}^{-1}$)				
	Factor	df	MS	F	p	Factor	df	MS	F	p
Independent experiment	sp	1	12.1961	5.9192	<0.05	sp	1	7.9929	256.2024	<0.001
	n	2	5.1036	2.4769	0.105	n	2	0.2302	7.3808	<0.01
	su	1	21.7075	10.5353	<0.01	su	1	2.4127	77.3321	<0.001
	sp x n	2	0.9617	0.4667	0.633	sp x n	2	0.3427	10.9800	<0.001
	sp x su	1	0.0003	0.0001	0.991	sp x su	1	0.0125	0.4014	0.533
	n x su	2	2.4615	1.1947	0.320	n x su	2	0.4722	15.1342	<0.001
	sp x n x su	2	1.4833	0.7199	0.497	sp x n x su	2	0.1701	5.4510	<0.05
	Error	24	2.0605			Error	24	0.0312		
Co-habiting experiment	sp	1	3.153	12.2095	<0.01	sp	1	21.6943	308.5390	<0.001
	Co-habiting (n)	2	0.9796	3.3082	0.054	Co-habiting (n)	2	0.3415	4.8570	<0.05
	su	1	51.9631	175.4904	<0.001	su	1	5.1268	72.9140	<0.001
	sp x n	2	0.4256	1.4374	0.257	sp x n	2	0.2537	3.6080	<0.05
	sp x su	1	0.1299	0.4387	0.514	sp x su	1	0.2373	3.3750	0.079
	n x su	2	4.1539	14.0286	<0.001	n x su	2	0.0503	0.7150	0.499
	sp x n x su	2	4.7260	15.9608	<0.001	sp x n x su	2	0.0196	0.2790	0.759
	Error	24	0.2961			Error	24	0.0703		

Table 4. Two-way ANOVA of the byssal attachment force, shell thickness and shell compressive force of the mussels as a function of species (fixed: sp *M. galloprovincialis* and *X. securis*) and density (fixed: n 5, 10, 20 for independent experiment or 5 / 15, 10 / 10 and 15 / 5 Mg / Xs for mixed co-habiting experiments). Autumn 2010

A. Byssal attachment (N)					
Independent experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	sp	1	0.8752	6.3040	<0.05
	n	2	0.1023	0.7370	0.483
	sp x n	2	0.7389	5.3220	<0.01
	Error	59	0.1388		
Co-habiting experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	co-habiting (n)	2	0.6177	3.5150	<0.05
	sp	1	7.1651	40.6760	<0.001
	co-habiting (n) x sp	2	0.4521	2.5720	0.084
	Error	67	0.1758		
B. Shell thickness (mm)					
Independent experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	sp	1	0.1888	5.7386	<0.05
	n	2	0.0009	0.0267	0.974
	sp x n	2	0.0068	0.2062	0.815
	Error	22	0.0329		
Co-habiting experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	co-habiting (n)	2	0.0068	0.2746	0.763
	sp	1	0.1097	4.4039	<0.05
	co-habiting (n) x sp	2	0.1515	6.0813	<0.01
	Error	21	0.0249		
C. Shell compressive force (N)					
Independent experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	sp	1	0.3998	4.4004	<0.05
	n	2	0.0125	0.1378	0.872
	sp x n	2	0.0217	0.2391	0.789
	Error	21	0.0909		
Co-habiting experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	co-habiting (n)	2	0.0349	0.3150	0.733
	sp	1	0.9888	8.9307	<0.01
	co-habiting (n) x sp	2	0.7095	6.4083	<0.01
	Error	21	0.1107		

588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601

Table 5. Three-way ANOVA of the byssal attachment force established by the mussels as a function of species (fixed: sp *M. galloprovincialis* and *X. securis*), density (fixed: n 5, 10, 20 for independent experiment or 5 / 15, 10 / 10 and 15 / 5 Mg / Xs for mixed co-habiting experiments) and substrate (fixed: su mud and hard rock). Winter-spring 2011

Byssal attachment (N)					
Independent experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	sp	1	3.2038	20.7431	<0.001
	n	2	0.6123	3.9643	<0.05
	su	1	5.1931	33.6220	<0.001
	sp x n	2	0.6993	4.5282	<0.05
	sp x su	1	0.5245	3.3961	0.068
	n x su	2	0.1882	1.2194	0.300
	sp x n x su	2	1.2558	8.1312	<0.001
	Error	103	0.1545		
Co-habiting experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	sp	1	8.4211	43.2712	<0.001
	Co-habiting (n)	2	0.0181	0.0931	0.911
	su	1	2.0512	10.5407	<0.01
	sp x n	2	0.4160	2.1372	0.123
	sp x su	1	0.5774	2.9670	0.088
	n x su	2	0.5154	2.6482	0.076
	sp x n x su	2	0.2833	1.4564	0.238
	Error	103	0.1946		

Legend of Figures

Figure 1. Experimental sites at the inner Ría de Vigo (NW Spain). San Simón (SS) and Sampaio (SP) represent the inner sheltered site and the mouth of River Oitavén-Verdugo flowing into the Ría, respectively.

Figure 2. Autumn. Mean mortality rates (%), mud content (g) and shell length growth rate ($\mu\text{m day}^{-1}$) values of the mussels deployed in independent (A,C,E) and mixed co-habiting (B,D,F) beds as function of density and population balance at San Simón. Values obtained in the independent tests with the alien *Xenostrobus securis* deployed at Sampaio are also shown for site comparison (A,C,E). Numbers 5 / 15, 10 / 10 and 15 / 5 refer to the balance rates between both mytilids *Mytilus galloprovincialis* / *Xenostrobus securis* in the mixed mussel beds at San Simón. nd: not detected.

Figure 3. Autumn. Mussel bed disposition observed at the end of the experimental time illustrating the two layers differentiation after interaction of mytilids. The indigenous *Mytilus galloprovincialis* colonised top layers of the mixed beds smothering the alien *Xenostrobus securis* underneath and restricting the latter species in the mud influence layer (A) or simply colonising top layers on hard rocks (B).

Figure 4. Winter-spring. Mean mortality rates (%), mud content (g) and shell length growth rate ($\mu\text{m day}^{-1}$) values of the mussels deployed in independent (A,C,E) and mixed co-habiting (B,D,F) beds as function of density, population balance and type of substrate. For other specificities, see legend of Figure 2.

Figure 5. Autumn. Byssal attachment force (N), shell thickness (mm) and shell compressive force (N) values of the mussels deployed in independent (A,C,E) and mixed co-habiting (B,D,F) mussel beds as function of density and population balance at San Simón. Values obtained in the independent tests with the alien *Xenostrobus securis* deployed at Sampaio are also shown for site comparison (A,C,E). For other specificities, see legend of Figure 2.

Figure 6. Autumn. Standardized shell compressive force (N mm^{-1}) values of the mussels deployed in independent (A) and mixed co-habiting (B) mussel beds as function of density and population balance at San Simón. Values obtained in the independent tests with the alien *Xenostrobus securis* deployed at Sampaio are also shown for site comparison (A). For other specificities, see legend of Figure 2.

Figure 7. Winter-spring. Byssal attachment force (N) of the mussels deployed in independent (A) and mixed co-habiting (B) mussel beds as a function of density, population balance and type of substrate.

638
639
640

641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665

Figure 1

666

A

B

667
668

C

D

669
670
671

E

F

672
673
674
675

Figure 2

676
677
678

679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716

A

B

Figure 3

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

Figure 4

726

727
728

729
730

731
732
733
734

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7

Appendix 1.

Two-way ANOVA of the mean mortality, shell length growth, byssal attachment, shell thickness and shell compressive force of the mussel *Xenostrobus securis* as a function of site (fixed: San Simón and Sampaio) and density (fixed: n 5, 10, 20) for the independent experiments. Standardized shell compressive force variability was analysed as a function of species (fixed: *M. galloprovincialis* and *X. securis*) and co-habiting number (fixed: 5/15, 10/10 and 15/5 for Mg/Xs) for the mixed experiments. Autumn 2010

Mortality (%)					
Independent experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	site	1	0.2395	9.2261	<0.05
	n	2	0.1567	6.0366	<0.05
	site x n	2	0.0680	2.6211	0.1136
	Error	12	0.0259		
Shell growth (µm day ⁻¹)					
Independent experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	site	1	3.0396	50.7355	<0.001
	n	2	0.0983	1.6408	0.2345
	site x n	2	0.1886	3.1490	0.0795
	Error	12	0.0599		
Byssal attachment (N)					
Independent experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	site	1	0.0006	0.0189	0.8910
	n	2	0.0864	2.8095	0.0673
	site x n	2	0.0069	0.2257	0.7892
	Error	67	0.0308		
Shell thickness (mm)					
Independent experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	site	1	0.1552	5.1994	<0.05
	n	2	0.0008	0.0268	0.9736
	site x n	2	0.0140	0.4695	0.6317
	Error	21	0.0299		
Shell compressive force (N)					
Independent experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	sp	1	0.0380	1.1628	0.2931
	n	2	0.0250	0.7649	0.4779
	sp x n	2	0.0152	0.4657	0.6340
	Error	21	0.0327		
Standardized shell compressive force (N mm ⁻¹)					
Co-habiting experiment	Factor	df	MS	F	p
	co-habiting (n)	2	0.0229	1.5332	0.2399
	sp	1	0.0905	6.0702	<0.05
	co-habiting (n) x sp	2	0.0352	2.3592	0.1191
	Error	21	0.0149		