



**QUEEN'S  
UNIVERSITY  
BELFAST**

## Comparative feeding rates of native and invasive ascidians

Hoxha, T., Crookes, S., Lejeusne, C., Dick, J. T. A., Chang, X., Bouchemousse, S., Cuthbert, R. N., & Maclsaac, H. J. (2018). Comparative feeding rates of native and invasive ascidians. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 135, 1067-1071. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.08.039>

**Published in:**  
Marine Pollution Bulletin

**Document Version:**  
Peer reviewed version

**Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:**  
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

### **Publisher rights**

© 2018 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>, which permits distribution and reproduction for noncommercial purposes, provided the author and source are cited.

### **General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### **Take down policy**

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact [openaccess@qub.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@qub.ac.uk).

1                    **Comparative feeding rates of native and invasive ascidians**

2  
3            Tedi Hoxha<sup>1\*</sup>, Steve Crookes<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Christophe Lejeune<sup>3</sup>, Jaimie T.A. Dick<sup>4</sup>, Xuexiu Chang<sup>5</sup>,  
4                    Sarah Bouchemousse<sup>3,6</sup>, Ross N. Cuthbert<sup>4</sup> and Hugh J. MacIsaac<sup>1,5</sup>

5  
6            <sup>1</sup> Great Lakes Institute for Environmental Research, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario,  
7                    N9B 3P4, Canada

8            <sup>2</sup> Biodiversity Institute of Ontario, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, N1G 2W1, Canada

9            <sup>3</sup> Sorbonne Université, CNRS, UMR 7144 AD2M, Station Biologique de Roscoff, Place Georges  
10                    Teissier, 29680 Roscoff, France

11            <sup>4</sup> Institute for Global Food Security, School of Biological Sciences, Queen's University Belfast,  
12                    Belfast, Northern Ireland, BT9 7BL, UK

13            <sup>5</sup> School of Ecology and Environmental Sciences, Yunnan University, Kunming 650091, China

14            <sup>6</sup> Department of Biology, University of Fribourg, Chemin du musée 10, 1700 Fribourg,  
15                    Switzerland

16  
17            \* Authors contributed equally

18  
19            **Keywords:** functional response, invasive species, relative impact, ascidians, nonindigenous  
20                    species, non-native species

21            **Correspondence:** hughm@uwindsor.ca, hughm@uwindsor.ca; ph. (+1)519 253-3000 ext. 3754,  
22                    Fax (+1) 519 971-3616

23

## 24 **Abstract**

25 Ascidians have a recent history of species introductions globally, often with strong ecological  
26 impacts. Comparisons of per capita effects of invaders and comparable natives are useful to  
27 assess such impacts. Here, we explore ingestion rates (IR) and clearance rates (CR) of *Ciona*  
28 *intestinalis* and *Ciona robusta*, co-occurring native and non-native ascidians, respectively, from  
29 Brittany, France. IR was positively related to food concentration, with the invader responding  
30 more strongly to increasing food concentration. CR also differed by species, with the invader  
31 demonstrating higher values. *C. robusta* exhibited a higher functional response (Type I) than did  
32 *C. intestinalis* (Type II). Relative impact measured using seasonal abundance and IR revealed  
33 that *C. robusta* has a much greater impact than *C. intestinalis* at all food concentrations tested,  
34 though the former has a constrained distribution which limits its regional impact. Nevertheless,  
35 when abundant, we expect *C. robusta* to exert a greater impact on algal foods.

36

## 37 **1. Introduction**

38 Aquatic invasive species (AIS) are increasingly common in both marine and freshwater  
39 habitats world-wide owing to a combination of intentional (e.g. stocking) and unintentional (e.g.  
40 hull fouling, ballast water) introductions (e.g. Ruiz et al. 2000; Ricciardi 2006). AIS are among  
41 the strongest stressors in many aquatic ecosystems (e.g. Clavero and Garcia-Berthou 2005; Allen  
42 et al. 2013; Arthington et al. 2016), with a subset of introduced species exerting strong ecological,  
43 health and/or economic costs.

44 Ascidians are primarily sessile organisms with a brief pelagic (lecithotrophic) larval stage.  
45 Numerous ascidian species have experienced an increase in global range linked to human-  
46 mediated spread and, in some cases, climate warming (e.g. Lambert 2001, 2007; Sorte et al.

47 2010; Bock et al. 2011; Zhan et al. 2015; Simkanin et al. 2016; Nydam et al. 2017). In total,  
48 Zhan et al. (2015) catalogued 80 species that were recognized as non-native in the habitats in  
49 which they were reported. In the Netherlands, non-native ascidians colonized during two major  
50 spates, one in 1974-1977, the other in 1991-2004 (Gittenberger 2007). The increase in the  
51 number of non-native ascidian species reported in the USA was low but relatively linear between  
52 1850 and 1950, thereafter increasing sharply on both Pacific and Atlantic coasts (Simkanin et al.  
53 2016).

54 On the English Channel coast of Brittany, France, non-native *Ciona robusta* (previously  
55 *Ciona intestinalis* type A) co-occurs with *C. intestinalis* (previously *C. intestinalis* type B)  
56 (Brunetti et al. 2015; Bouchemousse et al. 2016a). While the arrival date of *C. robusta* is not  
57 known, it is believed to have established since the turn of the 21st century (Bouchemousse et al.  
58 2016a). As the species occupy the same habitats and are filter feeders, they have the potential to  
59 compete for settling substrates or for food (Bouchemousse et al. 2017).

60 Human-mediated range enhancement of ascidians has been effected mainly by fouling on  
61 ships, transfer on equipment or as a fellow traveler on aquaculture stock, and by fishery or  
62 recreational boats, although there is a small likelihood of transfer in ballast water (see Zhan et al.  
63 2015). As introduced ascidians often adversely affect recipient communities, their spread is  
64 cause for concern (see Lambert 2009; Zhan et al. 2015).

65 Identifying which introduced species are likely to produce strong impacts is a daunting  
66 challenge owing to the varying nature of the species themselves, the nature of the ecosystems  
67 that they are introduced into, and a variety of context-dependencies (Kumschick et al. 2015).  
68 Recently, Dick et al. (2014) proposed analyzing comparative functional responses (FR) of  
69 introduced species (or those that might be introduced) versus those of comparable native taxa to

70 assess whether the former would have high impact. The functional response considers a species'  
71 *per capita* resource consumption as a function of resource availability, and Dick et al.'s (2014)  
72 study highlighted that invader FRs typically exceed those of native species. This approach was  
73 then extended by combining it with species abundance data to yield a total impact potential for  
74 the invader scaled to that of the native species (Dick et al. 2017a).

75 In this study, we explore the comparative feeding ecology of non-native *Ciona robusta*  
76 and native *C. intestinalis* to determine whether these taxa have similar feeding attributes and  
77 expected ecological effects, or whether the general pattern of invader > native that Dick et al.  
78 (2014) identified also holds for these very similar ascidians.

## 79 2. Methodology

### 80 2.1 Sampling procedure

81 *Ciona* individuals were collected by scraping from pontoons and pillars in Brest, France  
82 on 25<sup>th</sup> September, 2015 and acclimated in the animal husbandry lab (18°C) at the Roscoff  
83 Biological Station, France. *Ciona* cultures were maintained on *Isochrysis affinis galbana* algae  
84 (issued from the Roscoff Culture Collection (RCC) facility under the reference numbers  
85 RCC1349) at concentrations of 15-20 x10<sup>6</sup> cells/mL. Seven experimental food concentration  
86 treatments (1508, 3380, 5900, 12873, 29539, 51616, 133084 cells/mL) were determined using a  
87 Malassez cell counting chamber. Experimental *Ciona* individuals were housed in separate  
88 cylindrical tanks, each filled with 2 L seawater, totaling seven tanks. Six of the seven tanks  
89 contained *Ciona* individuals, with the remaining one containing only *Tisochrysis*, thereby  
90 serving as a control. Of the six experimental tanks, three contained a single *C. intestinalis*  
91 individual and food, while the other three had a single *C. robusta* individual and food. *Ciona*  
92 individuals were randomly selected and distinguished morphologically. This design was repeated

93 twice to produce six replicates for each ascidian species at each algal concentration, with the  
94 exception of the treatment with 12783 algal cells/mL, where time constraints only allowed for  
95 three replicates of each species.

## 96 2.2 Experimental setup

97 At the beginning of each trial, individuals were placed upright at the midpoint of each  
98 tank, while 10 mL of concentrated algae suspension was injected into the centre of the tank. The  
99 algal suspension was mixed using an air bubbler affixed with plasticine to the side of each tank.  
100 Feeding trials were run for 1 hr, after which algal cell counts were obtained using flow cytometry,  
101 focusing on cells 3.5-6  $\mu\text{m}$  in diameter (Bendif et al. 2013). Three replicate 1.5 mL samples were  
102 collected from the centre of each tank (2 cm below the surface) to assess algal concentration, and  
103 stored in 1.6 mL Eppendorf tubes containing 15  $\mu\text{L}$  of 25% glutaraldehyde at  $-80^\circ\text{C}$  for  
104 preservation. Cell densities were then quantified using a Cell Lab Quanta Flow Cytometer  
105 (Beckman Coulter, Inc.) at a calibrated flow rate of 30  $\mu\text{L min}^{-1}$ , and cell counts were converted  
106 to cells/mL. Final and initial algal concentrations in experimental tanks were compared with a  
107 correction for controls lacking animals. Following the experiment, the middle gut (from the  
108 stomach to the anus) of each individual was excised using 10% bleach-sterilized razor blades to  
109 ensure the mass of ingested food was excluded from subsequent body mass measurements.  
110 Individuals were then desiccated in an oven at  $65^\circ\text{C}$  to obtain total dry weight (g), which  
111 included a previously measured cup weight. Cup weight was subtracted from this value to obtain  
112 the dry weight of each individual.

## 113 2.3 Statistical analyses

114 The Ingestion Rate (IR) of each individual was measured using both pre- and post-  
115 experiment algal cell counts, adjusted for controls, as:

$$116 \quad IR = \frac{[(E_0 - E_t) - (C_0 - C_t)]}{t}$$

117 where  $E_0$  and  $E_t$  represent experimental algal cell concentrations at times 0 and  $t$ , respectively,  $C_0$   
 118 and  $C_t$  represent control algal cell concentrations at times 0 and  $t$ , and  $t$  is experimental duration  
 119 (1 hour).  $C_0 - C_t$  was included to adjust temporal changes in algal concentration due to algal  
 120 growth or sedimentation in controls. Pre- and post-experiment algal concentrations were also  
 121 used to determine the Clearance Rate (CR) of each individual as:

$$122 \quad CR = V \frac{[\ln(E_0 / E_t) - \ln(C_0 / C_t)]}{t}$$

123 where  $V$  represents the volume of suspension. As with IR, a correction factor was included in  
 124 CR to account for changes in control tanks where no animals were present (Coughlan 1969).

125 Four of six calculated IR and CR values for *C. intestinalis* at the highest algal  
 126 concentration (133084 cells/mL) were negative, possibly owing to a combination of sinking algal  
 127 cells and/or less active animal feeding. Consequently, we removed this algal density from  
 128 analysis for both species. Seven other negative values for IR and CR were also found for *C.*  
 129 *intestinalis* and subsequently discarded when performing analysis. The reason for this problem  
 130 is not clear, as we attempted to minimize disturbance and stress on animals prior to all feeding  
 131 trails. We conducted two three-way ANOVA tests with the factors species, animal mass, food  
 132 density, and their interactions to determine which factors affected IR and CR. Statistical analyses  
 133 were performed in R-3.5.0 (R Core Team 2018) and RStudio 1.1.447 (RStudio Team 2016).

134 Animal functional response to varying food concentration was modeled using the FRAIR  
 135 package in R-3.5.0 (Pritchard 2017). As food was not replaced after consumption, Rogers'  
 136 random predator equation was used to describe the type II functional response of *C. intestinalis*  
 137 (Barrios-O'Neill et al. 2014, Rogers 1972):

138 
$$N_e = N_0(1 - \exp(a(N_e h - T)))$$

139 where  $N_e$  is the number of food items consumed,  $N_0$  is the initial concentration of algal cells,  $a$  is  
140 attack rate,  $h$  is handling time, and  $T$  is experimental duration. As the ingestion rate of *C. robusta*  
141 generally increased linearly with increasing food concentration, a type I fit was applied to the  
142 consumption data (FRAIR; Pritchard 2017):

143 
$$N_e = N_0(aT)$$

144 These models were then non-parametrically bootstrapped (n = 2000) to generate 95% confidence  
145 intervals for the functional response curves.

146 Relative Impact Potential (RIP; Dick et al. 2017) was calculated for co-occurring  
147 ascidians using relative field abundance data from Brittany, France. For each instance in which  
148 the species co-occurred (130 in total; Bouchemousse et al., unpublished data, see Bouchemousse  
149 et al. (2017) for the sampling protocol) we obtained the ratio of relative abundance (A; measured  
150 as Ind./m<sup>2</sup>) of *C. robusta* to *C. intestinalis*. We then randomly drew (from between three and six  
151 measures per species) an IR for the invader and another for the native species. Relative Impact  
152 Potential (RIP) was then estimated as the product of a randomly drawn A (from 130 co-  
153 occurrence cases) and a randomly drawn IR ratio (invader IR divided by native IR) for that food  
154 concentration. Results were bootstrapped 10000 times incorporating different combinations of A  
155 and IR. Similar calculations were repeated for each food concentration. In Dick et al.'s (2017)  
156 original formulation of RIP, abundance was measured directly and utilized maximum feeding  
157 rate (1/h) from functional responses. Any combination of A and IR that yields a RIP>1 indicates  
158 a greater relative impact by the non-native species, while those <1 indicate greater impact by the  
159 native species. In this paper, we utilize individual IRs at different food concentrations to  
160 estimate feeding rather than maximum feeding rate.



161

162 **3. Results**

163 *C. robusta* individuals tended to be slightly larger than co-occurring *C. intestinalis* and  
164 also exhibited greater dispersion in dry mass (Fig. 1). However, mass was not a significant factor  
165 contributing to differences in ingestion rates ( $F_{1,51} = 0.07$ ,  $P = 0.7920$ ), although its effect on  
166 clearance rate was considerable ( $F_{1,51} = 8.76$ ,  $P = 0.0047$ ).

167 *C. robusta* had higher ingestion rates ( $F_{1,51} = 6.9$ ,  $P = 0.011$ ) and clearance rates ( $F_{1,51} =$   
168  $19.2$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ) than *C. intestinalis* (Fig. 2). Food concentration was a strong predictor of  
169 ingestion rates ( $F_{1,51} = 73.4$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), though it had no effect on clearance rate ( $F_{1,51} = 0.9$ ,  $P =$   
170  $0.353$ ). Ingestion rate was also affected by a species $\times$ food concentration interaction, with *C.*  
171 *robusta* increasing at a faster rate with increasing food level (Figs. 2, 3). A similar pattern was  
172 not apparent with species clearance rates ( $F_{1,51} = 2.1$ ,  $P = 0.154$ ). Ingestion rate ( $F_{1,51} = 6.7$ ,  $P =$   
173  $0.013$ ) and clearance rate ( $F_{1,51} = 4.5$ ,  $P = 0.038$ ) also exhibited a significant mass $\times$ food  
174 concentration interaction.

175 Functional responses of the two ascidian species differed substantially. The invader, *C.*  
176 *robusta*, exhibited a more profound increase in ingestion rate with increasing food level,  
177 consistent with a type I functional response (Fig. 3). The native species, *C. intestinalis*,  
178 displayed an asymptotic functional response to increasing food level, conforming to a type II  
179 curve. Modelling with the FRAIR package in R-3.5.0 allowed for the determination of feeding  
180 parameters for both species. Ingestion by *C. intestinalis* was best described using the Rogers'  
181 random predator equation for type II functional responses, resulting in an attack rate  $a = 0.124$  ( $P$   
182  $< 0.001$ ) and handling time  $h = 8.294 \times 10^{-5}$  ( $P < 0.001$ ). In contrast, *C. robusta* had a

183 substantially higher attack rate ( $a = 0.196$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ) and a negligible handling time,  
184 characteristic of type I functional responses.

185 Field abundance data in Brittany, France, where the species co-occur illustrate that *C.*  
186 *intestinalis* occurs more commonly than *C. robusta*. In over 361 quadrats studied, there were 188  
187 instances where only the former species was present, three cases where only *C. robusta* occurred,  
188 130 cases where species co-occurred, and 40 cases where neither species was found. When the  
189 species co-occurred, bootstrapped seasonal abundance data revealed dominance by the  
190 introduced species (mean ratio  $A$  of 1.31 of *C. robusta* to *C. intestinalis*). IR ratios ranged  
191 between 1.27 and 7.92 (mean 4.46), indicating higher feeding rates by *C. robusta*. RIP values  
192 (mean 5.77) indicate that *C. robusta* typically had a much greater relative impact. RIP values  
193 were generally higher at higher food concentrations, with mean bootstrapped values of 1.89, 7.10,  
194 1.61, 10.13, 6.62 and 7.25 across food concentrations of 1508, 3380, 5900, 12873, 29539 and  
195 51616 cells/mL, respectively. Most of *C. robusta*'s greater feeding impact was attributable to its  
196 higher IR, though higher abundance was also important.

197

#### 198 4. Discussion

199 Ascidians have experienced many biological invasions and concomitant range expansions  
200 in recent decades (e.g. Gittenberger 2007; Lambert 2007, 2009; Ruis et al. 2012; Ordóñez et al.  
201 2013; Zhan et al. 2015; Bullard and Carmen 2016; Simkanin et al. 2016; Nydam et al. 2017).  
202 The English Channel is no exception, with numerous reports of introduced ascidians including  
203 *Botrylloides violaceus*, *B. diegensis*, *Aplidium glabrum*, *Diplosoma listerianum*, *Molgula*  
204 *complanata*, *Corella eumyota*, *Perophora japonica*, *Styela clava*, *Didemnum vexillum*,  
205 *Asterocarpa humilis* and *Ciona robusta* established on both sides of the channel (Gittenberger

206 2007; Zhan et al. 2010; Minchin et al. 2013; Bishop et al. 2015). *C. robusta* was long confused  
207 with *C. intestinalis*, though they are genetically and morphologically distinct and seemingly  
208 reproductively isolated (Zhan et al. 2010; Sato et al. 2012; Brunetti et al. 2015; Bouchemousse et  
209 al. 2016a). As the species co-occur on both sides of the English Channel it is possible that they  
210 compete for settlement substrates, though Bouchemousse et al. (2017) reported highly variable  
211 settlement and suggested environmental variation modulated competition. It is also possible the  
212 species compete for food at times. Our study revealed significant feeding rate differences  
213 between the species, with introduced *C. robusta* exhibiting higher ingestion rates and clearance  
214 rates than native *C. intestinalis* (Fig. 2a,b). Differences in ingestion rate were more pronounced  
215 as food concentration increased, suggesting high food levels in nature could favor the introduced  
216 species.

217 Functional responses of *C. robusta* and *C. intestinalis* also differed, conforming to type I  
218 and II curves, respectively (Fig. 3). Type II curves and higher FR of the introduced species are  
219 consistent with an array of aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates, fishes and with plants (Dick et al.  
220 2017). The greater FR of *C. robusta* was largely responsible for its higher RIP scores. Thus,  
221 when the species co-occur, *C. robusta* should have a greater impact on algal foods than *C.*  
222 *intestinalis*. However, co-occurrence of the species in nature is less common (130 occurrences)  
223 than instances where *C. intestinalis* (188 cases) occurs alone, thus the regional impact of the  
224 invader will be muted by its more confined distribution. We expect that impact exerted by *C.*  
225 *robusta* would expand commensurate with the extension of its distribution.

226 Clearance rates have been well-studied in ascidians (see Jacobi et al. (2018) and  
227 references cited therein). The absence of an apparent asymptote in feeding rate in *C. robusta*  
228 (Fig. 3 dashed line) was surprising given the broad range of food concentrations provided to

229 study animals. However, Pascoe et al. (2007) observed that *C. intestinalis* exhibited a strong  
230 positive relationship between ingestion rate and food concentration up to  $10^6$  cells/mL of  
231 *Isochrysis galbana*. Armsworthy et al. (2001) also noted that IR increased linearly with food  
232 concentration in the ascidian *Halocynthia pyriformis*. Pascoe et al. (2007) also revealed that CR  
233 was maximal around  $5 \times 10^3$  cells/mL, whereas we did not observe a clear maximum for either  
234 species tested (Fig. 2b). Typically with filter-feeders, a maximum algal concentration is reached  
235 (i.e. Incipient Limiting Level) beyond which IR is constant and CR declines exponentially (e.g.  
236 Robbins 1983; Petersen and Riisgård 1992; Sigsgaard et al. 2003; Petersen 2007). At high  
237 suspended particulate load, a reduction in IR associated with satiation (Pascoe et al. 2007) could  
238 be active rejection (ie. squirting; Robbins 1984; Petersen 2007) or a reduction in lateral cilia beat  
239 frequency (Petersen 2007). It is important to note that we also did not observe a decline in CR at  
240 very low food levels, which some authors attributed to reduced cilia beating in the branchial  
241 basket (Petersen et al. 1999).

242 Our study had some unexpected IR, and hence CR, results. For example, from an initial  
243 39 total observations, a majority of IR and CR values for *C. intestinalis* at the highest food  
244 concentration were negative and thus removed. We likewise removed high food concentration  
245 feeding results for *C. robusta* even though this species was not plagued by this issue. A number  
246 of other studies have observed a reduction in clearance rate with increasing food concentration  
247 (Petersen and Riisgård 1992; Petersen et al. 1999). At high food concentrations, the gut reaches  
248 an intake threshold above which the clearance rate is reduced as a form of protection against gut  
249 saturation (see Petersen and Riisgård 1992; Petersen et al. 1999; Petersen 2007). Petersen (2007)  
250 recommended an acclimation period of 20-140 min prior to measuring clearance rates. While our  
251 experiment did not incorporate a formal adjustment period, we commenced experiments only

252 after animals appeared robust with seemingly normal feeding behaviour. Seven of the 39 trials  
253 conducted also yielded negative IR and CR results, though the problem was limited to *C.*  
254 *intestinalis* predominantly at the three lowest food concentrations. These cases were removed  
255 prior to statistical analysis, though the reason for the aberrant results remains unclear.

256       Clearly, comparative *per capita* studies of invasive versus native species, plus proxies for  
257 numerical responses such as abundance, can rapidly inform actual or potential ecological impacts  
258 of invasions (Dick et al. 2017a,b). Here, with our ascidian example, these methods are congruous  
259 with field patterns of invasions and ecological impact, including competition and species  
260 displacement. We encourage further development of these metrics across taxonomic and trophic  
261 groups, and incorporation of context-dependencies, such as temperature change with climate  
262 change (Dick et al. 2017b). This will allow invasion ecology to become truly predictive, with  
263 opportunities to focus limited resources on the most harmful actual and potential invaders.

264

## 265 **Acknowledgements**

266 This was supported by an NSERC undergraduate fellowship to TH, while HJM was supported by  
267 an NSERC Discovery grant and by a Canada Research Chair. We appreciate modeling  
268 assistance from Ryan Scott. We also thank the Centre de Ressources Biologiques Marines  
269 (CRBM) for algae culture and aquarium assistance, and the Service Mer & Observation (SMO)  
270 for diving and collection assistance, both of the Roscoff Biological Station, France. Jérôme  
271 Coudret, Thierry Comtet, and Dominique Marie (Roscoff Biological Station) were also of great  
272 help for technical and methodological assistance.

273

## 274 **References**

- 275 Allen JD, McIntyre PB, Smith SDP, Halpern BS, Boyer GL, Buchsbaum A, Burton GA,  
276 Campbell LM, Chadderton WL, Ciborowski JJH, Doran PJ, Eder T, Infante DM, Johnson LB,  
277 Joseph CA, Marino AL, Prusevich A, Read JG, Rose JB, Rutherford ES, Sowa SP, Steinman  
278 AD (2013) Joint analysis of stressors and ecosystem services to enhance restoration  
279 effectiveness. *Proc Natl Acad Sci (USA)* 110:372-377
- 280 Armsworthy SL, MacDonald BA, Ward JE (2001) Feeding activity, absorption efficiency and  
281 suspension feeding processes in the ascidian, *Holocynthia pyriformis* (Stolidobranchia:  
282 Ascidiacea): responses to variations in diet quantity and quality. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 260:41-  
283 69
- 284 Arthington AH, Dulvy NK, Gladstone W, Winfield IJ (2016) Fish conservation in freshwater and  
285 marine realms: status, threats and management. *Aquat Conserv: Mar Freshwat Ecosyst*  
286 26:838-857
- 287 Barrios-O'Neill D, Dick JTA, Emmerson MC, Ricciardi A, MacIsaac HJ, Alexander ME, Bovy  
288 HC (2014) Fortune favours the bold: a higher predator reduces the impact of a native but not  
289 an invasive intermediate predator. *J Anim Ecol* 83:693-701
- 290 Bendif EM, Probert I, Schroeder DC, de Vargas C (2013) On the description of *Tisochrysis lutea*  
291 gen. nov. sp. nov. and *Isochrysis nuda* sp. nov. in the Isochrysidales, and the transfer of  
292 *Dicrateria* to the Prymnesiales (Haptophyta). *J Appl Phycol* 25:1763-1776.
- 293 Bishop JDD, Wood CA, Yunnice ALE, Griffiths CA (2015) Unheralded arrivals: non-native  
294 sessile invertebrates in marinas on the English coast. *Aquat Invas* 10:249-264
- 295 Bock DG, Zhan A, Lejeune CL, MacIsaac HJ, Cristescu ME (2011) Looking at both sides of the  
296 invasion: patterns of colonization in the violet tunicate *Botrylloides violaceus*. *Mol Ecol*  
297 20:503–516

- 298 Bouchemousse, S (2015) Dynamique éco-évolutive de deux ascidies congénériques et  
299 interfertiles, l'une indigène et l'autre introduite, dans leur zone de sympatrie. Biodiversité.  
300 Université Pierre et Marie Curie - Paris VI.
- 301 Bouchemousse S, Lévêque L, Dubois G, Viard F (2016a) Co-occurrence and reproductive  
302 synchrony does not ensure hybridization between an alien tunicate and its infertile native  
303 congener. *Evol Ecol* 30:69-87
- 304 Bouchemousse S, Bishop JDD, Viard F (2016b) Contrasting global genetic patterns in two  
305 biologically similar, widespread and invasive *Ciona* species (Tunicata, Ascidiacea). *Sci*  
306 *Reports* 6:24875. DOI:10.1038/srep24875
- 307 Bouchemousse S, Lévêque L, Viard F (2017) Do settlement dynamics influence competitive  
308 interactions between an alien tunicate and its native congener? *Ecol Evolut* 7:200-213
- 309 Brunetti R, Gissi C, Pennati R, Caicci F, Gasparini F, Manni L (2015) Morphological evidence  
310 that the molecularly determined *Ciona intestinalis* type A and type B are different species:  
311 *Ciona robusta* and *Ciona intestinalis*. *J Zool Syst Evol Res* 53:186-193
- 312 Bullard SG, Carman MR (2016) Introduction to the proceedings of the 5th International Invasive  
313 Sea Squirt Conference 7:1-3
- 314 Clavero M, García-Berthou E (2005) Invasive species are a leading cause of animal extinctions.  
315 *Trends Ecol Evol* 20:110
- 316 Dick JTA, Alexander ME, Jeschke JM, Ricciardi A, MacIsaac HJ, Robinson TB, Kumschick S,  
317 Weyl OLF, Dunn AM, Hatcher MJ, Paterson RA, Farnsworth KD, Richardson DM (2014)  
318 Advancing impact prediction and hypothesis testing in invasion ecology using a comparative  
319 functional response approach. *Biol Invas* 16:735–753

- 320 Dick JTA, Lavery C, Lennon JJ, Barrios-O'Neill D, Mensink P, Britton JR, Medoc V, Boets P,  
321 Alexander ME, Taylor NG, Dunn AM, Hatcher MJ, Rosewarne PJ, Crookes S, MacIsaac  
322 HJ, Xu M, Ricciardi A, Wasserman RJ, Ellender BR, Lucy FE, Banks PB, Dodd JA,  
323 MacNeil C, Penk MR, Aldridge DC, Caffrey JM (2017a) Invader Relative Impact Potential:  
324 a new metric to understand and predict the ecological impacts of existing, emerging and  
325 future invasive alien species. *J Applied Ecol* 54: 1259-1267
- 326 Dick JTA, Alexander ME, Ricciardi A, Lavery C, Downey PO, Xu M, Jeschke JM, Saul W-C,  
327 Hill MP, Wasserman RJ, Barrios-O'Neill D, Weyl OLF, Shaw RH (2017b) Functional  
328 responses can unify invasion ecology. *Biol Invas* 19:1667-1672
- 329 Gittenberger A (2007) Recent population expansions of non-native ascidians in the Netherlands.  
330 *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 342:122-126
- 331 Jacobi Y, Yahel G, Shenkar N (2018) Efficient filtration of micron and submicron particles by  
332 ascidians from oligotrophic waters. *Limn Oceanogr* 63:S267-S279
- 333 Jeschke JN, Kopp M, Tollrian R (2004) Consumer-food systems: why type I functional  
334 responses are exclusive to filter feeders. *Biol Rev* 79:337-349
- 335 Kumschick S, Gaertner M, Vilà M, Essl F, Jeschke JM, Pyšek P, Bacher S, Blackburn TM, Dick  
336 JTA, Evans T, Hulme PE, Kühn I, Mrugała A, Pergl J, Rabitsch W, Ricciardi A, Richardson  
337 DM, Sendek A, Winter, M (2015) Ecological impacts of alien species: quantification, scope,  
338 caveats and recommendations. *Bioscience* 65:55-63
- 339 Lambert, G. 2001. A global overview of ascidian introductions and their possible impact on the  
340 endemic fauna. In: Sawada, H., Yokosawa, H. and Lambert, C. C. (ed.), *The Biology of*  
341 *Ascidians*. Tokyo, Springer-Verlag, pp. 249-257.



- 342 Lambert, G. 2007. Invasive sea squirts: A growing global problem. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.*  
343 342:3-4.
- 344 Lambert, G. 2009. Adventures of a sea squirt sleuth: unraveling the identity of *Didemnum*  
345 *vexillum*, a global ascidian invader. *Aquatic Invasions* 4:5-28.
- 346 Minchin D, Cook EJ, Clark PF (2013) Alien species in British brackish and marine waters.  
347 *Aquat Invas* 8:3-19
- 348 Nydam ML, Giesbrecht KB, Stephenson EE (2017) Origin and dispersal history of two colonial  
349 ascidian clades in the *Botryllus schlosseri* species complex. *PloS ONE* e0169944. DOI:  
350 10.1371/journal.pone.0169944
- 351 Ordóñez V, Pascual M, Ruis M, Turon X (2013) Mixed but not admixed: a spatial analysis of  
352 genetic variation of an invasive ascidian on natural and artificial substrates. *Mar Biol*  
353 160:1645-1660
- 354 Pascoe PL, Parry HE, Hawkins AJS (2007) Dynamic filter-feeding responses in fouling  
355 organisms. *Aquat Biol* 1:177-185
- 356 Petersen JK, Riisgård HU (1992) Filtration capacity of the ascidian *Ciona intestinalis* and its  
357 grazing impact in a shallow fjord. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 88:9-17
- 358 Petersen JK, Mayer S, Knudsen MÅ (1999) Beat frequency of cilia in the branchial basket of the  
359 ascidian *Ciona intestinalis* in relation to temperature and algal food concentration. *Mar Biol*  
360 133:185-192
- 361 Petersen, J. K. 2007. Ascidian suspension feeding. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* 342: 127-137.
- 362 Petersen JK, Maar M, Møhlenberg F, Larsen JEN (2012) Benthic grazing impact: coupling and  
363 uncoupling in relation to physical forcing. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 463:127-139

- 364 Pritchard D (2017) frair: Tools for Functional Response Analysis. R package version 0.5.100.  
365 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=frair>
- 366 R Core Team (2013). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for  
367 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- 368 Ricciardi A. 2006. Are modern biological invasions an unprecedented form of global change?  
369 *Con Biol* 21:329-336
- 370 Robbins IJ (1983) The effects of body size, temperature, and suspension density on the filtration  
371 and ingestion of inorganic particulate suspensions by ascidians. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 70:65-  
372 78
- 373 Rogers D (1972) Random search and insect population models. *J Anim Ecol* 41:369-383
- 374 Ruis M, Turon X, Ordóñez V, Pascual M (2012) Tracking invasion histories in the sea: facing  
375 complex scenarios using multilocus data. *PLoS ONE* 7(4) e35815  
376 [doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0035815](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0035815)
- 377 RStudio Team (2015). RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, Inc., Boston, MA  
378 <http://www.rstudio.com>
- 379 Sato A, Satoh N, Bishop JDD (2012) Field identification of ‘types’ A and B of the ascidian  
380 *Ciona intestinalis* in a region of sympatry. *Mar Biol* 159:1611-1619
- 381 Sigsgaard SJ, Petersen JK, Iversen JLL (2003) Relationship between specific dynamic action and  
382 food quality in the solitary ascidian *Ciona intestinalis*. *Mar Biol* 143:1143-1149
- 383 Simkanin C, Fofonoff PW, Larson K, Lambert G, Dijkstra JA, Ruiz GM (2016) Spatial and  
384 temporal dynamics of ascidian invasions in the continental United States and Alaska. *Mar*  
385 *Biol* 163: 1-16

- 386 Sorte CJB, Williams SL, Zerebecki RA (2010) Ocean warming increases threat of invasive  
387 species in a marine fouling community. *Ecology* 91:2198-2204
- 388 Zhan A, MacIsaac HJ, Cristescu ME (2010) Invasion genetics of the *Ciona intestinalis* species  
389 complex: from regional endemism to global homogeneity. *Mol Ecol* 19:4678-4694
- 390 Zhan A, Briski E, Bock DG, Ghabooli S, MacIsaac HJ (2015) Ascidians as models for studying  
391 invasion success. *Mar Biol* 162:2449–2470
- 392

393 **Figure Legends**

394 Figure 1. Ingestion rate (a) and clearance rate (b) of native (filled circles) and invasive (open  
395 circles) *Ciona* individuals as a function of animal dry mass. Note the log scale for both  
396 graphs.

397 Figure 2. Ingestion rate (a) and clearance rate (b) of *Ciona* individuals as a function of *Isochrysis*  
398 *affinis galbana* concentration. Overlapping points in b have been slightly offset to the  
399 right for clarity. Note the log scale for ingestion rate (a).


400 Figure 3. Fitted functional responses of native (solid line) and introduced (dashed) *Ciona* (with  
401 95% CI bands). *C. robusta* statistically conforms to a type I functional response, while *C.*  
402 *intestinalis* conforms to a type II response.

403

404 Figure 1

405

406




407

408 Figure 2

409


410



411

412 Figure 3

413



414