Portland State University

PDXScholar

Environmental Science and Management
Faculty Publications and Presentations

Environmental Science and Management

2006

Variation in the Response of Crustacean Zooplankton Species Richness and Composition to the Invasive Predator *Bythotrephes Longimanus*

Angela L. Strecker

Portland State University, angela.strecker@psu.edu

Shelley E. Arnott

Queen's University - Kingston, Ontario

Norman D. Yan

York University

Robert Girard

Ontario Ministry of the Environment

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/esm_fac

Part of the [Environmental Sciences Commons](#), and the [Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Citation Details

Strecker, Angela L.; Arnott, Shelley E.; Yan, Norman D.; and Girard, Robert, "Variation in the Response of Crustacean Zooplankton Species Richness and Composition to the Invasive Predator *Bythotrephes Longimanus*" (2006). *Environmental Science and Management Faculty Publications and Presentations*. 47.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/esm_fac/47

This Post-Print is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Environmental Science and Management Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Variation in the response of crustacean zooplankton species richness and composition to the invasive predator *Bythotrephes*

Angela L. Strecker*, Shelley E. Arnott

Department of Biology, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada, K7L 3N6

Email: strecker@biology.queensu.ca, arnotts@biology.queensu.ca

Norman D. Yan

Biology Department, York University, Toronto, ON, Canada, M3J 1P3 and

Dorset Environmental Science Centre, Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Dorset, ON,

Canada, P0A 1E0

Email: nyan@yorku.ca

Robert Girard

Dorset Environmental Science Centre, Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Dorset, ON,

Canada, P0A 1E0

Email: robert.girard@ene.gov.on.ca

* Corresponding author:

Department of Biology, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada, K7L 3N6

Email: strecker@biology.queensu.ca

Phone: (613) 533-6000 x78493

Fax: (613) 533-6617

Abstract

The predacious invertebrate *Bythotrephes longimanus* has now invaded > 90 freshwater lakes in North America. There is some evidence that *Bythotrephes* has a negative effect on summer zooplankton species richness; however, no study has examined the effect of *Bythotrephes* throughout the ice-free season in more than one lake. We visited ten invaded and four reference lakes every two weeks from May to September, collecting *Bythotrephes*, crustacean zooplankton, and water chemistry samples. Composite samples were pooled across the study season for each lake. *Bythotrephes* significantly reduced cladoceran species richness, diversity, and abundance, and the total zooplankton community also exhibited decreased richness, diversity, and abundance. Seasonal sampling was better than synoptic surveys at detecting changes in abundance, but richness estimates were similar. As *Bythotrephes* continues to spread across lake landscapes, we expect it will have profound impacts on local and regional richness and species distribution patterns.

Keywords: *Bythotrephes*, zooplankton, species richness, boreal shield lakes, invasive species

Introduction

Bythotrephes longimanus Leydig (Crustacea, Onychopoda) is a predatory zooplankton species that has invaded numerous lakes in North America. First detected in Lake Ontario in 1982 (Mills et al. 2003), *Bythotrephes* has spread to all of the Laurentian Great Lakes and > 90 inland lakes in Ontario (C. Gamble, Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, 4601 Guthrie Dr., Peterborough, ON K9J 8L5, Canada, unpubl. data), Minnesota (M. Brown, Department of Biology, University of Minnesota-Duluth, Duluth, MN 55812, USA, unpubl. data), Michigan (Jarnagin et al. 2000), and reservoirs in Ohio (Ferry and Wright 2002). *Bythotrephes* occupies lakes that span a gradient of temperature, salinity, pH, and depth within its native range in Eurasia (Grigorovich et al. 1998). Humans are an important dispersal vector for *Bythotrephes*, and with its broad tolerance of environmental conditions, it appears that it has the potential to invade a large number of lakes in North America (MacIsaac et al. 2000; 2004).

Our understanding of the impacts of *Bythotrephes* on inland aquatic communities in North America is incomplete. Invasion events are unpredictable, thus little empirical data documenting the effects of invasion on recipient communities exists. However, a single case study of long-term biweekly records of both pre- and post-invasion planktonic communities from Harp Lake, Ontario has revealed evidence of negative effects of *Bythotrephes* on crustacean zooplankton species richness and cladoceran zooplankton abundance since its invasion in 1993 (Yan et al. 2001; 2002).

Although trends seen in Harp Lake suggest that the invasion of *Bythotrephes* will have important consequences for zooplankton communities, effects of predation can be site-specific (Posey and Hines 1991). Broader spatial surveys are necessary to determine how universal the impacts of *Bythotrephes* are in temperate lakes. A study comparing 17 invaded boreal shield lakes to 13 uninvaded reference lakes provided strong evidence that the patterns of invasion

observed in Harp Lake were also expressed in other lakes of differing water chemistry, morphometry, and species assemblages (Boudreau and Yan 2003). However, sampling for this study was limited to a single mid-summer vertical zooplankton haul, which can underestimate the annual species pool by 50% (Arnott et al. 1998). As well, *Bythotrephes* abundances generally peak in mid-summer in boreal lakes (J. Young and E. Parrott, Department of Biology, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M3J 1P3, Canada, unpubl. data); however, they tend to be absent from the pelagic zone in the early and latter months of the ice-free season. If some zooplankton species are able to take advantage of vernal and autumnal temporal refuges that exist when *Bythotrephes* are rare or absent from the water column, then Boudreau and Yan (2003) may have overestimated the effect of *Bythotrephes* on annual zooplankton species pools. For example, some copepods may change the timing of reproduction in order to reduce overlap with predators which peak later in the summer (Hairston Jr. and Walton 1986), and *Daphnia* clones have exhibited earlier age at maturation in the presence of fish kairomones (Sakwińska 2002).

The primary objective of this study was to examine the effects of *Bythotrephes* on ice-free season averages of species richness, diversity, evenness, and abundance of crustacean zooplankton in boreal shield lakes. We expected that *Bythotrephes* would cause declines in all these indices of community structure. However, because of the inclusion of time periods when *Bythotrephes* were absent from the water column, there may be temporal refuges available for some species, during which time they might prosper. We used the persistence of *Bythotrephes* in the water column of our study lakes as a way to assess the availability of a temporal refuge for zooplankton. Therefore, high persistence would suggest that there is a short time available for zooplankton to avoid *Bythotrephes* and that we would expect to see greater negative effects as compared to low persistence of the invader, where zooplankton would have an opportunity to

survive in the absence of predation by this invertebrate. Hence, our seasonal purview might actually detect reduced effects in comparison with those observed during peak *Bythotrephes* abundance (Boudreau and Yan 2003; Barbiero and Tuchman 2004), or indeed no effects at all.

A secondary objective of this study was to assess the relationship between species richness and several environmental factors that are typically related to the number of crustacean zooplankton species in a lake. In general, species richness is positively related to lake area (Dodson 1992), and has a hump-shaped relationship with lake productivity (Dodson et al. 2000). In addition, invertebrate predators have been shown to be important in structuring zooplankton communities. In a survey of 60 lakes on the Precambrian Shield, Keller and Conlon (1994) found that a number of zooplankton species common to the region, such as *Daphnia galeata mendotae* and *Diaphanosoma birgei*, were completely absent from fishless lakes containing the phantom midge larvae, *Chaoborus americanus*, a factor attributed to invertebrate predation. Although our lakes were not chosen to span large gradients of area or productivity, we believe that *Bythotrephes* may alter these conventional relationships and will be an important driver of ecosystem change.

Materials and methods

Twenty lakes in the districts of Muskoka, Haliburton, and Parry Sound in south central Ontario, Canada were chosen for the survey. The lakes are oligo- to mesotrophic and circumneutral in pH, as is typical of many boreal shield lakes (Table 1). All of the study lakes have forested catchments (mixed deciduous and coniferous), small littoral zones, and are used primarily for recreation. Lake herring (*Coregonus artedii*), rainbow smelt (*Osmerus mordax*), lake whitefish (*Coregonus clupeaformis*), and yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*) are the primary planktivorous fish in these lakes (Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources: S. Scholten and E. McIntyre, District of Parry Sound, Parry Sound, ON P2A 1S4, Canada, and S. Sandstrom,

District of Muskoka, Bracebridge, ON P1L 1W9, Canada, unpubl. data). All the study lakes were chosen to have a similar glacial history and therefore, there were equal probabilities of including zooplankton species dispersed by glacial retreat. Although our intention was to have equal numbers of invaded and reference lakes, *Bythotrephes* was detected in six of our planned reference lakes reducing their number to four. Hence, we reported results from 14 study lakes – ten invaded and four reference.

Crustacean zooplankton were sampled every two weeks from May to September 2003 ($n = 9$) at a deep hole in each lake, located each time using GPS. Sample volume varied slightly among dates because of small differences in station depth (Table 1). A single zooplankton sample was taken by pulling a conical net with a 110 μm mesh size and 0.5 m diameter through the water column, starting 5 m off the lake bottom. Samples were preserved in 5.5% sugared and buffered formalin and following preservation, a seasonal composite sample was obtained by combining equal proportions from each of the nine biweekly zooplankton samples. Rotifers were sampled from the epilimnion in a concurrent study with a 2 cm diameter vertical tube sampler (Hovius et al. 2006). On each sampling date, *Bythotrephes* was sampled at five stations in each lake, including the deep hole, with a conical net of 400 μm mesh size and 0.5 m diameter. The stations were < 1 km apart. A single haul was taken at each station from 5 m off the lake bottom to the water surface. Mean ice-free *Bythotrephes* abundance in the ten invaded lakes was estimated by averaging *Bythotrephes* abundance in the five replicate hauls in each lake over eight sampling dates from June to September 2003. Only eight dates were used as *Bythotrephes* samples were not taken in May. The number of sampling dates that *Bythotrephes* was present and its persistence in invaded lakes are described in Table 2. Persistence was defined as the number of consecutive sampling dates that *Bythotrephes* abundance in the lake was > 5 individuals $\cdot \text{m}^{-3}$. It has been suggested that there may be an effect threshold of

Bythotrephes at abundances of 3-5 individuals·m⁻³, especially with regards to their main prey, cladocerans (Boudreau and Yan 2003). The higher threshold value (5 individuals·m⁻³) was chosen as it is a more conservative estimation of *Bythotrephes* effects on the zooplankton community.

Zooplankton were enumerated using a protocol designed to ensure reasonable representation of rare species (Girard and Reid 1990). Subsamples were generated with a Folsom plankton splitter, and a mean of 336 individuals (standard deviation = 109) were enumerated. The remainder of the sample was scanned for rare species. Juvenile copepods were excluded from all analyses, except total abundance. Zooplankton were identified and counted on a Leica MZ 12.5 dissecting microscope. Because of uncertainty in identification, *Bosmina* (*Bosmina*) *freysi* and *Bosmina* (*Bosmina*) *liederi* (Taylor et al. 2002) were pooled, as were *Chydorus sphaericus* and *C. brevilabris* (Frey 1980). Taxonomic revisions are listed in Table S1.

Water chemistry samples were taken the week of 14 July 2003. An integrated tube sampler (1 cm diameter) was used to collect water from the epilimnion, which was filtered through 80 µm mesh to remove large particles, especially zooplankton. Calcium, dissolved organic carbon (DOC), conductivity, pH, and total phosphorus (TP) were analyzed following Ontario Ministry of the Environment (1983) protocols (Table 1). Chlorophyll *a* (chl *a*) samples were collected every two weeks by concentrating a known volume of epilimnetic water onto a 0.7 µm glass fibre filter, extracting for 24 h in methanol, and analyzing with a TD 700 Fluorometer (Table 2) (Turner Designs, Sunnyvale, California, USA) (Welschmeyer 1994).

We used two methods to assess the adequacy of our zooplankton richness estimates. First, we compared observed species richness, the number of species found in the composite sample, to Chao's index (S_{Chao1}), a non-parametric measure that is recommended for estimating

species richness, as it does not require knowledge of the species abundance distribution (Magurran 2004). S_{Chao1} was calculated by

$$(1) \quad S_{Chao1} = S_{obs} + \frac{F_1^2}{2F_2}$$

where S_{obs} is the number of species observed in the sample, F_1 is the number of species in the sample that are represented by a single individual, and F_2 is the number of species that are represented by two individuals (Chao 1984). This estimator will exceed observed species richness as the relative frequency of singletons increases, providing an estimate of total richness based on the chance that some rare species might be missed (Magurran 2004). The second approach to assessing our richness estimates was to determine if our counting effort was sufficient to sample all species present by examining the relationship between number of individuals counted and richness. The difference in species richness using Chao's index was negligible ($t = -0.05, p = 0.96$), as was the relationship between number of individuals counted and richness ($r^2 = 0.10, p = 0.29$), suggesting that our observed richness is probably representative of the number of crustacean zooplankton species in the pelagic region of the lakes. *Bythotrephes* was not included in richness estimates.

Species diversity and evenness were assessed using the Shannon-Wiener diversity index and Smith and Wilson's (1996) evenness index, E_{var} , respectively. The values of E_{var} fall between 0 (minimum evenness) and 1 (maximum evenness),

$$(2) \quad E_{var} = 1 - \left(\frac{2}{\pi \arctan \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^S \left(\ln n_i - \sum_{j=1}^S \ln n_j / S \right)^2 / S}{\sum_{i=1}^S \ln n_i} \right\}} \right)$$

where n_i = number of individuals of species i , n_j = number of individuals of species j , and S = total number of species. E_{var} is recommended as the best evenness measure for general use (Smith and Wilson 1996).

Multivariate ordination techniques were used to evaluate species abundances in relation to environmental variables and the presence of *Bythotrephes*. A preliminary examination using correspondence analysis suggested that linear ordination analysis was appropriate, thus redundancy analysis (RDA) was performed using Canoco 4.5 (ter Braak and Šmilauer 2002). *Bythotrephes* was entered as a categorical variable to maximize differences between the levels of the treatments. Environmental variables were assessed for collinearity if the variance inflation factor was > 10 (Quinn and Keough 2002). All of the significant predictors were independent. All species represented by adults were included in the analysis, and abundances were log-transformed to reduce the influence of dominant species. Forward selection identified the variables that explained the most variance in species data, which were then tested for significance using a Monte Carlo permutation test (499 permutations).

Multiple regression analyses were performed to determine what proportion of the variation in species richness data could be explained by *Bythotrephes* abundance and persistence, presence/absence of dominant planktivorous fish species, and by environmental variables (i.e., TP, pH, maximum depth, and lake area), using the best subsets procedure (StatSoft 2001). Planktivorous fish data was provided from sampling by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, but because of uncertainty in quantifying fish abundance, the major planktivores were placed in categories of abundance (Table 2). For the multiple regression analysis, abundances were converted to categorical numerical values, e.g. absent = 0, absent/once present = 0, very low = 1, low = 2, medium = 3, high = 4, and averaged for each lake to create an index of fish density. Yellow perch could only be classed as present or absent, and as they were present in all

lakes, they were excluded from analyses. Collinearity of environmental predictor variables was detected if the variance inflation factor of any predictors was > 10 (Quinn and Keough 2002). Chl *a* was removed from the analysis due to collinearity with TP. Assumptions of normality, heterogeneity of variance, and independence were also assessed. The best models were chosen by using several criteria: adjusted r^2 , Mallow's C_p , and Akaike's information criterion (AIC) (Quinn and Keough 2002). When evaluating the models, smaller values of Mallow's C_p and AIC indicate the best fit.

Results

Physical and chemical characteristics did not differ between invaded and uninvaded lakes, with the exception of total phosphorus and chl *a*, which were, on average, $3.33 \mu\text{g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ and $0.94 \mu\text{g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ greater in the uninvaded lakes, respectively (TP: $t = -2.45$, $p = 0.03$; chl *a*: $t = -4.83$, $p < 0.01$) (Table 1,2). There were no significant differences between invaded and uninvaded lake calcium (log (x+1)-transformed), DOC, conductivity, and pH (Table 1). There was also no difference in general lake morphometry, as both maximum depth (Z_{max}) and surface area (log (x+1)-transformed) were similar between lake categories (Table 1).

In comparisons of invaded and non-invaded lakes, we found that there was a large reduction in observed species richness of zooplankton taxa in invaded lakes, from an average of 15.0 in uninvaded lakes down to 11.6 species in invaded lakes ($t = -2.12$, $p = 0.06$) (Fig. 1). This decline was largely due to changes in cladoceran zooplankton, which decreased on average by four taxa in invaded lakes ($t = -3.28$, $p < 0.01$) (Fig. 1). Copepod richness was similar in invaded and reference lakes ($t = 0.76$, $p = 0.46$) (Fig. 1). There was no difference in Shannon-Wiener diversity in total zooplankton ($t = -1.31$, $p = 0.22$) and copepods ($t = -0.40$, $p = 0.70$) in invaded lakes compared to the uninvaded lakes, but there was a significant reduction in the diversity of cladoceran zooplankton ($t = -2.17$, $p = 0.05$) (Fig. 1). Evenness of the total zooplankton

community ($t = 0.40, p = 0.70$) was unaffected by *Bythotrephes* invasion, while cladocerans experienced a slight increase with invasion ($t = 1.89, p = 0.08$), and copepods showed a slight decrease in the *Bythotrephes* lakes ($t = -1.89, p = 0.08$) (Fig. 1). Invasion had a negative effect on overall zooplankton ($t = -1.91, p = 0.08$) and copepod abundance ($t = -1.91, p = 0.08$), resulting in a 2-fold difference for both groups. In addition, there was a decline in cladoceran abundance in invaded lakes ($t = -2.86, p = 0.01$), where an almost 4-fold difference was observed (Fig. 1).

The relationship between *Bythotrephes* abundance and zooplankton species richness and abundance was inconsistent across the invaded study lakes (Fig. 2). The deviations in species richness and abundance from the reference lake condition generally increased with higher abundances of *Bythotrephes*, but some invaded lakes actually had greater richness and abundance than uninvaded lakes. When we explicitly considered changes in zooplankton communities relative to the abundance of *Bythotrephes* in the lakes using linear regression, we found that crustacean zooplankton species richness ($r^2 = 0.04, p = 0.52$), diversity ($r^2 < 0.01, p = 0.93$), and abundance ($r^2 = 0.06, p = 0.42$) were not related to the mean abundance of *Bythotrephes*. Likewise, cladoceran species richness ($r^2 = 0.13, p = 0.20$), diversity ($r^2 = 0.11, p = 0.26$), and abundance ($r^2 = 0.15, p = 0.14$) were not related to mean *Bythotrephes* abundance. Interestingly, it seems that *Bythotrephes* had a negative effect on both species richness and diversity when its mean abundance was < 4 individuals·m⁻³, but above this threshold, the effect is less clear.

RDA captured a significant amount of variance ($p < 0.01$) in zooplankton species abundances, with *Bythotrephes* presence/absence explaining 43% of total species variation, and $Z_{\max}$ (22%), chl *a* (20%), and TP (15%) contributing to the remainder of species abundance variation (Fig. 3). The first axis ($\lambda_1 = 0.22, p = 0.03$) contrasts the presence with the absence of

Bythotrephes, as most of the invaded lakes fall on the same side as the *Bythotrephes* vector, and all of the reference lakes are on the opposite side of the gradient. A number of species were negatively associated with the invader (e.g., *Diaphanosoma birgei*, *Mesocyclops edax*, *Holopedium gibberum*), and only one species, the glacial relict *Senecella calanoides*, was positively correlated with *Bythotrephes* presence. The second axis ($\lambda_2 = 0.10$) seems to be related to lake productivity, as some cladoceran taxa (*Bosmina* (*Bosmina*) spp., *Daphnia retrocurva*, and *D. birgei*) and omnivorous cyclopoids (*Mesocyclops edax* and *Orthocyclops modestus*) were positively associated with the TP and chl *a* vectors.

The majority of zooplankton taxa were, on average, in lower abundance in invaded lakes than in reference lakes (Fig. 4). The cladoceran taxa tended to fall further below the 1:1 line than did the copepods, especially smaller-bodied taxa such as *Chydorus* spp. and *Eubosmina coregoni*. A few larger taxa, such as *Senecella calanoides*, *Cyclops scutifer*, and *Daphnia dubia*, were more abundant in invaded lakes than reference lakes, on average, but for the most part, both large and small-bodied zooplankton were less abundant in *Bythotrephes*-invaded lakes.

Species richness tended to increase with longer persistence times of *Bythotrephes* populations throughout the summer ($r^2 = 0.31$, $p = 0.09$), suggesting that there is no temporal refuge available to zooplankton. Using multiple regression analysis we found that all of the most parsimonious models to explain species richness had negative associations of species richness with mean *Bythotrephes* abundance, but that zooplankton richness was positively related to *Bythotrephes* persistence in high abundances in the lake (Table 3). In both models, species richness was positively related to duration of *Bythotrephes* persistence and TP, and negatively related to mean *Bythotrephes* abundance. In addition, the best model selected by AIC had positive associations of zooplankton richness with area and pH. The presence of fish planktivore species had no effect on zooplankton species richness.

Discussion

Our study has demonstrated that *Bythotrephes* can have negative effects on zooplankton communities through parts of the ice-free season, reducing species richness, diversity, and abundance throughout the ice-free season. This negative effect was exacerbated in the cladocerans, which showed significant declines in richness (on average four less species in invaded lakes), abundance (a 4-fold decline), and diversity. These results are in agreement with the declines in zooplankton richness observed in Harp Lake (Yan et al. 2002), Muskoka lakes (Boudreau and Yan 2003), and lakes Michigan, Erie, and Huron (Barbiero and Tuchman 2004) (Table 4). Reductions in the abundance of zooplankton have been shown experimentally (Strecker and Arnott 2005) and in Harp Lake (Yan et al. 2001); however, some recent studies have failed to detect changes in total zooplankton community abundance (Boudreau and Yan 2003; Barbiero and Tuchman 2004) (Table 4). The samples in Boudreau and Yan's (2003) study were taken on a single sampling date, and this snapshot approach doesn't take in account seasonal dynamics, as was done in our study and Yan et al. (2001). Barbiero and Tuchman's (2004) samples were only taken for one month starting 1 August, and thus, do not reflect zooplankton abundance in late spring, early summer, and fall. A comparison of our study with others over a shorter period of time suggests that short-term synoptic surveys may adequately document changes in some measures of zooplankton community structure associated with *Bythotrephes* invasion. For example, the effect of *Bythotrephes* on species richness seems to be consistent between different sampling routines, but longer studies, especially in smaller inland lakes, that encompass the entire season seem to capture changes in total abundance better than single sampling dates (Table 4).

Several zooplankton taxa showed steep declines in *Bythotrephes*-invaded lakes. As past studies have documented the general negative effect that *Bythotrephes* has on many cladoceran

301 taxa (Boudreau and Yan 2003), we expected to observe this in our study as well. As expected,
302 the abundances of a number of common cladoceran species, such as *Bosmina* (*Bosmina*) spp. and
303 *D. birgei*, were severely reduced: on average, a decrease of > 4 times in invaded lakes. The
304 larger species *Daphnia longiremis*, *Daphnia mendotae*, and *Holopedium gibberum* also had
305 lower abundances in invaded lakes, suggesting that body size alone does not provide refuge from
306 predation. As well, it appears as though some hypolimnetic species, such as *D. longiremis*
307 (Keller and Conlon 1994), do not escape predation. These patterns are generally in agreement
308 with Boudreau and Yan (2003), Yan et al. (2001), and Barbiero and Tuchman (2004), although
309 there seem to be some system-specific differences. For example, *D. mendotae* has remained
310 unaffected by *Bythotrephes* in Harp Lake (Yan et al. 2001, Boudreau and Yan 2003, and this
311 study), but has declined in other lakes (Barbiero and Tuchman 2004). Unexpectedly, several
312 common copepod taxa (*Leptodiaptomus minutus*, *Diacyclops bicuspidatus thomasi*, and
313 *Mesocyclops edax*) in our study were also negatively affected by *Bythotrephes*. Previously, only
314 *Mesocyclops edax* was thought to be affected by invasion (Boudreau and Yan 2003; Barbiero
315 and Tuchman 2004). Given that copepods are in high abundance in the late spring in these lakes,
316 before *Bythotrephes* emerges from resting eggs and rapidly builds up populations through
317 parthenogenic reproduction (A. Strecker, unpubl. data), it is especially surprising that they
318 declined, as their earlier dominance in lakes would suggest that they should be able to use a
319 temporal refuge from *Bythotrephes* predation. However, longer-lived slow-reproducing
320 copepods may actually be more susceptible to predation by *Bythotrephes* because they are unable
321 to reproduce as quickly as cladocerans. Thus, the copepods are less able to respond to low
322 predator abundances, as *Bythotrephes* is known to have extremely patchy spatial and temporal
323 dynamics (J. Young and E. Parrott, Department of Biology, York University, Toronto, Ontario,
324 Canada, M3J 1P3, Canada, unpubl. data), and therefore, cannot take advantage of this window of

opportunity. This further supports the notion that to adequately assess changes in total and individual zooplankton abundances resulting from *Bythotrephes* invasion, longer-term surveys are necessary.

Our study suggests that most species are not able to take advantage of a temporal refuge from *Bythotrephes* predation. We found that longer persistence times of *Bythotrephes* resulted in higher species richness, the opposite of what we would expect to see if a temporal refuge was indeed available. *Bythotrephes* was detected in invaded lakes on an average of seven sampling dates, or about 14 weeks during the summer. This is likely a conservative estimate, as *Bythotrephes* was present in 90% of invaded lakes on the final sampling date in September, and has shown the ability to persist into late fall in some lakes (J. Young, Department of Biology, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M3J 1P3, Canada, pers. comm). Thus, in most lakes, the only opportunity for a temporal refuge is in the spring, and our evidence suggests that this window of opportunity is not being used by zooplankton, perhaps because water temperatures are cool and food availability is low in these oligo-mesotrophic lakes. If zooplankton were indeed using this temporal refuge, we would expect to see no effect of *Bythotrephes* on zooplankton richness and abundance, especially on copepods, which are typically in high numbers in these lakes in late spring, thus having reduced temporal overlap with the invader. However, this was not the case: overall zooplankton abundance and richness were reduced, and several copepod taxa were also negatively affected by *Bythotrephes*. Another potential explanation is that there are competitive interactions occurring between *Bythotrephes* and its predators. *Mysis relicta* and other zooplanktivores may benefit from longer *Bythotrephes* persistence times by switching from smaller zooplankton to the larger invader, thus freeing the zooplankton from intense predation. Gut content analysis of *M. relicta* collected from several of

our study lakes has revealed the presence of *Bythotrephes* body parts, thus it seems that the invader can also be a prey item for other invertebrate predators (Nordin 2005).

There was a substantial amount of among-lake variation in the responses of the zooplankton communities to *Bythotrephes* invasion. This variability appears to be unrelated to the actual abundance of *Bythotrephes*, which was not a strong predictor of zooplankton richness or abundance in invaded lakes. There is some evidence that zooplankton can adapt their morphologies in the presence of *Bythotrephes* (Bungartz and Branstrator 2003), suggesting that the abundance of the invader may play a role in eliciting behavioural and morphological responses in the zooplankton community, and thus increasing species survival. Two of the invaded lakes, Peninsula and Vernon, had zooplankton communities that more closely resembled communities in non-invaded reference lakes. Both lakes had relatively high mean *Bythotrephes* abundance (7.8 and 4.3 individuals·m⁻³, respectively), and had richness values that fall more into the range of uninvaded lakes. When these lakes were excluded from regression analyses, mean *Bythotrephes* abundance had a significant negative effect on species richness ($r^2 = 0.53$, $p < 0.01$). The redundancy analysis also suggests that Peninsula and Vernon lakes have species compositions that are more similar to reference lakes than to invaded lakes. We are unsure why the zooplankton community composition of these two lakes is seemingly unaffected by invasion. One possibility is that *Bythotrephes* is feeding in a density-dependent manner, reducing the abundances of certain preferred species to low densities, and then switching to higher density prey items that can be caught more easily. Thus, *Bythotrephes* is not reducing any species to the point where it can no longer be detected. Consistent with this hypothesis, the evenness of Peninsula and Vernon lakes was higher than the average of the invaded lakes, and the diversity was greater than the average diversity of the uninvaded lakes. The abundances of the zooplankton communities of both of these lakes is below the average of other invaded lakes, so

while it seems that *Bythotrephes* is reducing zooplankton abundance, species richness remains unaffected. However, if *Bythotrephes* feeding is indeed density dependent in these lakes, then why is this not occurring in all of the invaded lakes? It is possible that zooplankton reproduction in these lakes was high enough to fend off the loss of species richness. Yan et al. (1991) showed that for the rotifer, *Keratella taurocephala*, high rates of production could be maintained, even under intense predation by the invertebrate *Chaoborus*. Vernon Lake had high secondary production relative to *Bythotrephes* consumption (A. Strecker, unpubl. data), so this may, in part, explain the lack of effect on species richness.

Other potential explanations for the high levels of species richness observed in Peninsula and Vernon lakes are that they had different morphological, biotic, and chemical conditions than the rest of the invaded lakes, and thus, there existed some advantage that allowed coexistence. For instance, a deep water spatial refuge in the lake can afford some species a certain amount of protection from predation. However, Peninsula and Vernon lakes were the two shallowest invaded lakes, suggesting that they in fact had a smaller spatial refuge than other invaded lakes. Another possibility is that Peninsula and Vernon lakes were less clear than other invaded lakes, thus offering zooplankton a dark water refuge. This may be the case for Vernon Lake, which had higher DOC and lower Secchi disc values than did other invaded lakes, but not for Peninsula Lake, which had values that were within the range of the other invaded lakes. Thus, this variability that we observed between study lakes in response to an invasion of *Bythotrephes* may be due to a combination of factors related to characteristics of the invader, i.e., feeding strategy, and to characteristics of the lakes, such as productivity and lake clarity.

The importance of lake area and productivity in determining crustacean zooplankton species richness in temperate freshwater lakes has been well-established (Dodson 1992; Dodson et al. 2000). Surface area had little predictive power in our analysis of factors influencing

species richness in lakes invaded by *Bythotrephes*, but other variables related to the invader were much better predictors of zooplankton richness. Although we did not measure primary productivity, TP can be used as a surrogate for productivity (see Leibold 1999). A caveat of our study is that uninvaded lakes had slightly higher levels of TP and chl *a* than did the invaded lakes, but in our oligo-mesotrophic systems, these differences are small, and are unlikely to lead to the observed differences in species richness. In addition, our multiple regression analyses suggest that although TP is an important predictor, *Bythotrephes* explains far more variation in species richness. Although *Bythotrephes* abundance by itself was a poor predictor of species richness, when combined with persistence of the invader in multiple regression analysis, the explanatory power of the two variables was much greater. It is possible that the result from the linear regression was being influenced by the two outlier values, Vernon and Peninsula Lakes, while these values became less important with more predictive variables. In fact, neither of these values had an exceptionally large influence on the final multiple regression models, as measured by Cook's distance statistic (Quinn and Keough 2002).

The composition of the fish community can also have substantial effects on the structure of the zooplankton community (Brooks and Dodson 1965). While there appear to be some differences in the abundance of planktivores present in invaded versus reference lakes, our data suggest that *Bythotrephes* is still having a substantial negative effect. If fish were in fact responsible for the effects that we observed, then we would expect larger zooplankton species to be more negatively affected than small taxa. However, reductions in species richness were proportionately greater for small species (28%) than for large-bodied zooplankton (14%), which supports our assertion that *Bythotrephes* is largely responsible for the observed reduction in zooplankton species richness. Other variables, such as pH (Keller and Pitblado 1984), calcium (Schell et al. 2001; Wærvågen et al. 2002), and post-glacial history of the lake (Dadswell 1974;

Carter et al. 1980) can be important predictors of zooplankton richness. However, neither pH nor calcium were significantly different in *Bythotrephes* lakes compared to reference lakes, and all of our study lakes have a similar post-glacial history because of the presence of *Mysis relicta*. Thus, these factors did not influence our results.

There is now a significant body of evidence to suggest that *Bythotrephes* invasions cause changes to the zooplankton communities of freshwater lakes. This is especially true of cladoceran taxa, which seem to take the brunt of *Bythotrephes* predation, as our study has exhibited striking declines in their richness, abundance, and diversity in invaded lakes. A concurrent study of the rotifer composition and abundance of the same 14 lakes showed a positive relationship between rotifer and *Bythotrephes* abundance, perhaps as a result of reduced competition with herbivorous cladocerans for phytoplankton prey (Hovius et al. 2006). These results are somewhat surprising, since *Bythotrephes* is an invertebrate predator that has several native functional analogues in these boreal lakes, including *M. relicta*, *Leptodora kindtii*, *Chaoborus* spp., and water mites (Arachnida, Hydrachnidia). It could be argued that *Bythotrephes* occupies a unique feeding niche; however, its dietary overlap with other invertebrate predators is high (McNaught et al. 2004; Young and Riessen 2005), and so this seems unlikely. *Bythotrephes* employs several effective strategies to maintain high feeding rates in these boreal lakes: 1) although it is consumed by some fish species, presumably *Bythotrephes*' long tail spine decreases predation impact; 2) lack of large amplitude migrations (Yan and Pawson 1997), unlike many other invertebrate predators (*Chaoborus*, *Mysis*, *Leptodora*), so they are continuously in regions of high prey density; 3) parthenogenic reproduction, unlike mites, which are sexual and have slower reproductive times, so they can quickly respond to increases in food resources; and 4) larger neonates, allowing them to exploit a larger range of prey sizes, unlike the small-bodied clutches of *Leptodora* (Branstrator 2005). What is clear is that not all

lakes respond to *Bythotrephes* invasion in the same way. Our study has highlighted that there are substantial among-lake differences in the effect of the invader on richness, abundance and diversity of zooplankton communities.

As *Bythotrephes* continues to spread across the landscape of North America, it seems likely that it will be an important new factor in determining the zooplankton composition of freshwater lakes. This is certain to have implications for regional species richness, as our results suggest that certain species, such as the ubiquitous taxa *Diaphanosoma birgei* and *Mesocyclops edax*, have reduced abundances in invaded lakes across the landscape, leaving few populations left that may act as sources to disperse to new locales.

Acknowledgements

Funding for this project was provided by Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada Discovery Grants to SEA and NDY and Post-Graduate Scholarship to ALS, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, and Queen's University School of Graduate Studies and Research. We would like to thank the Dorset Environmental Science Centre and its staff, especially Keith Somers, for providing logistical support, water chemistry analyses, and advice. This project benefited from discussions with Ora Johannsson, Michael Arts, Beatrix Beisner, Jon Hovius, Joelle Young, William Taylor, and Lisa Nordin. We are grateful to the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources for providing fish data. We would also like to thank J. Hovius, Emily Parrott, and Greg Puncher for assistance in the field, and E. Parrott for enumerating the *Bythotrephes* samples.

References

- Arnott, S.E., Magnuson, J.J. and Yan, N.D. 1998. Crustacean zooplankton species richness: single- and multiple-year estimates. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **55**: 1573-1582.
- Barbiero, R.P. and Tuchman, M.L. 2004. Changes in the crustacean communities of Lakes Michigan, Huron, and Erie following the invasion of the predatory cladoceran *Bythotrephes longimanus*. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **61**: 2111-2125.
- Boudreau, S.A. and Yan, N.D. 2003. The differing crustacean zooplankton communities of Canadian Shield lakes with and without the nonindigenous zooplanktivore *Bythotrephes longimanus*. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **60**: 1307-1313.
- Branstrator, D.K. 2005. Contrasting life histories of the predatory cladocerans *Leptodora kindtii* and *Bythotrephes longimanus*. *J. Plankton Res.* **27**: 569-585.
- Brooks, J.L. and Dodson, S.I. 1965. Predation, body size, and composition of plankton. *Science* **150**: 28-35.
- Bungartz, B. and Branstrator, D.K. 2003. Morphological changes in *Daphnia mendotae* in the chemical presence of *Bythotrephes longimanus*. *Arch. Hydrobiol.* **158**: 97-108.
- Carter, J.C.H., Dadswell, M.J., Roff, J.C. and Sprules, W.G. 1980. Distribution and zoogeography of planktonic crustaceans and dipterans in glaciated eastern North America. *Can. J. Zoolog.* **58**: 1355-1387.
- Chao, A. 1984. Non-parametric estimation of the number of classes in a population. *Scand. J. Stat.* **11**: 265-270.
- Dadswell, M.J. 1974. Distribution, ecology, and postglacial dispersal of certain crustaceans and fishes in eastern North America. National Museum of Natural Sciences Publications in Zoology, No. 11, Ottawa, Ont.
- Dodson, S.I. 1992. Predicting zooplankton species richness. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **37**: 848-856.

490 Dodson, S.I., Arnott, S.E. and Cottingham, K.L. 2000. The relationship in lake communities
 491 between primary productivity and species richness. *Ecology* **81**: 2662-2679.
 492 Ferry, K.H. and Wright, R.A. 2002. *Bythotrephes cederstroemi* in Ohio reservoirs: evidence
 493 from fish diets. *Ohio J. Sci.* **102**: 116-118.
 494 Frey, D.G. 1980. On the plurality of *Chydorus sphaericus* (O.F. Müller) (Cladocera,
 495 Chydoridae), and designation of a neotype from Sjaelsø, Denmark. *Hydrobiologia* **69**:
 496 83-123.
 497 Girard, R. and Reid, R.A. 1990. Dorset Research Centre study lakes: sampling methodology
 498 (1986-1989) and lake morphometry. Ontario Ministry of the Environment. Data Report.
 499 Dorset, Ont.
 500 Grigorovich, I.A., Pashkova, O.V., Gromova, Y.F. and van Overdijk, C.D.A. 1998. *Bythotrephes*
 501 *longimanus* in the Commonwealth of Independent States: variability, distribution, and
 502 ecology. *Hydrobiologia* **379**: 183-198.
 503 Hairston Jr., N.G. and Walton, W.E. 1986. Rapid evolution of a life history trait. *P. Natl. Acad.*
 504 *Sci. USA* **83**: 4831-4833.
 505 Hovius, J.T., Beisner, B.E. and McCann, K.S. 2006. Epilimnetic rotifer community responses to
 506 *Bythotrephes longimanus* invasion in Canadian Shield lakes. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **51**:
 507 1004-1012.
 508 Jarnagin, S.T., Swan, B.K. and Kerfoot, W.C. 2000. Fish as vectors in the dispersal of
 509 *Bythotrephes cederstroemi*: diapausing eggs survive passage through the gut. *Freshw.*
 510 *Biol.* **43**: 579-589.
 511 Keller, W. and Conlon, M. 1994. Crustacean zooplankton communities and lake morphometry in
 512 Precambrian Shield lakes. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **51**: 2424-2434.

513 Keller, W. and Pitblado, J.R. 1984. Crustacean plankton in northeastern Ontario lakes subjected
514 to acidic deposition. *Water Air Soil Poll.* **23**: 271-291.

515 Leibold, M.A. 1999. Biodiversity and nutrient enrichment in pond plankton communities. *Evol.*
516 *Ecol. Res.* **1**: 73-95.

517 MacIsaac, H.J., Ketelaars, H.A.M., Grigorovich, I.A., Ramcharan, C.W. and Yan, N.D. 2000.
518 Modeling *Bythotrephes longimanus* invasions in the Great Lakes basin based on its
519 European distribution. *Arch. Hydrobiol.* **149**: 1-21.

520 MacIsaac, H.J., Borbely, J.V.M., Muirhead, J. and Graniero, P.A. 2004. Backcasting and
521 forecasting biological invasions of inland lakes. *Ecol. Appl.* **14**: 773-783.

522 Magurran, A.E. 2004. Measuring biological diversity. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK.

523 McNaught, A.S., Kiesling, R.L. and Ghadouani, A. 2004. Changes to zooplankton community
524 structure following colonization of a small lake by *Leptodora kindtii*. *Limnol. Oceanogr.*
525 **49**: 1239-1249.

526 Mills, E.L., Casselman, J.M., Dermott, R., Fitzsimons, J.D., Gal, G., Holeck, K.T., Hoyle, J.A.,
527 Johannsson, O.E., Lantry, B.F., Makarewicz, J.C., Millard, E.S., Munawar, I.F.,
528 Munawar, M., O'Gorman, R., Owens, R.W., Rudstam, L.G., Schaner, T. and Stewart, T.J.
529 2003. Lake Ontario: food web dynamics in a changing ecosystem (1970-2000). *Can. J.*
530 *Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **60**: 471-490.

531 Nordin, L.J. 2005. The impact of *Bythotrephes longimanus* on the diet, growth and energy
532 storage of *Mysis relicta* in central Ontario lakes. M.Sc. thesis, Department of Biology,
533 University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ont.

534 Ontario Ministry of the Environment. 1983. Handbook of analytical methods for environmental
535 samples. Tech. Rep. Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Laboratory Services and
536 Applied Research Branch, Toronto, Ont.

537 Posey, M.H. and Hines, A.H. 1991. Complex predator-prey interactions within an estuarine
 538 benthic community. *Ecology* **72**: 2155-2169.

539 Quinn, G.P. and Keough, M.J. 2002. Experimental design and data analysis for biologists.
 540 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

541 Sakwińska, O. 2002. Response to fish kairomone of *Daphnia galeata* life history traits relies on
 542 shift to earlier instar at maturation. *Oecologia* **131**: 409-417.

543 Schell, J.M., Santos-Flores, C.J., Allen, P.E., Hunker, B.M., Kloehn, S., Michelson, A., Lillie,
 544 R.A. and Dodson, S.I. 2001. Physical-chemical influences on vernal zooplankton
 545 community structure in small lakes and wetlands of Wisconsin, U.S.A. *Hydrobiologia*
 546 **445**: 37-50.

547 Smith, B. and Wilson, J.B. 1996. A consumer's guide to evenness indices. *Oikos* **76**: 70-82.

548 StatSoft. 2001. STATISTICA 6. StatSoft Inc. Tulsa, Oklahoma.

549 Strecker, A.L. and Arnott, S.E. 2005. Impact of *Bythotrephes* invasion on zooplankton
 550 communities in acid-damaged and recovered lakes on the Boreal Shield. *Can. J. Fish.*
 551 *Aquat. Sci.* **62**: 2450-2462.

552 Taylor, D.J., Ishikane, C.R. and Haney, R.A. 2002. The systematics of Holarctic bosminids and a
 553 revision that reconciles molecular and morphological evolution. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **47**:
 554 1486-1495.

555 ter Braak, C.J.F. and Šmilauer, P. (2002). CANOCO Version 4.5. Biometris - Plant Research
 556 International. Wageningen, The Netherlands.

557 Wærvågen, S.B., Rukke, N.A. and Hessen, D.O. 2002. Calcium content of crustacean
 558 zooplankton and its potential role in species distribution. *Freshw. Biol.* **47**: 1866-1878.

559 Welschmeyer, N.A. 1994. Fluorometric analysis of chlorophyll *a* in the presence of chlorophyll
 560 *b* and pheopigments. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **39**: 1985-1992.

561 Yan, N.D., Keller, W., MacIsaac, H.J. and McEachern, L.J. 1991. Regulation of zooplankton
 562 community structure of an acidified lake by *Chaoborus*. Ecol. Appl. **1**: 52-65.
 563 Yan, N.D. and Pawson, T.W. 1997. Changes in the crustacean zooplankton community of Harp
 564 Lake, Canada, following invasion by *Bythotrephes cederstroemi*. Freshw. Biol. **37**: 409-
 565 425.
 566 Yan, N.D., Blukacz, A., Sprules, W.G., Kindy, P.K., Hackett, D., Girard, R.E. and Clark, B.J.
 567 2001. Changes in zooplankton and the phenology of the spiny water flea, *Bythotrephes*,
 568 following its invasion of Harp Lake, Ontario, Canada. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **58**: 2341-
 569 2350.
 570 Yan, N.D., Girard, R.E. and Boudreau, S. 2002. An introduced invertebrate predator
 571 (*Bythotrephes*) reduces zooplankton species richness. Ecol. Lett. **5**: 481-485.
 572 Young, J.D. and Riessen, H. 2005. The interaction of *Chaoborus* size and vertical distribution
 573 determines predation effects on *Daphnia*. Freshw. Biol. **50**: 993-1006.
 574

575 Table 1. Physical and chemical characteristics of study lakes. Standard deviation of mean depth
 576 of the composite sample indicated in parentheses. A *t*-test was performed to contrast values in
 577 reference and invaded lakes. Lakes sorted by increasing *Bythotrephes* abundance. $Z_{\max}$ =
 578 maximum depth, DOC = dissolved organic carbon, Cond = conductivity, TP = total phosphorus.

Lake	N Lat W Long	$Z_{\max}$ (m)	Composite sample mean depth (m)	Area (ha)	Calcium (mg·L ⁻¹)	DOC (mg·L ⁻¹)	Cond (μmhos· cm ⁻¹)	pH	TP (μg·L ⁻¹)
Reference									
Buck	45°25' 79°23'	23.0	20.6 (1.7)	656.0	2.6	10.7	25.6	6.33	13.30
Doe	45°32' 79°25'	23.0	12.6 (1.5)	1187.0	3.6	7.0	46.0	7.08	12.00
Pickerel	45°41' 79°18'	38.0	26.7 (1.1)	513.0	2.8	6.7	32.4	6.82	8.10
Sand	45°37' 79°10'	59.0	37.4 (5.3)	568.2	3.5	6.0	37.2	6.78	7.10
Mean		35.8	24.3*	731.1	3.1	7.6	35.3	6.75	10.13*
Invaded									
Kashaga- wigamog	44°59' 78°36'	39.7	31.1 (0.8)	817.9	10.8	6.9	95.4	7.56	7.41
Skeleton	45°15' 79°27'	64.7	53.6 (3.3)	2155.5	3.8	2.6	44.0	6.94	3.82

Fairy	45°20' 79°11'	69.5	50.8 (3.6)	711.5	3.5	5.9	49.6	6.95	6.98
Mary	45°15' 79°15'	56.4	48.9 (1.4)	1065.4	3.4	6.6	51.0	6.96	7.21
Lake Muskoka	45°03' 79°28'	66.5	40.4 (0.9)	12206.0	3.6	5.5	54.4	7.02	5.50
Lake of Bays	45°15' 79°04'	70.1	39.3 (3.9)	6904.1	2.9	5.1	36.4	6.97	3.38
Harp	45°23' 79°07'	37.5	31.2 (1.2)	71.7	3.0	6.7	38.0	6.98	7.22
Vernon	45°20' 79°17'	37.2	28.8 (3.7)	1505.1	3.0	7.1	36.8	6.75	7.90
Bernard	45°45' 79°23'	47.9	40.3 (0.7)	2057.7	4.1	3.4	65.2	7.13	9.56
Peninsula	45°20' 79°06'	34.1	21.9 (0.8)	864.8	4.4	6.1	70.6	7.14	9.00
Mean		52.4	38.6*	2836.0	4.3	5.6	54.1	7.04	6.80*

580

581 * $p < 0.05$

582

583 Table 2. Biotic characteristics of study lakes. Persistence is defined as number of consecutive
584 sampling dates that *Bythotrephes* was > 5 individuals·m⁻³. Categorical abundance of
585 planktivorous fish provided by Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (S. Taylor, District of
586 Parry Sound, Parry Sound, ON P2A 1S4, Canada, and S. Sandstrom, District of Muskoka,
587 Bracebridge, ON P1L 1W9, Canada, unpubl. data). A two-tailed *t*-test was performed on chl *a*
588 concentrations in reference and invaded lakes. Lakes sorted by increasing *Bythotrephes*
589 abundance. A = absent, A/P = absent, but detected in past, VL = very low, L = low, M =
590 medium, H = high, N/A = not available, P = present.

Lake	Mean chl <i>a</i> (µg·L ⁻¹)	Sample dates <i>Bythotrephes</i> present	Persistence of <i>Bythotrephes</i>	Lake herring	Rainbow smelt	Lake whitefish	Yellow perch
Reference							
Buck	2.8	0	0	A/P	A	A	P
Doe	3.4	0	0	L	A	L	P
Pickereel	4.4	0	0	L	A/P	A	P
Sand	2.0	0	0	L	H	A	P
Mean	3.1*	0	0				
Invaded							
Kashaga- wigamog	2	5	0	M/H	L/M	A/P	P
Skeleton	0.7	6	0	L	L/M	M	P

591

592

593

Fairy	2.2	7	0	A/P	M	A/P	P
Mary	2.5	8	0	A/P	M	L	P
Lake Muskoka	2.9	8	1	VL	N/A	VL	P
Lake of Bays	1.7	7	1	L/M	M	M/H	P
Harp	1.7	7	2	H	A	A	P
Vernon	2.8	7	4	L	M	A/P	P
Bernard	2.8	7	2	A/P	L/M	H	P
Peninsula	2.6	8	6	A/P	M	A/P	P
Mean	2.2*	7	1.6				

594

595 * $p < 0.05$

596

597 Table 3. Multiple regression of crustacean zooplankton species richness with predictor variables
 598 in all study lakes (invaded: $n = 10$; reference: $n = 4$). Persistence is defined as number of
 599 consecutive sampling dates that *Bythotrephes* was > 5 individuals·m⁻³. AIC = Akaike's
 600 information criterion, TP = total phosphorus.
 601

	Adjusted	Mallows		<i>F</i> -	<i>p</i> -			Partial		
	R ²	C _p	AIC	ratio	value	Variable	Coefficient	correlation coefficient	<i>t</i> - value	<i>p</i> - value
Model						<i>Bythotrephes</i>				
1	0.73	4.59	16.37	12.57	<0.01*	abundance	-1.32	-0.84	-4.87	<0.01*
						<i>Bythotrephes</i>	1.23	0.83	4.77	<0.01*
						persistence				
						TP	-0.47	0.70	3.12	0.01*
Model						area	0.24	0.49	1.57	0.15
2	0.77	5.10	14.77	9.79	<0.01*	<i>Bythotrephes</i>	-1.78	-0.89	-5.65	<0.01*
						abundance				
						<i>Bythotrephes</i>	1.70	0.89	5.52	<0.01*
						persistence				
						pH	0.20	0.43	1.36	0.21
						TP	0.62	0.81	3.93	<0.01*

602 * $p < 0.05$

603 Table 4. Summary of effects of *Bythotrephes* on several zooplankton community attributes in
604 different types of sampling regimes. Symbols indicate: + positive effect ($p < 0.05$); — negative
605 effect ($p < 0.1$); — negative effect ($p < 0.05$); 0 no effect.

Variable	Long-term			
	study	Synoptic	Seasonal	Field
	of Harp L. ^{a,b} , Great Lakes ^c	survey ^d	survey ^e	experiment ^f
Richness				
total zooplankton	— ^{a,c}	—	—	0
cladocerans	— ^a	—	—	0 ^g
copepods	0 ^a	0	0	0 ^g
Abundance				
total zooplankton	— ^b	0	—	—
	0 ^c			
cladocerans	— ^b	—	—	— (small); 0 (large)
	0 ^c			
copepods	0 ^{b,c}	0	—	— (calanoids); 0 (cyclopoids)
Diversity				
total zooplankton	N/A	N/A	0	0
cladocerans	N/A	N/A	—	0 ^g

copepods

N/A

N/A

0

+ ^g

606

607 ^a Yan et al. (2002); biweekly/monthly collections (1980-2000)

608 ^b Yan et al. (2001); biweekly/monthly collections (1980-1998)

609 ^c Barbiero and Tuchman (2004); multiple stations in Lakes Michigan, Huron, and Erie
610 (1983-1999)

611 ^d Boudreau and Yan (2003); single mid-summer sampling date (2001)

612 ^e this study

613 ^f Strecker and Arnott (2005); 30 day enclosure experiment

614 ^g A. Strecker, unpubl. data

615

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Box-and-whisker plots of (a) species richness, (b) Shannon-Wiener diversity, (c) E_{var} , and (d) abundance (individuals·m⁻³) for total crustacean zooplankton, cladocerans, and copepods in invaded (white boxes; $n = 10$) and reference lakes (grey boxes; $n = 4$). The centre is the mean, the box is the standard error, the whiskers are the standard deviation, and the asterisk (★) is $p < 0.05$.

Figure 2. On the left axis, percent change in invaded lakes richness (white bars) and abundance (grey bars) from the average of the reference lakes, contrasted with mean *Bythotrephes* abundance (◆; individuals·m⁻³) on the right axis. Vertical error bars represent $\pm$ standard error. Lake names: BERN = Bernard, KASH = Kashagawigamog, LOB = Lake of Bays, MUSK = Lake Muskoka, PEN = Peninsula, SKEL = Skeleton, VERN = Vernon.

Figure 3. Redundancy analysis of zooplankton species abundances and environmental conditions. Environmental variables are represented by the large arrows and species by the small arrows. Species with short arrows were removed to reduce crowding. Circles are site scores for invaded (●) and reference (○) lakes. Species names are italicized. Lake names: BERN = Bernard, KASH = Kashagawigamog, LOB = Lake of Bays, MUSK = Lake Muskoka, PEN = Peninsula, PICK = Pickerel, SKEL = Skeleton, VERN = Vernon. Environmental variables: TP = total phosphorus, Z_{max} = maximum depth, chl a = chlorophyll a .

Figure 4. Mean abundance (individuals·m⁻³) of (a) calanoid (◇) and cyclopoid (▲) copepods and (b) large (■; > 1 mm) and small (○; < 1 mm) cladocerans in reference lakes plotted against corresponding abundance in invaded lakes. Abbreviations of zooplankton taxa are (a) *Aca rob* = *Acanthocyclops robustus*, cal naup = calanoid nauplii, cyc naup = cyclopoid nauplii, *Cyc scu* =

641 *Cyclops scutifer*, *Dia bic th* = *Diacyclops bicuspidatus thomasi*, *Epi lac* = *Epischura lacustris*,
 642 *Lep ash* = *Leptodiptomus ashlandi*, *Lep min* = *Leptodiptomus minutus*, *Lep sic* =
 643 *Leptodiptomus sicilis*, *Mes edax* = *Mesocyclops edax*, *Ort mod* = *Orthocyclops modestus*, *Sen*
 644 *cal* = *Senecella calanoides*, *Ski ore* = *Skistodiptomus oregonensis*, *Tro ext* = *Tropocyclops*
 645 *extensus*; and (b) *Acr har* = *Acroperus harpae*, *Bosm* = *Bosmina* (*Bosmina*) spp., *Chyd* =
 646 *Chydorus* spp., *Dap amb* = *Daphnia ambigua*, *Dap cat* = *Daphnia catawba*, *Dap dub* =
 647 *Daphnia dubia*, *Dap lon* = *Daphnia longiremis*, *Dap men* = *Daphnia mendotae*, *Dap ret* =
 648 *Daphnia retrocurva*, *Dia bir* = *Diaphanosoma birgei*, *Eub cor* = *Eubosmina coregoni*, *Eub tub*
 649 = *Eubosmina tubicen*, *Hol gib* = *Holopedium gibberum*, *Lat set* = *Latona setifera*, *Lep kin* =
 650 *Leptodora kindtii*, *Pol ped* = *Polyphemus pediculus*, *Sid cry* = *Sida crystallina*.
 651

652 Table S1. Zooplankton species presence/absence in study lakes. Taxonomic authorities in
653 parentheses indicate genus name has changed since original description. * = invaded lakes

Species	Authority	Bernard*	Buck	Doe	Fairy*
<i>Acanthocyclops robustus</i> ^a	(Sars)			x	
<i>Acroperus harpae</i>	(Baird)		x		
<i>Bosmina (Bosmina)</i> <i>liederi/freyi</i> ^b	De Melo and Hebert	x	x	x	x
<i>Chydorus</i> <i>sphaericus/brevilabris</i>	O.F. Müller/ Frey			x	
<i>Cyclops scutifer</i>	Sars	x			
<i>Daphnia (Daphnia) ambigua</i>	Scourfield		x	x	
<i>Daphnia (Daphnia) catawba</i>	Coker				
<i>Daphnia (Daphnia) retrocurva</i>	Forbes		x		
<i>Daphnia (Hyalodaphnia) dubia</i>	Herrick				
<i>Daphnia (Hyalodaphnia) longiremis</i>	Sars		x	x	x
<i>Daphnia (Hyalodaphnia) mendotae</i> ^c	Birge		x	x	x
<i>Diacyclops bicuspidatus thomasi</i>	(Forbes)	x	x	x	x
<i>Diaphanosoma birgei</i>	Kořínek		x	x	x
<i>Epischura lacustris</i>	Forbes	x	x	x	x
<i>Eubosmina (Eubosmina) coregoni</i> ^d	(Baird)				
<i>Eubosmina (Neobosmina) tubicen</i> ^e	(Brehm)			x	

654
655
656
657

<i>Holopedium gibberum</i>	Zaddach		x	x	x
<i>Latona setifera</i>	(O.F. Müller)				
<i>Leptodiaptomus ashlandi</i>	(Marsh)				
<i>Leptodiaptomus minutus</i>	(Lilljeborg)	x	x	x	x
<i>Leptodiaptomus sicilis</i>	(Forbes)		x	x	x
<i>Leptodora kindtii</i>	(Focke)		x	x	
<i>Mesocyclops edax</i>	(Forbes)	x	x	x	
<i>Orthocyclops modestus</i>	(Herrick)	x	x	x	x
<i>Polyphemus pediculus</i>	(Linnaeus)		x	x	
<i>Senecella calanoides</i>	Juday				x
<i>Sida crystallina</i>	(O.F. Müller)				
<i>Skistodiaptomus oregonensis</i>	(Lilljeborg)				
<i>Tropocyclops extensus</i> ^f	(Kiefer)				

658

659 ^a formerly *Acanthocyclops vernalis* complex

660 ^b formerly *Bosmina* (*Sinobosmina*) spp.

661 ^c formerly *Daphnia galeata mendotae*

662 ^d formerly *Bosmina* (*Eubosmina*) *coregoni*

663 ^e formerly *Bosmina* (*Neobosmina*) *tubicen*

664 ^f formerly *Tropocyclops prasinus mexicanus*

665

Species	Harp*	Kashaga- wigamog*	Lake Muskoka*	Lake of Bays*	Mary*
<i>Acanthocyclops robustus</i> ^a					
<i>Acroperus harpae</i>					
<i>Bosmina (Bosmina) liederi/freyi</i> ^b		x	x	x	x
<i>Chydorus sphaericus/brevilabris</i>				x	
<i>Cyclops scutifer</i>					x
<i>Daphnia (Daphnia) ambigua</i>					
<i>Daphnia (Daphnia) catawba</i>					
<i>Daphnia (Daphnia) retrocurva</i>				x	
<i>Daphnia (Hyalodaphnia) dubia</i>		x			
<i>Daphnia (Hyalodaphnia) longiremis</i>	x	x	x		x
<i>Daphnia (Hyalodaphnia) mendotae</i> ^c	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Diacyclops bicuspidatus thomasi</i>	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Diaphanosoma birgei</i>		x	x		x
<i>Epischura lacustris</i>	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Eubosmina (Eubosmina) coregoni</i> ^d					
<i>Eubosmina (Neobosmina) tubicen</i> ^e					

666

667

668

<i>Holopedium gibberum</i>	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Latona setifera</i>					
<i>Leptodiaptomus ashlandi</i>					
<i>Leptodiaptomus minutus</i>	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Leptodiaptomus sicilis</i>	x	x		x	x
<i>Leptodora kindtii</i>		x			
<i>Mesocyclops edax</i>	x		x		
<i>Orthocyclops modestus</i>		x	x	x	
<i>Polyphemus pediculus</i>		x			
<i>Senecella calanoides</i>	x		x	x	
<i>Sida crystallina</i>		x	x		
<i>Skistodiaptomus oregonensis</i>					
<i>Tropocyclops extensus</i> ^f	x				

669

670 ^a formerly *Acanthocyclops vernalis* complex

671 ^b formerly *Bosmina* (*Sinobosmina*) spp.

672 ^c formerly *Daphnia galeata mendotae*

673 ^d formerly *Bosmina* (*Eubosmina*) *coregoni*

674 ^e formerly *Bosmina* (*Neobosmina*) *tubicen*

675 ^f formerly *Tropocyclops prasinus mexicanus*

676

677

Species	Peninsula*	Pickerel	Sand	Skeleton*	Vernon*
<i>Acanthocyclops robustus</i> ^a	x			x	
<i>Acroperus harpae</i>					
<i>Bosmina (Bosmina) liederii/freyi</i> ^b	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Chydorus sphaericus/brevilabris</i>		x		x	
<i>Cyclops scutifer</i>	x				x
<i>Daphnia (Daphnia) ambigua</i>					x
<i>Daphnia (Daphnia) catawba</i>	x		x		
<i>Daphnia (Daphnia) retrocurva</i>		x			
<i>Daphnia (Hyalodaphnia) dubia</i>	x				
<i>Daphnia (Hyalodaphnia) longiremis</i>	x		x	x	x
<i>Daphnia (Hyalodaphnia) mendotae</i> ^c	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Diacyclops bicuspidatus thomasi</i>	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Diaphanosoma birgei</i>	x	x			
<i>Epischura lacustris</i>		x		x	x
<i>Eubosmina (Eubosmina) coregoni</i> ^d			x		
<i>Eubosmina (Neobosmina) tubicen</i> ^e	x	x	x		x

678
679

<i>Holopedium gibberum</i>	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Latona setifera</i>	X				
<i>Leptodiaptomus ashlandi</i>					X
<i>Leptodiaptomus minutus</i>	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Leptodiaptomus sicilis</i>		X		X	X
<i>Leptodora kindtii</i>		X			X
<i>Mesocyclops edax</i>	X	X			
<i>Orthocyclops modestus</i>	X	X	X		X
<i>Polyphemus pediculus</i>		X			X
<i>Senecella calanoides</i>					
<i>Sida crystallina</i>		X	X		
<i>Skistodiaptomus oregonensis</i>	X				
<i>Tropocyclops extensus</i> ^f					

680

681 ^a formerly *Acanthocyclops vernalis* complex

682 ^b formerly *Bosmina* (*Sinobosmina*) spp.

683 ^c formerly *Daphnia galeata mendotae*

684 ^d formerly *Bosmina* (*Eubosmina*) *coregoni*

685 ^e formerly *Bosmina* (*Neobosmina*) *tubicen*

686 ^f formerly *Tropocyclops prasinus mexicanus*

687

688

689

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

Figure 3.

Figure 4.