

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

The invasive seaweed Asparagopsis taxiformis erodes the habitat structure and biodiversity of native algal forests in the Mediterranean Sea

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Mancuso F.P., D'Agostaro R., Milazzo M., Badalamenti F., Musco L., Mikac B., et al. (2022). The invasive seaweed Asparagopsis taxiformis erodes the habitat structure and biodiversity of native algal forests in the Mediterranean Sea. MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH, 173, 1-11 [10.1016/j.marenvres.2021.105515].

Availability:

[This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/839425 since: 2023-08-04](https://hdl.handle.net/11585/839425)

Published:

[DOI: http://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2021.105515](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2021.105515)

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

> This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/). When citing, please refer to the published version.

> > (Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Mancuso FP, D'Agostaro R, Milazzo M, Badalamenti F, Musco L, Mikac B, et al. The invasive seaweed Asparagopsis taxiformis erodes the habitat structure and biodiversity of native algal forests in the Mediterranean Sea. Marine Environmental Research. 2022 Jan 1;173:105515.

The final published version is available online at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2021.105515

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/)

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Marine Environmental Research

The invasive seaweed Asparagopsis taxiformis erodes the habitat structure and
biodiversity of native algal forests in the Mediterranean Sea
--Manuscript Draft--

Highlights:

- \bullet Primary producer biomass is 90% lower in A. taxiformis than in E. brachycarpa habitat.
- From native to invasive seaweeds, epifaunal assemblages lost 40% of their diversity. \bullet
- Seaweed biomass was the structural attribute explaining the epifaunal variation. \bullet
- We suggest a complete shift from native to invasive seaweeds could impair rocky shore habitats.

29 the associated epifaunal assemblages in homogenous and mixed stands of E. brachycarpa and A. 30 taxiformis. The results showed that the biomass of primary producers is reduced by 90% in the A. 2 $\frac{4}{3}$ 1 *taxiformis* invaded habitat compared to the *E. brachycarpa* native habitat. The structure of the 32 epifaunal assemblages displayed significant variations among homogenous and mixed stands. The 7 33 abundance, species richness and Shannon-Wiener diversity index of the epifaunal assemblages 1234 decreased by 89%, 78% and 40%, respectively, from homogenous stands of the native E. brachycarpa $\frac{14}{12}$ 35 to the invasive *A. taxiformis.* Seaweed biomass was the structural attribute better explaining the 16
136 variation in epifaunal abundance, species richness and diversity. Overall, our results suggest that the $\frac{13}{2}$ shift from *E. brachycarpa* to *A. taxiformis* habitat would drastically erode the biomass of primary $2\frac{1}{2}$ producers and the associated biodiversity. We hypothesize that a complete shift from native to 39 invasive seaweeds could ultimately lead to bottom-up effects on rocky shore habitats, with negative 24 $^{26}_{24}$ 0 consequences for the ecosystem structure, functioning, and the services provided. 1 $\frac{3}{2}$ 51 *taxyormis* invaded habitat compared $6\overline{6}$ 8 and 2
8 and 2 10^{3} abundance, species fremess and σ 11 134
 13
 14
 15
 15 15^o to the invasive 11. taxyormis. Seaw 176 variation in epitaunal abundance, spe 18 20 22° producers and the associated biodiv $\frac{21}{22}8$
23 $2\frac{4}{3}9$
 25
 $2\frac{6}{2}40$ 270 consequences for the ecosystem structure.

 $^{31}_{22}$ Keywords: habitat shift; alga; *Ericaria brachycarpa*; epifauna diversity; *Cystoseira sensu lato*; rocky 43 shore; Marine Protected Area $32⁷²$ Rey words. Havitat sinit, arga, *Ericar* 33 and the set of the 343 shore; Marine Protected Area 35

$3\overline{4}5$ Introduction 38
 39 ⁴⁵

 $\frac{36}{4}$

37

40

63

28 291 30

2**941**
30

⁴46 Invasive species are globally recognized among the main drivers of habitat shift in both terrestrial $^{43}_{44}$ and marine ecosystems (Gallardo et al., 2016; Mačić et al., 2018). In marine environments, decades 48 of human activities related to global aquatic trade have enabled the dispersion of invasive species 46 $^{48}_{40}$ 49 among distant geographic areas worldwide (Bax et al., 2003; Williams and Smith, 2007; Molnar et 50 al., 2008; Servello et al., 2019). In addition, the rise in seawater temperature caused by global 51 $\frac{53}{2}$ 1 warming has allowed non-native species to cross environmental and geographical barriers, facilitating 52 their expansion and in turn eroding indigenous resistance (Occhipinti-Ambrogi and Galil, 2010; Lo 55 $\frac{5}{2}$ Brutto et al., 2019). Concerns over ecological and social-economic consequences have led researches $^{60}_{62}$ to investigate the effects of invasive species on many marine ecosystems around the world. 446
 42
 43
 447 44 ⁺/ and marine ecosysiems (Ganardo et 45 47 497 among uistant geographic areas word 50
5**50** 52 $54¹$ washing has allowed from half to spec 562 their expansion and in turn eroding i 57 59 $6P⁴$ to investigate the effects of invasive 62

55 Seaweeds are a significant component of marine non-native and invasive species (227 taxa 56 globally), with some of them being responsible for drastic habitat shifts (Williams and Smith, 2007). 2 $\frac{4}{5}$ 7 Studies have highlighted how invasive seaweeds can negatively impact the recipient habitats by 58 reducing biomass of primary producers, biodiversity, and nutrient flows, compromising ecosystem 7 $\frac{9}{20}$ functioning (Boudouresque et al., 2005; Streftaris and Zenetos, 2006; Thomsen et al., 2014; Maggi 1260 et al., 2015; Ramsay-Newton et al., 2017; Geburzi and McCarthy, 2018). Interestingly, the effects of $\frac{14}{10}$ non-native seaweeds seem to change depending on the complexity of the recipient habitat (Thomsen ¹⁶ et al., 2014). In less structured habitats (e.g. soft bottoms), the introduction of non-native seaweeds $\frac{1}{6}$ 3 enhances structural complexity that may favor the increase in biodiversity and food web length 2.54 (Dijkstra et al., 2017). Conversely, the introduction in well-structured habitats (e.g. seagrass ²45 meadows, algal canopies) may alter the diversity and function, depending on the structural features $^{26}_{25}$ 6 of the recipient habitat (Engelen et al., 2013; Veiga et al., 2014, 2018). 1 $3 \cdot 3 \cdot 7$ 5^{\prime} studies have inginighted now invasi- $6\overline{6}$ 8 and 2
8 and 2 10^{27} functioning (Dougourcsque et al., 20 11 13 $15²$ non narre seaweeds seem to enange $1\,\text{b}2$ et al., 2014). In less structured habita 18 20² 2294 (Dijkstra et al., 2017). Conversely 23 $\frac{265}{25}$
 $\frac{26}{26}$ 6 270 of the recipient habitat (Engelen et al.

267 Macroalgal complexity plays a significant role in shaping the abundance, richness and structure of $\frac{31}{2}68$ epifaunal assemblages associated with both non-native and native seaweeds (Chemello and Milazzo, 69 2002; Jormalainen and Honkanen, 2008; Pitacco et al., 2014; Veiga et al., 2014; Maggi et al., 2015; $\frac{36}{2}$ Dijkstra et al., 2017; Veiga et al., 2018; Chiarore et al., 2019). Algae with a high structural 38
 39 1 complexity, expressed as a combination of attributes, such as degree of branching, thallus width and ⁴₇₂ height, and wet weight, can support well-structured epifaunal communities (Hacker and Steneck, $^{43}_{44}$ $^{73}_{47}$ 1990; Chemello and Milazzo, 2002; Jormalainen and Honkanen, 2008; Pitacco et al., 2014; Veiga et 4 $\sqrt{44}$ al., 2014; Bitlis, 2019; Chiarore et al., 2019). Studies comparing the epifaunal diversity between $^{48}_{40}$ 5 invasive and native seaweeds revealed that, when invasive species are structurally less complex than 76 native ones, they support low abundance and richness, and a simplified structure of epifaunal 5377 assemblages (Navarro-Barranco et al., 2018; Veiga et al., 2018). However, when native macroalgae 55 are less complex, the abundance and diversity of epifauna associated with invasive seaweeds may be $\frac{58}{9}$ higher (Veiga et al., 2014; Dijkstra et al., 2017). This indicates that the effects of invasive seaweeds $^{60}_{60}$ on epifaunal assemblages may change depending on both the invasive and the native seaweed 30 320 epinamai assemblages associated when 33 and the contract of the con 3459 2002; Jormalainen and Honkanen, 20 35 37^o \rightarrow 37^o 39 1 complexity, expressed as a combinat 40 472
 42
 43
 44
 4 $44/3$ 1990; Chemeno and Milazzo, 2002; 45 47 $49³$ invasive and native scaweeds revealed 50 $51/6$ native ones, they support low abu 52 $54'$ assemblages (manalle Barraneo et al. $56/8$ are less complex, the abundance and 57 59 σ σ σ σ σ σ 6180 on epitaunal assemblages may changed 62

3

63

28

81 structural features. However, other studies have shown that native and invasive seaweeds with similar 82 morphologies can host either similar (Suárez-Jiménez et al., 2017) or different epifaunal diversity 2 $^{4}_{8}$ 3 (Navarro-Barranco et al., 2019). Overall, these contrasting evidences suggest that, apart from 84 seaweed morphology, other factors can be involved in structuring the associated assemblages. 7 1 $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ β 3 (Navarro-Darranco et al., 2019). Ov $6\overline{6}$ 8 and 2012 **1999**

 $\frac{9}{10}$ 85 In the last decades, the Mediterranean basin has witnessed an increase in the number of non-native 1286 and invasive seaweeds, with consequent modification of biodiversity and ecosystem functioning of $\frac{14}{12}$ 87 coastal areas (Ribera Siguan, 2002; Streftaris et al., 2005; Streftaris and Zenetos, 2006; Piazzi and 16
188 Balata, 2009; Musco et al., 2014; Bulleri et al., 2016; Corriero et al., 2016; Giangrande et al., 2020). ¹ 89 In particular, *Asparagopsis taxiformis* (Delile) Trevisan de Saint-Léon is listed among the 100 worst $\frac{21}{220}$ invasive species in this basin (Streftaris and Zenetos, 2006). The earliest reports of its presence in the 91 Mediterranean Sea date back to 1798-1801 in Alexandria (Egypt) as a result of trading operations 24 $\frac{26}{2}$ and the opening of the Suez Canal (Verlaque et al., 2015). It was first recorded along the Italian coast 93 on the western shore of Sicily, close to the city of Trapani, in May 2000 (Barone et al., 2003). While 29 $\frac{31}{2}$ 94 *A. taxiformis* has been suspected of producing harmful effects on native habitats (Barone et al., 2003), 95 as far as we know, only one study assessed its effects on biodiversity, in particular by comparing the $\frac{3}{2}$ 96 vagile macrofauna associated with this species to that of the native *Halopteris scoparia* (Linnaeus) 38
397 Sauvageau indicating that A. taxiformis hosted less diverse epifaunal assemblages compared to native ⁴98 algae (Navarro-Barranco et al., 2018). 10^{3} m the last decades, the iviedificitant 11 13 $15'$ coastar areas (Riocra Siguari, 2002, 1788 Balata, 2009; Musco et al., 2014; Bu 18 20 and $\frac{1}{20}$ are $\frac{1}{20}$ and $\$ 220 invasive species in this basin (Strefta 23 25 and 26 an 27^2 and the opening of the sucz Canal (v 28 30 $32⁴$ 21. taxyormis has been suspected of p. 33 3495 as far as we know, only one study as 35 37 39/ Sauvageau indicating that A. taxiform 40 42
 42
 43
 49
 49

 $^{43}_{42}$ 9 Along the Italian coast, gametophytes of *A. taxiformis* can colonize coastal areas dominated by 400 habitat-forming seaweeds, mainly belonging to the genus *Cystoseira* - recently divided into three $^{48}_{\mu}$ 01 genera Cystoseira, Gongolaria and Ericaria and hereafter referred to as Cystoseira sensu lato to 5102 include all three genera (Orellana et al., 2019; Molinari Novoa and Guiry, 2020). Cystoseira sensu $\frac{5}{10}$ 3 *lato* species are important ecological engineers, greatly increasing the habitat surface, complexity and 104 productivity in coastal ecosystems from the infra-littoral zone to the upper circalittoral zone. 55 105 (Giaccone et al., 1994; Bulleri et al., 2002; Falace and Bressan, 2006; Ballesteros et al., 2009; 58 10^{60} Mancuso et al., 2021b). By creating shelter, *Cystoseira sensu lato* species improve the biodiversity 449 Along the Italian coast, gametopi 45 47 $49¹$ genera Cysioseira, Gongoiaria and 50
5102 52 54 5404 productivity in coastal ecosystems 57 59 β ¹0 Mancuso et al., 2021b). By creating 62

- 63
- 64
- 65

107 of their related assemblages, leading to the development of well-structured food webs (Schiel and 108 Foster, 2006; Cheminée et al., 2013; Mineur et al., 2015; Mancuso et al., 2021b). According to the 2 1409 European Water Framework Directive (2000/60), they are also considered indicators of good water 170 and environmental quality (European Commission, 2000). 1 $3 \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)$ **149 European water Framework Directive** $6\overline{6}$ 8 and 2012 **1996**

 $1\frac{9}{11}$ In a recent study, we discovered that A. taxiformis had a less diverse and less structured molluscan 1212 assemblage than *E. brachycarpa*; however, no information about other epifaunal components $^{14}_{12}$ 3 associated with seaweeds was reported, nor information about intermediate states, such as mixed ¹⁶ stands of *E. brachycarpa* and *A. taxiformis* (Mancuso et al., 2021a). Here, we compared the structure $\frac{19}{12}$ 5 of the epifaunal community (amphipods, molluscs and annelids) associated with three plausible 21
 $\frac{1}{2}$ 16 alternative states of the transition between the native *Ericaria brachycarpa* (J.Agardth) Orellana & 2417 Sansón and the invasive A. taxiformis. In particular, we characterized and compared the biomass and $^{26}_{27}$ 8 the diversity (richness, evenness, structure and composition) of the epifauna associated with the 299 fronds of homogenous and mixed stands of E. brachycarpa and A. taxiformis. Moreover, we explored 3120 the variation of the epifaunal diversity in relation to the structural features of the two algae (dry 121 weight, thallus volume, canopy volume, and interstitial volume). We hypothesize that shifting from $\frac{35}{2}$ habitats dominated by *E. brachycarpa* to those dominated by *A. taxiformis* will have a negative 123 impact on the associated biodiversity, resulting in low abundances and diversity of each epifaunal 38 124 component. 41 10^{-1} in a recent study, we discovered the 11 1121 assemblage than *E. brachycarpa*; $\frac{11}{121}$
13 $15⁵$ associated with seaweeds was reported 1714 stands of *E. brachycarpa* and *A. taxif* 18 20 and the second continuing (see Fig. $2/2$ o alternative states of the transition be 23 $\frac{24}{25}$ 27° and diversity (fieldings, eventless, st 28 30 32° and variation of the epitalitian diverse 33 3421 weight, thallus volume, canopy volu 35 37 - \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots $3\frac{1}{2}$ impact on the associated biodiversit 40 $^{4124}_{42}$

126 Materials and Methods 46 45 47

 $^{43}_{44}$ 25

 $44\angle 3$

60 61 62 63

 $^{48}_{A2}$ 7 Study area and algal species characteristics $49'$ budy area and argar species enaracte

128 The research was performed on the southwestern, shallow rocky shore of Favignana Island 129 (Sicily, Italy), within the Egadi Islands Marine Protected Area (MPA) in June 2011 (Fig. 1). The 53 130 region consists of gently sloping (5°-10°) carbonate rocky platforms and scattered boulders (Pepe et 55 131 al., 2018) that provide substrates for well-developed macroalgal vegetation. 58 50 5128 The research was performed or 52 $54'$ (sixiff, $\lim_{t \to \infty} f(x)$), which are Egaar Isla. 5ω region consists of gently sloping (5° 57 59 , 1

132 In this area, A. taxiformis was first recorded in 2000 (Barone et al., 2003). Since then, no studies 133 have explored the temporal effects of this invasive species on native habitats. Although today A . $\frac{4}{12}$ 4 *taxiformis* is well established in the area, previous surveys allowed the identification of three sites 135 with distinctive habitats corresponding to three possible alternative states of the transition from native 7 $1,36$ to invasive seaweed habitats: "Scoglio Corrente" (37° 55' 2.0778" N, 12° 17' 6.0432" E) characterized 1237 by stands of *E. brachycarpa* (100% coverage); "Scoglio Palumbo" (37° 55' 10.4226" N, 12° 18' $^{14}_{12}$ 38 41.097" E) hosting stands of A. taxiformis (100% coverage), and "Cala Grande" (37° 55' 35.385" N, 16
1739 12° 16' 39.514" E) with mixed stands of *E. brachycarpa* (~50% coverage) and *A. taxiformis* (~50% $\frac{1940}{12}$ coverage) (Fig. 1). In this study, we decided to use these three sites to compare the epifaunal 21
 241 communities associated with three plausible alternative states of the transition from native to invasive 142 habitats. 24 1 $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{1}{3}$ 1594 *taxyormis* is well established in the a $6\overline{6}$ 8 and 2012 **1996** 10^{10} w invasive scawecu habitats. Seogn 11 1237 by stands of *E. brachycarpa* (100%) 15° 11.027 Le noving suites of 11. u_{avg} 1759 12 $^{\circ}$ 16' 39.514" E) with mixed stand 18 20° and 20° (-9°) is the same set of y , $2\frac{1}{2}$ communities associated with three pi 23

 $\frac{26}{243}$ Ericaria brachycarpa is a brown seaweed (Fucales) characterized by caespitosus thalli up to 20-144 25 cm in height with several perennial axes, up to 2-6 cm in height, connected to the substratum by a 29 3145 more or less compact discoid base formed by haptera (Molinari Novoa and Guiry, 2020). The apices 146 of the axes are flattened, smooth and not very prominent. Branches are cylindrical with smooth bases, $\frac{36}{12}$ or covered with tiny spinose appendages that are typically fertile in the spring-summer season 148 (Gómez-Garreta et al., 2002; Mannino and Mancuso, 2009; Cormaci et al., 2012). Like other 38 149 Cystoseira sensu lato species, E. brachycarpa displays seasonal differences in vegetative 41 $^{43}_{44}$ 50 development (Gómez-Garreta et al., 2002). At the study sites, new branches of *E. brachycarpa* grow 151 from the perennial axes in spring (May-June) providing new substrate and shelter for colonizing 46 $^{48}_{15}$ 2 fauna, while in autumn (September-October) *E. brachycarpa* starts to become quiescent, losing 153 almost all branches, leaving perennial axes that persist throughout the cold winter season. 51 273 *Ericaria brachycarpa* is a brown 28 30 $32²$ more of ress compact discord base to 33 3446 of the axes are flattened, smooth and 35 $37'$ as severed what any opinion appendix 31948 (Gomez-Garreta et al., 2002; Mani 40 4490 development (Gomez-Garreta et al., 45 49^2 and α , while in addition (September

 $\frac{5}{3}$ 34 *Asparagopsis taxiformis* is a red alga (Bonnemaisoniales) common in the tropics and subtropics 155 across the globe. The species experiences a heteromorphic life cycle, with an erect gametophyte 55 [156 alternating with a filamentous sporophyte known as *Falkenbergia hillebrandii* (Bornet) Falkenberg 157 (Andreakis et al., 2004; Ní Chualáin et al., 2004). The gametophytes are characterized by sparsely 60 54 565 across the globe. The species exper 57 59 βP (Andreakis et al., 2004; Ni Chualain

 $\frac{4}{160}$ *taxiformis* develops in the upper sublittoral zone of the rocky substrate or as an epiphyte of other algal 161 species. The gametophytes are present during all seasons with a maximum occurrence in spring 7 10^{9} (Barone et al., 2003). $\frac{1163}{13}$ 150 *taxyormis* develops in the upper subili $6\overline{6}$ 8 and 2
8 and 2 10^{10} (Darone et al., 2003). 11 11263 13 14 15 37.96°N 16 17 \sim 18 37.94°N 19 and $\frac{1}{2}$ 20 | 2 21 22 22 22 $37.92^{\circ}N -$ 23 SC 3 24 25 $37.9^{\circ}N$ - 26 27 and the contract of the con 28 and 28 an 29 37.88°N $\sqrt{ }$ 30 **and 1000 m**

1

 \sim 3

 $\frac{336}{300}$ Fig. 1 Location of the three study sites (red dots) along the rocky-shore of Favignana Island MPA 167 (green dot), Trapani, Sicily, Italy. $SC =$ Scoglio Corrente, $SP =$ Scoglio Palumbo, $CG =$ Cala Grande. $\frac{38}{368}$ 340 Fig. 1 Location of the time study si 35 37

 $12.34^{\circ}E$

 $12.36^{\circ}E$

12.38°E

 $12.4^{\circ}E$

 $12.32^{\circ}E$

158 branched, creeping stolons and erect shoots from which several side branches grow in all directions.

Favignana

CENT S P

 $12.3^{\circ}E$

1 $\overline{3}9$ The latter ramifies over and over again giving the thallus a plumose appearance. In the study area, A.

40
469 Sampling and analysis of epifauna 4169 Sampling and analysis of epitauna 40
 4169
 42

63

 $39⁰$

 $3\frac{1}{6}$ 12.28°E $3\frac{2}{5}5$

 $\frac{4}{3}$?0 Samples were collected by scuba diving at a depth of 5-7 m. For each site (hereafter referred to $^{45}_{4}$ das habitat), two areas (5 x 5 m) were haphazardly selected. For each area, 10 thalli of *E. brachycarpa* 4872 from homogenous stands (100% algal coverage), 10 thalli of E. brachycarpa from mixed stands and $\frac{50}{217}$ 10 gametophytes of *A. taxiformis* from homogenous stands (100% algal coverage) were collected (n 174 = 20 per habitat). Thalli were collected 50cm apart to avoid spatial autocorrelation among samples. 53 $\frac{55}{2}$ 5 Underwater, each thallus and the associated epifauna were enveloped in a plastic bag, then the alga 176 was detached from the substrate and the plastic bag was immediately closed to prevent the escape of $9/7$ vagile fauna. After collection, each sample was carefully drained of seawater in order to prevent 4370
 44
 45
 471 $4\frac{1}{6}$ as habitat), two areas (5 x 5 m) were 47 49 C C $51/3$ TO game to privies of A. *taxyormis* no 52 54 $56³$ Onderwater, each manus and the ass 57 5876 was detached from the substrate and 59 $61'$ $\sqrt{9}$ $\sqrt{9}$ $\sqrt{100}$ $\sqrt{100}$ $\sqrt{100}$ $\sqrt{100}$ $\sqrt{100}$ 62

64 65

 364 $\frac{365}{366}$

178 escape of small epifauna and stored at -20°C until laboratory analysis. In the laboratory, each thallus 199 of E. brachycarpa and gametophytes of A. taxiformis were transferred into buckets abundantly rinsed 180 under running water, allowing the associated fauna to detach from the algae. Then, the water was 181 sieved through a 1 mm mesh. After sorting, molluscs, amphipods, and annelids were stored in 70% 182 seawater ethanol solution and subsequently counted and identified to species, or the nearest possible 183 taxonomic level. Taxonomy and nomenclature were updated according to the World Register of 12 1.84 Marine Species database (WoRMS Editorial Board (2021)). 1 $\frac{3}{3}$ $\frac{1}{1}$ $\frac{3}{1}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ is under running water, allowing the ass $6\overline{6}$ 8 and 2010 10^{2} scaward chiallor solution and subseq 11 13 15
 15

 $\frac{186}{186}$ Seaweed structural attributes 20²

21
 $\frac{21}{287}$ For each thallus of *E. brachycarpa* and gametophyte of *A. taxiformis* collected, we measured 4 188 structural features (thallus volume, canopy volume, interstitial volume, and biomass), to explore their 24 $\frac{26}{28}$ 9 relationships with the diversity indices calculated for the epifaunal assemblages. Thallus volume was 190 measured as the variation of volume, in ml, after the immersion of a thallus into a graduated cylinder 3191 filled with seawater. Canopy and interstitial volumes were estimated according to Hacker and Steneck 1492 (1990). The canopy volume (CV, the volume, in ml, created by the overall dimension of a $\frac{36}{3}$ thallus submerged in seawater) was defined as the volume of a theoretical cylinder (CV = $\pi \times r^2 \times$ 38
394 *h*), where $\pi = 3.14$, *h* is the length of the thallus from the base to its apical portion of the thallus, 495 including epiphytes, and r is the radius calculated as an average measure of the radius of the thallus measured with a ruler (+/- 1 mm) at the apical, median, and basal parts. The interstitial volume (*IV*, 45
497 the volume, in ml, of water among the branches of the alga) was obtained by subtracting the thallus $\frac{15}{4}$ §8 volume (*TV*) from the canopy volume *CV* (*IV* = *CV* – *TV*).
50
599 Finally, the biomass of the macroalgae was calculated as dry weight (*DW*, gr) after drying in a $228/$ For each thailus of E. *bracnycar* 23 25^2 relationships with the diversity multi 28 2190 measured as the variation of volume, 30 $32¹$ med with scawater. Canopy and me. 33 3492 (1990). The canopy volume $(CV,$ 35 $37³$ manas submorged in sea and $\frac{1}{3}$ 394 h), where $\pi = 3.14$, h is the length 40 4440 measured with a ruler (+/- 1 mm) at 45 the volume, in ml, of water among the branches of the alga) was obtained by subtracting the thallus $\frac{48}{100}$ 1 (TINC 1 1) 498 volume (1) from the canopy volum

 $\frac{53}{20}$ 0 stove at 60 °C for 48 h (Stein-Taylor et al., 1985). Biomass was used as a proxy for the primary 201 production of each habitat. 56 54 ⁰ Stove at 00 C 101 40 II (Stelli-Taylor)

8

203 Data analysis

204 For each epifaunal species, we calculated total abundance (N) , frequency $(F\%;$ the percentage of 205 samples in which a particular species is present) and dominance index ($D\%$; the percentage of the 206 rate between the percentage of individuals of a particular species and the total number of individuals 207 within the sample) (Magurran, 1988). The epifaunal assemblages of each habitat were characterized 208 according to total abundance of individuals (N), rarefied species richness (S), Shannon-Wiener 209 diversity index (H') and Pielou's Evenness index (J). A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was $\frac{1}{21}$ 0 used to test differences in the epifaunal indices (N, S, H', J) between habitats (fixed with 3 levels: E. 16
 $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}$ 11 *brachycarpa, E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands and *A. taxiformis*) and areas (random and nested within $\frac{1}{22}$ habitat with 2 levels: area 1 and area 2). Cochran's tes 21
 $\frac{21}{22}$ 3 variances (Underwood 1997). Tukey's HSD procedure was used to separate means (at $\alpha = 0.05$) $\frac{24}{1}$ 4 following significant effects in the ANOVAs (Underwood, 1996). The hierarchical structure of the 26 taxonomic classifications of the epifaunal assemblages of E. brachycarpa, E. brachycarpa in mixed $2\frac{9}{16}$ stands, and A. taxiformis was visualized using the "heat tree" function in the "Metacoder" R-package $\frac{31}{22}$ 17 (Foster et al., 2017). 1 $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{1}{1}$ $\frac{1}{1}$ 230 rate between the percentage of mulvium $6\overline{6}$ 8 and 2012 **1999** 10° according to total abundance of the 11 1209 diversity index (H') and Pielou's Eve 13 15¹ about to test differences in the epital <u>1</u>71 brachycarpa, E. brachycarpa in mixe 18 20⁻ The contract of the cont 2213 variances (Underwood 1997). Tuke 23 25 2713 taxonomic classifications of the epita 28 $\frac{2916}{30}$
 $\frac{31}{20}17$ 32^1 (roster et al., 2017).

218 SIMPER analysis (Clarke, 1993) was performed to identify those taxa that contributed to the 34 $\frac{36}{24}$ 9 dissimilarity of the epifaunal assemblages between habitats (δ i%). The ratio δ i/SD_(δ i) was used to 220 measure the consistency of the contribution of a particular taxon to the average dissimilarity in the 39 $^{42}_{22}$ 1 comparison between habitats. A cut-off value of 70% was used to exclude low contributions. 33 35 $37'$ dissimilarity of the epitadian assem- $\frac{38}{220}$ 40 $42¹$ comparison seemeen mechanistricity

 $\frac{43}{22}$ Differences in the epifaunal community structure (which takes into account species identity and 223 relative abundance) and composition (presence/absence, which only takes into account species 46 $^{48}_{42}$ 4 identity) among habitats and areas were assessed by Permutational Multivariate Analysis of Variance 225 (PERMANOVA). The analyses were based on a Bray-Curtis distance matrix of square-root 51 $\frac{53}{22}6$ transformed epifaunal abundances (structure) and on a Jaccard distance matrix of presence/absence 227 data (composition) using 9999 permutations. PERMANOVA was also performed separately for each $\frac{52}{2}$ 8 component of the epifauna (molluscs, annelids and amphipods). Permutational analysis of 229 multivariate dispersion (PERMDISP) was used to test differences in multivariate dispersion 60 442 Differences in the epitaunal com 45 $\frac{4623}{47}$
 $\frac{48}{42}$
48 44 are nuclear allowing nabital and areas we 50 52 54° ansionned epitalitat abundances (s 55 $\frac{1}{2}$ data (composition) using 9999 permu 57 59° component of the epitating (mon 229 multivariate dispersion (PERMDIS 62

230 (Anderson et al., 2008). A principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) plot was generated to visualize the 231 variation of the epifaunal community structure (based on a Bray-Curtis distance matrix) and 2 $2\frac{4}{3}$ composition (based on a Jaccard distance matrix). 1 $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{252}{3}$ composition (based on a Jaccard dista

233 Differences in each of the structural attributes (CV, IV, TV, DW) among habitats and areas were 234 analyzed by two-way ANOVAs according to the above mentioned design. Cochran's test way 235 to check for the homogeneity of variances (Underwood, 1996). 12 8 and 2010 $10⁴$ analyzed by two-way AlvO v As acco 11

 $\frac{14}{2}$ 36 Linear regression (LM) analysis was used to test which algal structural attributes explained better ¹⁶ the variation of total abundance (N), rarefied species richness (S), Shannon-238 and Pielou's Evenness (J) of the whole epifaunal assemblages and its individual components 19 $\frac{21}{22}$ 9 (molluscs, annelids and amphipods). If a non-linear relationship between response and depended 240 variables was detected, we examined the significance of applying a quadratic term in the model. In 24 $^{26}_{24}$ 1 addition, a distance-based redundancy analysis (dbRDA, Legendre and Anderson, 1999) was used to 242 investigate the relationship between structural attributes and the epifaunal multivariate structure. 29 $\frac{31}{27}$ 3 Since dbRDA is susceptible to multicollinearity (i.e. high correlation between environmental 244 variables), draftsman plots were used to verify skewness or identify clear correlations between $\frac{364}{24}$ 5 structural attributes. A log(x + 1) transformation was used to correct the right-skewness of thallus 38
 $\frac{38}{246}$ volume (TV) and biomass (DW). Moreover, due to the high correlation between canopy volume (CV) $\frac{4047}{247}$ and interstitial volume (*IV*) we removed CV from the subsequent analyses. Then, the structural 248 attributes were normalised using a z-score transformation due to their varying measurement scales. 43 249 Finally, forward selection was used to identify the structural properties that mostly contributed to the 46 $^{48}_{25}$ 0 heterogeneity in the multivariate structure of the epifaunal assemblages. 15° Ellical regression (EM) analysis \mathcal{D} the variation of total abundance (N) 18 20 and the set of $\frac{1}{20}$ (b) is an γ 229 (moituscs, annetius and amphipods) 23 27^1 audition, a distance-based redundance 28 30 $32²$ since dond's is susception to if 33 3444 variables), draftsman plots were us 35 37° successful anti-sensor in regard 1, and $3/90$ volume (IV) and biomass (DW) . Moi 40 42 44 ^{to} authories were normalised using a z 45 47 490 neurogenery in the multivarian sum

251 Statistical analyses were performed using R open access statistical software 3.5.1 (R Core Team, 51 $\frac{5}{25}$ 2 2018). See the "Data availability and reproducible research" section for further details. 52 $54²$ 2010). See the *Bund availability and*

 $\frac{56}{254}$ Results

 \widetilde{a} 55 Epifauna

257 of taxa classified at the lowest taxonomic level possible on E. brachycarpa (a), E. brachycarpa in $\frac{52}{20}$ 8 mixed stands (b) and *A. taxiformis* (c). Bar charts show the total abundance of amphipods, annelids, 279 and molluscs for each habitat. 54° Fig. 2 DIRECTICES in the equation $\frac{1}{267}$ of taxa classified at the lowest taxor 59^o mineral status (c) and 11, taking \sim $\mathcal{L}/9$ and molluses for each habitat.

 Total abundance (N) and rarefied species richness (S), differed significantly among habitats, 283 with values that were higher in E. brachycarpa compared to E. brachycarpa in mixed stands and A. *taxiformis* (Fig. 3, Table S3). Shannon-Wiener diversity (H') varied significantly across habitats, with 285 E. brachycarpa and E. brachycarpa in mixed stands exhibiting closer and higher values than A. $\frac{1}{286}$ taxiformis. $\frac{26}{2}$ rotal abundance (iv) and rafel $6\overline{6}$ 8 and 2010 $10⁴$ and the times (Fig. 5, Table 55). Shanno and 15

¹⁶ Conversely, Pielou's evenness (J) was higher in *A. taxiformis* compared to the other two $\frac{1}{288}$ habitats, which showed comparable values (Fig. 3, Table S3). Conversely, Pielou's evenne 20²

290 Fig. 3 Comparison of the alpha diversity indices among habitats. Abundance (a), rarefied species $\frac{60}{2}$ 91 richness (b), Shannon-Wiener diversity (c), and Pielou's evenness index (d) of the epifaunal nemess (*v*), shannon wrener and

292 assemblage associated with E. brachycarpa, E. brachycarpa in mixed stands, and A. taxiformis. Bar 293 plots show mean $+/- 1$ standard error (n = 20). Significant codes: *** p ≤ 0.001 , * p ≤ 0.05 , ns $2\frac{4}{3}$ p>0.05. See Table S3 for further details. $3 \cdot \cdot \cdot$ $\frac{254}{3}$ p \geq 0.05. See Table S5 for further detail

 PERMANOVA showed that the structure and composition of the epifaunal assemblages 297 differed significantly among habitats (Table S4). PERMDISP analysis revealed a high dispersion of $\frac{1}{298}$ samples within habitats, especially for *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands and *A. taxiformis* (Fig. 4). 299 Notwithstanding this high dispersion, the epifaunal assemblages of the three habitats were clearly $\frac{1500}{1500}$ separated, as shown by the PCoA ordination plot (Fig. 4). The proportion of variance explained by $\frac{21}{2201}$ the first two axes was 62.8% for structure and 45.6% for composition. The first axis accounted for the larger part of the variance (structure = 49.5% and composition = 36.1%) and highlighted a shift, $36/33$ in both structure and composition, from *E. brachycarpa* to *A. taxiformis*, with *E. brachycarpa* in 304 mixed stands placed between the two homogeneous stands of native and invasive seaweeds (Fig. 4). $\frac{31}{20}$ 5 The second axis explained lower variation (structure = 13.3% and composition = 9.5%) and separated E. brachycarpa and A. taxiformis from E. brachycarpa in mixed stands (Fig. 4). 10^{10} 1 ENNETIVE SHOWED that 15^o sampres whilm hashais, especially i Notwithstanding this high dispersion $\frac{1}{20}$ $\frac{1}{2$ the first two axes was 62.8% for structure. in bour structure and composition, i The second axis explained fower vari- E. brachycarpa and A. taxiformis fro

309 Fig. 4 Structure (a) and composition (b) of the epifaunal assemblages associated with the three 310 habitats. The Principal coordinate analysis plot (PCoA) based on a Bray-Curtis distance matrix of 2 $3\frac{4}{3}$ 1 square-root transformed relative abundances (structure) or on a Jaccard distance matrix of 312 presence/absence data (composition). The circles show the 90% confidence interval for each seaweed. 7 1 $\frac{1}{3}$ 51 square-root transformed relative ab $6\overline{6}$ 8 and 2012 12:00 the contract of the contract

 324 The SIMPER analysis revealed that 28 taxa contributed 70% to the dissimilarity between E. $\frac{14}{21}$ 5 brachycarpa and A. taxiformis; 37 taxa contributed 70% to the dissimilarity between E. brachycarpa 16 and *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands; and 30 taxa contributed 70% to the dissimilarity between *E*. $\frac{153}{12}$ brachycarpa in mixed stand and A. taxiformis (Fig. S1, Table S5). Most of the species contributing $\frac{21}{22}$ 8 to the dissimilarities belonged to amphipods. The polychaete *Amphiglena mediterranea* (Leydig, 349 1851) was the species mostly contributing to the differences observed between both E. brachycarpa $^{26}_{22}$ O and *A. taxiformis* and between *E. brachycarpa* and *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands, contributing 321 respectively to 8% and 6% of the observed differences. The amphipod Apherusa alacris Krapp- $33/2$ Schickel, 1969 was the species most contributing to the differences (7%) between *E*. *brachycarpa* in 3423 mixed stands and A. taxiformis. In addition, the gastropod Obtusella macilenta (Monterosato, 1880) $\frac{352}{2}$ 4 was the species that contributed consistently (higher $\delta i/SD(\delta i)$ values) to the difference between E. 38
325 brachycarpa and A. taxiformis (Fig. S1, Table S5), while the amphipod Stenothoe monoculoides ⁴³²⁶ (Montagu, 1813) and the gastropod *Eatonina cossurae* (Calcara, 1841) were the species that $^{43}_{24}$ 27 contributed consistently to the differences between *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands and *E.* 928 brachycarpa, and between E. brachycarpa in mixed stands and A. taxiformis (Fig. S1, Table S5). The 329 polychaete S. *prolifera* was among the first 5 species contributing to the differences between each 330 couple of habitats (Fig. S1, Table S5). 13 15 orderly car parameter. assignment, 57 as 15/16 and *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands 18 20 22λ to the dissimilarities belonged to an 23 270 and A. *taxyormis* and between E. *b*. 28 321 respectively to 8% and 6% of the o $32²$ believed, 1707 was the species most 33 **33 August 2018** 3423 mixed stands and A. taxiformis. In a 35 37 \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots 3325 *bracnycarpa* and A. taxiformis (Fig 40 42 \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim 44 contributed consistently to the dif-45 47 49° polyenaete *b. protifera* was among t 50 5330 couple of habitats (Fig. S1, Table S5 52

 $\frac{53}{22}$ 1 Multivariate analyses conducted separately for the three dominant epifaunal groups (molluscs, 332 annelids, and amphipods) revealed patterns of variation comparable to those of the whole epifaunal 55 333 assemblage (Table S6). Only, amphipods showed less variability among habitats (Table S6). 58 $54¹$ matrix and good conduct 5532 annelids, and amphipods) revealed p 57 59 8 9 9 1

335 Seaweed structural attributes and relationships with the epifaunal assemblages.

336 Canopy volume (CV) and interstitial volume (IV) differed significantly among habitats with $3\frac{4}{3}$ 7 higher values in A. taxiformis compared to E. brachycarpa in mixed stands and E. brachycarpa (Fig. 338 5 a-b, Table S7). Biomass (DW) and thallus volume (TV) showed similar values between E. brachycarpa and E. brachycarpa in mixed stands and were significantly higher compared to those of *A. taxiformis* (Fig. 5 c-d, Table S7). $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{3}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ 55/ inglier values in A. *taxyormis* compare $6\overline{6}$ 8 and 2012 **12:20 and 2012** $10³$ brachycarpa and E. brachycarpa in i *A. taxiformis* (Fig. 5 c-d, Table S7).

 $\frac{1}{15}$
16
16 343 Fig. 5 Differences in structural attributes among habitats. Canopy volume (CV), interstitial $\frac{55}{24}$ 4 volume (IV), thallus volume (TV) and biomass (expressed as dry weight, DW) of the epifaunal 3345 assemblages associated with *E. brachycarpa, E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands and A. taxiformis. Bar $\frac{11}{13}$
 $\frac{13}{13}$ ^T volume $(1 \vee j)$, manus volume $(1 \vee j)$ 5845 assemblages associated with *E. brac*.

346 plots show mean \pm 1 standard error (n = 20). Significant codes: *** p <= 0.001, ** p <= 0.01, * p <= $\frac{347}{7}$ 0.05, ns p > 0.05. See Table S7 for further details. 1

 $3\frac{1}{4}9$ The linear regression analysis revealed that biomass (DW) was the attribute that explained better the β_0^9 variation in abundance (R²_N = 0.51), rarefied species richness (R²_S = 0.58), Shannon-Wiener diversity $1351 \text{ (R}^2_{\text{H}} = 0.54)$ and Pielou's evenness index $(R^2_{\text{J}} = 0.2)$ of the epifaunal assemblages (Table S8). The 352 variance explained by algal biomass increased if we considered a quadratic relationship between 353 those variables (Fig. 6). The relationship v $\frac{19}{20}$ 4 pattern of variation (Fig. 6). Otherwise, canopy volume (CV) interstitial volume (IV) and thallus 21
 225 volume (TV) explained less variation (and it was significant for N, S and H' but not for J) of the $\frac{25}{25}$ 6 epifaunal attributes (R-squared < 0.5, Table S8). The analysis conducted separately on the three 26
 $\frac{25}{25}$ 7 dominant epifaunal groups (molluscs, annelids, and amphipods) revealed similar results however for 358 amphipods and annelids the relationship between assemblage parameters and algal biomass was 29 $\frac{31}{32}$ 59 weaker (annelids: R²_N = 0.35, R²_S = 0.52, R²_{H'} = 0.49, R²_J = 0.03; amphipods: R²_N = 0.23, R²_S = 0.43, R^2 R^2 R^2 = 0.01) although remaining the most important explanatory variable for both groups. $\frac{36}{36}$ 1 Meanwhile, molluscs revealed patterns of variation similar to the whole assemblage (R²_N = 0.5, R²_S) $362 = 0.53$, R^2 _{H'} = 0.48, R^2 _J = 0.12) (Table S8). As for the other algal structural features, annelids showed $^{45}_{20}$ 63 a weaker and not significant relationship with the canopy and interstitial volumes, differing from 43
 $\frac{43}{464}$ amphipods and molluscs (Table S8). \sim 8 $10¹⁰$ variation in abundance $(K_N - 0.51)$, 11 13 and 2012 and 2013 and 2014 and 201 $15²$ variance explained by algar biomas. 16 18 $20'$ patient of variation (1.1.5. 0). Other 225 volume (TV) explained less variatio $\frac{21}{25}$
 $\frac{23}{23}$
 $\frac{24}{25}$
 $\frac{24}{5}$ 25 25) aominant epitaunal groups (molluses 28 30 329 weaker (annenus. K $N = 0.33$, K $S = 0$ 33 $\frac{360}{10}$ R²_H = 0.31, R²_J = 0.01) although rem 35 $3³$ ³⁷ Meanwine, monuses revealed patter 38 $362 = 0.53$, $R_{\text{H}} = 0.48$, $R_{\text{J}} = 0.12$) (Table 40 42⁵ a weaker and not significant relation 4404 amphipods and molluscs (1able S8). 45

366 Fig. 6 Relationship between seaweed structural attributes and epifaunal diversity. Results of the $\frac{5367}{20}$ linear regression analysis (LM) between the algal biomass (expressed as dry weight, DW) and the 368 abundance (a), rarefied species richness (b), Shannon-Wiener diversity (c) $\frac{5869}{300}$ index (d) of the epifaunal assemblages. $54'$ mixed regression analysis (2.0) occur 5368 abundance (a), rarefied species rich

- $\frac{60}{3170}$ ∂_1 / θ
-

371 Biomass (DW) was also the structural attribute selected for constrained db-RDA, explaining 372 24.7% of the variation in the structure of the epifaunal assemblages (Table S9). The first two axes of $3\frac{4}{3}$ the dbRDA plot explained 15.6% of the total variance of the multivariate structure of the epifaunal assemblages, with 12.4% for axis 1 and 3.2% for axis 2 (Fig. 7). $5/5$ and done DA plot explained 15.0% of the $6\overline{6}$ 8 and 2010 and 2010

 $^{40}_{\Lambda^1}$ 19 $^-$ Fig. 7 Relationship between structural attributes and the multivariate structure of the epifaunal 380 assemblages associated to the three habitats. The distance-based redundancy (dbRDA) plot $\frac{45}{28}$ 1 illustrates the structural attribute better explaining the multivariate structure of the three habitats. DW.log = seaweed biomass (log + 1). $41/2$ rig. Therationship between structure $46'$ must also the structural attribute be- DW.log = seaweed biomass (log + 1) $\frac{4}{3}$ 81
47
4882
49

387
61

385
56

 $\frac{3}{3}84$

 $\frac{57}{386}$

 Θ 87

 $5\&3$ 51^o $52.$ **558.5 558.6**

 $\frac{14}{15}7$

 10^{3} $\frac{1276}{1200}$ $\frac{1}{4}$

388 Discussion

1

389 The biodiversity and the socio-economic value of marine ecosystems are threatened by biological 2 $3\overline{3}90$ invasions around the world (Bax et al., 2003; Molnar et al., 2008). Understanding how invasive 391 seaweeds modify the functioning of recipient ecosystems may allow us to better understand large 7 392 scale effects on native rocky shore habitats. Here we investigated the effects of the invasive A. 393 taxiformis on the native E. brachycarpa by comparing the epifaunal assemblage associated with three $\frac{1}{2}$ 94 alternative states of the transition between native and invasive seaweeds, homogenous and mixed 395 stands of the two seaweeds. Our results showed differences in abundance and diversity of the 16 $\frac{1596}{120}$ epifaunal assemblages between three alternative states of the transition from native *E. brachycarpa* 21
 $\frac{21}{22}$ to invasive *A. taxiformis.* In particular, *A. taxiformis* hosted almost 6 times less epifaunal individuals 3498 compared to E. brachycarpa in mixed stands, and 10 folds less individuals compared to homogenous $\frac{26}{27}$ 9 stands of *E. brachycarpa*. Also, the number of epifaunal species was more than 4 folds lower in the 400 invasive compared to the native habitat, while diversity reduced by half. These results confirm that 29 $\frac{34}{24}01$ generally invasive seaweeds exhibit a less diverse epifaunal component compared to native seaweeds 402 (Guerra-García et al., 2012; Janiak and Whitlatch, 2012; Maggi et al., 2015; Navarro-Barranco et al., $\frac{3603}{10}$ 2018; Veiga et al., 2018). 3 5350 Invasions around the world (Dax et a $6\overline{6}$ 8 10^{22} scale effects on half today shore $\frac{11}{1393}$ 13 15 and 15 and 15 and 15 and 15 and 15 1795 stands of the two seaweeds. Our r 18 20 22 to invasive A. *taxiformis*. In particula 23 2398 277 statius of *E. bruchycurpu*. Also, the f 28 30 $32²$ generally invasive seaweeds exhibit a 33 3402 (Guerra-García et al., 2012; Janiak ai 35 37

404 We found that variation in diversity and multivariate structure of the epifaunal assemblages was 38 405 related to changes in algal structural features. In particular, biomass was the variable better explaining 41 $^{43}_{400}$ 6 the variation in abundance, number of species, and the multivariate structure of the epifaunal 407 assemblages. The role of macroalgal complexity in shaping the associated biota has been highlighted 46 $^{48}_{40}$ 8 in several studies, with complex algae hosting a larger abundance and diversity of epifauna than 409 simpler ones (Chemello and Milazzo, 2002; Pitacco et al., 2014; Veiga et al., 2014; Lolas et al., 2018; 51 $\frac{53}{20}$ 0 Veiga et al., 2018; Bitlis, 2019; Chiarore et al., 2019; Poursanidis et al., 2019; Mancuso et al., 2021b). 55
4d 1 In general, studies have highlighted that invasive seaweeds host lower (Guerra-García et al., 2012; 412 Navarro-Barranco et al., 2018; Rubal et al., 2018; Veiga et al., 2018) or higher (Veiga et al., 2014) 58 413 epifaunal abundance, species richness, and diversity, depending on whether their structural 60 34974 – We found that variation in divers 40 $^{4405}_{42}$
 $^{43}_{4406}$ 44μ o line variation in abundance, numbe 45 47 49° in several statics, with complex algebra 49° 50
5409 52 54° $\sqrt{254}$ at an, 2010, Dans, 2012, Channel 561 In general, studies have highlighted 57 59 θ ¹³ epitaunal abundance, species rich 62 63

- 64
- 65

414 complexity is respectively lower or higher compared to native seaweeds. Navarro-Barranco et al. 415 (2018) showed that A. taxiformis had low fractal complexity and hosted an impoverished faunal 2 4.46 assemblage compared to native seaweeds. Guerra-García et al., (2012) found that A. armata had low 417 algal volume and showed lower abundance, species richness, and diversity of associated isopods 7 \hat{A}^{β} 8 fauna compared to the native *Ellisolandia elongata* (J.Ellis & Solander) K.R.Hind & G.W.Saunders. 1419 Moreover, lower dry weight and fractal dimension in the invasive S. muticum compared to native $\frac{1}{4}20$ seaweeds have been shown to play a major role in shaping the associated faunal assemblages (Veiga 421 et al., 2014, 2018). Likewise other studies (Janiak and Whitlatch, 2012; Veiga et al., 2014; Rubal et 16 $\frac{1622}{12}$ al., 2018), our results indicated that the quantity of habitat (biomass) was the best predictor variable 423 explaining variation in terms of abundance, species richness, as well as multivariate structure of the 21 424 associated epifauna. 24 1 $\frac{3}{2}$ 4 assemblage compared to hallve seawe $6\overline{6}$ 8 10° a and compared to the native *Ethison* 11 13 15° seamed have seen shown to play a $fZ1$ et al., 2014, 2018). Likewise other st 18 20 222 explaining variation in terms of abure-23 $\frac{2424}{25}$

 $^{26}_{42}$ 5 Interestingly, our results highlight that A. taxiformis affected each component (molluscs, annelids, 426 and amphipods) of the epifaunal assemblages in the same way. However, in the available literature 29 3427 on the epifaunal assemblages of invasive seaweeds, we can find distinct responses among epifaunal 428 components (Schmidt and Scheibling, 2006; Gestoso et al., 2010; Guerra-García et al., 2012; Bedini 429 et al., 2014; Veiga et al., 2018; Navarro-Barranco et al., 2019). For example, species richness, 36 38
380 Shannon diversity and total abundance of isopods were significantly lower in A. armata compared to 431 native algae (Guerra-García et al., 2012). Bedini et al. (2014) found that the invasive Lophocladia 41 $^{43}_{42}$ *lallemandii* (Montagne) F. Schmitz hosted a higher abundance of amphipods, isopods, and 433 polychaetes, while native habitats harbored a greater abundance of molluscs and decapods. Bivalves 46 $^{48}_{A3}$ 4 associated with the invasive S. *muticum* were more abundant compared to native seaweeds, which, in 435 contrast, hosted more gastropods (Veiga et al., 2018), and Gestoso et al. (2010) found that isopods 51 $\frac{53}{2}36$ and amphipods were more abundant in S. *muticum* than in native seaweeds. Moreover, the invasive 55
\$§7 Codium fragile subsp. fragile (Suringar) Hariot supported higher densities of nematodes, bivalves, 438 and specialist herbivores compared to fronds of the native kelp, which, in contrast, supported greater 58 439 densities of gastropods and asteroids (Schmidt and Scheibling, 2006). Other authors revealed that 60 $27/2$ merestingly, our results inginight 28 30 32^{\prime} on the ephatinal assemblages of five 33 3428 components (Schmidt and Scheibling 35 $37'$ are \ldots , 2011 , \ldots 2011 , 2010 , \ldots 350 Shannon diversity and total abundancy 40 42
 42
 43
 43
 42 442 *tatiemandit* (womagne) **r**. Schiffl 45 47 $49⁺$ associated with the invasive *b*, *matter* 50
\$435 52 54° and display were more abandant 5657 Codium fragile subsp. fragile (Surin 57 59 ₆ equal densities of gastropods and asteroid 62

 15° on the behind ecosystem. $\frac{2450}{25}$ 4457
 42
 43
 458 50
54051 64 65

440 differences between invasive and native seaweeds in single components of epifaunal assemblages 441 changed depending on the site and the identity of the algal species (Navarro-Barranco et al., 2019). 2 442 The fact that in our study, the A. taxiformis habitat showed lower abundance, species richness, and 443 diversity values for all the epifaunal organisms, regardless of the groups investigated in this study 7 $\frac{9}{44}$ 4 (molluscs, amphipods and annelids), led us to hypothesize that a potential shift from the native (i.e. 445 E. brachycarpa) to the invasive (i.e. A. taxiformis) habitat could cause large negative cascade effects $\frac{14}{14}$ 6 on the benthic ecosystem. 1 $3 \qquad \qquad 3$ $\frac{44}{3}$ The fact that in our study, the A. laxy $6\overline{6}$ 8 10^{-4} (monuses, amplipous and annenus), 11 13

447 Although differences in the epifaunal assemblages among native and invasive seaweeds have 16 $\frac{1448}{1248}$ been largely explored, our results also suggest that the presence of A. taxiformis affects the epifaunal 21
 449 assemblages associated with E. brachycarpa in mixed stands. This result could be explained by other 450 attributes that differed between native and invasive seaweeds, such as the amount of epiphytes and/or 24 $\frac{26}{45}$ 1 the presence of chemical defenses, that have been related to the ability of seaweeds to shape their 452 associated fauna (Hay et al., 1987; Viejo, 1999; Paul et al., 2006; Cacabelos et al., 2010; Máximo et 29 $\frac{31}{25}$ 3 al., 2018; Gache et al., 2019). Invasive seaweeds can release secondary metabolites (e.g. halogenated 454 compounds) able to act as deterrents against epiphytes, and herbivores (Paul et al., 2006; Cacabelos $\frac{365}{12}$ et al., 2010; Vega Fernández et al., 2019). Secondary metabolites released by A. taxiformis can affect 456 the survival of fish in the post-larval stages, eventually leading to alteration of the grazing pressure 38 457 on the surrounding habitat (Máximo et al., 2018; Gache et al., 2019). Other studies suggest that 41 $^{43}_{42}$ 8 invasive seaweeds can alter the trophic web by changing the composition of epiphytes which reduces 459 suitable habitat for many epifaunal species (Viejo, 1999; Wikström and Kautsky, 2004). Several 46 $^{48}_{460}$ authors suggested that the amount of epiphytes could explain the higher species richness found in the 461 invasive S. muticum compared to native seaweeds (Viejo, 1999; Cacabelos et al., 2010). In our study, 51 $\frac{5362}{100}$ A. taxiformis had no or fewer epiphytes compared to *E. brachycarpa* (R.C. personal observation). As 463 epifauna is mostly represented by microalgae grazers, we can hypothesize that differences in the 55 $\frac{564}{464}$ abundance of epiphytes between A. taxiformis and E. brachycarpa could contribute to the variation 465 in epifaunal assemblages observed in this study. It is therefore arguable that further studies analyzing 60 1447 Although differences in the e 18 20² 2249 assemblages associated with *E. bract* 23 $27¹$ and presence of chemical defenses, t 28 30 $32³$ and 2010 , Sache et and 2017). Invasive 33 3454 compounds) able to act as deterrents 35 37 3956 the survival of fish in the post-larval 40 $44\degree$ invasive seaweeds can aller the troph 45 47 490 authors suggested that the amount of 52 $54²$ 11. and for the state of tenth epiping. 5463 epitauna is mostly represented by n 57 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ ₆465 in epitaunal assemblages observed in 62 63

466 the direct and indirect role of epiphyte abundance and secondary metabolites released by A. taxiformis 467 in structuring its associated epifauna would allow us to better clarify the effects of this seaweed on 2 468 the recipient habitats. 1 3 490 the recipient naturals.

469 Moreover, as suggested by other authors (Navarro-Barranco et al., 2019), landscape features 7 $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathcal{A}}$ could be another key aspect explaining the effect of A. taxiformis on E. brachycarpa associated 471 assemblages in mixed stands. In fact, the presence of invasive seaweeds may contribute to the 12 $\frac{1}{4}$ 72 fragmentation of native habitats, reducing the patch size of native seaweeds, and at the same time 473 increasing their isolation (Roberts and Poore, 2006; Lanham et al., 2015). It has been observed that 16 $\frac{16}{2}$ the reduction in patch size of *Cystoseira sensu lato* habitats reduces the diversity of associated faunal 21
 $4/75$ assemblages (Mancuso et al., 2021b). Thus, we can hypothesize that the presence of A. taxiformis in 476 mixed stands can act as a physical barrier to the dispersal of vagile fauna, reducing connectivity on a 24 $^{26}_{47}$ 7 small scale and ultimately eroding the diversity of native habitats (Lanham et al., 2015). However, 478 another possibility to consider is that some epifaunal groups may be able to disperse through the 29 $\frac{31}{247}$ 9 different seaweeds (Taylor, 1998) in mixed stands. In this case, the lower epifaunal abundance and 480 diversity observed on E. brachycarpa from mixed stands could be because part of this diversity may $\frac{36}{28}$ 1 have preferentially dispersed to the A. taxiformis portion of these mixed stands. Our study, however, 482 cannot address the effects of epifauna movement among seaweeds on the observed results, and more 38 483 studies are necessary to understand the possible role of mobile epifaunal assemblage movement 41 $6\overline{6}$ 8 and 20 and 10° could be allotted key aspect explain 11 13 $15²$ nagmentation of harve habitats, rea $\frac{4\pi}{3}$ increasing their isolation (Roberts and 18 20 are continued in fact that the contract $22/5$ assemblages (Mancuso et al., 2021b) 23 $\frac{2476}{25}$ 27 sinal scale and unimately elouing to 28 30 32^{\prime} anterent scawed (1 ayror, 1770) in 33 **33 August 2018** 3480 diversity observed on *E. brachycarpe* 35 37 and ϵ presentationally dispersed to the ϵ . 3982 cannot address the effects of epifauna 40 4483
 42
 43
 484 $\frac{43}{404}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ 4494 patterns within mixed stands of E. *or*

 $\frac{3684}{45}$ patterns within mixed stands of *E. brachycarpa*.
45 One inherent weakness of this study concerns the impossibility of separating the effects of *A*. $^{48}_{486}$ taxiformis from natural spatial variability. This should be accounted for by using more interspersed 487 sites for each condition (mono and mixed stands of native and invasive seaweeds). Unfortunately, we 51 $\frac{5488}{100}$ were not able to find more interspersed sites in the area of study. However, the three sites selected 489 had the same average values of different environmental variables (surface temperature, salinity, 55 490 nitrate and phosphate concentrations, dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll and photosynthetic active 58 491 radiation, Table S10), indicating that spatial variability had little effect. Then, we think that the data 60 4485
47 490 and 490 and 50
5487 52 54 5689 had the same average values of dif-57 59 $_{6}P1$ radiation, rable STO), indicating that 62

- 63 64
	- 65

492 presented in this study is still valuable, albeit with its limitations, for understanding epifaunal 493 community changes between plausible alternative states of the transition between E. brachycarpa 2 494 and *A. taxiformis.*
 6
 495 1 $\frac{3}{3}$, $\frac{3}{5}$, $\frac{3$ 4594 and A. *taxyormis*.

 496 In summary, our study suggests that shifting from native to invasive habitats may pose a serious 497 threat to biodiversity in coastal areas (Martin et al., 1992; Heck et al., 2003), potentially leading to 12 $\frac{1}{4}$ 98 bottom-up effects on rocky shore ecosystems. In addition, the low biomass supplied by the herein 16
 \uparrow 499 studied invasive species suggests that the shift from native canopy-forming algae to the invasive A. $\frac{1500}{100}$ taxiformis habitat would also drastically reduce the biomass of primary producers in affected coastal $\frac{21}{2201}$ areas. Predicting the ecological effects of invasive seaweeds is one of the main goals in the study of 502 biological invasions. Previous research has highlighted the context-dependent effects of invasive 24 $\frac{26}{29}$ 3 seaweeds, with larger impact caused by invasive species exerting a different functional role compared 504 to native habitat forming species (Ricciardi and Atkinson, 2004; Ricciardi et al., 2013; Navarro-29 $\frac{31}{20}$ 5 Barranco et al., 2019). Our results not only remark the negative effect of A. taxiformis on E. 506 brachycarpa epifaunal assemblages, but also suggest that invasive species are able to affect native 507 habitats in a transitional phase (mixed stands) of the habitat shift, facilitating fragmentation and 36 508 isolation. Further studies aimed at understanding the effects of the habitat shift from native to invasive 38 509 seaweeds should include multiple transitional phases (different percentage coverage), as well as the 41 $^{43}_{\mathcal{A}}$ analysis of changes in the trophic structure of the associated epifaunal assemblages. 10^{10} in summary, our study suggests to 11 13 15° conom up cricels on rocky shore co H₁99 studied invasive species suggests that 18 20² 22μ areas. Predicting the ecological effect-23 2473 scaweeds, with larger impact caused 28 30 $32³$ Darrance of all, 2017). Our results 33 **340** *brachycarpa* epitaunal assemblages, 35 $37'$ measures in a numerically prove (1) 3908 ISOLATION. Further studies aimed at une 40 44^{H} analysis of changes in the trophic structure.

- 451 1 47
- $\frac{48}{20}$ 2 Declarations 49^2 Decident Decreases

513 Not applicable 51

515 Funding 56

516 This work was partially supported by the University of Palermo (FFR grant). 58

- 64
- 65

$\frac{549}{3}$ Conflicts of interest/Competing interests $\frac{1}{3}$

 549 Conflicts of interest/Competing interests
 540 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial 521 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest. $3\frac{2}{3}0$ The authors declare that the research $\sqrt{2}$ $6¹$

523 Data availability and reproducible research 12

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 24 The repository with all the data and the scripts used to reproduce the research in this paper is 525 available at http://dx.doi.org/10.17632/h3r8ygnjfd.1 16 15 The repository while all the data and $\frac{1}{10}$ \tilde{p} 25 available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1763

$\frac{21}{22}$ 7 Acknowledgements 22 / ACKnowledgements

528 We would like to thank the three anonymous reviewers for their constructive and valuable 24 $\frac{26}{22}$ 9 comments and critical revision. 27^7 comments and critical revision.

$\frac{31}{22}$ 31 Author Contributions $32¹$ Truthof Contributions

532 Conceptualization, C.R., M.M. and D.R.; Methodology, C.R. and M.M.; Investigation, D.R.; Formal 3533 Analysis, M.F.P.; Data curation, M.F.P.; Writing – Original Draft Preparation, M.F.P.; Writing – 534 Review & Editing, M.F.P., M.M., C.R., B.F., M.L., M.B., L.B.S.; Visualization, M.F.P.; Validation, 38 535 M.F.P.; Supervision, C.R.; Project Administration, C.R.; Funding Acquisition, C.R.; Resources, C.R.; 41 $^{43}_{\text{A}20}$ 6 molluscs identification, C.R., D.R.; amphipods identification, L.B.S; annelids identification; B.F., 537 M.B., M.L. 46 $\frac{48}{53}8$ 539 540 541 $\frac{5642}{2}$ **3**332 Conceptualization, C.R., M.M. and L 35 37 and 37 3394 Review & Editing, M.F.P., M.M., C. 40 $42 \qquad \qquad \qquad 1 \qquad \qquad 7 \qquad \qquad 3$ $\Delta \phi$ monuscs identification, C.K., D.K., 45 49° 50 539 52 530° 54° 55 561 57 59⁻ 59-10 and 59-10

544 3 References
 $\frac{1}{2}$

64
65

569 regime shifts $85-101$.

621 doi:10.1111/jfb.14140

647 the nursery role hypothesis for seagrass meadows. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 253, 123–136. 648 doi:10.3354/meps253123 2 1

- $\overline{\cancel{6}}\cancel{5}6$ algal habitat on the fauna of neighbouring habitats. Mar. Environ. Res. 106, 10–18. 657 doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2015.02.006 24 2658 Legendre, P., Anderson, M.J., 1999. Distance-Based Redundancy Analysis: Testing Multispecies 659 Responses in Multifactorial Ecological Experiments. Ecol. Monogr. 69, 1 24. 29 660 doi:10.2307/2657192 21 23 25 and 26 an 27° Legendre, i., Anderson, M.J., 1999. 28 30 $\frac{31}{10}$ doi:10.2307/2657102
- 661 Lo Brutto, S., Iaciofano, D., Guerra García, J.M., Lubinevsky, H., Galil, B.S., 2019. Desalination 34 $\frac{3662}{100}$ effluents and the establishment of the non-indigenous skeleton shrimp *Paracaprella pusilla* 663 Mayer, 1890 in the south -eastern Mediterranean. BioInvasions Rec. 8, 661–669. 35 $37⁻$ convenience which the component of $37⁻$ 38 a 1990 d
- 664 doi:10.3391/bir.2019.8.3.23 41

59 (a) $\frac{1}{2}$ (b) $\frac{1}{2}$ (c) $\frac{1$

- 43
 μ 65 Lolas, A., Antoniadou, C., Vafidis, D., 2018. Spatial variation of molluscan fauna associated with 666 Cystoseira assemblages from a semi-enclosed gulf in the Aegean Sea. Reg. Stud. Mar. Sci. 19, 46 $\frac{48}{00}$ 7 17–24. doi:10.1016/j.rsma.2018.03.003 $\Delta \phi$ Loias, A., Antoniadou, C., Validis, L 45 47
- $49'$ 1/-27. a01.10.1010/j.isina.2010
- 1668 Mačić, V., Albano, P.G., Almpanidou, V., Claudet, J., Corrales, X., Essl, F., Evagelopoulos, A., $\frac{5}{54}$ 55
 56
 57 671 M., Trygonis, V., Katsanevakis, S., 2018. Biological Invasions in Conservation Planning: A 58 52 , C., Kark, S., Marković, O., Mazaris, A.D., Ólafsdóttir, G.Á., Panayotova, $54'$ Sioros, i., sincice, c., itun, s 55 bitsch, W., Ramdani, M., Rilov, G., Tricarico, E., Vega Fernández, T., Sini, 57
- 672 Global Systematic Review. Front. Mar. Sci. 5. doi:10.3389/fmars.2018.00178 60 δ ¹/2 Giobal Systematic Review. From
- 63 64
- 65

34

D.S., America, P.S. of, 1985. Handbook of Phycological

macroalga Asparagopsis armata Harvey, 1855 along the

Declaration of interests

 \boxtimes The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

CRediT author statement

Conceptualization, C.R., M.M. and D.R.; Methodology, C.R. and M.M.; Investigation, D.R.; Formal Analysis, M.F.P.; Data curation, M.F.P.; Writing - Original Draft Preparation, M.F.P.; Writing -Review & Editing, M.F.P., M.M., C.R., B.F., M.L., M.B., L.B.S.; Visualization, M.F.P.; Validation, M.F.P.; Supervision, C.R.; Project Administration, C.R.; Funding Acquisition, C.R.; Resources, C.R.; molluscs identification, C.R., D.R.; amphipods identification , L.B.S; annelids identification ; B.F., M.B., M.L.

Supplementary Material

Click here to access/download Supplementary Material
Draft_shift_E.brachy.A.taxi_supp_final.docx