

The invasive seaweed Asparagopsis taxiformis erodes the habitat structure and biodiversity of native algal forests in the Mediterranean Sea / Mareuse FIP. V'Agostaro R.; Milzzko N. Aadalamenti F.; Musco L.; Mikac B.; Lo Brutto S.; Chemello R.. - In: MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH. - ISSN 0141-1136. - STAMPA. - 173:(2022); pp. 105515!1-105515.111.[LO.1016/j.mareovres.2021.105515]

# 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:

Availability: This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/839425 since: 2023-08-04

Published:

DOI: 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 (<u>https://cris.unibo.it/</u>)

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 Number:	MERE-D-21-00590R2
Article Type:	Full Length Article
Keywords:	habitat shift; alga; Ericaria brachycarpa; epifauna diversity; Cystoseira sensu lato; rocky shore; Marine Protected Area
Corresponding Author:	Francesco Paolo MANCUSO University of Palermo: Universita degli Studi di Palermo Palermo, ITALY
First Author:	Francesco Paolo MANCUSO, PhD
Order of Authors:	Francesco Paolo MANCUSO, PhD
	Riccardo D'Agostaro
	Marco Milazzo, Associate Professor
	Fabio Badalamenti, Research Director
	Luigi Musco, Associate Professor
	Barbara Mikac, PhD
	Sabrina Lo Brutto, Associate Professor
	Renato Chemello, Associate Professor
Abstract:	Invasive seaweeds are listed among the most relevant threats to marine ecosystems worldwide. Biodiversity hotspots, such as the Mediterranean Sea, are facing multiple invasions and are expected to be severely affected by the introduction of new non- native seaweeds in the near future. In this study, we evaluated the consequences of the shift from the native Ericaria brachycarpa to the invasive Asparagopsis taxiformis habitat on the shallow rocky shores of Favignana Island (Egadi Islands, MPA, Sicily, Italy). We compared algal biomass and species composition and structure of the associated epifaunal assemblages in homogenous and mixed stands of E. brachycarpa and A. taxiformis . The results showed that the biomass of primary producers is reduced by 90% in the A. taxiformis invaded habitat compared to the E. brachycarpa native habitat. The structure of the epifaunal assemblages displayed significant variations among homogenous and mixed stands. The abundance, species richness and Shannon-Wiener diversity index of the epifaunal assemblages decreased by 89%, 78% and 40%, respectively, from homogenous stands of the native E. brachycarpa to the invasive A. taxiformis . Seaweed biomass was the structural attribute better explaining the variation in epifaunal abundance, species richness and diversity. Overall, our results suggest that the shift from E. brachycarpa to A. taxiformis habitat would drastically erode the biomass of primary producers and the associated biodiversity. We hypothesize that a complete shift from native to invasive seaweeds could ultimately lead to bottom-up effects on rocky shore habitats, with negative consequences for the ecosystem structure, functioning, and the services provided.
Suggested Reviewers:	Antonia Chiarore, PhD Stazione Zoologica Anton Dohrn Napoli antonia.chiarore@szn.it For her scientific skills and publications on the topic of the paper Pedro Augusto Dos Santos Longo, PhD State University of Campinas: Universidade Estadual de Campinas pedro.slongo@gmail.com For his scientific skills and publications on the subject of the paper Javier Urra
	Instituto Español de Oceanografía: Instituto Espanol de Oceanografia

Powered by Editorial Manager® and ProduXion Manager® from Aries Systems Corporation

	javier.urra@ieo.es For his scientific skills and publications on the subject of the paper
	Valentina Pitacco National Institute of Biology: Nacionalni institut za biologijo valentina.pitacco@mbss.org For her scientific skills and publications on the topic of the paper
Response to Reviewers:	

#### Highlights:

- 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.
- Seaweed biomass was the structural attribute explaining the epifaunal variation.
- We suggest a complete shift from native to invasive seaweeds could impair rocky shore habitats.

1 1	The invasive seaweed Asparagopsis taxiformis erodes the habitat structure and
2 3 2 4 5 -	biodiversity of native algal forests in the Mediterranean Sea
<sup>5</sup> <sub>6</sub> 3 7	
8 <b>4</b> 9	F. Paolo Mancuso <sup>a</sup> , Riccardo D'Agostaro <sup>b</sup> , Marco Milazzo <sup>b,c</sup> , Fabio Badalamenti <sup>d</sup> , Luigi Musco <sup>c,e</sup> ,
10 11 5	Barbara Mikac <sup>f</sup> , Sabrina Lo Brutto <sup>g</sup> , Renato Chemello <sup>b,c</sup>
$^{12}_{13}6$	<sup>a</sup> Department of Earth and Marine Sciences (DiSTeM), University of Palermo, viale delle Scienze Ed. 16, 90128 Palermo,
$^{14}_{15}7$	Italy
$^{16}_{17}8$	<sup>b</sup> Department of Earth and Marine Sciences (DiSTeM), University of Palermo, via Archirafi 20-22, 90123 Palermo, Italy
$^{18}_{19}9$	°Consorzio Nazionale Interuniversitario per le Scienze del Mare (CoNISMa), Rome, Italy
20 21 <b>10</b>	<sup>d</sup> Institute of Anthropic Impacts and Sustainability in Marine Environment (CNR-IAS), via Lungomare Cristoforo
22 23 <b>11</b>	Colombo 4521, 90149, Palermo, Italy
24 25 <b>12</b>	<sup>e</sup> Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences and Technologies, University of Salento, Lecce, Italy
26 27 <b>13</b>	<sup>f</sup> Department of Biological, Geological and Environmental Sciences, University of Bologna, via Sant'Alberto 16,
28 29 <b>14</b>	48123 Ravenna, Italy
30 31 <b>15</b>	<sup>g</sup> Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie Biologiche, Chimiche e Farmaceutiche (STEBICEF), University of Palermo,
32 33 <b>16</b>	Palermo, Italy
34 35 <b>17</b>	
36 37 <b>18</b> 38 <sup>39</sup> 19	Corresponding author: Mancuso F.P. email: francesco.mancuso@unipa.it
40 <sup>4</sup> 9 41 4 <b>220</b> 43	
<sup>44</sup> <sub>45</sub> 1	
46 4 <b>22</b> 48	Abstract
49 <b>23</b>	Invasive seaweeds are listed among the most relevant threats to marine ecosystems worldwide.
51 5 <b>24</b> 53	Biodiversity hotspots, such as the Mediterranean Sea, are facing multiple invasions and are expected
5425 55	to be severely affected by the introduction of new non-native seaweeds in the near future. In this
56 5 <b>26</b> 58	study, we evaluated the consequences of the shift from the native Ericaria brachycarpa to the
5 <b>%27</b> 60	invasive Asparagopsis taxiformis habitat on the shallow rocky shores of Favignana Island (Egadi
61 62 8	Islands, MPA, Sicily, Italy). We compared algal biomass and species composition and structure of
63 64 65	1

 the associated epifaunal assemblages in homogenous and mixed stands of *E. brachycarpa* and *A. taxiformis*. The results showed that the biomass of primary producers is reduced by 90% in the *A. taxiformis* invaded habitat compared to the *E. brachycarpa* native habitat. The structure of the epifaunal assemblages displayed significant variations among homogenous and mixed stands. The abundance, species richness and Shannon-Wiener diversity index of the epifaunal assemblages decreased by 89%, 78% and 40%, respectively, from homogenous stands of the native *E. brachycarpa* to the invasive *A. taxiformis*. Seaweed biomass was the structural attribute better explaining the variation in epifaunal abundance, species richness and diversity. Overall, our results suggest that the shift from *E. brachycarpa* to *A. taxiformis* habitat would drastically erode the biomass of primary producers and the associated biodiversity. We hypothesize that a complete shift from native to invasive seaweeds could ultimately lead to bottom-up effects on rocky shore habitats, with negative consequences for the ecosystem structure, functioning, and the services provided.

Keywords: habitat shift; alga; *Ericaria brachycarpa*; epifauna diversity; *Cystoseira sensu lato*; rocky shore; Marine Protected Area

#### 5 Introduction

Invasive species are globally recognized among the main drivers of habitat shift in both terrestrial and marine ecosystems (Gallardo et al., 2016; Mačić et al., 2018). In marine environments, decades of human activities related to global aquatic trade have enabled the dispersion of invasive species among distant geographic areas worldwide (Bax et al., 2003; Williams and Smith, 2007; Molnar et al., 2008; Servello et al., 2019). In addition, the rise in seawater temperature caused by global warming has allowed non-native species to cross environmental and geographical barriers, facilitating their expansion and in turn eroding indigenous resistance (Occhipinti-Ambrogi and Galil, 2010; Lo Brutto et al., 2019). Concerns over ecological and social-economic consequences have led researches to investigate the effects of invasive species on many marine ecosystems around the world.

55 Seaweeds are a significant component of marine non-native and invasive species (227 taxa 1 2**5**6 globally), with some of them being responsible for drastic habitat shifts (Williams and Smith, 2007). 4 57 Studies have highlighted how invasive seaweeds can negatively impact the recipient habitats by 6 7**5**8 8 reducing biomass of primary producers, biodiversity, and nutrient flows, compromising ecosystem <sup>9</sup><sub>10</sub>59 functioning (Boudouresque et al., 2005; Streftaris and Zenetos, 2006; Thomsen et al., 2014; Maggi 11 1**260** 13 et al., 2015; Ramsay-Newton et al., 2017; Geburzi and McCarthy, 2018). Interestingly, the effects of 14 15 non-native seaweeds seem to change depending on the complexity of the recipient habitat (Thomsen 16 1**%**2 et al., 2014). In less structured habitats (e.g. soft bottoms), the introduction of non-native seaweeds 18 <sup>1</sup>63 20 enhances structural complexity that may favor the increase in biodiversity and food web length 21 22**64** 23 (Dijkstra et al., 2017). Conversely, the introduction in well-structured habitats (e.g. seagrass 2**%5** 25 meadows, algal canopies) may alter the diversity and function, depending on the structural features 26 2**66** of the recipient habitat (Engelen et al., 2013; Veiga et al., 2014, 2018).

2**%**7 Macroalgal complexity plays a significant role in shaping the abundance, richness and structure of 30 <sup>31</sup> 3268 epifaunal assemblages associated with both non-native and native seaweeds (Chemello and Milazzo, 33 3**469** 2002; Jormalainen and Honkanen, 2008; Pitacco et al., 2014; Veiga et al., 2014; Maggi et al., 2015; 35 3670 37 Dijkstra et al., 2017; Veiga et al., 2018; Chiarore et al., 2019). Algae with a high structural 38 3971 complexity, expressed as a combination of attributes, such as degree of branching, thallus width and 40 <sup>4</sup><sup>172</sup> <sup>42</sup> <sup>43</sup> <sup>43</sup> <sup>43</sup> height, and wet weight, can support well-structured epifaunal communities (Hacker and Steneck, 1990: Chemello and Milazzo, 2002; Jormalainen and Honkanen, 2008; Pitacco et al., 2014; Veiga et 45 4674 al., 2014; Bitlis, 2019; Chiarore et al., 2019). Studies comparing the epifaunal diversity between 47 <sup>48</sup>/<sub>49</sub>75 invasive and native seaweeds revealed that, when invasive species are structurally less complex than 50 5176 native ones, they support low abundance and richness, and a simplified structure of epifaunal 52 <sup>53</sup>77 54 assemblages (Navarro-Barranco et al., 2018; Veiga et al., 2018). However, when native macroalgae 55 5Ø8 are less complex, the abundance and diversity of epifauna associated with invasive seaweeds may be 57 58**79** 59 higher (Veiga et al., 2014; Dijkstra et al., 2017). This indicates that the effects of invasive seaweeds  $^{60}_{61}\!\!80$ on epifaunal assemblages may change depending on both the invasive and the native seaweed 62

63

structural features. However, other studies have shown that native and invasive seaweeds with similar
 morphologies can host either similar (Suárez-Jiménez et al., 2017) or different epifaunal diversity
 (Navarro-Barranco et al., 2019). Overall, these contrasting evidences suggest that, apart from
 seaweed morphology, other factors can be involved in structuring the associated assemblages.

3**8**5 In the last decades, the Mediterranean basin has witnessed an increase in the number of non-native 11 1**286** 13 and invasive seaweeds, with consequent modification of biodiversity and ecosystem functioning of <sup>14</sup> 15 7 coastal areas (Ribera Siguan, 2002; Streftaris et al., 2005; Streftaris and Zenetos, 2006; Piazzi and 16 1**%**8 Balata, 2009; Musco et al., 2014; Bulleri et al., 2016; Corriero et al., 2016; Giangrande et al., 2020). 18 1**989** 20 In particular, Asparagopsis taxiformis (Delile) Trevisan de Saint-Léon is listed among the 100 worst <sup>21</sup> 2**290** 23 invasive species in this basin (Streftaris and Zenetos, 2006). The earliest reports of its presence in the 2**491** 25 Mediterranean Sea date back to 1798-1801 in Alexandria (Egypt) as a result of trading operations 26 2**9**2 and the opening of the Suez Canal (Verlaque et al., 2015). It was first recorded along the Italian coast 28 2**993** 30 on the western shore of Sicily, close to the city of Trapani, in May 2000 (Barone et al., 2003). While <sup>31</sup> 32</sub>94 A. taxiformis has been suspected of producing harmful effects on native habitats (Barone et al., 2003), 33 3**495** as far as we know, only one study assessed its effects on biodiversity, in particular by comparing the 35 36**96** 37 vagile macrofauna associated with this species to that of the native Halopteris scoparia (Linnaeus) 38 3**9**7 Sauvageau indicating that A. taxiformis hosted less diverse epifaunal assemblages compared to native 40 41**98** 42 algae (Navarro-Barranco et al., 2018).

43 44**9**9 Along the Italian coast, gametophytes of A. taxiformis can colonize coastal areas dominated by 45 400 habitat-forming seaweeds, mainly belonging to the genus Cystoseira - recently divided into three 47 41801 genera Cystoseira, Gongolaria and Ericaria and hereafter referred to as Cystoseira sensu lato to 50 51102 include all three genera (Orellana et al., 2019; Molinari Novoa and Guiry, 2020). Cystoseira sensu 52 5**1**303 lato species are important ecological engineers, greatly increasing the habitat surface, complexity and 55 51604 productivity in coastal ecosystems from the infra-littoral zone to the upper circalittoral zone. 57 59 59 (Giaccone et al., 1994; Bulleri et al., 2002; Falace and Bressan, 2006; Ballesteros et al., 2009;  $^{60}_{40}$ Mancuso et al., 2021b). By creating shelter, Cystoseira sensu lato species improve the biodiversity 62

- 63
- 64 65

of their related assemblages, leading to the development of well-structured food webs (Schiel and 1
 Foster, 2006; Cheminée et al., 2013; Mineur et al., 2015; Mancuso et al., 2021b). According to the Lorenza Water Framework Directive (2000/60), they are also considered indicators of good water and environmental quality (European Commission, 2000).

 $1^{9}_{1}1^{1}_{1}$ In a recent study, we discovered that A. taxiformis had a less diverse and less structured molluscan 11 11212 13 assemblage than E. brachycarpa; however, no information about other epifaunal components  $^{1}_{15}$ associated with seaweeds was reported, nor information about intermediate states, such as mixed 16 11714 stands of E. brachycarpa and A. taxiformis (Mancuso et al., 2021a). Here, we compared the structure 18 <sup>1</sup>1<sup>9</sup>15 of the epifaunal community (amphipods, molluscs and annelids) associated with three plausible 21 21216 23 alternative states of the transition between the native Ericaria brachycarpa (J.Agardth) Orellana & 2**1417** 25 Sansón and the invasive A. taxiformis. In particular, we characterized and compared the biomass and 26 the diversity (richness, evenness, structure and composition) of the epifauna associated with the fronds of homogenous and mixed stands of E. brachycarpa and A. taxiformis. Moreover, we explored the variation of the epifaunal diversity in relation to the structural features of the two algae (dry weight, thallus volume, canopy volume, and interstitial volume). We hypothesize that shifting from habitats dominated by E. brachycarpa to those dominated by A. taxiformis will have a negative impact on the associated biodiversity, resulting in low abundances and diversity of each epifaunal component.

# 28 2**1919** 30 <sup>31</sup>20 33 3**1**421 35 3122 38 3**1**323 40 4124 42 43 4**1**425 45 4**26** 47 ${}^{4}_{4}1{}^{8}_{2}7$ 50 5**1**128 52 5**1329** 54 55 5**130** 57 5**1831** 59 60 61 62 63 64

65

#### 6 Materials and Methods

Study area and algal species characteristics

The research was performed on the southwestern, shallow rocky shore of Favignana Island (Sicily, Italy), within the Egadi Islands Marine Protected Area (MPA) in June 2011 (Fig. 1). The region consists of gently sloping (5°-10°) carbonate rocky platforms and scattered boulders (Pepe et al., 2018) that provide substrates for well-developed macroalgal vegetation.

In this area, *A. taxiformis* was first recorded in 2000 (Barone et al., 2003). Since then, no studies have explored the temporal effects of this invasive species on native habitats. Although today *A.* taxiformis is well established in the area, previous surveys allowed the identification of three sites with distinctive habitats corresponding to three possible alternative states of the transition from native to invasive seaweed habitats: "Scoglio Corrente" ( $37^{\circ} 55' 2.0778"$  N,  $12^{\circ} 17' 6.0432"$  E) characterized by stands of *E. brachycarpa* (100% coverage); "Scoglio Palumbo" ( $37^{\circ} 55' 10.4226"$  N,  $12^{\circ} 18'$ 41.097" E) hosting stands of *A. taxiformis* (100% coverage), and "Cala Grande" ( $37^{\circ} 55' 35.385"$  N, 12° 16' 39.514" E) with mixed stands of *E. brachycarpa* (~50% coverage) and *A. taxiformis* (~50% coverage) (Fig. 1). In this study, we decided to use these three sites to compare the epifaunal communities associated with three plausible alternative states of the transition from native to invasive habitats.

*Ericaria brachycarpa* is a brown seaweed (Fucales) characterized by caespitosus thalli up to 20-25 cm in height with several perennial axes, up to 2-6 cm in height, connected to the substratum by a more or less compact discoid base formed by haptera (Molinari Novoa and Guiry, 2020). The apices of the axes are flattened, smooth and not very prominent. Branches are cylindrical with smooth bases, or covered with tiny spinose appendages that are typically fertile in the spring-summer season (Gómez-Garreta et al., 2002; Mannino and Mancuso, 2009; Cormaci et al., 2012). Like other *Cystoseira sensu lato* species, *E. brachycarpa* displays seasonal differences in vegetative development (Gómez-Garreta et al., 2002). At the study sites, new branches of *E. brachycarpa* grow from the perennial axes in spring (May-June) providing new substrate and shelter for colonizing fauna, while in autumn (September-October) *E. brachycarpa* starts to become quiescent, losing almost all branches, leaving perennial axes that persist throughout the cold winter season.

*Asparagopsis taxiformis* is a red alga (Bonnemaisoniales) common in the tropics and subtropics across the globe. The species experiences a heteromorphic life cycle, with an erect gametophyte alternating with a filamentous sporophyte known as *Falkenbergia hillebrandii* (Bornet) Falkenberg (Andreakis et al., 2004; Ní Chualáin et al., 2004). The gametophytes are characterized by sparsely

branched, creeping stolons and erect shoots from which several side branches grow in all directions. The latter ramifies over and over again giving the thallus a plumose appearance. In the study area, *A*. taxiformis develops in the upper sublittoral zone of the rocky substrate or as an epiphyte of other algal species. The gametophytes are present during all seasons with a maximum occurrence in spring (Barone et al., 2003). Barone et al., 2003).



**Fig. 1** Location of the three study sites (red dots) along the rocky-shore of Favignana Island MPA (green dot), Trapani, Sicily, Italy. **SC** = Scoglio Corrente, **SP** = Scoglio Palumbo, **CG** = Cala Grande.

469 Sampling and analysis of epifauna

**1**370 Samples were collected by scuba diving at a depth of 5-7 m. For each site (hereafter referred to 4171 as habitat), two areas (5 x 5 m) were haphazardly selected. For each area, 10 thalli of E. brachycarpa **1872** 49 from homogenous stands (100% algal coverage), 10 thalli of E. brachycarpa from mixed stands and 51173 10 gametophytes of A. taxiformis from homogenous stands (100% algal coverage) were collected (n = 20 per habitat). Thalli were collected 50cm apart to avoid spatial autocorrelation among samples. Underwater, each thallus and the associated epifauna were enveloped in a plastic bag, then the alga was detached from the substrate and the plastic bag was immediately closed to prevent the escape of 61 vagile fauna. After collection, each sample was carefully drained of seawater in order to prevent 

**1667** 

<sup>3</sup>164 <sup>3</sup>165  178 escape of small epifauna and stored at  $-20^{\circ}$ C until laboratory analysis. In the laboratory, each thallus 179 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 184 Marine Species database (WoRMS Editorial Board (2021)).

6 Seaweed structural attributes

For each thallus of *E. brachycarpa* and gametophyte of *A. taxiformis* collected, we measured 4 structural features (thallus volume, canopy volume, interstitial volume, and biomass), to explore their relationships with the diversity indices calculated for the epifaunal assemblages. Thallus volume was measured as the variation of volume, in ml, after the immersion of a thallus into a graduated cylinder filled with seawater. Canopy and interstitial volumes were estimated according to Hacker and Steneck (1990). The canopy volume (*CV*, the volume, in ml, created by the overall dimension of a thallus submerged in seawater) was defined as the volume of a theoretical cylinder ( $CV = \pi \times r^2 \times h$ ), where  $\pi = 3.14$ , *h* is the length of the thallus from the base to its apical portion of the thallus, including epiphytes, and *r* is the radius calculated as an average measure of the radius of the thallus weasured with a ruler (+/- 1 mm) at the apical, median, and basal parts. The interstitial volume (IV, the volume, in ml, of water among the branches of the alga) was obtained by subtracting the thallus volume (TV) from the canopy volume CV (IV = CV - TV).

Finally, the biomass of the macroalgae was calculated as dry weight (*DW*, gr) after drying in a
stove at 60 °C for 48 h (Stein-Taylor et al., 1985). Biomass was used as a proxy for the primary
production of each habitat.

Data analysis

204 For each epifaunal species, we calculated total abundance (N), frequency (F%; the percentage of 1 205 3 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 6 207 8 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 11 1209 13 diversity index (H') and Pielou's Evenness index (J). A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was  $\frac{14}{15}0$ used to test differences in the epifaunal indices (N, S, H', J) between habitats (fixed with 3 levels: E. 16 12/11 18 brachycarpa, E. brachycarpa in mixed stands and A. taxiformis) and areas (random and nested within <sup>1</sup>2<sup>9</sup>12 habitat with 2 levels: area 1 and area 2). Cochran's test was used to check for the homogeneity of 21 2213 variances (Underwood 1997). Tukey's HSD procedure was used to separate means (at  $\alpha = 0.05$ ) 23 <sup>2</sup>2<sup>4</sup>14 following significant effects in the ANOVAs (Underwood, 1996). The hierarchical structure of the 26 2715 taxonomic classifications of the epifaunal assemblages of E. brachycarpa, E. brachycarpa in mixed 28 22916 30 stands, and A. taxiformis was visualized using the "heat tree" function in the "Metacoder" R-package  $\frac{31}{32}$ (Foster et al., 2017).

**3241 8** 35 SIMPER analysis (Clarke, 1993) was performed to identify those taxa that contributed to the 36 2719 dissimilarity of the epifaunal assemblages between habitats ( $\delta i$ %). The ratio  $\delta i/SD_{(\delta i)}$  was used to 38 3220 measure the consistency of the contribution of a particular taxon to the average dissimilarity in the 4212 42 43 43 42222 comparison between habitats. A cut-off value of 70% was used to exclude low contributions.

Differences in the epifaunal community structure (which takes into account species identity and 4**223** 47 relative abundance) and composition (presence/absence, which only takes into account species 48 42 24 identity) among habitats and areas were assessed by Permutational Multivariate Analysis of Variance 50 5225 52 (PERMANOVA). The analyses were based on a Bray-Curtis distance matrix of square-root 5<u>3</u>26 transformed epifaunal abundances (structure) and on a Jaccard distance matrix of presence/absence 55 5227 data (composition) using 9999 permutations. PERMANOVA was also performed separately for each <u>5</u>28 5298 component of the epifauna (molluscs, annelids and amphipods). Permutational analysis of 60 2129 multivariate dispersion (PERMDISP) was used to test differences in multivariate dispersion

65

62

57

33

40

(Anderson et al., 2008). A principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) plot was generated to visualize the variation of the epifaunal community structure (based on a Bray-Curtis distance matrix) and composition (based on a Jaccard distance matrix).

Differences in each of the structural attributes (*CV*, *IV*, *TV*, *DW*) among habitats and areas were analyzed by two-way ANOVAs according to the above mentioned design. Cochran's test was used to check for the homogeneity of variances (Underwood, 1996).

Linear regression (LM) analysis was used to test which algal structural attributes explained better the variation of total abundance (N), rarefied species richness (S), Shannon-Wiener diversity (H') and Pielou's Evenness (J) of the whole epifaunal assemblages and its individual components (molluscs, annelids and amphipods). If a non-linear relationship between response and depended variables was detected, we examined the significance of applying a quadratic term in the model. In addition, a distance-based redundancy analysis (dbRDA, Legendre and Anderson, 1999) was used to investigate the relationship between structural attributes and the epifaunal multivariate structure. Since dbRDA is susceptible to multicollinearity (i.e. high correlation between environmental variables), draftsman plots were used to verify skewness or identify clear correlations between structural attributes. A log(x + 1) transformation was used to correct the right-skewness of thallus volume (*TV*) and biomass (*DW*). Moreover, due to the high correlation between canopy volume (*CV*) and interstitial volume (*IV*) we removed *CV* from the subsequent analyses. Then, the structural attributes were normalised using a z-score transformation due to their varying measurement scales. Finally, forward selection was used to identify the structural properties that mostly contributed to the heterogeneity in the multivariate structure of the epifaunal assemblages.

Statistical analyses were performed using R open access statistical software 3.5.1 (R Core Team, 2018). See the "*Data availability and reproducible research*" section for further details.

10

54 **Results** 

55 Epifauna

256	Overall, we identified 5676 individuals of epifauna belonging to 199 taxa (74 molluscs, 50
2257 3	amphipods, and 75 annelids). Of these, 46 and 38 taxa were exclusively found on homogenous and
258	mixed stands of the native E. brachycarpa respectively, while the invasive A. taxiformis hosted only
6 259 8	12 unique taxa (Fig. 2, Table S1-S2). Syllidae (annelids) and Rissoidae (molluscs) were the most
$260_{11}^{9}$	species rich families (35 spp. and 21 spp. respectively), while all the other families contained less
1261 13	than 10 species each (Fig. 2, Table S1). Among molluscs, the most abundant species were Eatonina
1262 15	cossurae (Calcara, 1841) on both E. brachycarpa (186 ind.) and A. taxiformis (12 ind.) and Setia
16 <u>1</u> 263 18	ambigua (Brugnone, 1873) on E. brachycarpa from mixed stands (161 ind.). The most abundant
<sup>1</sup> 264 20	species among amphipods were Ampithoe ramondi on E. brachycarpa (164 ind.), Apherusa
$21 \\ 2265$	alacris (Krapp-Schickel, 1969) on E. brachycarpa from mixed stands (253 ind.) and Caprella
23 2266 25	acanthifera (Leach, 1814) on A. taxiformis (33 ind.). Finally, annelids were mostly represented by
26 2 <b>6</b> 7	Amphiglena mediterranea (Leydig, 1851) on E. brachycarpa (457 ind.) and Syllis prolifera (Krohn,
28 2268 30	1852) on both E. brachycarpa in mixed stands (171 ind.) and A. taxiformis (17 ind.) (Fig. 2, Table
$\frac{31}{32}69$	S1).
33 32470	
35	
37 37	
38 3972	
40 4 <b>0173</b>	
42 43	
44	
45 46	
47	
48 49	
50	
51	
52 53	
54	
55	
56 57	
58	
59 60	
61	
62	
63 64	11
65	



Fig. 2 Differences in the epifaunal assemblages among habitats. Heat trees show the abundances of taxa classified at the lowest taxonomic level possible on *E. brachycarpa* (a), *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands (b) and *A. taxiformis* (c). Bar charts show the total abundance of amphipods, annelids, and molluses for each habitat.

Total abundance (**N**) and rarefied species richness (**S**), differed significantly among habitats, 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 *E. brachycarpa* and *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands exhibiting closer and higher values than *A. taxiformis*.

Conversely, Pielou's evenness (**J**) was higher in *A. taxiformis* compared to the other two habitats, which showed comparable values (Fig. 3, Table S3).



Fig. 3 Comparison of the alpha diversity indices among habitats. Abundance (a), rarefied species
richness (b), Shannon-Wiener diversity (c), and Pielou's evenness index (d) of the epifaunal

 assemblage associated with *E. brachycarpa*, *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands, and *A. taxiformis*. Bar
plots show mean +/- 1 standard error (n = 20). Significant codes: \*\*\* p<= 0.001, \* p <= 0.05, ns</li>
p>0.05. See Table S3 for further details.

PERMANOVA showed that the structure and composition of the epifaunal assemblages differed significantly among habitats (Table S4). PERMDISP analysis revealed a high dispersion of samples within habitats, especially for *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands and *A. taxiformis* (Fig. 4). Notwithstanding this high dispersion, the epifaunal assemblages of the three habitats were clearly separated, as shown by the PCoA ordination plot (Fig. 4). The proportion of variance explained by 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, in both structure and composition, from *E. brachycarpa* to *A. taxiformis*, with *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands placed between the two homogeneous stands of native and invasive seaweeds (Fig. 4). 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).



#### Fig. 4 Structure (a) and composition (b) of the epifaunal assemblages associated with the three

habitats. The Principal coordinate analysis plot (PCoA) based on a Bray-Curtis distance matrix of
 square-root transformed relative abundances (structure) or on a Jaccard distance matrix of
 presence/absence data (composition). The circles show the 90% confidence interval for each seaweed.

The SIMPER analysis revealed that 28 taxa contributed 70% to the dissimilarity between E. brachycarpa and A. taxiformis; 37 taxa contributed 70% to the dissimilarity between E. brachycarpa and E. brachycarpa in mixed stands; and 30 taxa contributed 70% to the dissimilarity between E. brachycarpa in mixed stand and A. taxiformis (Fig. S1, Table S5). Most of the species contributing to the dissimilarities belonged to amphipods. The polychaete Amphiglena mediterranea (Leydig, 1851) was the species mostly contributing to the differences observed between both E. brachycarpa and A. taxiformis and between E. brachycarpa and E. brachycarpa in mixed stands, contributing respectively to 8% and 6% of the observed differences. The amphipod Apherusa alacris Krapp-Schickel, 1969 was the species most contributing to the differences (7%) between E. brachycarpa in mixed stands and A. taxiformis. In addition, the gastropod Obtusella macilenta (Monterosato, 1880) was the species that contributed consistently (higher  $\delta i/SD(\delta i)$  values) to the difference between E. brachycarpa and A. taxiformis (Fig. S1, Table S5), while the amphipod Stenothoe monoculoides (Montagu, 1813) and the gastropod *Eatonina cossurae* (Calcara, 1841) were the species that contributed consistently to the differences between E. brachycarpa in mixed stands and E. brachycarpa, and between E. brachycarpa in mixed stands and A. taxiformis (Fig. S1, Table S5). The polychaete S. prolifera was among the first 5 species contributing to the differences between each couple of habitats (Fig. S1, Table S5).

Multivariate analyses conducted separately for the three dominant epifaunal groups (molluscs, annelids, and amphipods) revealed patterns of variation comparable to those of the whole epifaunal assemblage (Table S6). Only, amphipods showed less variability among habitats (Table S6).

335 Seaweed structural attributes and relationships with the epifaunal assemblages.

Canopy volume (CV) and interstitial volume (IV) differed significantly among habitats with higher values in *A. taxiformis* compared to *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands and *E. brachycarpa* (Fig. 5 a-b, Table S7). Biomass (DW) and thallus volume (TV) showed similar values between *E.*  $\frac{9}{10}$ *brachycarpa* and *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands and were significantly higher compared to those of *A. taxiformis* (Fig. 5 c-d, Table S7).



**Fig. 5 Differences in structural attributes among habitats.** Canopy volume (CV), interstitial volume (IV), thallus volume (TV) and biomass (expressed as dry weight, DW) of the epifaunal assemblages associated with *E. brachycarpa*, *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands and *A. taxiformis*. Bar

plots show mean ± 1 standard error (n = 20). Significant codes: \*\*\* p<= 0.001, \*\* p <= 0.01, \* p <=</li>
0.05, ns p>0.05. See Table S7 for further details.

The linear regression analysis revealed that biomass (DW) was the attribute that explained better the variation in abundance ( $R_N^2 = 0.51$ ), rarefied species richness ( $R_S^2 = 0.58$ ), Shannon-Wiener diversity  $(R^{2}_{H'} = 0.54)$  and Pielou's evenness index  $(R^{2}_{i} = 0.2)$  of the epifaunal assemblages (Table S8). The variance explained by algal biomass increased if we considered a quadratic relationship between those variables (Fig. 6). The relationship was positive for N, S and H', while J presented and opposite pattern of variation (Fig. 6). Otherwise, canopy volume (CV) interstitial volume (IV) and thallus volume (TV) explained less variation (and it was significant for N, S and H' but not for J) of the epifaunal attributes (R-squared < 0.5, Table S8). The analysis conducted separately on the three dominant epifaunal groups (molluscs, annelids, and amphipods) revealed similar results however for amphipods and annelids the relationship between assemblage parameters and algal biomass was weaker (annelids:  $R_N^2 = 0.35$ ,  $R_S^2 = 0.52$ ,  $R_H^2 = 0.49$ ,  $R_J^2 = 0.03$ ; amphipods:  $R_N^2 = 0.23$ ,  $R_S^2 = 0.43$ ,  $R^{2}_{H'} = 0.31$ ,  $R^{2}_{J} = 0.01$ ) although remaining the most important explanatory variable for both groups. Meanwhile, molluscs revealed patterns of variation similar to the whole assemblage ( $R^2_N = 0.5$ ,  $R^2_S$ = 0.53,  $R_{H}^2$  = 0.48,  $R_J^2$  = 0.12) (Table S8). As for the other algal structural features, annelids showed a weaker and not significant relationship with the canopy and interstitial volumes, differing from amphipods and molluscs (Table S8).



Fig. 6 Relationship between seaweed structural attributes and epifaunal diversity. Results of the linear regression analysis (LM) between the algal biomass (expressed as dry weight, DW) and the abundance (a), rarefied species richness (b), Shannon-Wiener diversity (c) and Pielou's evenness index (d) of the epifaunal assemblages.

13

- 64

Biomass (DW) was also the structural attribute selected for constrained db-RDA, explaining 24.7% of the variation in the structure of the epifaunal assemblages (Table S9). The first two axes of 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).



Fig. 7 Relationship between structural attributes and the multivariate structure of the epifaunal
assemblages associated to the three habitats. The distance-based redundancy (dbRDA) plot
illustrates the structural attribute better explaining the multivariate structure of the three habitats.
DW.log = seaweed biomass (log + 1).

**389** 3 The biodiversity and the socio-economic value of marine ecosystems are threatened by biological 3**9**0 invasions around the world (Bax et al., 2003; Molnar et al., 2008). Understanding how invasive 6 **39**1 8 seaweeds modify the functioning of recipient ecosystems may allow us to better understand large 392 scale effects on native rocky shore habitats. Here we investigated the effects of the invasive A. 11 **1393** 13 taxiformis on the native E. brachycarpa by comparing the epifaunal assemblage associated with three <sup>1</sup>394 alternative states of the transition between native and invasive seaweeds, homogenous and mixed 16 1**395** stands of the two seaweeds. Our results showed differences in abundance and diversity of the 18 1**396** 20 epifaunal assemblages between three alternative states of the transition from native E. brachycarpa 21 23297 to invasive A. taxiformis. In particular, A. taxiformis hosted almost 6 times less epifaunal individuals 23 2**3498** 25 compared to *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands, and 10 folds less individuals compared to homogenous <sup>2</sup>399 stands of E. brachycarpa. Also, the number of epifaunal species was more than 4 folds lower in the 28 24900 invasive compared to the native habitat, while diversity reduced by half. These results confirm that 30 3401 generally invasive seaweeds exhibit a less diverse epifaunal component compared to native seaweeds 33 3402 (Guerra-García et al., 2012; Janiak and Whitlatch, 2012; Maggi et al., 2015; Navarro-Barranco et al., 35 3**403** 2018; Veiga et al., 2018).

38 3**40**4 We found that variation in diversity and multivariate structure of the epifaunal assemblages was 40 **4405** 42 related to changes in algal structural features. In particular, biomass was the variable better explaining 43 406 the variation in abundance, number of species, and the multivariate structure of the epifaunal 45 4407 assemblages. The role of macroalgal complexity in shaping the associated biota has been highlighted 47 4408 4408 in several studies, with complex algae hosting a larger abundance and diversity of epifauna than 50 5409 simpler ones (Chemello and Milazzo, 2002; Pitacco et al., 2014; Veiga et al., 2014; Lolas et al., 2018; 52  $543_{54}$ Veiga et al., 2018; Bitlis, 2019; Chiarore et al., 2019; Poursanidis et al., 2019; Mancuso et al., 2021b). 55 54d1 In general, studies have highlighted that invasive seaweeds host lower (Guerra-García et al., 2012; 57 54912 59 Navarro-Barranco et al., 2018; Rubal et al., 2018; Veiga et al., 2018) or higher (Veiga et al., 2014) 60 #113 epifaunal abundance, species richness, and diversity, depending on whether their structural 62

- 63
- 64 65

414 complexity is respectively lower or higher compared to native seaweeds. Navarro-Barranco et al. 1 4**4**15 (2018) showed that A. taxiformis had low fractal complexity and hosted an impoverished faunal 416 assemblage compared to native seaweeds. Guerra-García et al., (2012) found that A. armata had low 6 4717 algal volume and showed lower abundance, species richness, and diversity of associated isopods 8 418 fauna compared to the native *Ellisolandia elongata* (J.Ellis & Solander) K.R.Hind & G.W.Saunders. 11 142**19** 13 Moreover, lower dry weight and fractal dimension in the invasive S. muticum compared to native  $\frac{1420}{15}$ seaweeds have been shown to play a major role in shaping the associated faunal assemblages (Veiga 16 1**421** et al., 2014, 2018). Likewise other studies (Janiak and Whitlatch, 2012; Veiga et al., 2014; Rubal et 18 <sup>1</sup>4<sup>9</sup>22 20 al., 2018), our results indicated that the quantity of habitat (biomass) was the best predictor variable 21 2**423** explaining variation in terms of abundance, species richness, as well as multivariate structure of the 23 2**4**€2 25 associated epifauna.

<sup>2</sup>425 Interestingly, our results highlight that A. taxiformis affected each component (molluscs, annelids, 28 24226 and amphipods) of the epifaunal assemblages in the same way. However, in the available literature 30 <sup>3</sup>427 on the epifaunal assemblages of invasive seaweeds, we can find distinct responses among epifaunal 33 3**42**8 components (Schmidt and Scheibling, 2006; Gestoso et al., 2010; Guerra-García et al., 2012; Bedini 35 3**429** 37 et al., 2014; Veiga et al., 2018; Navarro-Barranco et al., 2019). For example, species richness, 38 3**430** Shannon diversity and total abundance of isopods were significantly lower in A. armata compared to 40 **4431** 42 native algae (Guerra-García et al., 2012). Bedini et al. (2014) found that the invasive Lophocladia 43 ∦432 lallemandii (Montagne) F. Schmitz hosted a higher abundance of amphipods, isopods, and 45 4433 polychaetes, while native habitats harbored a greater abundance of molluscs and decapods. Bivalves 47 4834 associated with the invasive S. muticum were more abundant compared to native seaweeds, which, in 50 54135 contrast, hosted more gastropods (Veiga et al., 2018), and Gestoso et al. (2010) found that isopods 52 54336 54 and amphipods were more abundant in S. muticum than in native seaweeds. Moreover, the invasive 55 5**43**7 Codium fragile subsp. fragile (Suringar) Hariot supported higher densities of nematodes, bivalves, 57 5**438** 59 and specialist herbivores compared to fronds of the native kelp, which, in contrast, supported greater 60 **4**39 densities of gastropods and asteroids (Schmidt and Scheibling, 2006). Other authors revealed that 62 63

differences between invasive and native seaweeds in single components of epifaunal assemblages changed depending on the site and the identity of the algal species (Navarro-Barranco et al., 2019). The fact that in our study, the *A. taxiformis* habitat showed lower abundance, species richness, and diversity values for all the epifaunal organisms, regardless of the groups investigated in this study (molluscs, amphipods and annelids), led us to hypothesize that a potential shift from the native (i.e. *E. brachycarpa*) to the invasive (i.e. *A. taxiformis*) habitat could cause large negative cascade effects on the benthic ecosystem.

Although differences in the epifaunal assemblages among native and invasive seaweeds have been largely explored, our results also suggest that the presence of A. taxiformis affects the epifaunal assemblages associated with *E. brachycarpa* in mixed stands. This result could be explained by other attributes that differed between native and invasive seaweeds, such as the amount of epiphytes and/or the presence of chemical defenses, that have been related to the ability of seaweeds to shape their associated fauna (Hay et al., 1987; Viejo, 1999; Paul et al., 2006; Cacabelos et al., 2010; Máximo et al., 2018; Gache et al., 2019). Invasive seaweeds can release secondary metabolites (e.g. halogenated compounds) able to act as deterrents against epiphytes, and herbivores (Paul et al., 2006; Cacabelos et al., 2010; Vega Fernández et al., 2019). Secondary metabolites released by A. taxiformis can affect the survival of fish in the post-larval stages, eventually leading to alteration of the grazing pressure on the surrounding habitat (Máximo et al., 2018; Gache et al., 2019). Other studies suggest that invasive seaweeds can alter the trophic web by changing the composition of epiphytes which reduces suitable habitat for many epifaunal species (Viejo, 1999; Wikström and Kautsky, 2004). Several authors suggested that the amount of epiphytes could explain the higher species richness found in the invasive S. muticum compared to native seaweeds (Viejo, 1999; Cacabelos et al., 2010). In our study, A. taxiformis had no or fewer epiphytes compared to E. brachycarpa (R.C. personal observation). As epifauna is mostly represented by microalgae grazers, we can hypothesize that differences in the abundance of epiphytes between A. taxiformis and E. brachycarpa could contribute to the variation in epifaunal assemblages observed in this study. It is therefore arguable that further studies analyzing

the direct and indirect role of epiphyte abundance and secondary metabolites released by *A. taxiformis* in structuring its associated epifauna would allow us to better clarify the effects of this seaweed on the recipient habitats.

469 Moreover, as suggested by other authors (Navarro-Barranco et al., 2019), landscape features 8 470 could be another key aspect explaining the effect of A. taxiformis on E. brachycarpa associated 11 14271 13 assemblages in mixed stands. In fact, the presence of invasive seaweeds may contribute to the <sup>1</sup>472 fragmentation of native habitats, reducing the patch size of native seaweeds, and at the same time 16 1**473** increasing their isolation (Roberts and Poore, 2006; Lanham et al., 2015). It has been observed that 18 <sup>1</sup>4974 20 the reduction in patch size of Cystoseira sensu lato habitats reduces the diversity of associated faunal 21 2**4**275 assemblages (Mancuso et al., 2021b). Thus, we can hypothesize that the presence of A. taxiformis in 23 2**4476** 25 mixed stands can act as a physical barrier to the dispersal of vagile fauna, reducing connectivity on a <sup>2</sup>477 small scale and ultimately eroding the diversity of native habitats (Lanham et al., 2015). However, 28 24978 another possibility to consider is that some epifaunal groups may be able to disperse through the 30 <sup>3</sup>479 different seaweeds (Taylor, 1998) in mixed stands. In this case, the lower epifaunal abundance and 33 3480 diversity observed on *E. brachycarpa* from mixed stands could be because part of this diversity may 35 3**48**1 have preferentially dispersed to the A. taxiformis portion of these mixed stands. Our study, however, 38 3**4382** cannot address the effects of epifauna movement among seaweeds on the observed results, and more 40 **4483** 42 studies are necessary to understand the possible role of mobile epifaunal assemblage movement 43 484 patterns within mixed stands of *E. brachvcarpa*.

4485 One inherent weakness of this study concerns the impossibility of separating the effects of A. 47 4886 4886 taxiformis from natural spatial variability. This should be accounted for by using more interspersed 50 54187 sites for each condition (mono and mixed stands of native and invasive seaweeds). Unfortunately, we 52 5**4388** 54 were not able to find more interspersed sites in the area of study. However, the three sites selected 55 5**489** had the same average values of different environmental variables (surface temperature, salinity, 57 5**490** 59 nitrate and phosphate concentrations, dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll and photosynthetic active 60 **49**1 radiation, Table S10), indicating that spatial variability had little effect. Then, we think that the data 62

23

63 64 65

45

492 presented in this study is still valuable, albeit with its limitations, for understanding epifaunal community changes between plausible alternative states of the transition between E. brachycarpa and A. taxiformis.

In summary, our study suggests that shifting from native to invasive habitats may pose a serious threat to biodiversity in coastal areas (Martin et al., 1992; Heck et al., 2003), potentially leading to bottom-up effects on rocky shore ecosystems. In addition, the low biomass supplied by the herein studied invasive species suggests that the shift from native canopy-forming algae to the invasive A. taxiformis habitat would also drastically reduce the biomass of primary producers in affected coastal areas. Predicting the ecological effects of invasive seaweeds is one of the main goals in the study of biological invasions. Previous research has highlighted the context-dependent effects of invasive seaweeds, with larger impact caused by invasive species exerting a different functional role compared to native habitat forming species (Ricciardi and Atkinson, 2004; Ricciardi et al., 2013; Navarro-Barranco et al., 2019). Our results not only remark the negative effect of A. taxiformis on E. brachycarpa epifaunal assemblages, but also suggest that invasive species are able to affect native habitats in a transitional phase (mixed stands) of the habitat shift, facilitating fragmentation and isolation. Further studies aimed at understanding the effects of the habitat shift from native to invasive seaweeds should include multiple transitional phases (different percentage coverage), as well as the analysis of changes in the trophic structure of the associated epifaunal assemblages.

- Declarations

Not applicable

### Funding

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

- 62 63
- 64 65

#### **Conflicts of interest/Competing interests**

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

#### Data availability and reproducible research

The repository with all the data and the scripts used to reproduce the research in this paper is available at http://dx.doi.org/10.17632/h3r8ygnjfd.1

#### 7 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the three anonymous reviewers for their constructive and valuable comments and critical revision.

#### 1 Author Contributions

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.
M.B., M.L.

#### References

5 <sup>3</sup> <sub>4</sub> 45	Anderson, M.J., Gorley, R.N., Clarke, K.R., 2008. PERMANOVA+ for PRIMER: Guide to
5 546	Software and Statistical Methods, Plymouth, UK. PRIMER-E, Plymouth.
5 <sup>9</sup> 47	doi:10.13564/j.cnki.issn.1672-9382.2013.01.010
10 1548	Andreakis, N., Procaccini, G., Kooistra, W.H.C.F., 2004. Asparagopsis taxiformis and
12 1 <b>5349</b> 14	Asparagopsis armata (Bonnemaisoniales, Rhodophyta): Genetic and morphological
$15_{15}^{15}$	identification of Mediterranean populations. Eur. J. Phycol. 39, 273-283.
17 1 <b>535 1</b> 19	doi:10.1080/0967026042000236436
$20 \\ 25 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 1 \\ 22 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2$	Ballesteros, E., Garrabou, J., Hereu, B., Zabala, M., Cebrian, E., Sala, E., 2009. Deep-water stands
22 25353	of Cystoseira zosteroides C. Agardh (Fucales, Ochrophyta) in the Northwestern
<sup>25</sup> 54	Mediterranean: Insights into assemblage structure and population dynamics. Estuar. Coast.
27 2555	Shelf Sci. 82, 477–484. doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2009.02.013
3556 31	Barone, R., Mannino, A., Marino, M., 2003. Asparagopsis taxiformis (Bonnemaisoniales,
32 3537	Rhodophyta): first record of gametophytes on the Italian coast. Bocconea 16, 1021–1025.
34 3558 36	Bax, N., Williamson, A., Aguero, M., Gonzalez, E., Geeves, W., 2003. Marine invasive alien
<sup>37</sup> 3859	species: a threat to global biodiversity. Mar. Policy 27, 313-323. doi:10.1016/S0308-
39 4 <b>560</b> 41	597X(03)00041-1
42 4361	Bedini, R., Bonechi, L., Piazzi, L., 2014. Mobile epifaunal assemblages associated with Cystoseira
44 <b>4562</b>	beds: comparison between areas invaded and not invaded by Lophocladia lallemandii. Sci.
4563 48	Mar. 78, 425–432. doi:10.3989/scimar.03995.28B
49 5 <b>64</b>	Bitlis, B., 2019. Mollusk fauna associated with Cystoseira barbata (Stockhouse) C. Agardh, 1820
51 5765 53	in the Sea of Marmara (Turkey). Oceanol. Hydrobiol. Stud. 48, 174–183. doi:10.1515/ohs-
54 5566	2019-0016
56 5567 58	Boudouresque, C.F., Ruitton, S., Verlaque, M., 2005. Large-Scale Disturbances , Regime Shift and
568	Recovery in Littoral Systems Subject To Biological Invasions. UNESCO-ROSTE/BAS Work.
61 62 63	
64 65	26

regime shifts 85-101.

**5**70 Bulleri, F., Badalamenti, F., Iveša, L., Mikac, B., Musco, L., Jaklin, A., Rattray, A., Vega 54 571 Fernández, T., Benedetti-Cecchi, L., 2016. The effects of an invasive seaweed on native 6 5772 8 communities vary along a gradient of land-based human impacts. PeerJ 4, e1795. 573 doi:10.7717/peerj.1795 11 1**5274** 13 Bulleri, F., Benedetti-Cecchi, L., Acunto, S., Cinelli, F., Hawkins, S.J., 2002. The influence of  $^{14}_{15}$ canopy algae on vertical patterns of distribution of low-shore assemblages on rocky coasts in 16 15776 18 the northwest Mediterranean. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 267, 89–106. doi:10.1016/S0022-<sup>1</sup>5977 20 0981(01)00361-6 21 25278 Cacabelos, E., Olabarria, C., Incera, M., Troncoso, J.S., 2010. Effects of habitat structure and tidal 23 2**5479** 25 height on epifaunal assemblages associated with macroalgae. Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci. 89, 43-26 580 52. doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2010.05.012 28 2**5%1** 30 Chemello, R., Milazzo, M., 2002. Effect of algal architecture on associated fauna: Some evidence 3182 3282 from phytal molluscs. Mar. Biol. 140, 981-990. doi:10.1007/s00227-002-0777-x 33 **3483** Cheminée, A., Sala, E., Pastor, J., Bodilis, P., Thiriet, P., Mangialajo, L., Cottalorda, J.M., 35 35**8**4 Francour, P., 2013. Nursery value of *Cystoseira* forests for Mediterranean rocky reef fishes. J. 38 3**5**85 Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 442, 70–79. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2013.02.003 40 **45186** 42 Chiarore, A., Bertocci, I., Fioretti, S., Meccariello, A., Saccone, G., Crocetta, F., Patti, F.P., 2019. 43 **4 4 4 7** Syntopic *Cystoseira* taxa support different molluscan assemblages in the Gulf of Naples 45 4**588** 47 (southern Tyrrhenian Sea). Mar. Freshw. Res. 70, 1561–1575. doi:10.1071/MF18455 48 4**3**89 Clarke, K.R., 1993. Non-parametric multivariate analyses of changes in community structure. Aust. 50 5190 J. Ecol. 18, 117–143. doi:10.1111/j.1442-9993.1993.tb00438.x 52 53**9**1 Cormaci, M., Furnari, G., Catra, M., Alongi, G., Giaccone, G., 2012. Flora marina bentonica del 55 592 Mediterraneo: Phaeophyceae\*. Boll. dell'Accademia Gioenia di Sci. Nat. 45, 1–508. 57 5**393** 59 Corriero, G., Pierri, C., Accoroni, S., Alabiso, G., Bavestrello, G., Barbone, E., Bastianini, M., 60 5194 Bazzoni, A.M., Bernardi Aubry, F., Boero, F., Buia, M.C., Cabrini, M., Camatti, E., Cardone, 62 63 27 64 65

595	F., Cataletto, B., Cattaneo Vietti, R., Cecere, E., Cibic, T., Colangelo, P., De Olazabal, A.,
⊥ 5996 3	D'onghia, G., Finotto, S., Fiore, N., Fornasaro, D., Fraschetti, S., Gambi, M.C., Giangrande,
5 <u>9</u> 7	A., Gravili, C., Guglielmo, R., Longo, C., Lorenti, M., Lugliè, A., Maiorano, P., Mazzocchi,
6 598 8	M.G., Mercurio, M., Mastrototaro, F., Mistri, M., Monti, M., Munari, C., Musco, L., Nonnis-
5999	Marzano, C., Padedda, B.M., Patti, F.P., Petrocelli, A., Piraino, S., Portacci, G., Pugnetti, A.,
11 1 <b>600</b> 13	Pulina, S., Romagnoli, T., Rosati, I., Sarno, D., Satta, C.T., Sechi, N., Schiaparelli, S.,
1401 1501	Scipione, B., Sion, L., Terlizzi, A., Tirelli, V., Totti, C., Tursi, A., Ungaro, N., Zingone, A.,
16 16102	Zupo, V., Basset, A., 2016. Ecosystem vulnerability to alien and invasive species: A case study
1 <b>603</b> 20	on marine habitats along the Italian coast. Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst. 26, 392-
21 2004	409. doi:10.1002/aqc.2550
23 <b>2605</b> 25	Dijkstra, J.A., Harris, L.G., Mello, K., Litterer, A., Wells, C., Ware, C., 2017. Invasive seaweeds
2606	transform habitat structure and increase biodiversity of associated species. J. Ecol. 105, 1668-
28 2 <b>6907</b> 30	1678. doi:10.1111/1365-2745.12775
36108	Engelen, A.H., Primo, A.L., Cruz, T., Santos, R., 2013. Faunal differences between the invasive
33 36409 35	brown macroalga Sargassum muticum and competing native macroalgae. Biol. Invasions 15,
3610 37	171–183. doi:10.1007/s10530-012-0276-z
38 <b>36</b> 11 40	European Commission, 2000. Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), Official Journal of the
<b>4612</b> 42	European Communities. doi:2004R0726 - v.7 of 05.06.2013
43 44 45	Falace, A., Bressan, G., 2006. Seasonal variations of Cystoseira barbata (Stackhouse) C. Agardh
<b>4614</b> 47	frond architecture. Hydrobiologia 555, 193-206. doi:10.1007/s10750-005-1116-2
48 49 5	Foster, Z.S.L., Sharpton, T.J., Grünwald, N.J., 2017. Metacoder: An R package for visualization
50 56116 52	and manipulation of community taxonomic diversity data. PLoS Comput. Biol. 13, 1–15.
5317 54	doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005404
55 57 57	Gache, C., Bertucci, F., Guerra, A.S., Calandra, M., Berr, T., Lafaye, J., Jorissen, H., Nugues, M.,
5 <b>619</b> 59	Cossy, J., Lecchini, D., 2019. Effects of Asparagopsis taxiformis metabolites on the feeding
60 620	behaviour of post- larval Acanthurus triostegus. J. Fish Biol. 95, 1355–1358.
63 64	28
65	

# doi:10.1111/jfb.14140

622 3	Gallardo, B., Clavero, M., Sánchez, M.I., Vilà, M., 2016. Global ecological impacts of invasive
6 <u>4</u> 6 <u>2</u> 3	species in aquatic ecosystems. Glob. Chang. Biol. 22, 151-163. doi:10.1111/gcb.13004
624 8	Geburzi, J.C., McCarthy, M.L., 2018. How Do They Do It? - Understanding the Success of Marine
625	Invasive Species, in: YOUMARES 8 – Oceans Across Boundaries: Learning from Each Other.
1626 13	Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 109–124. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-93284-2_8
1627	Gestoso, I., Olabarria, C., Troncoso, J.S., 2010. Variability of epifaunal assemblages associated
<b>16</b> 28 18	with native and invasive macroalgae. Mar. Freshw. Res. 61, 724–731. doi:10.1071/MF09251
1 <b>629</b> 20	Giaccone, G., Alongi, G., Pizzuto, F., Cossu, A.V.L., 1994. La Vegetazione marina bentonica
21 2630 23	fotofila del Mediterraneo: 2. Infralitorale e Circalitorale: proposte di aggiornamento. Boll.
<b>263</b> 1 25	dell'Accademia Gioenia di Sci. Nat. 27, 111–157.
26 2 <b>632</b> 28	Giangrande, A., Pierri, C., Del Pasqua, M., Gravili, C., Gambi, M.C., Gravina, M.F., 2020. The
<b>26933</b> 30	Mediterranean in check: Biological invasions in a changing sea. Mar. Ecol. 41.
3134	doi:10.1111/maec.12583
<b>1635</b> 35	Gómez-Garreta, A., Barceló, M., Gallardo, T., Pérez-Ruzafa, I., Ribera, M.A., Rull, J., 2002. Flora
<b>3636</b>	Phycologica Iberica. Vol. 1. Fucales, Universida. ed. Murcia.
38 3637 40	Guerra-García, J.M., Ros, M., Izquierdo, D., Soler-Hurtado, M.M., 2012. The invasive
<b>638</b> 42	Asparagopsis armata versus the native Corallina elongata: Differences in associated peracarid
43 439 45	assemblages. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 416-417, 121-128. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2012.02.018
<b>4640</b> 47	Hacker, S.D., Steneck, R.S., 1990. Habitat Architecture and the Abundance and Body-Size-
48 49 50	Dependent Habitat Selection of a Phytal Amphipod. Ecology 71, 2269–2285.
<b>5642</b> 52	doi:10.2307/1938638
5343	Hay, M.E., Duffy, J.E., Pfister, C.A., Fenical, W., 1987. Chemical Defense Against Different
55 57 57	Marine Herbivores: Are Amphipods Insect Equivalents? Ecology 68, 1567–1580.
<b>5845</b> 59	doi:10.2307/1939849
62 62 62	Heck, K.L., Hays, G., Orth, R.J., Heck Hay, K.L., Hays, G., Orth, R.J., 2003. Critical evaluation of
63 64 65	29

647	the nursery role hypothesis for seagrass meadows. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 253, 123-136.
1 648	doi:10.3354/meps253123
6 <u>4</u> 9	Janiak, D.S., Whitlatch, R.B., 2012. Epifaunal and algal assemblages associated with the native
6 650	Chondrus crispus (Stackhouse) and the non-native Grateloupia turuturu (Yamada) in eastern
° 1951	Long Island Sound. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 413, 38–44. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2011.11.016
11 1652	Jormalainen, V., Honkanen, T., 2008. Macroalgal chemical defenses and their roles in structuring
13 1453	temperate marine communities. Algal Chem. Ecol. 9783540741, 57-89. doi:10.1007/978-3-
16 1654	540-74181-7_3
$\frac{18}{2655}$	Lanham, B.S., Gribben, P.E., Poore, A.G.B., 2015. Beyond the border: Effects of an expanding
20 21 26256	algal habitat on the fauna of neighbouring habitats. Mar. Environ. Res. 106, 10–18.
23 26 <b>5</b> 7	doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2015.02.006
25 26 658	Legendre, P., Anderson, M.J., 1999. Distance-Based Redundancy Analysis: Testing Multispecies
28 26559	Responses in Multifactorial Ecological Experiments. Ecol. Monogr. 69, 1–24.
30 3660	doi:10.2307/2657192
33 <b>3661</b>	Lo Brutto, S., Iaciofano, D., Guerra García, J.M., Lubinevsky, H., Galil, B.S., 2019. Desalination
35 3662	effluents and the establishment of the non-indigenous skeleton shrimp Paracaprella pusilla
38 5653	Mayer, 1890 in the south -eastern Mediterranean. BioInvasions Rec. 8, 661–669.
40 <b>664</b>	doi:10.3391/bir.2019.8.3.23
42 43 665	Lolas, A., Antoniadou, C., Vafidis, D., 2018. Spatial variation of molluscan fauna associated with
45 <b>666</b>	<i>Cystoseira</i> assemblages from a semi-enclosed gulf in the Aegean Sea. Reg. Stud. Mar. Sci. 19,
47 48 667	17–24. doi:10.1016/j.rsma.2018.03.003
49 50 <b>5668</b>	Mačić, V., Albano, P.G., Almpanidou, V., Claudet, J., Corrales, X., Essl, F., Evagelopoulos, A.,
52 5 <b>669</b>	Giovos, I., Jimenez, C., Kark, S., Marković, O., Mazaris, A.D., Ólafsdóttir, G.Á., Panavotova
54	

57

55 5670 M., Petović, S., Rabitsch, W., Ramdani, M., Rilov, G., Tricarico, E., Vega Fernández, T., Sini,

**67**1 59 M., Trygonis, V., Katsanevakis, S., 2018. Biological Invasions in Conservation Planning: A

- 60 6172 Global Systematic Review. Front. Mar. Sci. 5. doi:10.3389/fmars.2018.00178
- 62 63 64
- 65

673	Maggi, E., Benedetti- Cecchi, L., Castelli, A., Chatzinikolaou, E., Crowe, T.P., Ghedini, G., Kotta,
674 3	J., Lyons, D.A., Ravaglioli, C., Rilov, G., Rindi, L., Bulleri, F., 2015. Ecological impacts of
6 <b>7</b> 5	invading seaweeds: a meta- analysis of their effects at different trophic levels. Divers. Distrib.
6 6776 8	21, 1–12. doi:10.1111/ddi.12264
677	Magurran, A.E., 1988. Ecological Diversity and Its Measurement, Transactions of the American
16278 13	Institute of Electrical Engineers. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht. doi:10.1007/978-94-015-
1 <b>6</b> 79	7358-0
16 <b><u>1</u>680</b> 18	Mancuso, F.P., D'Agostaro, R., Milazzo, M., Chemello, R., 2021a. The invasive Asparagopsis
1681 20	taxiformis hosts a low diverse and less trophic structured molluscan assemblage compared
<sup>21</sup> 2682	with the native Ericaria brachycarpa. Mar. Environ. Res. 166, 105279.
23 2683 25	doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2021.105279
2684	Mancuso, F.P., Milazzo, M., Chemello, R., 2021b. Decreasing in patch-size of Cystoseira forests
20 2685 30	reduces the diversity of their associated molluscan assemblage in Mediterranean rocky reefs.
36 3286	Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci. 250, 107163. doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2020.107163
33 36487 35	Mannino, A.M., Mancuso, F.P., 2009. Guida all'identificazione delle Cistoseire (Area Marina
<b>3688</b> 37	Protetta "Capo Gallo-Isola delle Femmine"). Palermo.
38 <b>5589</b> 40	Martin, T.H., Crowder, L.B., Dumas, C.F., Burkholder, J.M., 1992. Indirect effects of fish on
<b>4690</b> 42	macrophytes in Bays Mountain Lake: evidence for a littoral trophic cascade. Oecologia 89,
43 491	476-481. doi:10.1007/BF00317152
<b>4692</b> 47	Máximo, P., Ferreira, L., Branco, P., Lima, P., Lourenço, A., 2018. Secondary Metabolites and
4893	Biological Activity of Invasive Macroalgae of Southern Europe. Mar. Drugs 16, 265.
50 <b>5694</b> 52	doi:10.3390/md16080265
<b>595</b>	Mineur, F., Arenas, F., Assis, J., Davies, A.J., Engelen, A.H., Fernandes, F., Malta, E., Thibaut, T.,
55 596 57	Van Nguyen, T., Vaz-Pinto, F., Vranken, S., Serrão, E. a., De Clerck, O., 2015. European
<b>59</b> 7	seaweeds under pressure: Consequences for communities and ecosystem functioning. J. Sea
60 698	Res. 98, 91–108. doi:10.1016/j.seares.2014.11.004
63 64	31
65	

699	Molinari Novoa, E.A., Guiry, M.D., 2020. Reinstatement of the genera Gongolaria Boehmer and
1 700 3	Ericaria Stackhouse (Sargassaceae, Phaeophyceae). Not. Algarum 172, 1–10.
7 <u>4</u> 01	Molnar, J.L., Gamboa, R.L., Revenga, C., Spalding, M.D., 2008. Assessing the global threat of
°702 8	invasive species to marine biodiversity. Front. Ecol. Environ. 6, 485-492. doi:10.1890/070064
1703	Musco, L., Andaloro, F., Mikac, B., Mirto, S., Vega Fernandex, T., Badalamenti, F., 2014. Concern
1 <b>7204</b> 13	about the spread of the invader seaweed Caulerpa taxifolia var. distichophylla (Chlorophyta:
1405	Caulerpales) towards the West Mediterranean. Mediterr. Mar. Sci. 15, 532.
16 1 <b>7/06</b> 18	doi:10.12681/mms.742
1 <b>707</b> 20	Navarro-Barranco, C., Florido, M., Ros, M., González-Romero, P., Guerra-García, J.M., 2018.
21 27208	Impoverished mobile epifaunal assemblages associated with the invasive macroalga
27 <b>09</b> 25	Asparagopsis taxiformis in the Mediterranean Sea. Mar. Environ. Res. 141, 44-52.
$\frac{26}{27}$	doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2018.07.016
20 27911 30	Navarro-Barranco, C., Muñoz-Gómez, B., Saiz, D., Ros, M., Guerra-García, J.M., Altamirano, M.,
$^{31}_{32}$	Ostalé-Valriberas, E., Moreira, J., 2019. Can invasive habitat-forming species play the same
33 37413 35	role as native ones? The case of the exotic marine macroalga Rugulopteryx okamurae in the
<sup>379</sup> 14	Strait of Gibraltar. Biol. Invasions 21, 3319-3334. doi:10.1007/s10530-019-02049-y
38 379 <b>15</b> 40	Ní Chualáin, F., Maggs, C.A., Saunders, G.W., Guiry, M.D., 2004. The invasive genus
47416 42	Asparagopsis (Bonnemaisoniaceae, Rhodophyta): Molecular systematics, morphology, and
43 47417	ecophysiology of Falkenbergia isolates. J. Phycol. 40, 1112–1126. doi:10.1111/j.1529-
47618 47	8817.2004.03135.x
48 479 19	Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A., Galil, B., 2010. Marine alien species as an aspect of global change. Adv.
50 5 <b>720</b> 52	Oceanogr. Limnol. 1, 199-218. doi:10.1080/19475721003743876
57321 54	Orellana, S., Hernández, M., Sansón, M., 2019. Diversity of Cystoseira sensu lato (Fucales,
55 5722 57	Phaeophyceae) in the eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean based on morphological and DNA
57 <b>23</b> 59	evidence, including Carpodesmia gen. emend. and Treptacantha gen. emend. Eur. J. Phycol.
60 724	54, 447-465. doi:10.1080/09670262.2019.1590862
63 64	32
65	

725	Paul, N., de Nys, R., Steinberg, P., 2006. Seaweed-herbivore interactions at a small scale: direct
7 <u>2</u> 6	tests of feeding deterrence by filamentous algae. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 323, 1-9.
7 <u>4</u> 7 <u>4</u> 27	doi:10.3354/meps323001
6 728 8	Pepe, F., Corradino, M., Parrino, N., Besio, G., Presti, V. Lo, Renda, P., Calcagnile, L., Quarta, G.,
7 <mark>9</mark> 29	Sulli, A., Antonioli, F., 2018. Boulder coastal deposits at Favignana Island rocky coast (Sicily,
17 <b>30</b> 13	Italy): Litho-structural and hydrodynamic control. Geomorphology 303, 191-209.
$^{173}_{15}1$	doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2017.11.017
16 1 <b>732</b> 18	Piazzi, L., Balata, D., 2009. Invasion of alien macroalgae in different Mediterranean habitats. Biol.
1 <b>733</b> 20	Invasions 11, 193–204. doi:10.1007/s10530-008-9224-3
<sup>21</sup> 27234	Pitacco, V., Orlando-Bonaca, M., Mavric, B., Popocic, A., Lipej, L., Orlando-Banaca, M.,
23 27335 25	MAVRIČ, B., POPOVIĆ, A., Lipej, L., Mavric, B., Popocic, A., Lipej, L., 2014. Mollusc
<sup>2</sup> 6 2 <b>73</b> 6	fauna associated with the Cystoseira algal associations in the Gulf of Trieste (Northern
28 2 <b>7337</b> 30	Adriatic Sea). Mediterr. Mar. Sci. 15, 225. doi:10.12681/mms.466
313738	Poursanidis, D., Chatzigeorgiou, G., Dimitriadis, C., Koutsoubas, D., Arvanitidis, C., 2019. Testing
33 3 <b>7439</b> 35	the robustness of a coastal biodiversity data protocol in the Mediterranean: insights from the
<sup>3</sup> /40	molluskan assemblages from the sublittoral macroalgae communities. Hydrobiologia 826,
38 3 <b>9</b> 1 40	159–172. doi:10.1007/s10750-018-3725-6
4742 42	Ramsay-Newton, C., Drouin, A., Hughes, A.R., Bracken, M.E.S., 2017. Species, community, and
43 47 <b>43</b> 45	ecosystem-level responses following the invasion of the red alga Dasysiphonia japonica to the
47 <b>644</b> 47	western North Atlantic Ocean. Biol. Invasions 19, 537-547. doi:10.1007/s10530-016-1323-y
48 479 45	Ribera Siguan, M.A., 2002. Review of Non-Native Marine Plants in the Mediterranean Sea, in:
50 5 <b>746</b> 52	Invasive Aquatic Species of Europe. Distribution, Impacts and Management. Springer
57 <b>4</b> 7	Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 291-310. doi:10.1007/978-94-015-9956-6_31
55 5748 57	Ricciardi, A., Atkinson, S.K., 2004. Distinctiveness magnifies the impact of biological invaders in
5 <b>7849</b> 59	aquatic ecosystems. Ecol. Lett. 7, 781–784. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2004.00642.x
60 7 <b>5</b> 0	Ricciardi, A., Hoopes, M.F., Marchetti, M.P., Lockwood, J.L., 2013. Progress toward
63 64	33
65	

751	understanding the ecological impacts of
7 <b>52</b>	doi:10.1890/13-0183.1
753	Roberts, D.A., Poore, A.G.B.B., 2006. Habita
6 754 8	marine algal bed. Biol. Conserv. 127, 18
17055	Rubal, M., Costa-Garcia, R., Besteiro, C., So
11 1 <b>756</b> 13	associated with the non-indigenous mac
<sup>1</sup> /57	Atlantic coast of the Iberian Peninsula.
16 17 <b>5</b> 8	doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2018.02.025
10 1 <b>759</b> 20	Schiel, D.R., Foster, M.S., 2006. The Popula
21 27260	Consequences of Multiphase Life Histor
23 27/61 25	Ecol. Evol. Syst. 37, 343-372. doi:10.11
<sup>2</sup> 62	Schmidt, A.L., Scheibling, R.E., 2006. A con
28 2 <b>7963</b> 30	(Laminaria species) and an invasive alg
$^{31}_{32}_{32}$ 64	Canada. Bot. Mar. 49, 315-330. doi:10.
33 37465 35	Servello, G., Andaloro, F., Azzurro, E., Casti
37 <b>66</b> 37	D'Alessandro, M., Denitto, F., Froglia,
38 37 <b>∮</b> 67	Mastrototaro, F., Petrocelli, A., Pipitone
47 <b>68</b> 42	Zenetos, A., 2019. Marine alien species
43 47469	descriptor D2 of the marine strategy fram
43 4 <b>7</b> 670 47	doi:10.12681/mms.18711
48 47971	Stein-Taylor, J.R., Littler, M.M., Littler, D.S.
50 5 <b>7172</b> 52	Methods: Volume 4: Ecological Field M
57 <b>373</b> 54	Streftaris, N., Zenetos, A., 2006. Alien marin
55 5774	invasives" and their impact. Mediterr. N
5 <b>%75</b> 59	Streftaris, N., Zenetos, A., Papathanassiou, E
60 J176	of non-indigenous marine species across
63	
64 65	

# ousa-Pinto, I., Veiga, P., 2018. Mollusc diversity croalga Asparagopsis armata Harvey, 1855 along the Mar. Environ. Res. 136, 1–7. tion Biology of Large Brown Seaweeds: Ecological ries in Dynamic Coastal Environments. Annu. Rev. 146/annurev.ecolsys.37.091305.110251 nparison of epifauna and epiphytes on native kelps ga (Codium fragile ssp. tomentosoides) in Nova Scotia, 1515/BOT.2006.039 riota, L., Catra, M., Chiarore, A., Crocetta, F., C., Gravili, C., Langer, M.R., Lo Brutto, S., e, C., Piraino, S., Relini, G., Serio, D., Xentidis, N.J., in Italy: A contribution to the implementation of mework directive. Mediterr. Mar. Sci. 18, 64–76. ., America, P.S. of, 1985. Handbook of Phycological Aethods: Macroalgae. Cambridge University Press. he species in the Mediterranean - the 100 "worst Aar. Sci. 7, 87–118. doi:10.12681/mms.180 2., 2005. Globalisation in marine ecosystems: The story s European seas. Oceanogr. Mar. Biol. 43, 419–453.

at configuration affects colonisation of epifauna in a

nonnative species. Ecol. Monogr. 83, 263–282.

8–26. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2005.07.010

777	Suárez-Jiménez, R., Hepburn, C., Hyndes, G., McLeod, R., Taylor, R., Hurd, C., 2017. The
1478	invasive kelp Undaria pinnatifida hosts an epifaunal assemblage similar to native seaweeds
4 7579	with comparable morphologies. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 582, 45-55. doi:10.3354/meps12321
6 780 8	Taylor, R.B., 1998. Short-term dynamics of a seaweed epifaunal assemblage. J. Exp. Mar. Bio.
7 <mark>8</mark> 1	Ecol. 227, 67-82. doi:10.1016/S0022-0981(97)00262-1
11 1 <b>7282</b> 13	Thomsen, M.S., Byers, J.E., Schiel, D.R., Bruno, J.F., Olden, J.D., Wernberg, T., Silliman, B.R.,
<sup>1</sup> /83	2014. Impacts of marine invaders on biodiversity depend on trophic position and functional
16 1 <b>784</b> 18	similarity. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 495, 39-47. doi:10.3354/meps10566
1785 20	Underwood, A.J., 1996. Experiments in Ecology: Their Logical Design and Interpretation Using
21 27286	Analysis of Variance. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511806407
23 27/87 25	Vega Fernández, T., Badalamenti, F., Bonaviri, C., Di Trapani, F., Gianguzza, P., Noè, S., Musco,
26 27 <b>8</b> 8	L., 2019. Synergistic reduction of a native key herbivore performance by two non-indigenous
28 2 <b>789</b> 30	invasive algae. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 141, 649–654. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2019.02.073
$^{37}_{32}$ 90	Veiga, P., Rubal, M., Sousa-Pinto, I., 2014. Structural complexity of macroalgae influences
33 37491 35	epifaunal assemblages associated with native and invasive species. Mar. Environ. Res. 101,
3792 37	115–123. doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2014.09.007
38 3 <b>9</b> 93	Veiga, P., Torres, A.C., Besteiro, C., Rubal, M., 2018. Mollusc assemblages associated with
4 <b>794</b> 42	invasive and native Sargassum species. Cont. Shelf Res. 161, 12-19.
43 47495	doi:10.1016/j.csr.2018.04.011
45 4 <b>796</b> 47	Verlaque, M., Ruitton, S., Mineur, F., Boudouresque, C., Briand, F., 2015. CIESM Atlas of Exotic
48 47 <b>9</b> 7	Species in the Mediterranean. Volume 4. Macrophytes.
50 5 <b>798</b> 52	Viejo, R.M., 1999. Mobile epifauna inhabiting the invasive Sargassum muticum and two local
57 <b>99</b> 54	seaweeds in northern Spain. Aquat. Bot. 64, 131–149. doi:10.1016/S0304-3770(99)00011-X
55 5 <b>800</b> 57	Wikström, S.A., Kautsky, L., 2004. Invasion of a habitat-forming seaweed: Effects on associated
59 59	biota. Biol. Invasions 6, 141–150. doi:10.1023/B:BINV.0000022132.00398.14
60 802	Williams, S.L., Smith, J.E., 2007. A Global Review of the Distribution, Taxonomy, and Impacts of
o∠ 63 64	35
65	

803	Introduced Seaweeds. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 38, 327-359.
1 804 3	doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.38.091206.095543
8 <b>4</b> 5	WoRMS Editorial Board (2021), 2021. World Register of Marine Species (WoRMS).
6	
806	
9	
10	
11 12	
13	
14 15	
16	
17	
18 19	
20	
21 22	
23	
24	
26	
27	
28 29	
30	
31 32	
33	
34 35	
36	
37	
39	
40	
41 42	
43	
44 45	
46	
47 48	
49	
50 51	
52	
53 54	
55	
56	
с / 58	
59	
60 61	
62	
63 64	36
65	

#### **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