Functional responses of a cosmopolitan invader demonstrate intraspecific variability in consumer-resource dynamics

Brett R. Howard[1], Daniel Barrios-O'Neill[2], Mhairi E. Alexander[3], Jaimie T.A. Dick[2], Thomas W. Therriault[4], Tamara B. Robinson[5] and Isabelle M. Côté[1]

[1] Earth to Ocean Research Group, Department of Biological Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada
[2] Institute for Global Food Security, School of Biological Sciences, The Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, Northern Ireland, United Kingdom
[3] Institute of Biomedical and Environmental Health Research (IBEHR), School of Science and Sport, University of the West of Scotland, Paisley, United Kingdom
[4] Pacific Biological Station, Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Nanaimo, British Columbia, Canada
[5] Centre for Invasion Biology, Department of Botany and Zoology, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, Maiteland, South Africa

OPEN ACCESS

ABSTRACT

Background. Variability in the ecological impacts of invasive species across their geographical ranges may decrease the accuracy of risk assessments. Comparative functional response analysis can be used to estimate invasive consumer-resource dynamics, explain impact variability, and thus potentially inform impact predictions. The European green crab (*Carcinus maenas*) has been introduced on multiple continents beyond its native range, although its ecological impacts appear to vary among populations and regions. Our aim was to test whether consumer-resource dynamics under standardized conditions are similarly variable across the current geographic distribution of green crab, and to identify correlated morphological features.

Methods. Crabs were collected from multiple populations within both native (Northern Ireland) and invasive regions (South Africa and Canada). Their functional responses to local mussels (*Mytilus* spp.) were tested. Attack rates and handling times were compared among green crab populations within each region, and among regions (Pacific Canada, Atlantic Canada, South Africa, and Northern Ireland). The effect of predator and prey morphology on prey consumption was investigated.

Results. Across regions, green crabs consumed prey according to a Type II (hyperbolic) functional response curve. Attack rates (i.e., the rate at which a predator finds and attacks prey), handling times and maximum feeding rates differed among regions. There was a trend toward higher attack rates in invasive than in native populations. Green crabs from Canada had lower handling times and thus higher maximum feeding rates than those from South Africa and Northern Ireland. Canadian and Northern Ireland crabs had significantly larger claws than South African crabs. Claw size was a more important predictor of the proportion of mussels killed than prey shell strength.

Discussion. The differences in functional response between regions reflect observed impacts of green crabs in the wild. This suggests that an understanding of consumer–resource dynamics (e.g., the *per capita* measure of predation), derived from simple, standardized experiments, might yield useful predictions of invader impacts across geographical ranges.

INTRODUCTION

The ever-increasing rate of introductions of species beyond their native ranges and the potential negative impacts on native biodiversity of species that become invasive continue to generate worldwide concern (*Seebens et al., 2017*). However, the effects of invaders are notoriously difficult to predict, especially across geographical ranges (*Simberloff et al., 2013*; *Doherty et al., 2016*). Many predatory invaders are responsible for large declines in the abundance and richness of native species (e.g., *Wiles et al., 1995*; *Medina et al., 2011*). These impacts are often attributed to advantages of invasive predators in novel environments, including the lack of prey resistance, release from natural enemies/pathogens, or behavioural, morphological, and physiological pre-adaptations (*Alpert, 2006*; *Sih et al., 2010*; *Weis, 2010*; *Roy et al., 2011*). However, not all introduced predators cause notable declines in native populations (*Gurevitch & Padilla, 2004*; *Zenni & Nuñez, 2013*); some have minimal detectable impacts on recipient ecosystems (*Simberloff & Gibbons, 2004*; *Hampton & Griffiths, 2007*; *Howard, Therriault & Côté, 2017*). These variable outcomes may arise because the impacts of an invasive predator are influenced by context-specific biotic and abiotic conditions (*Lipcius & Hines, 1986*; *Alcaraz, Bisazza & García-Berthou, 2008*; *Robinson, Smee & Trussell, 2011*; *Barrios-O'Neill et al., 2014*; *Paterson et al., 2015*). This variability can make it difficult to accurately predict the impacts of invasive species (*Dick et al., 2017*), especially when the same invasive species occurs at multiple locations (*Melbourne et al., 2007*; *Kumschick et al., 2015*).

Comparative functional response analysis (CFRA) has become a useful tool for elucidating relative variability in consumer–resource interactions among invasive species and under different contexts (*Barrios-O'Neill et al., 2014*; *Alexander et al., 2015*; *Paterson et al., 2015*; *Dick et al., 2017*). The functional response is the relationship between consumer (e.g., predator) consumption rate and resource (e.g., prey) density (*Holling, 1959*; *Holling, 1965*). This relationship provides information on the ability of a predator to find and consume prey and, by extension, its potential ecological impacts (*Dick et al., 2013*; *Dick et al., 2014*). Unlike predation studies, which seek to directly measure the impact of an invasive species in a particular location or on a particular species, the CFRA approach uses simplified experimental conditions to generate relative (not absolute) parameters that are comparable across contexts. Functional responses can be linear (Type I), hyperbolic (Type II), or sigmoidal (Type III) (*Holling, 1965*). The magnitude and type of functional response

can determine predator–prey coexistence (*Holling, 1959*; *Oaten & Murdoch, 1975*; *Hassell, 1978*). Type II responses in particular may potentially destabilize prey populations and lead to localized prey extinction (e.g., *Lipcius & Hines, 1986*; *Rindone & Eggleston, 2011*; *Spencer, Van Dyke & Thompson, 2016*). Studies using CFRA have consistently demonstrated that invasive species, ranging from plants (*Funk & Vitousek, 2007*) to invertebrates (*Dick et al., 2013*) and vertebrates (*Alexander et al., 2014*), consume available resources at a higher rate than analogous native species. While these results support the general concept that successful invasive species do well, in part, because they are more efficient at using resources, context-dependent biotic interactions or abiotic conditions can cause variation in invasive species functional responses (*Barrios-O'Neill et al., 2014*; *Barrios-O'Neill et al., 2016*; *Paterson et al., 2015*). It is thus unclear whether we should expect the functional responses of an invasive species to be conserved across geographical ranges or whether context differences between populations will result in variable functional responses. Intraspecific geographic comparisons of functional responses should make it possible to estimate the relative importance of local behavioural and morphological adaptations in determining invader responses to resource availability and their potential ecological impacts.

The European green crab (*Carcinus maenas*) is a well-known invasive species that occurs in intertidal and shallow subtidal habitats around the world (*Behrens Yamada, 2001*) (Fig. 1). Green crabs are viewed as highly effective generalist predators (*Gillespie et al., 2007*), with detrimental effects for native biodiversity in some regions (*Welch, 1968*; *Walton et al., 2002*; *Matheson et al., 2016*). However, there is large variation in the reported impacts among green crab populations, which does not simply relate to time since invasion. For example, on the east coast of North America, where green crab have been established since the 1800s (*Say, 1817*), significant declines in commercially important shellfish stocks have been attributed to green crab predation (*Glude, 1955*; *Welch, 1968*). There are also notable ecological impacts on shellfish species on the west coast of North America, where green crab have been established since the 1990s (*Grosholz et al., 2000*; *Grosholz et al., 2011*). In contrast, there are limited observed impacts by green crab populations in both Australia (introduced 1880s) and South Africa (introduced 1980s) (*Fulton & Grant, 1902*; *Le Roux, Branch & Joska, 1990*; *Carlton & Cohen, 2003*; *Hampton & Griffiths, 2007*); *Mabin et al., 2017*).

In this study, we investigate variability in consumer-resource dynamics of green crabs from regions within both their invasive and native ranges using CFRA. If green crab functional responses are variable among regions, we expect these differences to reflect local ecological impacts, as demonstrated in interspecific CFRA studies (e.g., *Dick et al., 2013*; *Alexander et al., 2014*; *Paterson et al., 2015*). Thus, crabs from populations within regions should have similar functional responses, but crabs from North American regions (in this study, Atlantic and Pacific Canada) might be expected to have higher functional responses than those from regions within the native range (in this study, Northern Ireland) and parts of the invaded range where their impacts appear limited (in this study, South Africa). We also investigated morphological differences among both crab and prey populations that might potentially cause inter-regional differences in functional responses.

Figure 1 Global distribution of European green crab (*Carcinus maenas*) and sampling locations for green crab populations used in this study. Native (black) and invaded (dark grey) ranges of European green crab (*Carcinus maenas*). Locations where green crabs occur in isolated populations are indicated by black dots. Open circles indicate locations where green crabs have been collected but established populations are not yet known to exist (see *Carlton & Cohen, 2003* for additional details). Insets show the sampling locations (black dots) for populations of green crabs used in this study: BC (British Columbia, Canada), NS (Nova Scotia, Canada), SA (South Africa), and NI (Northern Ireland, UK). White diamonds indicate locations of major cities near sampling locations.

Full-size ⬚ DOI: 10.7717/peerj.5634/fig-1

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Site selection and animal collection

Green crabs were collected from nine populations from four regions where green crab have been introduced: British Columbia, Pacific Canada (BC, $n = 2$ populations), Nova Scotia, Atlantic Canada (NS, $n = 2$), and South Africa (SA, $n = 2$), and from the region where they are native: Northern Ireland, UK (NI, $n = 3$) (Fig. 1). A minimum of 18 crabs were collected from each site between July and September 2014 (Table S1). All crabs collected were males, with carapace widths between 55.0 and 65.0 mm, intact claws, and a firm shell (as springy or soft shells indicate recent moulting). Although the invasive congener *C. aestuarii* was previously recorded as co-occurring in very low densities alongside *C. maenas* in South Africa in the mid 1990s, they were no longer present a decade later (*Robinson et al., 2005*; *Robinson et al., 2016*). As such, all South African crabs were correctly identified as European green crab. Intertidal mussels of the genus *Mytilus* (BC: *M. trossulus*; NS: *M. edulis*; NI: *M. edulis*; SA: *M. galloprovincialis*) were used as prey because they are widely available in

all four regions (*Gosling, 1992*), are readily consumed by green crabs (*Elner, 1981*; *Morton & Harper, 2008*; *Behrens Yamada, Davidson & Fisher, 2010*), and are ecologically similar to one another (*Seed & Suchanek, 1992*). Mussels of 25 mm (±3 mm) length were collected by hand from a single site in each region, which standardized prey across populations within region. A similar standardization (i.e., using the same prey species) was not possible across regions, owing to ethical concerns about non-native species introductions.

Animals were housed in local research laboratories (BC: Bamfield Marine Sciences Centre; NS: Bedford Institute of Oceanography; NI: Queen's University Belfast; SA: Stellenbosch University). All crabs were housed in indoor tanks, with artificial lighting on day/night cycles similar to local summer conditions. In BC and NS, tanks were supplied with flow-through seawater from adjacent inlets. Tanks in SA and NI used artificial seawater systems. Across all trials, water temperatures varied across a narrow range (9–15 °C) suitable for green crab feeding (7–26 °C, *Behrens Yamada, 2001*). Salinity range (30–36‰) was also well within green crab tolerances (4–54‰; *Behrens Yamada, 2001*). Prior to and after being used in experiments, crabs in all locations were fed raw bait fish (e.g., herring) every two to three days. Prey animals were held separately from green crabs but under similar conditions.

Experimental set-up and methods

At all locations, we used plastic bins (61 cm long × 40.6 cm wide), filled with seawater to a depth of 23 cm, as experimental chambers for all trials. The lids had a mesh screen to prevent escape while allowing light to diffuse inside the bins.

Prior to trials, green crabs were isolated and starved for 48 h to standardize hunger levels. Each crab was used only once. Intact mussels were cleaned of encrusting biota and checked for pre-existing damage. The evening prior to a trial, each bin received a randomly assigned prey density of two, four, eight, 16, 32, or 64 mussels, which were scattered across the bottom. The following morning, a single crab was placed into each bin and allowed to forage for eight daylight hours. Each prey density was replicated three times for each of the nine green crab populations tested. We retained, fed, and monitored all crabs for one week after testing to ensure that feeding behaviour had not been affected by imminent moulting. Because no moulting was observed, crabs that had eaten no prey (BC = 1/36 trials, NS = 2/35 trials, SA = 6/36 trials, NI = 15/54 trials) were retained in the analysis to reflect individual variation and because reduced consumption at low prey densities can be indicative of a Type III functional response. One Nova Scotia trial (at prey density = 2) was omitted owing to crab mortality. One predator-free control bin was run for every prey density and region to measure mussel mortality unrelated to predation.

Morphological measurements

We evaluated morphological characteristics of both predator and prey that could cause differences in functional responses among populations. Claw size in green crabs is known to vary among populations (*Smith, 2004*; *Schaefer & Zimmer, 2013*), and claw strength is directly proportional to claw size, which has implications for handling times of crabs consuming shelled prey (*Behrens Yamada, Davidson & Fisher, 2010*). We therefore

measured crusher claw propal height as an index of claw size for each crab (*Behrens Yamada & Boulding, 1998*). Similarly, mussel shell thickness could influence consumption by green crab. We did not measure shell thickness of mussels in each trial, as mussels that were not consumed may have been rejected due to their thickness. Instead, in each region we collected an additional 19 to 30 randomly selected mussels of the same size as used in the trials, euthanized them and removed the tissue, keeping the valves intact. Shells were air-dried, measured and weighed to the nearest 0.01 g. Following *Freeman, Meszaros & Byers (2009)*, we calculated the shell thickness index (*STI*) as:

$$STI = Shell\ weight\ / [L * (H^2 + W^2)^{0.5} * \pi / 2]$$

where *L*, *H*, and *W* correspond to linear measurements (in mm) of shell length (maximum anterior-posterior axis), height (maximum dorsal-ventral axis), and width (maximum lateral axis), respectively (*Lowen, Innes & Thompson, 2013*).

Analysis

All analyses were done using R version 3.3.2 (*R Development Core Team, 2008*). Data were tested for homogeneity of variances and normality prior to statistical analyses to determine possible regional differences. The carapace width data were non-normal so a Kruskal–Wallis test was used, and the claw size data were heteroskedastic and thus a Welch's F test was used. We examined the relationship between the number of prey killed and average temperature (i.e., start temperature + end temperature/2) across all 64-mussel trials, using a linear mixed-effect model with region as a random effect. Temperature did not explain a significant amount of variation in number of mussels killed (Likelihood ratio test: $X^2 = 0.618$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.43$; Fig. S1). We therefore did not consider temperature in further analyses.

To determine functional responses as Type II or Type III, we first fit the proportion of prey consumed to prey density for each population using a logistic regression with the package 'frair' (frair::frair_test). Because the logistic regressions generated negative first-order terms in all cases, indicative of Type II functional responses (*Juliano, 2001*), we then fit the data using the appropriate random predator equation (see 'Results'), without prey replacement (*Rogers, 1972*):

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

where N_e is the number of prey eaten, N_0 is the starting prey density, *a* is the attack rate, *h* is the handling time, and *T* is the experimental duration. Values of N_e and N_0 were generated experimentally, while *a* and *h* were estimated by fitting the model. Models were fit for each population using maximum likelihood estimation with the package function frair::frair_fit and bootstrapped ($n = 2,000$) to generate 95% confidence intervals.

Because functional responses were similar within regions (see 'Results', Figs. S2 and S3), we pooled populations within regions to test whether inter-regional differences were driven by differences in attack rate (*a*) or handling time (*h*). We re-fitted Rogers' Type II curves to regional data and bootstrapped the fits ($n = 2,000$) to generate parameter estimates for *a*, *h* and maximum feeding rates ($1/hT$). The 95% confidence intervals for these parameter estimates were first compared visually and then more formally where necessary (Table S2).

Finally, to identify factors underpinning regional differences in prey consumption, we used generalized linear mixed-effects models (GLMMs) with a binomial error distribution to predict the proportion of prey consumed by green crabs as a function of claw size, prey STI, and region using a suite of additive candidate models. Mean prey STI for each region was included as a continuous, fixed effect. Because attack rates and handling times by green crabs from both Canadian regions (see 'Results') were similar, we combined BC and NS into a single region (North America, NA) for comparison with SA and NI. Finally, we included initial prey density as a fixed effect—not as an explanatory variable *per se* but because it is important in functional responses—and population as a random effect in all candidate models. The best-supported model was identified using Akaike's Information Criterion corrected for small sample sizes (AICc), where the top model had the lowest AICc value (*Burnham & Anderson, 2002*). We also determined the relative variable importance (RVI) of each fixed effect, based on the sum of the AICc weights for models that included the focal variable (*Burnham & Anderson, 2002*), and the marginal and conditional R^2 values for the top model (*Nakagawa & Schielzeth, 2013*). To display the individual effect of each variable included in the top model on the predicted proportion of mussels killed, we used the 'effects' package to calculate effect sizes for each variable, relative to the mean values (continuous data) or proportional distribution (categorical data) of the other factors in the model (*Fox, 2003*; *Fox & Hong, 2009*).

RESULTS

Regional patterns of functional responses

In trials without crabs, 100% of mussels survived. All logistic regressions indicated the predation data were best fit using Type II functional response models. Within regions, the confidence intervals around the number of prey killed overlapped between populations at most prey densities, indicating that differences in predatory behaviour within regions were minimal (Figs. S2 and S3). Inter-regionally, we found the highest functional response curves for North American green crab (BC and NS) (Fig. 2). Attack rates (*a*) were highest in BC, NS, and SA and the lowest in NI, but there was overlap in confidence intervals between all regions except BC and NI and NS and NI (Fig. 3A, Table S2). Handling times (*h*) were lower in BC and NS than in SA and NI, with no overlap of confidence intervals between these two groups (Fig. 3B, Table S2). By extension, the maximum feeding rates of North American green crabs were considerably higher than those of crabs in SA or NI (Fig. 3C).

Potential drivers of regional variation in prey consumption

Although there was no significant difference in crab carapace width among regions (Kruskal–Wallis test, $P = 0.68$), claw size did differ significantly among regions (Welch's $F_{3,84.55} = 40.28$, $P < 0.01$), with crabs from NI, BC and NS having the largest claws and those from SA, the smallest (Fig. 4A). Mussel shell thickness index (STI) also differed significantly among regions (Kruskal–Wallis test, $P < 0.01$), resulting in a clear regional ranking (SA>NI>BC>NS) of decreasing mussel shell thickness (Fig. 4B).

Figure 2 Functional response curves for European green crab preying on mussels (*Mytilus* spp.) in four regions. Functional response curves, modeled from the raw data (open symbols) with a Type II Rogers random predator equation without prey replacement, for European green crab preying on mussels (*Mytilus* spp.) in four regions: BC (British Columbia, Pacific Canada; solid line; open square), NS (Nova Scotia, Atlantic Canada; dashed line; open circle), SA (South Africa; dotted line; open triangle), and NI (Northern Ireland, UK; dot-dashed line; open diamond). The mean number of prey consumed by green crab in each region has been averaged across the multiple populations shown in Fig. S3. Shaded areas represent the 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals.

Full-size 🖾 DOI: 10.7717/peerj.5634/fig-2

Prey density was the most important variable (RVI = 1.0) and was included in all models of proportion of prey consumed by green crabs. Region (RVI = 0.98), claw size (RVI = 0.85) were the next most important variables across all models. Prey STI (RVI = 0.48) was relatively less important.

There was substantial support for two of the candidate models (Table 1). Both included claw size and region as important predictors of the proportion of mussels killed. The second-ranked model also included prey STI, but this variable had poor explanatory power: it did not substantially improve the model fit (as indicated by the log-likelihood) or the marginal R^2 (Table 1).

The variables in the top model were prey density, claw size, and region (Table 1). Increasing prey density resulted in proportionally fewer mussels being killed, as expected

Figure 3 **Parameter estimates of attack rate *a*, handling time *h*, and maximum feeding rate 1/*h* T for European green crabs feeding on mussels.** Parameter estimates (±95% CI) of (A) attack rate *a*, (B) handling time *h*, and (C) maximum feeding rate 1/*h* T, from bootstrapped Type II functional response curves of green crabs preying on varying densities of mussels. Green crabs were collected from BC (British Columbia, Pacific Canada), NS (Nova Scotia, Atlantic Canada), SA (South Africa), and NI (Northern Ireland, UK).

Full-size 🖼 DOI: 10.7717/peerj.5634/fig-3

Figure 4 Regional variation in European green crab claw size and *Mytilus* mussel shell thickness for four regions. Regional variation in potential determinants of proportion of mussels killed by European green crabs in four regions: BC (British Columbia, Pacific Canada), NS (Nova Scotia, Atlantic Canada), SA (South Africa), and NI (Northern Ireland, UK). (A) Claw size (i.e., propal height, in mm) of crabs, and (B) mussel shell thickness index. Raw data indicated by open circles.

Full-size ◪ DOI: 10.7717/peerj.5634/fig-4

Howard et al. (2018), *PeerJ*, DOI 10.7717/peerj.5634

10/22

Table 1 Results of model selection on all candidate binomial generalized linear mixed-effects models of variation in the proportion of mussels killed by European green crabs in functional response trials. Results of model selection using Akaike's Information Criterion AICc, showing all candidate binomial generalized linear mixed-effects models of variation in the proportion of mussels killed by European green crabs in functional response trials. Fixed effects included crab claw size, region (North America, South Africa, or Northern Ireland), and the shell thickness index (STI) of mussels from each region. Prey density per trial (density) was included as a fixed effect, and crab population as a random effect in all models. k is the number of parameters in each model; ΔAIC_c is the difference in AICc value between the focal model and the model with the lowest AIC_c; Akaike weight w_i is interpreted as the probability that a given model is the best model of the candidate set given the data at hand. Marginal R^2 values are also given as an index of model fit.

Model	k	LL	AIC_c	ΔAIC_c	w_i	Cumulative w_i	Marginal R^2
Density + claw + region	6	−474.5	961.58	0	0.44	0.44	0.29
Density + claw + STI + region	7	−473.5	961.79	0.21	0.40	0.84	0.29
Density + STI + region	6	−476.3	965.17	3.59	0.07	0.91	0.29
Density + region	5	−477.4	965.17	3.59	0.07	0.98	0.28
Density + claw + STI	5	−479.5	969.47	7.89	0.01	0.99	0.23
Density + claw	4	−481.3	970.83	9.26	0	1.00	0.18
Density + STI	4	−482.2	972.58	11.00	0	1.00	0.22
Density-only	3	−484.2	974.55	12.97	0	1.00	0.17
Intercept-only	2	−733.88	1,471.84	510.26	0	1.00	0

from Type II functional responses that reach saturation (Fig. 5A). The proportion of mussels killed increased with claw size, as expected, regardless of region and prey density (Fig. 5B). At mean prey density and claw size, mussels had a 33% chance of being killed by green crabs in NI and SA (Fig. 5C). In contrast, and as predicted, green crabs in North America imposed the highest prey mortality. The probability of a mussel being killed in North America was 67% (Fig. 5C). Together, these three fixed effects in the top model explained 29% of variation in the proportion of prey killed (marginal R^2). The combination of the fixed effects and random effect (population) explained 31% of this variation (conditional R^2). To validate our approach of combining the North American populations we also re-ran the analysis on a modified version of our top model that included all four regions, rather than three, to see if there were any differences in the results. All the trends were consistent with our top model (Fig. S4), and there were no differences in the marginal and conditional R^2 values or the model coefficients for prey density and claw size.

DISCUSSION

Comparative functional response analysis (CFRA) has consistently demonstrated that the functional responses of invaders reflect their known ecological impacts, but it has traditionally focussed on interspecific comparisons between invasive and native species (e.g., *Dick et al., 2013*; *Alexander et al., 2014*; *Paterson et al., 2015*). CFRA has not previously been used to investigate geographic variation in functional responses of a single, cosmopolitan invader. Here, we did not observe large differences in the functional responses of green crabs from populations within regions: Although it cannot be assumed our results apply to entire ranges, as this would require more extensive sampling in both North America and Europe, crabs from populations several hundred kilometres apart but in the same region showed similar attack rates, prey handling times, and maximum feeding

Figure 5 **Predicted proportion of mussels killed by European green crabs in relation to prey density, claw size (mm), and the region of origin, derived from top generalized linear mixed-effects model.** The predicted proportion of mussels killed by European green crabs (with 95% confidence intervals) in relation to (A) prey density, (B) claw size (mm), and (C) the region from which crabs were collected: North America (British Columbia and Nova Scotia, BC & NS), South Africa (SA), and Northern Ireland, UK (NI). Predictions are derived from a generalized linear mixed-effects model (see top model in Table 1), and are shown for each factor when the other factors are fixed at their mean or proportional values.

Full-size 🖼 DOI: 10.7717/peerj.5634/fig-5

rates. However, differences in functional response curves and parameters among regions were large. Furthermore, the higher functional responses of invasive green crabs from North America compared to South Africa and Northern Ireland appear to reflect, at least qualitatively, their predatory impacts in the wild (see *Glude, 1955*; *Welch, 1968*; *Grosholz et al., 2000*; *Grosholz et al., 2011*; *Mabin et al., 2017*). Despite their experimental simplicity, functional responses might therefore be a useful, relative estimate of predation that can help inform predictions about the ecological impacts of green crabs in areas where more refined impact predictions are not yet available or impossible to make.

We found regional differences in green crab capacity to kill mussels. These differences stemmed mainly from differences in handling times, and by extension maximum feeding rates (which are mathematically derived from handling times), although some variation in attack rates was also observed. The foraging success of predators depends on their behaviour, morphology, and physiology as they detect, attack, capture, and consume prey (*Hassell, 1978*; *Lima, 2002*). Attack rate (a) reflects the first two steps of this foraging sequence. We found some inter-regional differences in attack rates, with invasive crabs from BC demonstrating higher attack rates than those in Northern Ireland. Handling time (h), by comparison, reflects the time it takes for a predator to capture and consume prey items and is influenced by physiological and morphological constraints on the predator (*Elner & Hughes, 1978*; *Hassell, 1978*; *Vucic-Pestic et al., 2010*). Handling times were markedly lower, and maximum feeding rates ($1/h$ T) higher, for green crabs from North America than for those from South Africa and Northern Ireland. Interestingly, higher resource consumption by invasive species, compared to native species, is usually realized either through higher attack rates (e.g., *Dick et al., 2013*) or lower prey handling times (e.g., *Bollache et al., 2008*; *Haddaway et al., 2012*; *Alexander et al., 2014*), but rarely both. Differences in attack rates

among regions might have been driven by differences in individual activity levels, which are often higher in invasive than in native species (*Sih, Bell & Johnson, 2004*). In contrast, differences in claw size likely drove the observed differences in handling times. Green crabs from North America (BC and NS) had significantly larger claws, and shorter handling times, than crabs from South Africa. Crabs with larger claws have a morphological advantage over crabs with smaller claws, because large claws reduce the effort required to break mussels and the risk of claw damage (*Behrens Yamada, Davidson & Fisher, 2010*). This suggests that invasive green crabs from North America are morphologically better suited to handling hard-shelled prey than those from South Africa. Contrary to the pattern, however, native green crabs in Northern Ireland had large claws, on par with those of North American green crabs, but their handling times were significantly lower, more closely matching those seen in South African crabs. Because handling time incorporates both breaking time and eating time (*Elner & Hughes, 1978*; *Lee & Seed, 1992*; *Smallegange & Van der Meer, 2003*; *Calderwood, O'Connor & Roberts, 2016*), perhaps crabs in Northern Ireland are under less pressure to 'eat quickly' due to less competition or kleptoparasitism (*Smallegange, Van der Meer & Kurvers, 2006*; *Chakravarti & Cotton, 2014*), while still requiring large claws to crush thick-shelled local mussels.

There are four possible explanations for inter-regional differences in claw size and prey handling times. First, differences could be primarily driven by genetic variation. While there are detectable founder effects in some green crab populations (*Darling et al., 2008*), genetic variation does not explain the large phenotypic variation seen, including in claw size, within the native range of green crabs (*Brian et al., 2006*). It therefore seems unlikely that inter-regional variation in claw size is linked to a variable genetic make-up of founder individuals. Second, claw size could be a highly plastic trait. Green crabs can modify their claw sizes in response to prey shell thickness (*Brian et al., 2006*; *Schaefer & Zimmer, 2013*). This phenotypic response occurs under laboratory conditions (*Baldridge & Smith, 2008*) and along biogeographic gradients (*Smith, 2004*). In our study, claw size did not covary with prey shell thickness. However, the standardized mussel prey we offered might have not always reflected local diets of green crabs. For example, green crabs in British Columbia are currently only found in soft-sediment habitats where their diet consists mainly of infaunal clams (*Klassen & Locke, 2007*), which can have very thick shells (*Boulding, 1984*). In contrast South African green crabs eat predominantly small gastropods and soft-bodied prey (e.g., polychaetes) (*Le Roux, Branch & Joska, 1990*). Claw size may therefore normally be more closely linked to prey characteristics than our results suggest. Third, differences in water temperatures could affect the calcification of crab exoskeletons and of their molluscan prey. Warmer temperatures lead to decreased calcification, so crabs in warmer habitats may therefore have weaker claws with which to attack shelled prey. However, because the effect of decreased calcification would also make prey shells weaker, handling times should be unaffected overall (*Landes & Zimmer, 2012*). Finally, inter-regional variation in claw sizes, and by extension handling times, may reflect selective forces beyond prey defenses, including reproduction (mate competition) and agonistic interactions (interference competition) (*Lee & Seed, 1992*). Claw size is the best determinant of success in intra- and interspecific agonistic interactions between crabs

(*Lee & Seed, 1992*; *Sneddon, Huntingford & Taylor, 1997*). It is notable that green crabs in North America face competition from large-clawed decapods like Dungeness crab (*Metacarcinus magister*) in BC and American lobster (*Homarus americanus*) in NS (*McDonald, Jensen & Armstrong, 2001*; *Rossong et al., 2006*). A combination of exposure to thick-shelled prey and a highly competitive environment could explain the especially large claws and fast handling times of green crabs sampled from North America compared to those from other populations.

Globally, the impacts of green crabs seem to vary among regions, with some populations (e.g., North America and Tasmania) appearing to have larger impacts on intertidal communities than others (e.g., South Africa, Australia, or Japan) (*Behrens Yamada, 2001*). The quantitative evidence for this variability is provided by a few large-scale field studies showing that green crabs are effective bivalve predators that have negatively impacted native community composition, trophic interactions, critical habitat, and human economic interests (*Welch, 1968*; *Grosholz et al., 2000*; *Walton et al., 2002*; *DeRivera, Grosholz & Ruiz, 2011*; *Matheson et al., 2016*). Our finding that green crabs sampled from North America have higher attack rates and lower prey handling times than those sampled from other regions is consistent with these field observations. Moreover, North American green crabs have had markedly different patterns of spread than in other regions, including in South Africa where green crabs have a comparatively restricted range despite becoming established decades ago (*Mabin et al., 2017*). The limited success and impacts of invasive green crabs in South Africa have been attributed to abiotic conditions (e.g., fast-flowing water and highly exposed coasts) being unfavourable to range expansion (*Le Roux, Branch & Joska, 1990*; *Robinson et al., 2005*; *Hampton & Griffiths, 2007*). Our results demonstrate that South African green crabs exploit a similar prey less effectively than green crabs from other invasive regions. This suggests that the variable success of different populations of green crabs is partially driven by biotic interactions, not just habitat suitability.

The CFRA approach has been successful because it entails an extreme reduction of the complexity of experimental conditions. Functional response studies do not seek to generate absolute values of foraging parameters under realistic environmental and other contexts (e.g., habitat structure). Instead, the approach generates relative parameters that are comparable across species and contexts. Thus, high-impact invasive species typically display functional response curves that are steeper and/or have higher asymptotes than similar native species or lower-impact invaders (e.g., *Dick et al., 2013*; *Alexander et al., 2014*; *Paterson et al., 2015*). Our study is the first to establish that there is also marked inter-regional variation in the functional responses of a globally invasive consumer that appears to reflect, at least qualitatively, the regionally variable impacts of green crabs.

CONCLUSIONS

CFRA can be a powerful approach with which to compare the relative impacts of invasive consumers both within and among species. As it relates to European green crab, it would be interesting to apply the method used here to populations of green crab we were not able to cover, such as those in Australia, the more southern parts of the North American ranges,

and elsewhere in the native range. This method could also be applied to native decapod species that co-occur with green crab to help identify how much competition influences foraging behaviours. Finally, while we make the inference that the functional responses described here may reflect impacts of green crabs in the field, data gaps in the literature make it difficult to be more definitive about that relationship or use these functional response results predictively. Methods to link experimental functional responses to field impacts exist (e.g., *Parker et al., 1999*; *Dick et al., 2017*), but at a minimum require data on abundance that is largely unavailable for European green crab. Where this information is available, functional responses offer a simplified, standardized metric of *per capita* impact that can be used to predict the ecological impacts of invasive species.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND DECLARATIONS

Funding

Grant Disclosures

Competing Interests

The authors declare there are no competing interests.

Author Contributions

- Brett R. Howard conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the paper, approved the final draft, led the writing of the manuscript.
- Daniel Barrios-O'Neill and Mhairi E. Alexander conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, authored or reviewed drafts of the paper, approved the final draft.

- Jaimie T.A. Dick, Thomas W. Therriault and Tamara B. Robinson conceived and designed the experiments, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, authored or reviewed drafts of the paper, approved the final draft.
- Isabelle M. Côté conceived and designed the experiments, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, authored or reviewed drafts of the paper, approved the final draft, led the writing of the manuscript.

Data Availability

The following information was supplied regarding data availability:

Raw data can be found in the Supplemental Information.

Supplemental Information

Supplemental information for this article can be found online at http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.5634#supplemental-information.

REFERENCES

Alcaraz C, Bisazza A, García-Berthou E. 2008. Salinity mediates the competitive interactions between invasive mosquitofish and an endangered fish. *Oecologia* **155**:205–213 DOI 10.1007/s00442-007-0899-4.

Alexander ME, Dick JTA, Weyl OLF, Robinson TB, Richardson DM. 2014. Existing and emerging high impact invasive species are characterized by higher functional responses than natives. *Biology Letters* **10**:20130946 DOI 10.1098/rsbl.2013.0946.

Alexander ME, Kaiser H, Weyl OLF, Dick JTA. 2015. Habitat simplification increases the impact of a freshwater invasive fish. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* **98**:477–486 DOI 10.1007/s10641-014-0278-z.

Alpert P. 2006. The advantages and disadvantages of being introduced. *Biological Invasions* **8**:1523–1534 DOI 10.1007/s10530-005-5844-z.

Baldridge AK, Smith LD. 2008. Temperature constraints on phenotypic plasticity explain biogeographic patterns in predator trophic morphology. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **365**:25–34 DOI 10.3354/meps07485.

Barrios-O'Neill D, Dick JTA, Emmerson MC, Ricciardi A, MacIsaac HJ, Alexander ME, Bovy HC. 2014. Fortune favours the bold: a higher predator reduces the impact of a native but not an invasive intermediate predator. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **83**:693–701 DOI 10.1111/1365-2656.12155.

Barrios-O'Neill D, Kelly R, Dick JTA, Ricciardi A, MacIsaac HJ, Emmerson MC. 2016. On the context-dependent scaling of consumer feeding rates. *Ecology Letters* **19**:668–678 DOI 10.1111/ele.12605.

Behrens Yamada S. 2001. *Global invader: the European green crab.* Corvallis: Oregon State University.

Behrens Yamada S, Boulding EG. 1998. Claw morphology, prey size selection and foraging efficiency in generalist and specialist shell-breaking crabs. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **220**:191–211 DOI 10.1016/S0022-0981(97)00122-6.

Behrens Yamada S, Davidson TM, Fisher S. 2010. Claw morphology and feeding rates of introduced European green crabs (*Carcinus maenas* L, 1758) and native Dungeness crabs (*Cancer magister* Dana, 1852). *Journal of Shellfish Research* **29**:471–477 DOI 10.2983/035.029.0225.

Bollache L, Dick JT, Farnsworth KD, Montgomery WI. 2008. Comparison of the functional responses of invasive and native amphipods. *Biology Letters* **4**:166–169 DOI 10.1098/rsbl.2007.0554.

Boulding EG. 1984. Crab-resistant features of shells of burrowing bivalves: decreasing vulnerability by increasing handling time. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **76**:201–223 DOI 10.1016/0022-0981(84)90189-8.

Brian JV, Fernandes T, Ladle RJ, Todd PA. 2006. Patterns of morphological and genetic variability in UK populations of the shore crab, *Carcinus maenas* Linnaeus, 1758 (Crustacea: Decapoda: Brachyura). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **329**:47–54 DOI 10.1016/j.jembe.2005.08.002.

Burnham KP, Anderson DR. 2002. *Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical information-theoretic approach*. 2nd edition. New York: Springer.

Calderwood J, O'Connor NE, Roberts D. 2016. Breaking and entering: examining the role of stress and aerial exposure in predator–prey relationships between the common shore crab (*Carcinus maenas*) and cultivated blue mussels (*Mytilus edulis*). *Aquaculture* **452**:217–223 DOI 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2015.11.009.

Carlton JT, Cohen AN. 2003. Episodic global dispersal in shallow water marine organisms: the case history of the European shore crabs *Carcinus maenas* and *C. aestuarii*. *Journal of Biogeography* **30**:1809–1820 DOI 10.1111/j.1365-2699.2003.00962.x.

Chakravarti LJ, Cotton PA. 2014. The effects of a competitor on the foraging behaviour of the shore crab *Carcinus maenas*. *PLOS ONE* **9**:e93546 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0093546.

Darling JA, Bagley MJ, Roman J, Tepolt CK, Geller JB. 2008. Genetic patterns across multiple introductions of the globally invasive crab genus *Carcinus*. *Molecular Ecology* **17**:4992–5007 DOI 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2008.03978.x.

DeRivera CE, Grosholz ED, Ruiz GM. 2011. Multiple and long-term effects of an introduced predatory crab. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **429**:145–155 DOI 10.3354/meps09101.

Dick JTA, Alexander ME, Jeschke JM, Ricciardi A, MacIsaac HJ, Robinson TB, Kumschick S, Weyl OLF, Dunn AM, Hatcher MJ, Paterson RA, Farnsworth KD, Richardson DM. 2014. Advancing impact prediction and hypothesis testing in invasion ecology using a comparative functional response approach. *Biological Invasions* **16**:735–753 DOI 10.1007/s10530-013-0550-8.

Dick JTA, Gallagher K, Avlijas S, Clarke HC, Lewis SE, Leung S, Minchin D, Caffrey J, Alexander ME, Maguire C, Harrod C, Reid N, Haddaway NR, Farnsworth KD, Penk M, Ricciardi A. 2013. Ecological impacts of an invasive predator explained and predicted by comparative functional responses. *Biological Invasions* **15**:837–846 DOI 10.1007/s10530-012-0332-8.

Dick JTA, Laverty C, Lennon JJ, Barrios-O'Neill D, Mensink PJ, Britton JR, Medoc V, Boets P, Alexander ME, Taylor NG, Dunn AM, Hatcher MJ, Rosewarne PJ, Crookes S, MacIsaac HJ, Xu M, Ricciardi A, Wasserman RJ, Ellender BR, Weyl OLF, Lucy FE, Banks PB, Dodd JA, MacNeil C, Penk MR, Aldridge DC, Caffrey JM. 2017. Invader Relative Impact Potential: a new metric to understand and predict the ecological impacts of existing, emerging and future invasive alien species. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **54**:1259–1267 DOI 10.1111/1365-2664.12849.

Doherty TS, Glen AS, Nimmo DG, Ritchie EG, Dickman CR. 2016. Invasive predators and global biodiversity loss. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **113**:11261–11265 DOI 10.1073/pnas.1602480113.

Elner RW. 1981. Diet of green crab *Carcinus maenas* (L.) from Port Hebert, southwestern Nova Scotia. *Journal of Shellfish Research* **1**:89–94.

Elner RW, Hughes RN. 1978. Energy maximization in the diet of the shore crab, *Carcinus maenas*. *The Journal of Animal Ecology* **47**:103–116 DOI 10.2307/3925.

Fox J. 2003. Effect displays in R for generalised linear models. *Journal of Statistical Software* **8(15)**:1–27 DOI 10.18637/jss.v008.i15 .

Fox J, Hong J. 2009. Effect displays in R for multinomial and proportional-odds logit models: extensions to the effects package. *Journal of Statistical Software* **32**:1–24.

Freeman AS, Meszaros J, Byers JE. 2009. Poor phenotypic integration of blue mussel inducible defenses in environments with multiple predators. *Oikos* **118**:758–766 DOI 10.1111/j.1600-0706.2008.17176.x.

Fulton SW, Grant FE. 1902. Some little known Victorian decapod Crustacea with description of a new species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Victoria* **14**:55–64.

Funk JL, Vitousek PM. 2007. Resource-use efficiency and plant invasion in low-resource systems. *Nature* **446**:1079–1081 DOI 10.1038/nature05719.

Gillespie GE, Phillips AC, Paltzat DL, Therriault TW. 2007. Status of the European green crab, *Carcinus maenas*, in British Columbia—2006. *Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **2700**:vii–39.

Glude JB. 1955. The effects of temperature and predators on the abundance of the soft-shell clam, *Mya arenaria*, in New England. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* **84**:13–26 DOI 10.1577/1548-8659(1954)84[13:TEOTAP]2.0.CO;2.

Gosling EM. 1992. Systematics and geographic distribution of *Mytilus*. In: Gosling EM, ed. *The mussel Mytilus: ecology, physiology, genetics and culture.* Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1–20.

Grosholz E, Lovell S, Besedin E, Katz M. 2011. Modeling the impacts of the European green crab on commercial shellfisheries. *Ecological Applications* **21**:915–924 DOI 10.1890/09-1657.1.

Grosholz ED, Ruiz GM, Dean CA, Shirley KA, Maron JL, Connors PG. 2000. The impacts of a nonindigenous marine predator in a California bay. *Ecology* **81**:1206–1224 DOI 10.1890/0012-9658(2000)081[1206:TIOANM]2.0.CO;2.

Gurevitch J, Padilla DK. 2004. Are invasive species a major cause of extinctions? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **19**:470–474 DOI 10.1016/j.tree.2004.07.005.

Haddaway NR, Wilcox RH, Heptonstall REA, Griffiths HM, Mortimer RJG, Christmas M, Dunn AM. 2012. Predatory functional response and prey choice identify predation differences between native/invasive and parasitised/unparasitised crayfish. *PLOS ONE* **7**(2):e32229 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0032229.

Hampton SL, Griffiths CL. 2007. Why *Carcinus maenas* cannot get a grip on South Africa's wave-exposed coastline. *African Journal of Marine Science* **29**:123–126 DOI 10.2989/AJMS.2007.29.1.11.76.

Hassell MP. 1978. *The dynamics of arthropod predator-prey systems.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Holling CS. 1959. Some characteristics of simple types of predation and parasitism. *The Canadian Entomologist* **91**:385–398 DOI 10.4039/Ent91385-7.

Holling CS. 1965. The functional response of predators to prey density and its role in mimicry and population regulation. *Memoirs of the Entomological Society of Canada* **97**:5–60 DOI 10.4039/entm9745fv.

Howard BR, Therriault TW, Côté IM. 2017. Contrasting ecological impacts of native and non-native marine crabs: a global meta-analysis. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **577**:93–103 DOI 10.3354/meps12245.

Juliano SA. 2001. Nonlinear curve fitting: predation and functional response curves. In: Scheiner SM, Gurevitch J, eds. *Design and analysis of ecological experiments.* 2nd edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 178–196.

Klassen G, Locke A. 2007. A biological synopsis of the European green crab, *Carcinus maenas. Canadian Manuscript Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **2818**:vii–75.

Kumschick S, Gaertner M, Vilà M, Essl F, Jeschke JM, Pyšek P, Ricciardi A, Bacher S, Blackburn TM, Dick JTA, Evans T, Hulme PE, Kühn I, Mrugała A, Pergl J, Rabitsch W, Richardson DM, Sendek A, Winter M. 2015. Ecological impacts of alien species: quantification, scope, caveats, and recommendations. *BioScience* **65**:55–63 DOI 10.1093/biosci/biu193.

Landes A, Zimmer M. 2012. Acidification and warming affect both a calcifying predator and prey, but not their interaction. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **450:**1–10 DOI 10.3354/meps09666.

Le Roux PJ, Branch GM, Joska MAP. 1990. On the distribution, diet and possible impact of the invasive European shore crab *Carcinus maenas* (L.) along the South African coast. *South African Journal of Marine Science-Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif Vir Seewetenskap* **9**:85–93 DOI 10.2989/025776190784378835.

Lee SY, Seed R. 1992. Ecological implications of cheliped size in crabs: some data from *Carcinus maenas* and *Liocarcinus holsatus. Marine Ecology Progress Series* **84**:151–160 DOI 10.3354/meps084151.

Lima SL. 2002. Putting predators back into behavioral predator-prey interactions. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **17**:70–75 DOI 10.1016/S0169-5347(01)02393-X.

Lipcius RN, Hines AH. 1986. Variable functional responses of a marine predator in dissimilar homogeneous microhabitats. *Ecology* **67**:1361–1371 DOI 10.2307/1938692.

Lowen JB, Innes DJ, Thompson RJ. 2013. Predator-induced defenses differ between sympatric *Mytilus edulis* and *M. trossulus*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **475**:135–143 DOI 10.3354/meps10106.

Mabin CA, Wilson JRU, Le Roux JJ, Robinson TB. 2017. Reassessing the invasion of South African waters by the European shore crab, *Carcinus maenas*. *African Journal of Marine Science* **39(3)**:259–267 DOI 10.2989/1814232X.2017.1363818.

Matheson K, McKenzie CH, Gregory RS, Robichaud DA, Bradbury IR, Snelgrove PVR, Rose GA. 2016. Linking eelgrass decline and impacts on associated fish communities to European green crab *Carcinus maenas* invasion. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **548**:31–45 DOI 10.3354/meps11674.

McDonald PS, Jensen GC, Armstrong DA. 2001. The competitive and predatory impacts of the nonindigenous crab *Carcinus maenas* (L.) on early benthic phase Dungeness crab *Cancer magister* Dana. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **258**:39–54 DOI 10.1016/S0022-0981(00)00344-0.

Medina FM, Bonnaud E, Vidal E, Tershy BR, Zavaleta ES, Donlan CJ, Keitt BS, Le Corre M, Horwath SV, Nogales M. 2011. A global review of the impacts of invasive cats on island endangered vertebrates. *Global Change Biology* **17**:3503–3510 DOI 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02464.x.

Melbourne BA, Cornell HV, Davies KF, Dugaw CJ, Elmendorf S, Freestone AL, Hall RJ, Harrison S, Hastings A, Holland M, Holyoak M, Lambrinos J, Moore K, Yokomizo H. 2007. Invasion in a heterogeneous world: resistance, coexistence or hostile takeover? *Ecology Letters* **10**:77–94 DOI 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.00987.x.

Morton B, Harper EM. 2008. Predation upon *Mytilus galloprovincialis* (Mollusca: Bivalvia: Mytilidae) by juvenile *Carcinus maenas* (Crustacea: Decapoda) using mandibular chipping. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom* **88**:563–568 DOI 10.1017/S0025315408000799.

Nakagawa S, Schielzeth H. 2013. A general and simple method for obtaining R^2 from generalized linear mixed-effects models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **4**:133–142 DOI 10.1111/j.2041-210x.2012.00261.x.

Oaten A, Murdoch WW. 1975. Functional response and stability in predator-prey systems. *The American Naturalist* **109**:289–298 DOI 10.1086/282998.

Parker IM, Simberloff D, Lonsdale WM, Goodell K, Wonham M, Kareiva PM, Williamson MH, Von Holle B, Moyle PB, Byers JE, Goldwasser L. 1999. Impact: toward a framework for understanding the ecological effects of invaders. *Biological Invasions* **1**:3–19 DOI 10.1023/A:1010034312781.

Paterson RA, Dick JTA, Pritchard DW, Ennis M, Hatcher MJ, Dunn AM. 2015. Predicting invasive species impacts: a community module functional response approach reveals context dependencies. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **84**:453–463 DOI 10.1111/1365-2656.12292.

R Development Core Team. 2008. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. *Available at https://www.r-project.org*.

Rindone RR, Eggleston DB. 2011. Predator–prey dynamics between recently established stone crabs (*Menippe* spp.) and oyster prey (*Crassostrea virginica*). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **407**:216–225 DOI 10.1016/j.jembe.2011.06.018.

Robinson TB, Alexander ME, Simon CA, Griffiths CL, Peters K, Sibanda S, Miza S, Groenewald B, Majiedt P, Sink KJ. 2016. Lost in translation? Standardising the terminology used in marine invasion biology and updating South African alien species lists. *African Journal of Marine Science* **38**:129–140 DOI 10.2989/1814232X.2016.1163292.

Robinson TB, Griffiths CL, McQuaid CD, Rius M. 2005. Marine alien species of South Africa—status and impacts. *African Journal of Marine Science* **27**:297–306 DOI 10.2989/18142320509504088.

Robinson EM, Smee DL, Trussell GC. 2011. Green crab (*Carcinus maenas*) foraging efficiency reduced by fast flows. *PLOS ONE* **6**:e21025 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0021025.

Rogers DJ. 1972. Random search and insect population models. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **41**:369–383 DOI 10.2307/3474.

Rossong MA, Williams PJ, Comeau M, Mitchell SC, Apaloo J. 2006. Agonistic interactions between the invasive green crab, *Carcinus maenas* (Linnaeus) and juvenile American lobster, *Homarus americanus* (Milne Edwards). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **329**:281–288 DOI 10.1016/j.jembe.2005.09.007.

Roy HE, Lawson Handley L-J, Schönrogge K, Poland RL, Purse BV. 2011. Can the enemy release hypothesis explain the success of invasive alien predators and parasitoids? *BioControl* **56**:451–468 DOI 10.1007/s10526-011-9349-7.

Say T. 1817. An account of the Crustacea of the United States. *Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* **1**:57–63.

Schaefer G, Zimmer M. 2013. Ability of invasive green crabs to handle prey in a recently colonized region. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **483**:221–229 DOI 10.3354/meps10276.

Seebens H, Blackburn TM, Dyer EE, Genovesi P, Hulme PE, Jeschke JM, Pagad S, Pyšek P, Winter M, Arianoutsou M, Bacher S, Blasius B, Brundu G, Capinha C, Celesti-Grapow L, Dawson W, Dullinger S, Fuentes N, Jäger H, Kartesz J, Kenis M, Kreft H, Kühn I, Lenzner B, Liebhold A, Mosena A, Moser D, Nishino M, Pearman D, Pergl J, Rabitsch W, Rojas-Sandoval J, Roques A, Rorke S, Rossinelli S, Roy HE, Scalera R, Schindler S, Štajerová K, Tokarska-Guzik B, Van Kleunen M, Walker K, Weigelt P, Yamanaka T, Essl F. 2017. No saturation in the accumulation of alien species worldwide. *Nature Communications* **8**:1–9 DOI 10.1038/s41467-016-0009-6.

Seed R, Suchanek TH. 1992. Population and community ecology of *Mytilus*. In: Gosling E, ed. *The mussel Mytilus: ecology, physiology, genetics and culture.* Amsterdam: Elsevier, 171–222.

Sih A, Bell A, Johnson JC. 2004. Behavioral syndromes: an ecological and evolutionary overview. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **19**:372–378 DOI 10.1016/j.tree.2004.04.009.

Sih A, Bolnick DI, Luttbeg B, Orrock JL, Peacor SD, Pintor LM, Preisser E, Rehage JS, Vonesh JR. 2010. Predator-prey naïveté, antipredator behavior, and the ecology of predator invasions. *Oikos* **119**:610–621 DOI 10.1111/j.1600-0706.2009.18039.x.

Simberloff D, Gibbons L. 2004. Now you see them, now you don't!—population crashes of established introduced species. *Biological Invasions* **6**:161–172 DOI 10.1023/B:BINV.0000022133.49752.46.

Simberloff D, Martin J-L, Genovesi P, Maris V, Wardle DA, Aronson J, Courchamp F, Galil B, Garcáa-Berthou E, Pascal M, Pyšek P, Sousa R, Tabacchi E, Vilà M. 2013. Impacts of biological invasions: what's what and the way forward. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **28**:58–66 DOI 10.1016/j.tree.2012.07.013.

Smallegange IM, Van der Meer J. 2003. Why do shore crabs not prefer the most profitable mussels? *Journal of Animal Ecology* **72**:599–607 DOI 10.1046/j.1365-2656.2003.00729.x.

Smallegange IM, Van der Meer J, Kurvers RHJM. 2006. Disentangling interference competition from exploitative competition in a crab-bivalve system using a novel experimental approach. *Oikos* **1**:157–167.

Smith LD. 2004. Biogeographic differences in claw size and performance in an introduced crab predator *Carcinus maenas. Marine Ecology Progress Series* **276**:209–222 DOI 10.3354/meps276209.

Sneddon LU, Huntingford FA, Taylor AC. 1997. Weapon size versus body size as a predictor of winning in fights between shore crabs, *Carcinus maenas* (L.). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **41**:237–242 DOI 10.1007/s002650050384.

Spencer R-J, Van Dyke JU, Thompson MB. 2016. The ethological trap: functional and numerical responses of highly efficient invasive predators driving prey extinctions. *Ecological Applications* **26**:1969–1983 DOI 10.1002/eap.1375.

Vucic-Pestic O, Rall BC, Kalinkat G, Brose U. 2010. Allometric functional response model: body masses constrain interaction strengths. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **79**:249–256 DOI 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01622.x.

Walton WC, MacKinnon C, Rodriguez LF, Proctor C, Ruiz GM. 2002. Effect of an invasive crab upon a marine fishery: green crab, *Carcinus maenas*, predation upon a venerid clam, *Katelysia scalarina*, in Tasmania (Australia). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **272**:171–189 DOI 10.1016/S0022-0981(02)00127-2.

Weis JS. 2010. The role of behavior in the success of invasive crustaceans. *Marine and Freshwater Behaviour and Physiology* **43**:83–98 DOI 10.1080/10236244.2010.480838.

Welch WR. 1968. Changes in abundance of the green crab, *Carcinus maenas* (L.), in relation to recent temperature changes. *Fishery Bulletin* **67**:337–345.

Wiles GJ, Aguon CF, Davis GW, Grout DJ. 1995. The status and distribution of endangered animals and plants in Northern Guam. *Micronesica* **28**:31–49.

Zenni RD, Nuñez MA. 2013. The elephant in the room: the role of failed invasions in understanding invasion biology. *Oikos* **122**:801–815 DOI 10.1111/j.1600-0706.2012.00254.x.