Impacts Following Boom-and-Bust Invasion Dynamics: African Jewelfish

#### Joel Trexler<sup>1,3</sup>, Matt R. Pintar<sup>1</sup>, Peter Flood<sup>1,4</sup>, Jeff Kline<sup>2</sup>, and Nate Dorn<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Environment, Florida International University <sup>2</sup>South Florida Natural Resource Center, Everglades National Park Currently: <sup>3</sup>Coastal and Marine Laboratory, Florida State University, <sup>4</sup>School for Environment and Sustainability, University of Michigan









#### Invasion dynamics

Post-introduction population dynamics follow a diversity of patterns

Local establishment followed by

- ➤ apparent extinction
- stable persistence at modest density
- > spread and subsequent explosive density growth and spatial expansion
- spread and subsequent explosive density growth followed by rapid decline... boom and bust







# Invasion dynamics: Questions

Do native communities recover composition and function following 'bust' dynamics of a boom-bust invader?

We use a 26-year dataset of fish and decapod population dynamics in Shark River Slough to assess potential effects of African Jewelfish invasion on the native prey.

In a recent paper, we compared these effects to those of Asian Swamp Eels and a long-established non-native species, Mayan Cichlids.







#### Data collection

• Throw traps

 $\odot$  Density and biomass (#/m² or g/m²)

 $\odot$  Fish ~0.1 cm to 8 cm SL

 $\odot$  Macroinvertebrates retained on 0.2 cm sieve

- Electrofishing
  - Catch per unit effort (CPUE; 5-minute samples)
  - Fish > 8 cm SL





# Data collection

- Sampled 1996 through 2021 (25 years)
  - Throw traps: Feb, Apr, July, Oct, Dec
  - Over 120 consecutive samples
  - Three or five plots at each site, 5-7 samples per plot visit
  - Electrofishing: Feb, Apr, July, Oct
- Throw trap sampling at sites 6 and 23
  - 1977 through 2021 (44 years)
  - One plot from 1977 through 1984
  - Three plots from 1985 to present





# Modeling Framework





Hypothesis testing in **BACI-like framework** 

Shark River Slough in 'impact' space and 2010present is 'impact' time



Biological Invasions 25:3887-3903

ORIGINAL PAPER

# Contrasting invasion histories and effects of three non-native fishes observed with long-term monitoring data

Matthew R. Pintar<sup>D</sup> · Nathan J. Dorn<sup>D</sup> · Jeffrey L. Kline · Joel C. Trexler<sup>D</sup>

#### Jewelfish invasion in Shark River Slough

- Data from six long-term monitoring sites
- Relative Biomass (Jewelfish mass/Total fish mass)
- Black dotted line marks first Jewelfish
- Red dotted lines indicate 'boom' period



Date



- SRS six long-term monitoring sites
- Pre-invasion 1996-2011
- Boom 2012 2017
- Bust (Post-Boom) 2018-2021

\*Jewelfish excluded from this ordination but when added they fall in top left corner



Similarity by Morisita-Horn distances All groups different by pairwise PERMANOVA

# Ordination

#### Macroinvertebrates

- SRS six long-term monitoring sites
- Pre-invasion 1996-1999
- Jewelfish low density (2000-2011)
- Boom 2012 2017
- Bust (Post-Boom) 2018-2021



Similarity by Morisita-Horn distances All groups different by pairwise PERMANOVA

#### Ordination

Expanding pre-invasion perspective

SRS sites 6 and 23: 44 years Water Management Periods

- Pre-pre invasion 1977-1995
- Pre-invasion 1996-2011
- Post-invasion 2012 2021

\*Jewelfish excluded from this ordination but when added they fall in top left corner

Similarity by Morisita-Horn distances All groups different by pairwise PERMANOVA



Species pairwise comparisons contributing to ordination patterns

- Dominance diversity curve using SIMPER output to show the species contributing to 95% of the variance among phases of invasion.
- Error bars represent two standard deviations
- Boom (2012-2017) and Bust (2018-2021), 1996-199 MDW before invasion, 1985-1988 pre-MDW.



Species pairwise comparisons contributing to ordination patterns

- Bluefin killifish were the most abundance species in Boom-Bust period and in 1996-1999
- There was relatively little change in their density in any of these comparisons.



Species pairwise comparisons contributing to ordination patterns

- Eastern Mosquitofish were the second or third most abundant species before Jewelfish invasion.
- Bluefin Killifish, Eastern Mosquitofish, and Least Killifish were similarly abundant from 1977 through 2011, except for 1989-1999 drought.
- Eastern Mosquitofish (and Least Killifish) decreased dramatically (70-75%) during Jewelfish Boom period and remained low in Bust.

![](_page_13_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_0.jpeg)

- Pre-invasion isotopic data from 1994; stomach content data from 1977 to 1981 (not reported here)
- Post-boom data from 2018-2019
- Trophic niches were modeled using the tRophicPosition package in R.
- All significant changes shift to lower trophic position in postinvasion (indicated by asterisk)

![](_page_14_Figure_5.jpeg)

# Energy sources for diets estimated with $\delta^{15}N$ isotopes

- Alpha was the proportion of  $\delta^{15}N$  in a consumer's tissues derived from detritus
- Detrital "brown" (alpha > 0.5) and algal "green" (alpha < 0.5) energy</li>
- All significant changes shift to greener diet in postinvasion (indicated by asterisk)

![](_page_15_Figure_4.jpeg)

### Conclusions

- After accounting for effects of hydrologic variation, several native species were reduced following boom of jewelfish (discussed in 2023 paper).
- Several invertebrate taxa also decreased during the jewelfish boom, notably planorbid snails decreased by 65%. Taxa that underwent the largest declines were those that are likely consumed by jewelfish.
- Our findings for jewelfish were consistent with some, but not all, findings from experimental mesocosm and solution-hole studies... Grass shrimp were not dramatically impacted.

## Conclusions continued

- Community compositional changes (relative abundance) persisted from boom (2012-2017) into 'bust' period (2018-2021).
- Isotopic and gut content data are consistent with changes in trophic position for several abundant species with implications for food-web function.
- Long-term monitoring data provide opportunities to probe for novel population-level effects at field scales.

## Acknowledgements

- Funding and other support from the National Park Service, US Army Corps of Engineers, and the National Science Foundation was necessary to produce the information reported here.
- Many FIU post-docs, graduate and undergraduate students, and technicians made collection of the data reported here possible.
- Permits and technical support was provided from the Everglades National Park

![](_page_18_Picture_4.jpeg)

Environment

FCE LTER FLORIDA COASTAL EVERGLADES LONG TERM ECOLOGICAL RESEARCH

![](_page_18_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

Florida Estuary 16 x 34" giclée print on fine art paper, edition of 125 S/N http://www.dianepeebles.com/landscapes.html