# **Distribution and Colonization of** *Limnoperna fortunei:* **Special Traits of an Odd Mussel**

**Demetrio Boltovskoy**

**Abstract** The invasional success of *Limnoperna fortunei* was largely determined by the combination of two key components. One of them is rare biological traits of the species, generally unfavorable in freshwater bivalves: the possession of planktonic larvae and a sessile, byssate adult. The other component is man's extensive modification of landscapes, in particular construction of reservoirs, large interbasin connections—canals and aqueducts and freshwater navigation. This combination was instrumental for the fast dispersal and success of a species that would otherwise have remained inconspicuous and restricted geographically. Environmental tolerance, while helpful, was probably of lesser importance. Possession of planktonic larvae results in a significant advantage for adults that manage to travel upstream, but is a major limitation for those that settle too close to the river outlet into the sea because their offspring are doomed due to expatriation into saline waters. Short rivers are therefore less vulnerable to colonization by self-sustaining populations, especially if there are no lakes or reservoirs along their path that can serve as refuge and seeding grounds for reproducing adults. In South America, interbasin spread has not occurred as fast as anticipated, but will most probably continue increasing.

Keywords *Limnoperna fortunei* · Golden mussel · Adaptation · Biological invasion · Geographic spread

D. Boltovskov  $(\boxtimes)$ 

Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Instituto de Ecología, Genética y Evolución de Buenos Aires (IEGEBA), Universidad de Buenos Aires-CONICET, Ciudad Universitaria, 1428 Buenos Aires, Argentina e-mail: demetrio@ege.fcen.uba.ar

Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales 'Bernardino Rivadavia'-CONICET, Buenos Aires, Argentina

<sup>©</sup> Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2015

D. Boltovskoy (ed.), *Limnoperna fortunei,* Invading Nature - Springer Series in Invasion Ecology 10, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-13494-9\_16

### **Mussel Traits and Man's Alteration of Earth: A Key Combination for Expansion**

The fast dispersal and widespread nuisance effects of freshwater byssate mussels in general, and of *Limnoperna fortunei* in particular, are largely the result of five converging factors. Two of these factors are biological traits of the bivalve: (1) free swimming larvae and (2) a sessile, byssate adult. The other three factors are driven by human activities: (3) increasing interbasin connectivity, (4) construction of reservoirs, and (5) growing navigation in continental waters (Fig. [1\)](#page-2-0).

It is widely acknowledged that the lack of a free-swimming larval stage in the vast majority of freshwater invertebrates is an adaptation to avoid expatriation into hostile marine environments—the sea. In contrast to marine benthic animals, most of which have planktonic larvae (Thorson [1950](#page-10-0)), the majority of invertebrates that have adapted to freshwaters have lost a planktonic larval stage (Lopez [1988](#page-9-0)), indicating that in the trade-off between lowering expatriation rates versus maintaining the high dispersal potential of their marine ancestors, evolution favored the former.

Possession of a byssus is also a rarity among freshwater bivalves (it occurs in  $\sim$  1% of all North American species: McMahon and Bogan [2001](#page-9-1); <1% of all South American bivalves: Pereira et al. [2014\)](#page-10-1), as most have an infaunal mode of life, burrowing into soft sediment. This, too, probably reflects an adaptation to the scarcity of hard surfaced bottoms in lakes and lowland rivers. When present, hard substrata are normally limited to the shoreline fringe and river bank. Thus, *L. fortunei* is an oddity that has adapted to and survived in freshwaters despite these unfavorable traits.

For millions of years, *L. fortunei* has been constrained to a limited area in continental Southeast Asia, most probably restricted to the south of the Yangtze River (Morton and Dinesen [2010;](#page-9-2) Ye et al. [2011;](#page-10-2) see Chapter "Distribution and Spread of *Limnoperna fortunei* in China" in this volume). It somehow succeeded in establishing permanent, seeding populations upstream far enough from the sea for its larvae to complete metamorphosis and settle before being flushed out into saline waters, but it did not expand beyond this region (colonization of Indochina, including Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam, is probably relatively recent and likely associated with the influence of human migrations: Morton and Dinesen [2010](#page-9-2)). From its present distribution area (Fig. [2a](#page-3-0)) and the characteristics of the waterbodies where it thrives, it is clear that the range of the golden mussel was limited not because of its narrow ecological requirements, but because it was unable to overcome the geographic barriers involved. Models of its potential worldwide distribution (Kluza and McNyset [2005](#page-9-3); Campos [2014;](#page-8-0) Campos et al. [2014;](#page-8-1) Fig. [2b\)](#page-3-0) reinforce this assumption. In other words, as shown for other invasives (Kraft et al. [2002](#page-9-4); Karatayev et al. [2007b\)](#page-9-5), interbasin transportation was the bottleneck, rather than survival in a different milieu. Indeed, *L. fortunei* is thought to be extremely tolerant of a wide spectrum of environmental conditions (see Chapter "Parallels and Contrasts Between *Limnoperna fortunei* and Species of *Dreissena*" in this volume; Karatayev et al. [2007a](#page-9-6), [2010\)](#page-9-7), which may represent a necessary counterbalance to its primitive, mytiloid,

<span id="page-2-0"></span>

#### **Before civilization**



**Fig. 1** Expansion vectors and mechanisms instrumental for the geographic spread of *Limnoperna fortunei* before (**a**) and after (**b**) large-scale modifications brought about by man's activities

freshwater-unfavorable traits (planktonic larvae and the requirement of hard substrata), allowing it to survive in a hostile habitat.

It should be stressed that invasional success does not necessarily imply broad environmental tolerance. Objective comparative studies of tolerance to environmental extremes between *L. fortunei* and native mussels have not been performed, but research in other geographic areas suggests that invaders may be less tolerant than native species. McMahon [\(2002](#page-9-8)), for example, concluded that *Dreissena polymorpha*, a highly successful invader, is not more resistant to ecological stress than

<span id="page-3-0"></span>

**Fig. 2** Current worldwide distribution of *Limnoperna fortunei* (**a**) and potential distribution according to one of many possible modeling results (**b**). (b: modified from Kluza and McNyset [2005](#page-9-3))

native unionids, its invasional success being largely explained by the fact that it is a typical r-strategist which recovers swiftly from catastrophic population reductions. *L. fortunei* is also an r-strategist, but unlike the zebra mussel it seems to be more resilient to stress than local mussels. Ancillary observations in various Chinese and Argentine waterbodies indicate that it is regularly present under extreme conditions, particularly in low oxygen and highly polluted waters, where many other organisms fail to survive (Boltovskoy et al. [2006](#page-8-2); Contardo-Jara et al. [2009;](#page-8-3) Young et al. [2014\)](#page-10-3).

The expansion of man is changing drastically the original rules of the game for much of the Earth's biota, but for some species, like *L. fortunei,* the changes are particularly profound and, unlike for many plants and animals, occasionally favorable. Increasing interbasin connectivity due to large hydraulic projects, such as irrigation and shipping canals, and aqueducts, is one significant shift that affects mussels (Minchin and Gollasch [2002;](#page-9-9) Nehring [2002;](#page-9-10) Karatayev et al. [2007b](#page-9-5)). However, large hydraulic projects are not particularly selective for *L. fortunei,* or for other byssate species, as they promote the spread more or less evenly of all freshwater organisms. On the other hand, shipping within continental waters, both natural and new man-made ones, became a key factor for organisms capable of traveling upstream by attaching to watercraft below the waterline (Fig. [1b](#page-2-0)). In the invasion of the Río de la Plata watershed by *L. fortunei,* the available evidence points at precisely this type of mechanism. After having been introduced in the freshwater estuarine area through the Río de la Plata estuary in ballast water, some adult specimens traveled upstream attached to the hulls of ships and barges that regularly sail on the Paraná-Paraguay rivers as far north as Cáceres (Brazil), over 2500 km upstream from the estuary (Boltovskoy et al. [2006](#page-8-2)). A similar dispersion vector has been found very important for other freshwater byssate mussels (Minchin et al. [2002;](#page-9-11) Karatayev et al. [2007b](#page-9-5)). Once established upstream, seeding the rest of the waterway with downstream drifting larvae was a natural and effortless outcome (see Chapter "Colonization and Spread of *Limnoperna fortunei* in South America" in this volume).

Admittedly, attachment to boat hulls (waterborne or carried upstream overland; Fig. [1b\)](#page-2-0) is not the only vector possible. In Japan, where inland boat traffic is very limited, upstream transportation of *L. fortunei* is probably associated with fish culturing activities (Nomura et al. [2008;](#page-9-12) see Chapter "Colonization and Spread of *Limnoperna fortunei* in Japan" in this volume). Mussels can also be transported in mud caught in the limbs, wings, feathers, or fur of insects, amphibians, birds, or aquatic mammals (as shown for other freshwater invertebrates: Anastácio et al. [2014](#page-8-4)), or even in the stomachs of fishes that are known to egest intact animals (Belz et al. [2012\)](#page-8-5), but these mechanisms are likely rare and ineffective for long-distance transport (Johnson and Carlton [1996\)](#page-9-13).

An additional human activity which may have further facilitated geographic expansion of *L. fortunei,* particularly in areas where hard substrata are scarce, is modification of the coastline through the construction of docks, piers, spur dikes, groynes, pilings, breakwaters, revetments, rock armors, gabions, quay walls, etc., as well as deployment of buoys and other waterborne structures. In some areas, these objects are the only hard and stable substrate available for mussels, and although the populations they can harbor are comparatively small, they can be important as seeding areas or stepping stones for further expansion.

### **The Importance of River Length**

Planktonic larvae are clearly advantageous for downstream dispersal. However, in order to benefit from their free-swimming veligers, reproducing adults must have reached safe areas far enough from the river mouth for their larvae to complete development before being flushed into the sea. For populations restricted to the middle or lower river reaches, drifting larvae represent a significant risk. Surface current speeds in major rivers of the Río de la Plata watershed can be around 1–3 m/s. At these speeds larvae, which spend around 10 to more than 20 days in the plankton (Cataldo et al. [2005\)](#page-8-6), can drift downstream over 2000 km before they are ready to

settle on a substratum. Thus, large, navigable rivers are more likely to succeed in maintaining reproducing populations of golden mussels than shorter, nonnavigable waterways. Models based on various environmental variables (calcium concentration, temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, total suspended solids, slope, elevation, flow accumulation, flow direction, precipitation, etc.) simulating prospective spread of this mussel yielded interesting results (Kluza and McNyset [2005;](#page-9-3) Cohen [2009;](#page-8-7) Oliveira et al. [2010a](#page-9-14), [b;](#page-10-4) Campos [2014;](#page-8-0) Campos et al. [2014\)](#page-8-1), but constraints associated with limitations imposed by planktonic larvae have not been explicitly addressed. For example, some models (Kluza and McNyset [2005](#page-9-3); Campos [2014](#page-8-0)) indicate that *L. fortunei* could colonize areas along the western coast of South and Central America (Fig. [2b\)](#page-3-0), most of which are characterized by short rivers with high current speeds. However, the above considerations suggest that this is unlikely.

Admittedly, the history of the geographic spread of *L. fortunei* shows that invasions are not restricted to large rivers. The mussel has been successfully colonizing Japan since 1990 (Kimura [1994](#page-9-15)), where rivers are short and mostly located in areas with steep topographic gradients (Yoshimura et al. [2005;](#page-10-5) Japan Commission on Large Dams [2009;](#page-9-16) see Chapter "Colonization and Spread of *Limnoperna fortunei* in Japan" in this volume). Research on expatriation of planktonic organisms by currents, dubbed as the "drift paradox," shows that in order to counterbalance downstream advection thus enhancing the chances of persistence, organisms rely on lateral diffusion, high dispersal rates, and the availability of refugia in hydrodynamically dead zones (Reynolds and Carling [1991](#page-10-6); Reckendorfer et al. [1999;](#page-10-7) Speirs and Gurney [2001;](#page-10-8) Pachepsky et al. [2005\)](#page-10-9). Local settings, such as embayments, inlets, or backwater areas where water movement is minimal, could significantly improve the ability of *L. fortunei* to survive in short, exorheic rivers, but it is probably the presence of dams that has had the greatest influence on the mussel's chances of establishing self-sustaining populations under these adverse conditions.

The presence of lentic waterbodies in the course of a river is particularly significant, as they serve as refugia for seeding populations (Havel et al. [2005](#page-8-8)), especially for large species with longer life cycles unable to compensate for downstream transit (Speirs and Gurney [2001](#page-10-8); Pollux et al. [2004](#page-10-10); Pachepsky et al. [2005;](#page-10-9) Allan and Castillo [2007\)](#page-8-9). *L. fortunei* has managed to establish self-sustaining populations in these short, fast flowing, and turbulent Japanese rivers because most of them are punctuated by dams and reservoirs. Japan has more than 2600 dams higher than 15 m, and over 60,000 smaller irrigation ponds and dams (Japan Commission on Large Dams [2009\)](#page-9-16). In terms of the number of dams, Japan occupies the fourth place in the world, and is third in number of reservoirs per unit surface  $(0.71/100 \text{ km}^2)$ ; Yoshimura et al. [2005](#page-10-5)). Most Japanese rivers have been modified by man, chiefly for flood control and water use for agriculture and other purposes (Japan Commission on Large Dams [2009\)](#page-9-16), thus creating thousands of refugia with significantly higher water residence times where planktonic organisms thrive best (Søballe and Kimmel [1987;](#page-10-11) Karatayev et al. [2007b\)](#page-9-5).

In addition to dams, canals and pipelines connecting different rivers and watersheds have also greatly facilitated the spread and persistence of *L. fortunei* in Japan. The country is crossed by 400,000 km of man-made canals, chiefly for irrigation purposes, that connect most watersheds (Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries [2003;](#page-9-17) see Chapter "Colonization and Spread of *Limnoperna fortunei* in Japan" in this volume).

## **Why Did the Golden Mussel Take So Long to Start Expanding?**

Given the fast and apparently effortless colonization of South America, an intriguing question is: "Why didn't it happen earlier?" While growing trade with Southeast Asia must play an important role (Darrigran and Pastorino [1995](#page-8-10); Karatayev et al. [2007b\)](#page-9-5), it is conceivable that the successful  $\sim$  1990 colonization of the Río de la Plata watershed was but one of many previous attempts when mussels were seeded in the area, but whose offspring were entirely swept into the ocean (Boltovskoy et al. [2006\)](#page-8-2). The notion that there might have been several unsuccessful introductions, both in South America and in Japan, before the mussel finally managed to establish local reproductive populations, is supported by biogeographic data (Boltovskoy et al. [2006](#page-8-2)), and by genetic evidence (Ito [2011;](#page-8-11) Zhan et al. [2012;](#page-10-12) Ghabooli et al. [2013\)](#page-8-12) that suggest that there have been multiple successful introductions.

Ballast water-related invasions by overseas freshwater organisms are faced with the problem that most freshwater ports serving ocean-going ships are located in estuarine areas, in the vicinity of and upstream from brackish and saline waters. This may explain why freshwater invasions like those of the golden mussel do not occur more often. Interestingly, the unintentional introduction of *L. fortunei* in South America is exceptional in that practically all other freshwater nonindigenous species recorded in Argentina are the result of deliberate introductions associated with aquarium trade, angling, and aquaculture (Baigún and Quirós [1985;](#page-8-13) Vigliano and Darrigran [2002](#page-10-13)).

#### **Future Spread**

Since its first records in Hong Kong, and especially after having been found in Japan and South America in the early 1990s, many reports have forecast that *L. fortunei* will rapidly spread northwards to Central and North America, and elsewhere (Morton [1975](#page-9-18); Ricciardi [1998;](#page-10-14) Boltovskoy et al. [2006;](#page-8-2) Karatayev et al. [2007b;](#page-9-5) Oliveira et al. [2010b\)](#page-10-4). Comparison of its current geographic range with estimates of its potential worldwide distribution (Fig. [1](#page-2-0)) suggests that we are only witnessing the beginning of its expansion. However, almost 25 years after it invaded the Río de la Plata watershed, it has not yet been recorded in the next large South American basin—the Amazon, which is considered highly vulnerable and largely suitable for the mussel (Boltovskoy et al. [2006](#page-8-2); Oliveira et al. [2010b\)](#page-10-4). In Japan, the geographic expansion of the mussel's range is relentless but slow (see Chapter "Colonization

and Spread of *Limnoperna fortunei* in Japan" in this volume). This may suggest that interbasin transfer is a more important bottleneck than originally anticipated (Karatayev et al. [2007b\)](#page-9-5), but it is very unlikely that watershed limits will deter further colonization indefinitely. In South America, the Cuiabá River, a tributary of the Paraguay River, which has been colonized by *L. fortunei* at least since 2000 (Boltovskoy et al. [2006](#page-8-2)) is only 150 km from the Teles Pires River in the Tapajós River basin within the Amazon watershed (Calazans et al. [2013](#page-8-14)). Both this proximity and the fact that the Amazon is navigable to ocean liners of virtually any tonnage, including ships with ballast water from infested ports along the Paraná-Uruguay-Río de la Plata waterways and the Guaiba basin (where compliance with international water ballast regulations in rather loosely enforced; Boltovskoy et al. [2011](#page-8-15)), suggest that sooner or later *L. fortunei* will invade this basin and, eventually, other freshwater bodies worldwide.

### **Concluding Remarks**

Bivalve traits that evolution allowed reluctantly to persist for millions of years tolerating the existence of such "outlyers" as *L. fortunei,* suddenly became a major asset for expanding a historically small geographic range when man created interbasin dispersion corridors and supplied upstream transportation vectors (Fig. [1\)](#page-2-0).

These conclusions cast a shadow of doubt on the widely accepted assumption that the success of *L. fortunei* stems from the fact that it is particularly well adapted to freshwater habitats. While it obviously does possess many traits which became instrumental for its impressive geographic expansion (e.g., low requirements of calcium, very high fertility, comparatively short life span, early sexual maturation, extended reproductive period, etc.; Morton [1973,](#page-9-19) [1975\)](#page-9-18), before man's intervention planktonic larvae and the requirement of hard substrata were most probably major limitations, rather than advantages.

Interestingly, this conclusion conflicts with the notion that the success of invasive species is due to their having the same general suite of traits exhibited by most successful organisms in general, irrespective of their alien or native status (Thompson and Davis [2011](#page-10-15)). While this has been shown for many invasives (Thompson et al. [1995\)](#page-10-16), alteration of Earth by man is changing the adaptive value of traits acquired in the course of millions of years of evolution in pristine environments.

When contrasted with those of many other species, invasions by golden and zebra mussels indicate that invasive success may be associated with quite dissimilar intrinsic and environmental variables, and that unifying concepts in invasion ecology are far from foolproof. Lumping all invasive species in an attempt to synthesize unique settings that explain success and effects on the ecosystems is probably not only questionable, but may also be counterproductive. As noticed by Gurevitch and Padilla ([2004,](#page-8-16) p. 474), "If we determine that domestic livestock are causing widespread plant extinctions, it is far more informative to focus on the impact of domestic livestock than to say, more generally, that aliens are causing these extinctions."

**Acknowledgments** This work was partially financed by grants from the University of Buenos Aires, Argentina (UBA X-020 and 20020100100035) and from the Argentine Agencia Nacional de Promoción Científica y Tecnológica, Argentina (PICT 2007 1968) to D. Boltovskoy.

### **References**

- <span id="page-8-9"></span>Allan JD, Castillo MM (2007) Stream ecology. Structure and function of running waters. Springer, Dordrecht, pp 1–436
- <span id="page-8-4"></span>Anastácio PM, Ferreira MP, Banha F, Capinha C, Rabaça JE (2014) Waterbird-mediated passive dispersal is a viable process for crayfish ( *Procambarus clarkii* ). Aquat Ecol 48:1–10
- <span id="page-8-13"></span>Baigún CM, Quirós R (1985) Itroducción de peces exóticos en la República Argentina. INIDEP (Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero, Argentina), Departamento de Aguas Continentales, Informe Técnico. INIDEP (Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero, Argentina), Departamento de Aguas Continentales, Informe Técnico, pp 1–90
- <span id="page-8-5"></span>Belz CE, Darrigran GA, Netto OSM, Boeger WA, Ribeiro PJ (2012) Analysis of four dispersion vectors in inland waters: the case of the invading bivalves in South America. J Shellfish Res 31:777–784
- <span id="page-8-2"></span>Boltovskoy D, Correa N, Cataldo D, Sylvester F (2006) Dispersion and ecological impact of the invasive freshwater bivalve *Limnoperna fortunei* in the Río de la Plata watershed and beyond. Biol Invasions 8:947–963
- <span id="page-8-15"></span>Boltovskoy D, Almada P, Correa N (2011) Biological invasions: assessment of threat from ballastwater discharge in Patagonian (Argentina) ports. Environ Sci Policy 14:578–583
- <span id="page-8-14"></span>Calazans SHC, Americo JA, Fernandes FD, Aldridge DC, Rebelo MD (2013) Assessment of toxicity of dissolved and microencapsulated biocides for control of the golden mussel *Limnoperna fortunei*. Marine Environ Res 91:104–108
- <span id="page-8-0"></span>Campos MCS (2014) Modelagem matemática do processo de invasão de *Limnoperna fortunei* (Dunker, 1857). Fundação Centro Tecnológico de Minas Gerais (Brazil). Technical Report GT 343, Controle do Mexilhão Dourado: Bioengenharia e novos materiais para aplicações em ecossistemas e usinas hidrelétricas, pp 3–36
- <span id="page-8-1"></span>Campos MCS, Andrade AFA, Kunzmann B, Galvão DD, Silva FA, Cardoso AV, Carvalho MD, Mota HR (2014) Modelling of the potential distribution of *Limnoperna fortunei* (Dunker, 1857) on a global scale. Aquat Invasions 9:239–242
- <span id="page-8-6"></span>Cataldo D, Boltovskoy D, Hermosa JL, Canzi C (2005) Temperature-dependent larval development rates of *Limnoperna fortunei* (Bivalvia: Mytilidae). J Molluscan Stud 71:41–46
- <span id="page-8-7"></span>Cohen A (2009) Managing the exotic mussels *Dreissena polymorpha, Dreissena bugensis, Limnoperna fortunei* and *Mytilopsis leucophaeata* in SFPUC's Reservoirs. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Final Report. San Francisco (USA), pp 1–236
- <span id="page-8-3"></span>Contardo-Jara V, Galanti LN, Ame MV, Monferran MV, Wunderlin DA, Wiegand C (2009) Biotransformation and antioxidant enzymes of *Limnoperna fortunei* detect site impact in watercourses of Córdoba, Argentina. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf 72:1871–1880
- <span id="page-8-10"></span>Darrigran GA, Pastorino G (1995) The recent introduction of a freshwater Asiatic bivalve, *Limnoperna fortunei* (Mytilidae) into South America. The Veliger 38:171–175
- <span id="page-8-12"></span>Ghabooli S, Zhan A, Sardiña P, Paolucci E, Sylvester F, Perepelizin PV, Briski E, Cristescu ME, MacIsaac HJ (2013) Genetic diversity in introduced golden mussel populations corresponds to vector activity. PLoS ONE 8:e59328
- <span id="page-8-16"></span>Gurevitch J, Padilla DK (2004) Are invasive species a major cause of extinctions? Trends Ecol Evol 19:470–474
- <span id="page-8-8"></span>Havel JE, Lee CE, Vander Zanden MJ (2005) Do reservoirs facilitate invasion into landscapes? BioScience 55:518–525
- <span id="page-8-11"></span>Ito K (2011) Spatial distribution and status of the golden mussel, *Limnoperna fortunei* in Kanto region, Japan. Report of Yahagi River Institute 15:91–96 [In Japanese]
- <span id="page-9-16"></span>Japan Commission on Large Dams (2009) Dams in Japan. Past, present and future. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp 1–232
- <span id="page-9-13"></span>Johnson LE, Carlton JT (1996) Post-establishment spread in large-scale invasions: dispersal mechanisms of the zebra mussel *Dreissena polymorpha*. Ecology 77:1686–1690
- <span id="page-9-6"></span>Karatayev AY, Boltovskoy D, Padilla DK, Burlakova LE (2007a) The invasive bivalves *Dreissena polymorpha* and *Limnoperna fortunei*: parallels, contrasts, potential spread and invasion impacts. J Shellfish Res 26:205–213
- <span id="page-9-5"></span>Karatayev AY, Padilla DK, Minchin D, Boltovskoy D, Burlakova LE (2007b) Changes in global economies and trade: the potential spread of exotic freshwater bivalves. Biol Invasions 9:161– 180
- <span id="page-9-7"></span>Karatayev AY, Burlakova LE, Karatayev VA, Boltovskoy D (2010) *Limnoperna fortunei* versus *Dreissena polymorpha* : Population densities and benthic community impacts of two invasive freshwater bivalves. J Shellfish Res 29:975–984
- <span id="page-9-15"></span>Kimura T (1994) The earliest record of *Limnoperna fortunei* (Dunker) from Japan. Chiribotan (J Malacol Soc Jpn) 25:34–35 [In Japanese]
- <span id="page-9-3"></span>Kluza DA, McNyset KM (2005) Ecological niche modeling of aquatic invasive species. Aquat Invaders 16:1–7
- <span id="page-9-4"></span>Kraft CE, Sullivan PJ, Karatayev AY, Burlakova LE, Nekola JC, Johnson LE, Padilla DK (2002) Landscape patterns of an aquatic invader: assessing dispersal extent from spatial distributions. Ecol Appl 12:749–759
- <span id="page-9-0"></span>Lopez GR (1988) Comparative ecology of the macrofauna of freshwater and marine muds. Limnol Oceanogr 33:946–962
- <span id="page-9-8"></span>McMahon RF (2002) Evolutionary and physiological adaptations of aquatic invasive animals: r selection versus resistance. Can J Fish Aquat Sci 59:1235–1244
- <span id="page-9-1"></span>McMahon RF, Bogan AE (2001) Mollusca: Bivalvia. In: Thorn JH, Covich AP (eds) Ecology and classification of North American freshwater invertebrates, Academic Press, San Diego, pp 331–429
- <span id="page-9-9"></span>Minchin D, Gollasch S (2002) Vectors—How exotics get around. In: Leppakoski E, Gollasch S, Olenin S (eds) Invasive aquatic species of Europe: distribution, impacts and management, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp 183–194
- <span id="page-9-11"></span>Minchin D, Lucy F, Sullivan M (2002) Zebra mussel: Impacts and spread. In: Leppakoski E, Gollasch S, Olenin S (eds) Invasive aquatic species of Europe: distribution, impacts and management, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp 135–148
- <span id="page-9-17"></span>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (2003) The global diversity of irrigation. http:// www.maff.go.jp/j/nousin/keityo/mizu\_sigen/index.html. Accessed 5 April 2014
- <span id="page-9-19"></span>Morton B (1973) Some aspects of the biology and functional morphology of the organs of feeding and digestion of *Limnoperna fortunei* (Dunker) (Bivalvia: Mytilacea). Malacologia 12:265– 281
- <span id="page-9-18"></span>Morton B (1975) The colonization of Hong Kong's raw water supply system by *Limnoperna fortunei* (Dunker 1857) (Bivalvia: Mytilacea) from China. Malacological Rev 8:91–105
- <span id="page-9-2"></span>Morton B, Dinesen G (2010) Colonization of Asian freshwaters by the Mytilidae (Bivalvia): a comparison of *Sinomytilus harmandi* from the Tonle-Sap River, Phnom Penh, Cambodia, with *Limnoperna fortunei*. Molluscan Res 30:57–72
- <span id="page-9-10"></span>Nehring S (2002) Biological invasions into german waters: an evaluation of the importance of different human-mediated vectors for nonindigenous macrozoobenthic species. In: Leppakoski E, Gollasch S, Olenin S (eds) Invasive aquatic species of Europe: distribution, impacts and management. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp 373–383
- <span id="page-9-12"></span>Nomura M, Kanai H, Takahashi K, Matsumoto I, Matsumoto H (2008) Golden mussel, *Limnoperna fortunei* from Tomioka to Fujioka area. Research Reports of the Gunma Museum of Natural History 4:40–47 [In Japanese]
- <span id="page-9-14"></span>Oliveira MD, Hamilton SK, Calheiros DF, Jacobi CM, Latini RO (2010a) Modeling the potential distribution of the invasive golden mussel *Limnoperna fortunei* in the Upper Paraguay River system using limnological variables. Braz J Biol 70:831–840
- <span id="page-10-4"></span>Oliveira MD, Hamilton SK, Jacobi CM (2010b) Forecasting the expansion of the invasive golden mussel *Limnoperna fortunei* in Brazilian and North American rivers based on its occurrence in the Paraguay River and Pantanal wetland of Brazil. Aquat Invasions 5:59–73
- <span id="page-10-9"></span>Pachepsky E, Lutscher F, Nisbet RM, Lewis MA (2005) Persistence, spread and the drift paradox. Theor Popul Biol 67:61–73
- <span id="page-10-1"></span>Pereira D, Mansur MCD, Duarte LDS, Oliveira AS, Pimpão DM, Callil CT, Ituarte C, Parada E, Peredo S, Darrigran G, Scarabino F, Clavijo C, Lara G, Miyahira IC, Rodriguez MTR, Lasso C (2014) Bivalve distribution in hydrographic regions in South America: historical overview and conservation. Hydrobiologia 735:15–44
- <span id="page-10-10"></span>Pollux BJA, Santamaria L, Ouborg NJ (2004) Differences in endozoochorous dispersal between aquatic plant species, with reference to plant population persistence in rivers. Freshw Biol 50:232–242
- <span id="page-10-7"></span>Reckendorfer W, Keckeis H, Winkler G, Schiemer F (1999) Zooplankton abundance in the River Danube, Austria: the significance of inshore retention. Freshw Biol 41:583–591
- <span id="page-10-6"></span>Reynolds CS, Carling PA (1991) Flow in river channels: new insights into hydraulic retention. Archiv Hydrobiologie-Beiheft Ergebnisse der Limnologie 121:171–179
- <span id="page-10-14"></span>Ricciardi A (1998) Global range expansion of the Asian mussel *Limnoperna fortunei* (Mytilidae): another fouling threat to freshwater systems. Biofouling 13:97–106
- <span id="page-10-11"></span>Søballe DM, Kimmel BL (1987) A large-scale comparison of factors influencing phytoplankton abundance in rivers, lakes, and impoundments. Ecology 68:1943–1954
- <span id="page-10-8"></span>Speirs DC, Gurney WSC (2001) Population persistence in rivers and estuaries. Ecology 82:1219– 1237
- <span id="page-10-15"></span>Thompson K, Davis MA (2011) Why research on traits of invasive plants tells us very little. Trend Ecol Evol 26:155–156
- <span id="page-10-16"></span>Thompson K, Hodgson JG, Rich TCG (1995) Native and alien invasive plants: more of the same? Ecography 18:390–402
- <span id="page-10-0"></span>Thorson G (1950) Reproductive and larval ecology of marine bottom invertebrates. Biol Rev 25:1–45
- <span id="page-10-13"></span>Vigliano PH, Darrigran GA (2002) Argentina's freshwater systems: aliens in wonderland. In: 11th International Conference on Aquatic Invasive Species, Alexandria (USA)
- <span id="page-10-2"></span>Ye BM, Cao XW, Xu M, Wang ZY, Lin CC (2011) Study of *Limnoperna fortunei* invasion in long distance water transmission project. Water Wastewater Eng 37:99–102 [In Chinese]
- <span id="page-10-5"></span>Yoshimura C, Omura T, Furumai H, Tockner K (2005) Present state of rivers and streams in Japan. River Res Appl 21:93–112
- <span id="page-10-3"></span>Young SS, Yang HN, Huang DJ, Liu SM, Huang YH, Chiang CT, Liu JW (2014) Using benthic macroinvertebrate and fish communities as bioindicators of the Tanshui River Basin around the greater Taipei area—multivariate analysis of spatial variation related to levels of water pollution. Int J Environ Res Public Health 11:7116–7143
- <span id="page-10-12"></span>Zhan A, Perepelizin PV, Ghabooli S, Paolucci E, Sylvester F, Sardiña P, Cristescu ME, MacIsaac HJ (2012) Scale-dependent post-establishment spread and genetic diversity in an invading mollusc in South America. Divers Distrib 18:1042–1055