bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

No impact of biocontrol predator on development time or size of surviving *Aedes albopictus* under optimal nutritional availability

Marie C. Russell[1]* and Lauren J. Cator[1]

[1]Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, Silwood Park Campus, Ascot, UK

*Correspondence: marie.clare.russell@gmail.com

Graphical abstract



Abstract

Background: Cyclopoid copepods have been applied successfully to limit populations of highly invasive *Aedes albopictus* mosquitoes that can vector diseases, including chikungunya, dengue, yellow fever, and Zika, to humans. However, there is concern that changes in certain vector traits, induced by exposure to copepod predation, might increase the risk of disease

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

transmission. In this study, we tested whether cyclopoid copepod predation has sublethal effects on the development time or adult size of *Ae. albopictus* under the scenario of an invasion in southeast England, which lies at the northern edge of the vector's expanding global range.

Methods: Third instar *Ae. albopictus* larvae, hereafter referred to as "focal individuals", were placed in individual Petri dishes, each containing four newly-hatched *Ae. albopictus* larvae, which were counted, removed, and replaced daily. All focal individuals were provided with fish food *ad libitum*, and half were exposed to *Megacyclops viridis* copepod predators. The day of pupation was recorded for each focal individual, and the wing length of each focal adult was also measured.

Results: Exposing late instar *Ae. albopictus* to predation decreased their chances of surviving to adulthood. Mortality of the focal individuals was 12.9% in the predator treatment, and 2.9% in the controls. Three focal larvae that died in the predator treatment showed signs of melanization, indicative of wounding. Among surviving *Ae. albopictus*, no significant difference in either pupation day or wing length was observed due to copepod predation.

Conclusions: We found that *M. viridis* predation on smaller *Ae. albopictus* larvae does not significantly affect the pupation day or adult size of surrounding larger larvae that are less vulnerable to copepod attacks. This study controlled for density effects on size by maintaining a constant number of newly-hatched prey larvae surrounding each focal larva. Those working to control *Ae. albopictus* populations in the field should be made aware that increased adult body size can occur if copepod biocontrol agents are applied at lower than necessary levels. The absence of a significant sublethal impact from *M. viridis* copepod predation on surviving later-stage larvae in this analysis supports the use of *M. viridis* as a biocontrol agent.

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Keywords

predator-prey interactions, sublethal effects, vector traits

Background

Aedes albopictus is an important vector of dengue, chikungunya, yellow fever, and Zika [1]. This species is highly invasive due, in part, to its ability to lay desiccation-resistant eggs that can be transported across long distances, often by the shipment of used tires [2-6]. The northern limits of the global range of *Ae. albopictus* include North American populations in New York and Connecticut, USA [7], as well as European populations throughout Italy and France [8].

Several different methods have been proposed for controlling aedine mosquitoes in Europe, including chemical, genetic, and biological techniques [9]. Although space spraying with pyrethroid insecticide has been found to be effective against *Ae. albopictus* in Catalonia, this control strategy would require regular monitoring for insecticide resistance [10]. The Sterile Insect Technique (SIT) has previously been tested on *Ae. albopictus* mosquitoes from Italy, but it was not found to significantly reduce their population due to the reduced mating competitiveness of irradiated males [11]. Cyclopoid copepods have been used successfully as biocontrol agents against mosquito larvae in the US [12], Australia [13], Vietnam [14], and Italy [15]. Copepods are an especially convenient type of biocontrol because they are small enough to be distributed through a backpack sprayer [16]. When local predators are used to limit populations of a disease vector, there is a risk that these predation interactions could have unintended effects on the ability of surviving prey to reproduce and transmit disease.

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Copepod predators are much more effective at killing first and second instar than third and fourth instar *Ae. albopictus* [17]. Thus, after an application of copepod predators to *Ae. albopictus* larval habitats, it is likely that any immatures that were third and fourth instar larvae at the time of application would still emerge as adults. These individuals may have withstood both unsuccessful copepod attacks and exposure to the deaths of surrounding smaller conspecifics. Such indirect interactions between predator and prey species can strongly impact prey traits [18, 19].

In aquatic ecosystems, sublethal effects are governed by olfactory cues, including predator kairomones and chemical alarm cues from the prey [20]. For example, *Culex pipiens* larvae significantly reduce their movement when exposed to conspecifics that have been killed by notonectid predators [21]. In *Cx. restuans*, both freezing (hanging at the water's surface or drifting in the water column) and fleeing (moving for nearly a full minute without resting) behaviors were observed as responses to conspecific alarm cues [22]. *Cx. restuans* larvae have also learned to recognize a salamander predator's odor as a threat, after experiencing the predator's odor paired with conspecific alarm cues [23]. When *Ae. triseriatus* larvae were exposed to chemical cues of *Toxorhynchites rutilus* predation until adult emergence, females exhibited significantly shorter development times under high nutrient availability [24].

Adult body size is an important vector trait that can be affected by predation. For example, exposure to a backswimmer predator, *Anisops jaczewskii*, was found to reduce the size of *Anopheles coluzzi*, one of the main vectors of the human malaria parasite *Plasmodium falciparum* in Africa [25]. Similarly, larval exposure to chemical cues from the predatory fish *Hypseleotris galii* reduces adult size of *Ae. notoscriptus*, the main vector of canine heartworm, *Dirofilaria immitis* in Australia [26]. However, in comparison to how other

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

mosquito species respond to predators, studies on *Ae. albopictus* indicate this species may be less sensitive to predator cues [27, 28].

As an invader, *Ae. albopictus* is less likely to share an evolutionary history with the predators that it encounters. A lack of a shared evolutionary history between predator and prey species has been shown to weaken non-consumptive predator effects in arthropods [29]. Previous work has shown that second instar *Ae. albopictus* reduce their movement in response to cues from the act of predation by *C. appendiculata*, which likely include dead conspecifics and predator feces, but not in response to cues from a non-feeding predator [30]. However, larger fourth instar *Ae. albopictus* are less vulnerable to predation and show no behavioral response to cues from *C. appendiculata*, even to cues from the act of predation [31].

If copepods are to be used as biocontrol agents, it is important to understand how predation may alter the adult traits of larvae that are too large to be consumed at the time of application. The body size of aedine mosquitoes can be altered by predation cues [26, 32], and changes in size can have important consequences for population dynamics and disease transmission. In *Ae. albopictus*, larger adults have greater reproductive success [33, 34]. Larger males have been shown to produce more sperm [34], and in larger females, more spermathecae have been observed to contain sperm [35]. Larger female body size consistently correlates with higher fecundity, when measured as the number of mature follicles in the ovaries [36], or as the number of eggs laid [33]. Thus, larger emerging *Ae. albopictus* could lead to increased mosquito abundance.

In addition, larger *Ae. albopictus* adults have displayed significantly longer median lifespans, when controlling for differences due to sex and diet [37]. However, smaller *Ae. albopictus*

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

females are more likely to become infected with dengue and to disseminate the virus than larger females [38]. Furthermore, small females have been shown to be more likely than large females to take multiple bloodmeals within a single gonotrophic cycle [39], and the lifetime cumulative number of bloodmeals is also higher among smaller females [40]. This higher contact frequency with hosts increases the risk for disease transmission by small-sized *Ae. albopictus* vectors.

Previous studies have shown an increase in *Ae. albopictus* adult size after exposure to predation, but these studies were not designed to control for the greater per capita nutrition or decreased intraspecific competition that often occur when the population density has been significantly lowered due to successful predation [27, 41-43]. The phenomenon of increasing animal body size with decreasing population density has been documented across taxa [44]. This study is designed to test for sublethal effects of copepod predation on the development and adult size of *Ae. albopictus* that have been exposed to the act of predation during the later larval stages, while controlling for density effects. Due to the suitability of some areas in southeast England for *Ae. albopictus* populations [45], we used *Megacyclops viridis*, a likely copepod species for future biocontrol applications [46], collected from Longside Lake in Egham, UK, and *Ae. albopictus* that were originally collected in Montpellier, France. Our results show that while cyclopoid copepod predation by *M. viridis* significantly increases mortality of late-instar *Ae. albopictus*, the related predation cues do not significantly change development time or adult size of those late-instar *Ae. albopictus* that survive, assuming optimal nutritional availability.

Methods

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Local copepod collections:

One hundred thirty adult female *M. viridis* copepods were collected during the third week of September in 2019 from the edge of Longside Lake in Egham, Surrey, UK (N 51° 24.298', W 00° 32.599'). Copepods were identified as *M. viridis* (Jurine, 1820) by morphology. The copepods were kept in ten 1 L containers, each holding approximately 500 mL of spring water (Highland Spring, UK) at a 12:12 light/dark cycle, and 20 ± 1°C. *Paramecium caudatum* were provided *ad libitum* as food for the copepods, and boiled wheat seeds were added to the containers to provide a food source for the ciliates [47].

Temperate *Ae. albopictus* colony care:

A colony of *Ae. albopictus* mosquitoes (original collection Montpellier, France 2016 obtained through Infravec2) was maintained at 27 ± 1°C, 70% relative humidity, and a 12:12 light/dark cycle. Larvae were fed fish food (Cichlid Gold Hikari®, Japan), and adults were given 10% sucrose solution and horse blood administered through a membrane feeding system (Hemotek®, Blackburn, UK). *Ae. albopictus* eggs were collected from the colony on filter papers and stored in plastic bags containing damp paper towels to maintain humidity.

Experimental procedure:

On the morning of the tenth day after the last *M. viridis* were collected from the field, *Ae. albopictus* larvae were hatched over a 3-hour period at 27 ± 1°C. The hatching temperature was kept high, relative to the temperature of the experiment (20 ± 1°C), to maximize the yield of larvae over a semi-synchronous period. Stored egg papers were submerged in 3 mg/L nutrient broth solution (Sigma-Aldrich © 70122 Nutrient Broth No 1) and oxygen was displaced by vacuum suction for 30 min. Immediately following oxygen displacement, ground fish food (Cichlid Gold Hikari®, Japan) was added *ad libitum*. After three hours, 500

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

larvae were counted and placed into spring water to dilute residual food from the hatching media. These focal larvae were then placed in a 1 L container with 600 mL of spring water and twelve pellets (each 50 mg) of fish food at 20 ± 1°C. The water and fish food were changed every other day.

The focal larvae were held at a constant temperature of 20°C because a previous median regression showed that summer temperatures in Southeast England rose from 14.9°C to 17.0°C between 1971 and 1997 [48]. This warming trend is very likely to continue, with the London climate projected to resemble that of present-day Barcelona by 2050 [49]. The average summer maximum temperature for the Greater London area from 1976 to 2003 was 22.3°C [50]; therefore, 20°C is within the range of realistic summer temperatures to be experienced in Southeast England during the next few decades.

On the sixth day of focal larvae development, 70 female *M. viridis* copepods were each placed in a Petri dish (diameter: 50 mm, height: 20.3 mm) holding 20 mL of spring water to begin a 24-hour starvation period. A second set of *Ae. albopictus* eggs were hatched according to the previously described method, except that the hatch was held at 27 ± 1°C for 18 hours.

On the seventh day of focal larvae development, 140 third instar focal *Ae. albopictus* larvae were each placed in a Petri dish holding 20 mL of spring water, a 50 mg pellet of fish food, and four first instar larvae from the hatch that was started on the previous day. A subset of 30 third instar focal larvae were preserved in 80% ethanol for head capsule width measurements [51]. Seventy starved *M. viridis* copepods were then introduced to 70 out of the 140 Petri dishes (Fig 1).

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.




Fig 1. Experiment schedule

Each day, the number of surviving first or second instar larvae in each of the 140 Petri dishes was recorded, surviving first or second instars were removed, and four new first instars from the 18-hour hatch started on the previous day were added to each replicate (Fig 1). The status (dead or alive) of each focal larva was recorded daily, and in predator treatment replicates, the status of the copepod was also recorded. In the case of a focal larva death, the larva was preserved in 80% ethanol, and that replicate was removed from further observation. In the case of a copepod death, the copepod was preserved in 80% ethanol, and a new adult female *M. viridis* copepod from the September field collections was randomly chosen to replace it.

Pupation among focal individuals was recorded each day at 18:00 hrs. Pupae were transferred to 10 mL of spring water in a graduated cylinder with a mesh cover for emergence. Emerged adults were frozen at -20°C. Wings were removed and measured as a proxy for body size [52].

Data analysis:

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

All analyses were completed in R version 3.4.2 [53]. Welch two sample t-tests for samples of unequal variance were used to compare percent survival of first or second instar larvae between copepod absent and copepod present treatments. The possibility of a difference in the proportion of focal larvae emerging as adults based on copepod presence was examined using a Pearson's chi-squared test without Yates' continuity correction. Two Kruskal-Wallis tests, one for males and one for females, were used to compare adult wing lengths between copepod absent and copepod present treatments. A Kruskal-Wallis test was also used to compare pupation day distributions between predator present and predator absent treatments. A non-parametric local regression method ("loess", "ggplot2" package) was used to present the cumulative proportion of focal larvae pupated over time, by predator presence.

Results

Head capsule width measurements (mean = 0.59 mm, sd = 0.062 mm) of a subset of the focal mosquito larvae (n = 30) confirmed that they were third instars on the first day of exposure to copepod predation [51]. One hundred fifteen copepods (mean length = 1.75 mm, sd = 0.16 mm) were used throughout the experiment across the 70 predator treatment replicates.

Out of the 70 focal larvae that were not exposed to copepod predators, 68, or 97.1%, emerged successfully as adults; one died in the larval stage, and one died in the pupal stage. Out of the 70 focal larvae that were exposed to copepod predators, 61, or 87.1%, emerged successfully as adults; five died in the larval stage, and four died in the pupal stage. Results of a Pearson's chi-squared test showed that the probability of successful adult emergence was higher in the absence of copepod predators (p-value = 0.0279). Three of the five focal larvae that died in

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

the presence of a predator showed clear signs of melanization in the abdominal region, most likely due to wounding from copepod attacks (Fig 2).




Fig 2. Evidence of melanization in focal larvae that died in the presence of a copepod predator on the eighth, ninth, and tenth days of observation, respectively

The percentage of first instar *Ae. albopictus* surviving each day was significantly lower in the presence of a copepod predator throughout the six days immediately following predator introduction (Table 1). No significant difference in first instar survival was observed on the last two days, when the number of remaining replicates was very low (Table 1).

Table 1. First instar percent survival by day and predator presence


Day of Experiment	Predator Absent (mean ± se)	Number of Predator Absent Replicates	Predator Present (mean ± se)	Number of Predator Present Replicates	P-value[a]
8	99.3 ± 0.5	70	6.8 ± 2.0	70	<0.0001
9	99.3 ± 0.5	70	30.1 ± 4.1	69	<0.0001
10	99.3 ± 0.5	70	47.8 ± 3.9	68	<0.0001
11	100 ± 0.0	70	42.9 ± 4.3	67	<0.0001
12	100 ± 0.0	42	55.9 ± 6.6	34	<0.0001
13	100 ± 0.0	12	58.3 ± 8.9	12	0.0007
14	100 ± 0.0	5	33.3 ± 33.3	3	0.1835
15	100	1	25 ± 14.4	3	NA

[a]P-value corresponds to a Welch two sample t-test for samples of unequal variance used to determine if there was a difference in first instar survival based on predator presence.

Ae. albopictus adult wing length data were left-skewed among both males and females. Female wing lengths (median = 2.87 mm) were significantly larger than male wing lengths (median = 2.33 mm, Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test, p-value < 0.0001). However, there were no significant differences in male wing length (Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test, p-value =

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

255 0.6387) or in female wing length (Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test, p-value = 0.1769), due to
256 copepod presence (Fig 3a).
257



258 **Fig 3.** Size and development: a.) Boxplot of wing lengths by sex and predator presence,
259 b.) Cumulative proportion pupated by predator presence
260

261 Pupation day data were right-skewed among both males and females. Sex did not affect the
262 day of pupation (Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test, geometric mean ± sd: males = 11.8 ± 1.1,
263 females = 11.9 ± 1.1; p-value = 0.2607). In addition, neither male pupation day (geometric
264 mean ± sd: copepod present = 11.8 ± 1.1, copepod absent = 11.7 ± 1.1; Kruskal-Wallis rank
265 sum test, p-value = 0.7819), nor female pupation day (geometric mean ± sd: copepod present
266 = 11.8 ± 1.1, copepod absent = 12.0 ± 1.1; Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test, p-value = 0.1580),
267 differed with copepod presence (Fig 3b).
268

269 **Discussion**
270

271 Although third and fourth instar *Ae. albopictus* larvae are generally less vulnerable to
272 copepod predators than first and second instars [17], some of the third instar, fourth instar,
273 and pupal stage deaths observed in this study were likely due to *M. viridis* copepod attacks.
274 Three focal individuals that died in the larval stage showed signs of melanization (Fig. 2), a
275 response triggered locally by cuticular wounding that results in the accumulation of melanin,

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

a brown-black pigment, at the wound site [54-56]. Melanization is an energetically costly response that is likely to be influenced by nutritional status in mosquitoes [54, 57, 58]. Since the focal larvae in this study were provided with fish food *ad libitum*, it is unlikely that their immune responses were limited due to poor nutritional status. The location of the three melanization sites in the abdominal region (Fig. 2) is consistent with a previous study, which found that the larval abdomen was attacked more frequently by cyclopoid copepods than either the head/thorax region or the last body segment, containing the siphon [59].

While successfully emerging males were spread evenly between the predator and control treatments, less females emerged successfully from the predator treatment. These observations are consistent with those of a previous study showing that *Ae. albopictus* survivorship is skewed towards males in response to predation by *Toxorhynchites rutilus* [41]. A longer (five-week) semi-field study found that the *Ae. albopictus* sex ratio was skewed towards females after extended exposure to cyclopoid copepod predation [42]. However, lower larval densities have been shown to produce lower proportions of males in *Ae. albopictus* rearing [60]. One possible explanation for this is that the increased nutrient availability for each larva at lower densities might better support the larger body size of females. Thus, lower larval density resulting from predation, is likely to be the main cause of the female-dominated sex ratio that was previously observed [42].

In order for cyclopoid copepods to be effective biocontrols, enough adult female copepods need to be applied in order to quickly eliminate first and second instar mosquito larvae, which are the most vulnerable stages to copepod predation [17]. In some cases of incomplete control, *Ae. albopictus* adults that developed in the presence of predators emerged larger than adults that developed in control conditions because the lower larval density produced by

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

predators resulted in less intraspecific competition and greater per capita nutrition [41-43]. It has also been suggested that first instar larvae benefit nutritionally from decomposing dead conspecifics [27]. First and second instar larvae are likely to benefit the most from increased nutrition because most larval growth occurs between the first and third instar stages. Under the scenario of incomplete biocontrol leading to the emergence of larger *Ae. albopictus* adults, it is important to consider that *Ae. albopictus* females do not avoid copepods during oviposition [17, 42]. Therefore, the higher fecundity that is associated with larger female size [33, 36] is likely to be strongly counteracted by copepod predation against newly-hatched *Ae. albopictus* larvae of the next generation.

Among *Ae. albopictus* adults that emerged successfully in this experiment, there was a significant difference in wing length due to sex (Fig. 3a), but there was not a significant difference in pupation day between sexes. *Ae. albopictus* males have previously been observed to be 17-20% smaller than females [61]. Accordingly, the male median wing length in this study is 18.8% smaller than the female median wing length, and wing length is known to correlate positively with mass in *Ae. albopictus* [52]. Previous work has shown that while mass clearly differs due to sex, development time in *Ae. albopictus* is less sexually dimorphic [62].

There was no significant difference in wing length or pupation day due to *M. viridis* predation cues (Fig. 3). Therefore, neither the greater reproductive success observed among larger *Ae. albopictus* [33-36], nor the higher risk for disease transmission observed among smaller female *Ae. albopictus* [38-40], is likely to result directly from *M. viridis* predation. A similar lack of predator impact on mosquito size and development time was observed when *Toxorhynchites amboinensis* was tested against newly-hatched *Ae. polynesiensis* in coconuts

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

at three different larval densities [63]. In addition, a study spanning four generations of *Ae. albopictus* did not find any evidence of an evolutionary response to predator exposure in the larval stage [64].

Conclusions

We found evidence of lethal attacks on late instar larvae that resulted in a small, but significant, reduction in the probability of emergence. However, we did not find any evidence that experiencing *M. viridis* predation, both directly and on smaller conspecifics, affects size or development time of surviving *Ae. albopictus* adults at optimal nutritional availability. Previous work has shown that *M. viridis* exhibits a type II functional response curve and a relatively high predation efficiency against *Ae. albopictus* prey at temperatures representative of UK larval habitats [46]. This study builds on recent work and further supports the use of *M. viridis* as a biocontrol agent for *Ae. albopictus* in the southeastern UK, at the northern edge of the vector's expanding global range.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate:

Not applicable

Consent for publication:

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials:

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

All data that were collected during this study will be made publicly accessible from the Dryad Digital Repository.

Competing interests:

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding:

This project relied on resources funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No 731060 (Infravec2). The work was primarily funded by a President's PhD Scholarship from Imperial College London awarded to Marie C. Russell. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, interpretation of results, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Authors' contributions:

LJC and MCR conceptualized the experiment and determined the methodology, including the type of statistical analyses that were employed. MCR collected the data, performed the data analysis, produced the tables and figures, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements:

We thank Alima Qureshi for her assistance with the mosquito wing measurements. We also thank Catalina Estrada, Martin Selby, and Paul Beasley for their technical support throughout the experiment.

References

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

1. Centers for Disease C, Prevention. Surveillance and Control of Aedes aegypti and Aedes albopictus in the United States. 2017. Contract No.: Report.
2. Eritja R, Escosa R, Lucientes J, Marques E, Molina R, Roiz D, et al. Worldwide invasion of vector mosquitoes: present European distribution and challenges for Spain. Biological Invasions. 2005;7(1):87-97.
3. Juliano SA, Lounibos LP. Ecology of invasive mosquitoes: effects on resident species and on human health. Ecology Letters. 2005;8(5):558-74.
4. Lounibos LP. Invasions by insect vectors of human disease. Annual Review of Entomology. 2002;47:233-66.
5. Medlock JM, Avenell D, Barrass I, Leach S. Analysis of the potential for survival and seasonal activity of Aedes albopictus (Diptera : Culicidae) in the United Kingdom. Journal of Vector Ecology. 2006;31(2):292-304.
6. Benedict MQ, Levine RS, Hawley WA, Lounibos LP. Spread of the tiger: Global risk of invasion by the mosquito Aedes albopictus. Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases. 2007;7(1):76-85.
7. Kache PA, Eastwood G, Collins-Palmer K, Katz M, Falco RC, Bajwa WI, et al. Environmental Determinants of Aedes albopictus Abundance at a Northern Limit of Its Range in the United States. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2020;102(2):436-47.
8. European Centre for Disease P, Control, cartographers. Aedes albopictus - current known distribution: May 20202020.
9. Baldacchino F, Caputo B, Chandre F, Drago A, della Torre A, Montarsi F, et al. Control methods against invasive Aedes mosquitoes in Europe: a review. Pest management science. 2015;71(11):1471-85.
10. Paaijmans K, Brustollin M, Aranda C, Eritja R, Talavera S, Pages N, et al. Phenotypic insecticide resistance in arbovirus mosquito vectors in Catalonia and its capital Barcelona (Spain). Plos One. 2019;14(7).
11. Bellini R, Balestrino F, Medici A, Gentile G, Veronesi R, Carrieri M. Mating Competitiveness of Aedes albopictus Radio-Sterilized Males in Large Enclosures Exposed to Natural Conditions. Journal of Medical Entomology. 2013;50(1):94-102.
12. Marten GG. Elimination of Aedes-Albopictus from Tire Piles by Introducing Macrocyclops-Albidus (Copepoda, Cyclopidae). Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association. 1990;6(4):689-93.
13. Russell BM, Muir LE, Weinstein P, Kay BH. Surveillance of the mosquito Aedes aegypti and its biocontrol with the copepod Mesocyclops aspericornis in Australian wells and gold mines. Medical and Veterinary Entomology. 1996;10(2):155-60.
14. Kay BH, Nam VS, Van Tien T, Yen NT, Phong TV, Diep VTB, et al. Control of Aedes vectors of dengue in three provinces of Vietnam by use of Mesocyclops (Copepoda) and community-based methods validated by entomologic, clinical, and serological surveillance. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2002;66(1):40-8.
15. Veronesi R, Carrieri M, MacCagnani B, Maini S, Bellini R. Macrocyclops Albidus (Copepoda: Cyclopidae) for the Biocontrol of Aedes Albopictus and Culex Pipiens in Italy. Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association. 2015;31(1):32-43.
16. Marten GG. Issues in the development of cyclops for mosquito control. Arbovirus Research in Australia. 1990;5:159-64.
17. Dieng H, Boots M, Tuno N, Tsuda Y, Takagi M. A laboratory and field evaluation of Macrocyclops distinctus, Megacyclops viridis and Mesocyclops pehpeiensis as control agents

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

424 of the dengue vector Aedes albopictus in a peridomestic area in Nagasaki, Japan. Medical and
425 Veterinary Entomology. 2002;16(3):285-91.
426 18. Preisser EL, Bolnick DI, Benard MF. Scared to death? The effects of intimidation and
427 consumption in predator-prey interactions. Ecology. 2005;86(2):501-9.
428 19. Werner EE, Peacor SD. A review of trait-mediated indirect interactions in ecological
429 communities. Ecology. 2003;84(5):1083-100.
430 20. Ferrari MCO, Wisenden BD, Chivers DP. Chemical ecology of predator-prey
431 interactions in aquatic ecosystems: a review and prospectus. Canadian Journal of Zoology.
432 2010;88(7):698-724.
433 21. Sih A. ANTIPREDATOR RESPONSES AND THE PERCEPTION OF DANGER
434 BY MOSQUITO LARVAE. Ecology. 1986;67(2):434-41.
435 22. Ferrari MCO, Messier F, Chivers DP. Variable predation risk and the dynamic nature
436 of mosquito antipredator responses to chemical alarm cues. Chemoecology. 2007;17(4):223-
437 9.
438 23. Ferrari MCO, Messier F, Chivers DP. Threat-sensitive learning of predators by larval
439 mosquitoes Culex restuans. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology. 2008;62(7):1079-83.
440 24. Ower GD, Juliano SA. The demographic and life-history costs of fear: Trait-mediated
441 effects of threat of predation on Aedes triseriatus. Ecology and Evolution. 2019;9(7):3794-
442 806.
443 25. Roux O, Vantaux A, Roche B, Yameogo KB, Dabire KR, Diabate A, et al. Evidence
444 for carry-over effects of predator exposure on pathogen transmission potential. Proceedings
445 of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences. 2015;282(1821):20152430.
446 26. van Uitregt VO, Hurst TP, Wilson RS. Reduced size and starvation resistance in adult
447 mosquitoes, Aedes notoscriptus, exposed to predation cues as larvae. Journal of Animal
448 Ecology. 2012;81(1):108-15.
449 27. Costanzo KS, Muturi EJ, Alto BW. Trait-mediated effects of predation across life-
450 history stages in container mosquitoes. Ecological Entomology. 2011;36(5):605-15.
451 28. Ohba S-Y, Ohtsuka M, Sunahara T, Sonoda Y, Kawashima E, Takagi M. Differential
452 responses to predator cues between two mosquito species breeding in different habitats.
453 Ecological Entomology. 2012;37(5):410-8.
454 29. Buchanan AL, Hermann SL, Lund M, Szendrei Z. A meta-analysis of non-
455 consumptive predator effects in arthropods: the influence of organismal and environmental
456 characteristics. Oikos. 2017;126(9):1233-40.
457 30. Kesavaraju B, Juliano SA. Nature of Predation Risk Cues in Container Systems:
458 Mosquito Responses to Solid Residues From Predation. Ann Entomol Soc Am.
459 2010;103(6):1038-45.
460 31. Kesavaraju B, Juliano SA. Behavioral Responses of Aedes albopictus to a Predator
461 Are Correlated with Size-Dependent Risk of Predation. Annals of the Entomological Society
462 of America. 2008;101(6):1150-3.
463 32. van Uitregt VO, Hurst TP, Wilson RS. Greater costs of inducible behavioural
464 defences at cooler temperatures in larvae of the mosquito, Aedes notoscriptus. Evolutionary
465 Ecology. 2013;27(1):13-26.
466 33. Blackmore MS, Lord CC. The relationship between size and fecundity in Aedes
467 albopictus. Journal of Vector Ecology. 2000;25(2):212-7.
468 34. Hatala AJ, Harrington LC, Degner EC. Age and Body Size Influence Sperm Quantity
469 in Male Aedes albopictus (Diptera: Culicidae) Mosquitoes. Journal of Medical Entomology.
470 2018;55(4):1051-4.
471 35. Carrasquilla MC, Lounibos LP, Honorio NA, Murr S. Spermathecal Filling in Aedes
472 aegypti and Aedes albopictus: Effects of Female and Male Body Sizes and Species. Journal
473 of Medical Entomology. 2019;56(2):334-40.

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

474 36. Armbruster P, Hutchinson RA. Pupal mass and wing length as indicators of fecundity
475 in Aedes albopictus and Aedes geniculatus (Diptera : culicidae). Journal of Medical
476 Entomology. 2002;39(4):699-704.
477 37. Xue RD, Barnard DR, Muller GC. Effects of Body Size and Nutritional Regimen on
478 Survival in Adult Aedes albopictus (Diptera: Culicidae). Journal of Medical Entomology.
479 2010;47(5):778-82.
480 38. Alto BW, Reiskind MH, Lounibos LP. Size Alters Susceptibility of Vectors to
481 Dengue Virus Infection and Dissemination. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and
482 Hygiene. 2008;79(5):688-95.
483 39. Farjana T, Tuno N. Multiple Blood Feeding and Host-Seeking Behavior in Aedes
484 aegypti and Aedes albopictus (Diptera: Culicidae). Journal of Medical Entomology.
485 2013;50(4):838-46.
486 40. Leisnham PT, Sala LM, Juliano SA. Geographic variation in adult survival and
487 reproductive tactics of the mosquito Aedes albopictus. Journal of Medical Entomology.
488 2008;45(2):210-21.
489 41. Alto BW, Griswold MW, Lounibos LP. Habitat complexity and sex-dependent
490 predation of mosquito larvae in containers. Oecologia. 2005;146(2):300-10.
491 42. Cardoso HCB, da Silva BQ, de Assis TB, Lopez LCS. Effects of predation by the
492 copepod Mesocyclops ogunnus on the sex ratios of mosquito Aedes albopictus.
493 Hydrobiologia. 2013;705(1):55-61.
494 43. Dieng H, Boots M, Mwandawiro C, Satho T, Hasegawa M, Nyambura GJ, et al.
495 Effects of a copepod predator on the survivorship and development of Aedes albopictus
496 (Diptera: Culicidae). Medical Entomology and Zoology. 2003;54(2):187-92.
497 44. Peters RH. Animal abundance. In: Beck E, Birks HJB, Connor EF, editors. The
498 ecological implications of body size. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1983. p. 164-
499 83.
500 45. Metelmann S, Caminade C, Jones AE, Medlock JM, Baylis M, Morse AP. The UK's
501 suitability for Aedes albopictus in current and future climates. Journal of the Royal Society
502 Interface. 2019;16(152).
503 46. Russell MC, Qureshi A, Wilson CG, Cator LJ. Size, not temperature, drives cyclopoid
504 copepod predation of invasive mosquito larvae. PLOS ONE. 2021;16(2):e0246178.
505 47. Suarez MF, Marten GG, Clark GG. A Simple Method for Cultivating Fresh-Water
506 Copepods used in Biological-Control of Aedes-Aegypti. Journal of the American Mosquito
507 Control Association. 1992;8(4):409-12.
508 48. Donaldson GC, Keatinge WR, Nayha S. Changes in summer temperature and heat-
509 related mortality since 1971 in North Carolina, South Finland, and Southeast England.
510 Environmental Research. 2003;91(1):1-7.
511 49. Bastin JF, Clark E, Elliott T, Hart S, van den Hoogen J, Hordijk I, et al.
512 Understanding climate change from a global analysis of city analogues. Plos One.
513 2019;14(7).
514 50. Gosling SN, McGregor GR, Paldy A. Climate change and heat-related mortality in six
515 cities Part 1: model construction and validation. International Journal of Biometeorology.
516 2007;51(6):525-40.
517 51. Teng HJ, Apperson CS. Identification of larval instars of Aedes albopictus (Skuse)
518 and Aedes triseriatus (Say) (Diptera: culicidae) based on head capsule size. Journal of Vector
519 Ecology. 1996;21(2):186-91.
520 52. Siegel JP, Novak RJ, Ruesink WG. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WING LENGTH
521 AND DRY-WEIGHT OF MOSQUITOS. Journal of the American Mosquito Control
522 Association. 1994;10(2):186-96.

bioRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.16.460697; this version posted September 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

523 53. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,
524 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020.
525 54. Christensen BM, Li JY, Chen CC, Nappi AJ. Melanization immune responses in
526 mosquito vectors. Trends Parasitol. 2005;21(4):192-9.
527 55. Lai SC, Chen CC, Hou RF. Immunolocalization of prophenoloxidase in the process of
528 wound healing in the mosquito Armigeres subalbatus (Diptera : Culicidae). Journal of
529 Medical Entomology. 2002;39(2):266-74.
530 56. Nakhleh J, El Moussawi L, Osta MA. The Melanization Response in Insect Immunity.
531 In: Ligoxygakis P, editor. Insect Immunity. Advances in Insect Physiology. 522017. p. 83-
532 109.
533 57. Chapman RF, editor. The insects: structure and function: Cambridge University Press;
534 1998.
535 58. Lee KP, Simpson SJ, Wilson K. Dietary protein-quality influences melanization and
536 immune function in an insect. Functional Ecology. 2008;22(6):1052-61.
537 59. Awasthi AK, Wu CH, Tsai KH, King CC, Hwang JS. How Does the Ambush
538 Predatory Copepod Megacyclops formosanus (Harada, 1931) Capture Mosquito Larvae of
539 Aedes aegypti? Zoological Studies. 2012;51(7):927-36.
540 60. Puggioli A, Carrieri M, Dindo ML, Medici A, Lees RS, Gilles JRL, et al.
541 Development of Aedes albopictus (Diptera: Culicidae) Larvae Under Different Laboratory
542 Conditions. Journal of Medical Entomology. 2017;54(1):142-9.
543 61. Briegel H, Timmermann SE. Aedes albopictus (Diptera : Culicidae): Physiological
544 aspects of development and reproduction. Journal of Medical Entomology. 2001;38(4):566-
545 71.
546 62. Wormington JD, Juliano SA. Sexually dimorphic body size and development time
547 plasticity in Aedes mosquitoes (Diptera: Culicidae). Evolutionary Ecology Research.
548 2014;16(3):223-34.
549 63. Mercer DR, Wettach GR, Smith JL. Effects of larval density and predation by
550 Toxorhynchites amboinensis on Aedes polynesiensis (Diptera : culicidae) developing in
551 coconuts. Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association. 2005;21(4):425-31.
552 64. Kesavaraju B, Juliano SA. No Evolutionary Response to Four Generations of
553 Laboratory Selection on Antipredator Behavior of Aedes albopictus: Potential Implications
554 for Biotic Resistance to Invasion. Journal of Medical Entomology. 2009;46(4):772-81.

555