Size, not temperature, drives cyclopoid copepod predation of invasive mosquito larvae

Marie C. Russell[1]*, Alima Qureshi[1], Christopher G. Wilson[1], and Lauren J. Cator[1]

[1]Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, Silwood Park Campus, Ascot SL5 7PY, UK

*Corresponding author. E-mail: m.russell17@imperial.ac.uk

Abstract

During range expansion, invasive species can experience new thermal regimes. Differences between the thermal performance of local and invasive species can alter species interactions, including predator-prey interactions. The Asian tiger mosquito, *Aedes albopictus*, is a known vector of several viral diseases of public health importance. It has successfully invaded many regions across the globe and currently threatens to invade regions of the UK where conditions would support seasonal activity. We assessed the functional response and predation efficiency of the cyclopoid copepods *Macrocyclops albidus* and *Megacyclops viridis* from South East England, UK against newly-hatched French *Ae. albopictus* larvae. First, we assessed the functional response of each copepod species at 15, 20, and 25°C. We then examined the predation efficiency of both copepod species at the same three temperatures, holding the density of mosquito larvae prey constant. Predator-absent controls were included in all experiments to account for background prey mortality. We found that temperature was not a significant driver of predator-prey interactions over temperatures likely to be experienced in UK larval mosquito habitats. Both copepod species exhibited type II functional responses across all three temperature treatments and there was no significant change in predation efficiency due to temperature. We did observe differences between predator species. The predation efficiency of *M. viridis* was approximately 7.5 percentage points higher than that of *M. albidus*. Furthermore, there was a significant positive relationship between the body masses of the copepods and their predation efficiencies, and copepod body mass explained more of the variability in predation efficiency than copepod species. The type II functional responses indicated that both *M. albidus* and *M. viridis* would be suitable biocontrol agents in the event of an *Ae. albopictus* invasion in the UK, but our analysis of predation efficiency suggests that *M. viridis* would be a slightly superior predator due to its larger size. More research is needed to quantify how well the conditions of artificial container mosquito habitats can support the long-term stability of different copepod populations. This work highlights the importance of size relationships in predicting interactions between invading prey and local predators.

Keywords

cyclopoid copepods, predation efficiency, functional response, invasion, biocontrol, public health, range expansion, vector-borne

Introduction

An invasion of the Asian tiger mosquito, *Aedes albopictus*, into the UK is a major public health concern. This species is not only an aggressive nuisance biter, but also a known vector of arboviruses such as dengue, chikungunya, yellow fever, and Zika (Centers for Disease and Prevention, 2017). The ability of *Ae. albopictus* mosquitoes to lay desiccation-resistant eggs has enabled their introduction into cities across the globe, often via used tire shipments (Eritja et al., 2005, Juliano and Lounibos, 2005, Lounibos, 2002, Medlock et al., 2006). According to the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, *Ae. albopictus* populations have already established throughout the vast majority of Italy, southern France, and as far north as the French department of Aisne (European Centre for Disease and Control, 2019). Although the species has not yet established in the UK, it has been introduced in Kent, a coastal county in the southeast of the UK, where 37 *Ae. albopictus* eggs were found in September of 2016 (European Centre for Disease and Control, 2019, Medlock et al., 2017).

Approximately one decade prior to the first recorded introduction of *Ae. albopictus* into the UK, a model based on abiotic factors including photoperiod, rainfall, and temperature suggested that upon introduction, *Ae. albopictus* adults would be active from May to September in areas near London and the southern coastal ports (Medlock et al., 2006). A more recent study that also considered diurnal temperature range and human population density found that the most suitable areas for *Ae. albopictus* in the UK currently are centered around London (Metelmann et al., 2019). Owing to the warming climate, the UK is expected to become increasingly suitable for *Ae. albopictus* establishment; projections of climate and human population conditions into future decades suggest that if introduced, the vector species could establish throughout most of England and southern Wales during the 2060s (Metelmann et al., 2019). Another recent model predicts that the UK will report *Ae. albopictus* presence by either 2050 or 2080, depending on the patterns of future greenhouse gas emissions (Kraemer et al., 2019).

Predation by copepods has been identified as a biological method for controlling *Ae. albopictus* in Europe following the success of past field trials (Baldacchino et al., 2015). The cyclopoid copepod *Macrocyclops albidus* has previously been used to eliminate *Ae. albopictus* populations from tire piles in New Orleans, Louisiana, USA (Marten, 1990a). In 1994, *Mesocyclops aspericornis* were distributed into wells in Charters Towers, Queensland, Australia to eliminate *Ae. aegypti* populations (Russell et al., 1996). In addition,

Mesocyclops copepods were used to effectively control populations of *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus* in six communes in northern Vietnam (Kay et al., 2002). A semi-field study conducted in Bologna, Italy in 2007 found that *M. albidus* reduced the *Ae. albopictus* density in experimental drums by greater than 99% (Veronesi et al., 2015). In the UK, laboratory experiments using *M. albidus* and *Megacyclops viridis* from Northern Ireland as predators against *Culex pipiens* mosquito larvae from Surrey, UK have shown that these cyclopoid copepods are effective control agents against *Cx. pipiens* and that the predators' attack rates tend to increase with temperature (Cuthbert et al., 2018b). However, the use of UK copepods as predators of invasive *Ae. albopictus* larvae has not been thoroughly examined over the range of temperatures that the invasive larvae are predicted to experience. Due to the potentially negative impacts of exporting copepods to non-native regions for biocontrol purposes (Coelho and Henry, 2017), it is important to investigate the performance of copepods local to the predicted sites of *Ae. albopictus* establishment: London and South East England.

Populations of *M. albidus* and *M. viridis* cyclopoid copepods from the benthos of the Cumbrian lakes in the UK have previously been studied at temperatures from 5 to 20°C (Laybournparry et al., 1988). Based on the dry body masses of adult specimens, males were consistently smaller than females, and *M. albidus* copepods were consistently smaller than *M. viridis* (Laybournparry et al., 1988). The general adult body length ranges for *M. albidus* and *M. viridis* are 1.3 – 2.5 mm (Einsle, 1993) and 1.2 – 3 mm (Dussart, 1969, Einsle, 1988, Kiefer, 1960), respectively. These are small enough to enable the distribution of copepod cultures to mosquito larval habitats using "a simple backpack sprayer with a 5 mm hole in the nozzle," as has been previously recommended (Marten, 1990b). Copepods reproduce sexually, and females that can produce new egg sacs every 3-6 days tend to predominate in mature populations (Marten and Reid, 2007). Cyclopoid copepods are considered sit-and-wait ambush predators because of their attack behaviors, which have been described in six steps: encounter, aiming, stalking, attack, capture, and ingestion (Awasthi et al., 2012). When preying on mosquito larvae, copepods often avoid ingesting the head and thorax (Awasthi et al., 2012).

Functional response curves were originally developed to relate the number of prey attacked by an invertebrate predator to the prey density (Holling, 1966, Holling, 1959). Previous work has suggested that the best predators to use in an "inundative release" biocontrol program are those that have type II functional responses to prey density, so that the predators' attack rates are high even at low prey densities (Daane et al., 1996). Predators that display a type III functional response against an invasive prey species —such as signal crayfish (*Pacifastacus*

leniusculus) against New Zealand mud snails (*Potamopyrgus antipodarum*)— may be able to limit the spread of the invader, but cannot prevent it from establishing (Twardochleb et al., 2012). Like other interspecific interactions, predation is likely to be thermally sensitive because each species may react differently to changes in temperature (Grigaltchik et al., 2012, Kruse et al., 2008).

In this study, we determined the type of functional response of *M. albidus* and *M. viridis* copepods from Surrey, UK against *Ae. albopictus* larvae from Montpellier, France at three different temperatures likely to be experienced by container-dwelling mosquito larvae in London and South East England. We also calculated predation efficiency of both copepod species at a constant mosquito prey density under the same three temperatures. We found that both *M. albidus* and *M. viridis* display type II functional response curves, and that both would therefore be appropriate for use in an inundative release program. *M. viridis* had a higher predation efficiency, likely because of its larger size. No significant effect of temperature, tested at 15, 20, and 25°C, on the predation interaction was detected by either type of analysis.

Materials and methods

Collection of field temperature data:

Previous work has suggested that the microclimates experienced by *Ae. albopictus* are not represented well by climate data reported from local weather stations (Murdock et al., 2017). Since used tire shipments are a common source of *Ae. albopictus* introductions (Eritja et al., 2005, Juliano and Lounibos, 2005, Lounibos, 2002, Medlock et al., 2006), we measured the temperature of rainwater collected in used car tires that were divided between an urban London site and a suburban site. These temperature data provided rough guidelines for our choice of the three temperatures to be tested in our functional response and predation efficiency experiments. The minimum water temperature was 9°C, the 25th percentile was 16.1°C, the median was 18.1°C, the 75th percentile was 20°C, and the maximum was 25°C. Thus, our choice of 15, 20, and 25°C as the three main temperatures of interest is representative of more than 75% of the tire water temperatures recorded in the field from May through September of 2018 (Supplementary Material).

Local copepod cultures:

Adult gravid female copepods were collected from the edge of Longside Lake in Egham, Surrey, UK using a 53 micron sieve (Reefphyto Ltd, UK) in August of 2018. Separate cultures were started from each gravid female. The copepods were kept in 3 L containers of spring water (Highland Spring, UK) at a 12:12 light/dark cycle, and 20 ± 1°C, a temperature previously found to increase the portion of their life cycle spent in the reproductive phase (Laybournparry et al., 1988). *Chilomonas paramecium* and *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 (Suarez et al., 1992). Adult copepods were identified as *Macrocyclops albidus* (Jurine, 1820) and *Megacyclops viridis* (Jurine, 1820) by Maria Holyńska from the Museum and Institute of Zoology in Warsaw, Poland.

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. The colony maintenance temperature of 27°C was chosen because it falls at the upper bound of the 95% confidence interval that was fitted around mean daily Montpellier temperatures from 1996-2005 in the summer months, and these temperatures are expected to increase in the coming decades (Zidon et al., 2016). 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).

Design of functional response experiments:

Adult non-gravid female copepods, identified by larger relative size, were removed from their culture and each was placed in a Petri dish (diameter: 50 mm, height: 20.3 mm) holding 20 mL of spring water. At approximately 11am, the copepods were placed in three different controlled environments set to 15 ± 1, 20 ± 1, and 25 ± 1°C, all at a 12:12 light/dark cycle to begin a 24 h starvation and temperature-acclimation period for the predators (Fig. 1). Each combination of copepod species (*M. albidus* or *M. viridis*) and temperature had 28 copepods, each

one held in its own Petri dish; there were 168 copepods in total (Fig. S3a). Ten additional gravid females were randomly selected from each species of copepod and preserved in 80% ethanol solution for size measurements.

At noon, groups of 87 newly-hatched *Ae. albopictus* larvae (Supplementary Material) were each pipetted into a small plastic tub containing 150 mL of spring water to strongly dilute any residual food from the hatching media. Each tub of 87 larvae was then split into seven Petri dishes each containing 20 mL of spring water and the following larval densities: 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 24, and 32. All larvae were counted into dishes at room temperature and then divided into the three different controlled environments, allowing a 12 h temperature acclimation period before predator introduction (Fig. 1). For each combination of copepod species and temperature, there were 35 Petri dishes containing a total of 435 newly-hatched *Ae. albopictus* larvae, with a total of 2,610 larvae used across all predator treatments and controls (Fig. S3a). This sample size allowed for four replicates of each larval density and one predator-absent control at each density, for each combination of copepod species and temperature (Fig. S3a).



Fig. 1. General schedule of both functional response and predation efficiency experiments

At approximately 11am the next day, the copepod predators held at three different temperatures were introduced to larval Petri dishes of matching controlled temperatures (Fig. 1). The copepods were removed after a 6 h period of predation (Fig. 1), which follows the schedule of similar previously-conducted experiments (Cuthbert

et al., 2018a, Cuthbert et al., 2019). Each copepod was preserved in 80% ethanol and labelled to match its larval Petri dish so that its body size could later be measured and matched to the larval count data. Immediately following the removal of the copepods, the number of surviving larvae in each Petri dish was counted and recorded. In addition, the body lengths of the 10 gravid females selected from each species of copepod, as well as the body lengths of all copepods included as predators in the functional response experiments, were measured from the front of the cephalosome to the end of the last urosomite (Dussart and Defaye, 2001).

Design of predation efficiency experiment:

In addition to functional response, predation efficiency has previously been measured to assess copepod predators of mosquito larvae (Baldacchino et al., 2017). We measured predation efficiency using a constant density of 24 larvae in 20 mL of spring water. This density was chosen from the higher end of the range of densities used in the functional response experiments, where the curves generally start to plateau (Juliano, 2001) (Fig. 2a).

Ae. albopictus larvae were hatched (Supplementary Material) and any residual food was diluted in spring water following the same procedure used for the functional response experiments. Adult non-gravid female copepods were each placed in a Petri dish at approximately 11am for a 24 h period of starvation and acclimation to three different temperature settings: 15 ± 1, 20 ± 1, and 25 ± 1°C, all at a 12:12 light/dark cycle (Fig. 1). The largest non-gravid copepods of each species were selected to minimize the risk of selecting males or immature stages. The Petri dishes containing larvae were split into the three different temperature settings 12 h prior to the introduction of copepod predators, and there was a 6 h period of predation between 11am and 5pm (Fig. 1). At the end of the 6 h period, the copepods were removed, and each was stored in 80% ethanol and labelled according to its larval Petri dish. The number of surviving larvae in each Petri dish was recorded immediately after removing the copepods.

At each of the three temperature settings, there was a total of 24 Petri dishes, each containing 24 larvae (1,728 larvae across all temperatures); the 24 dishes were divided into three groups (n = 8): one with *M. albidus* predation, one with *M. viridis* predation, and one as a control (Fig. S3b). Every predator treatment was matched to a control that had been held at the same temperature (Fig. S3b). Each temperature setting had a total of 192

control larvae. Larval background mortality was 5% at 15°C, 11% at 20°C, and 3% at 25°C. A total of 24 *M. albidus* and 24 *M. viridis* copepods were used in this experiment. The body lengths of these copepods were measured after each was preserved in 80% ethanol.

Functional response curve analysis:

The general shapes of the functional response curves were determined for each combination of copepod species and temperature using predator-present data. When polynomial logistic functions are fit to describe the relationship between the proportion of larvae killed and the initial larval density, a negative first-order term indicates a type II response, and a positive first-order term indicates a type III response (Juliano, 2001, Pritchard et al., 2017). The "frair_test" function ("frair" package, R version 3.4.2) was used to determine the shapes of the functional response curves according to the sign and significance of first-order and second-order terms in logistic regressions (Pritchard et al., 2017). Three observations were excluded from the *M. albidus* at 25°C group. Two exclusions were due to copepod deaths during the starvation period, and the third was because two copepod predators were introduced into the same Petri dish. Three observations were excluded from the *M. viridis* at 25°C group, and one was excluded from the *M. viridis* at 15°C group; all four *M. viridis* exclusions were due to insufficient body length of the copepod indicating that these predators could have been either males or immatures, rather than adult non-gravid females.

Mortality of *Ae. albopictus* larvae was observed in controls for five out of the six combinations of copepod species and temperature. *M. viridis* predators at 25°C was the only group without larval mortality in any of the controls. For *M. albidus*, across all control larvae (n=87) at 15°C, three deaths were observed (3% mortality); four deaths were observed at 20°C (5% mortality); and eleven deaths were observed at 25°C (13% mortality). For *M. viridis*, two deaths were observed among control larvae at 15°C (2% mortality), and three deaths were observed at 20°C (3% mortality). Mortality rates of aedine larvae in predator-absent controls have previously been observed to be as high as 20% (Baldacchino et al., 2017). To account for background mortality, the functional response parameters (attack coefficient and handling time) were estimated by simulating the following differential equation:

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = -\frac{bN^{1+q}}{1+bhN^{1+q}}P - mN \qquad \text{eqn 1}$$

where *dN/dt* is the change in prey density over time, *b* is the attack coefficient, *q* is an exponent that can fall between a type II response (q = 0) and a type III response (q = 1), *h* is the handling time, *P* is the predator density, and *m* is the mortality rate (Rosenbaum and Rall, 2018).

Since background prey mortality should not alter the general shape of the functional response curve (Rosenbaum and Rall, 2018), the *q* parameter was fixed to either 0 or 1 based on the results of the "frair_test" function, which only considers data from predator-present treatments (Pritchard et al., 2017). The attack coefficient (*b*) was given a starting value of one, the handling time (*h*) had a starting value equivalent to the inverse of the maximum feeding rate, and the mortality rate (*m*), if applicable, was given a starting value of 0.01 (Rosenbaum and Rall, 2018).

Predation efficiency analysis:

For each pair of predator treatment and control (Fig. S3b), the copepod's predation efficiency was calculated according to Abbott's formula (Abbott, 1987, Baldacchino et al., 2017):

$$\text{Predation efficiency} = \frac{Number\ alive\ in\ control - Number\ alive\ in\ treatment}{Number\ alive\ in\ control}\ (100) \qquad \text{eqn 2}$$

Copepod body lengths, measured in mm, were converted to estimates of body mass (mg) using an equation from previous studies (Alcaraz and Strickler, 1988, Klekowski and Shushkina, 1966, Novich et al., 2014):

$$\text{Mass} = 0.055 \times \text{length}^{2.73} \qquad \text{eqn 3}$$

Two linear regression models were fitted to explain predation efficiency. The first tested temperature and copepod species as predictors (eqn S1), and the second tested copepod body mass in place of species (eqn S2). Both models were also fitted without temperature predictors (Supplementary Material).

Body mass difference between copepod species by experimental design:

Among the predators used in the functional response experiments, each *M. albidus* copepod was randomly paired with an *M. viridis* copepod (80 pairs). Predation efficiency predators were also randomly paired, yielding 23 pairs of the two species. For each pair, the *M. albidus* body mass was subtracted from that of *M. viridis*, generating 103 differences in body mass due to species. A Wilcoxon rank sum test was used to determine if the body mass differences between copepod species varied by experimental design.

Analyses were completed in R version 3.4.2, and all data will be made available from the Dryad Digital Repository.

Results

Functional response curves:

A type II functional response, demonstrated through logistic regression results, was observed in every combination of copepod species and temperature (Table S1). Methods capable of accounting for background mortality were used to graph the functional response curves, and to estimate the attack coefficient and handling time parameters (Fig. 2).

Attack coefficient estimates are higher for *M. viridis* than for *M. albidus* in some instances. However, there are no significant differences between any of the six estimates due to copepod species, temperature, or any interaction of those variables (Fig. 2b). Similarly, the lower handling time estimates for *M. viridis* are not significant; thus, no differences can be attributed to copepod species, temperature, or an interaction of those predictors (Fig. 2c). For both parameter estimates, *M. albidus* predation at 25°C has the largest standard error; this is likely due to the relatively high background mortality observed in this group (Fig. 2b, 2c).



Fig. 2a.) Type II functional response curves for each combination of copepod species and temperature (Points are shown in the "jitter" position.) **b.)** Attack coefficient estimates by copepod species and temperature (Error bars represent ± the standard error.) **c.)** Handling time estimates by copepod species and temperature (Error bars represent ± the standard error.)

Predation efficiency:

Predation efficiency values ranged from 5.0% to 58.3%, with a median of 21.7%, and a slightly right-skewed distribution (skewness = 0.61, kurtosis = 2.9).

A linear model testing copepod species and temperature category as predictors of predation efficiency explained 6.8% of the variance in predation efficiency (Table 1). The predation efficiency of *M. viridis* copepods was 25.7%, significantly higher (p-value = 0.0288) than that of *M. albidus* copepods, which had a predation efficiency of 18.2%, when controlling for differences in temperature (Table 1, Fig. 3a). Interactions between

species and temperature were not significant. Removing the temperature predictors from the model increased the adjusted R^2 value to 0.081 and decreased the AIC from 368.1 to 365.6 (Table S2).

Table 1. Linear regression of predation efficiency by copepod species and temperature (n = 47)

Parameter	Estimate	Standard Error	p-value	Adjusted R^2	AIC
Intercept	18.19	3.30	1.92×10^{-6}	0.068	368.1
Species (*M. viridis*, ref = *M. albidus*)	7.54	3.33	0.0288		
Temperature (20°C, ref = 15°C)	0.80	4.04	0.8432		
Temperature (25°C, ref = 15°C)	4.56	4.10	0.2731		

A linear model testing copepod body mass and temperature category as predictors of predation efficiency explained 14.0% of the variance in predation efficiency (Table 2). For each 0.1 mg increase in copepod body mass, the predation efficiency increased by approximately 3.4 percentage points (p-value = 0.0042), when controlling for differences in temperature (Table 2, Fig. 3b). Interactions between body mass and temperature were not significant. Removing the temperature predictors from the model increased the adjusted R^2 value to 0.156 and decreased the AIC from 364.3 to 361.5 (Table S3).

Table 2. Linear regression of predation efficiency by copepod body mass and temperature (n = 47)

Parameter	Estimate	Standard Error	p-value	Adjusted R^2	AIC
Intercept	9.72	4.88	0.0528	0.140	364.3
Body Mass (mg)	34.44	11.37	0.0042		
Temperature (20°C, ref = 15°C)	0.83	3.88	0.8305		
Temperature (25°C, ref = 15°C)	4.04	3.94	0.3106		



Fig. 3a.) Bar chart of predation efficiency by copepod species and temperature (Error bars represent ± the standard error.) **b.)** Predation efficiency by copepod body mass (Points are shown in the "jitter" position.)

Body mass differences between copepod species by experimental design:

M. viridis copepods were larger than *M. albidus* copepods in both the functional response and the predation efficiency experiments, and both copepod species were larger in the predation efficiency experiments than in the functional response experiments (Supplementary Material, Fig. S4).

The body mass difference between copepod species was greater in the predation efficiency experiments than in the functional response experiments (p-value = 0.0136). In the predation efficiency experiments, the median increase from *M. albidus* to *M. viridis* was 0.24 mg, while in the functional response experiments, the median increase was 0.12 mg.

Discussion

Both *M. albidus* and *M. viridis* copepods collected from Surrey, UK would be appropriate for use in an inundative release biocontrol program because both predator species display type II functional response curves when presented with invasive *Ae. albopictus* larvae (Table S1). Type II functional response curves are preferred because they demonstrate the predator's ability to eliminate invasive populations at low prey densities (Daane et al., 1996). Another study using *M. albidus* and *M. viridis* from Northern Ireland against *Culex* mosquitoes from Surrey, UK also found evidence of type II functional response curves (Cuthbert et al., 2018b). No significant differences in functional response type, attack coefficient, or handling time were observed due to copepod species or temperature, tested at 15, 20, and 25°C (Fig. 2). A previous study of predator-prey interactions involving sit-and-wait copepod predators found no significant difference in the attack parameter of the functional response across three different temperatures: 18, 22, and 26°C (Novich et al., 2014). In addition, we found that temperature categorical variables were not significant predictors of copepod predation efficiency against *Ae. albopictus* larvae, and removing these predictors decreased the AICs and increased the adjusted R^2 values of our linear models (Tables 1-2, S2-S3).

Our handling time estimates (Fig. 2c) are likely over-estimations of ingestion time and may also include some of the predators' search time. Although a cyclopoid copepod has previously been observed eating a chironomid larva for more than 30 minutes (Fryer, 1957a), another study states that a mosquito larva is usually consumed

within a few minutes (Marten and Reid, 2007). A previous study that compared directly-observed handling times to handling times fitted by functional response calculations found that the directly-observed handling times were significantly lower than the fitted handling time estimates (Poole et al., 2007). However, when handling time was assumed to include both the time that the predator takes to move to the prey, and the ingestion time, there was no significant difference between observed and estimated handling times (Poole et al., 2007). The prey-searching techniques of *M. albidus* and *M. viridis* have previously been described as "[relying] on bumping into … prey during the course of … meanderings" (Fryer, 1957a). Thus, it is plausible that inefficient searching made up a large portion of our handling time estimates (Fig. 2c).

We found that *M. viridis* was a significantly more efficient predator of *Ae. albopictus* than *M. albidus* (Tables 1 & S2, Fig. 3). An analysis of the gut contents of English Lake District copepods previously found that 15.7% of *M. viridis* had consumed dipterous larvae, compared to only 7.4% of *M. albidus* (Fryer, 1957b). Thus, it is possible that English *M. viridis* may be better adapted to feeding on mosquito larvae than English *M. albidus*. A study using *M. albidus* and *M. viridis* from Northern Ireland against *Culex* mosquitoes from Surrey, UK suggested that *M. albidus* is more effective than *M. viridis* as a biocontrol (Cuthbert et al., 2018b). It appears this is not the case for invasive *Ae. albopictus* prey. Blaustein and Margalit (1994) found that an aedine species (*Ae. aegypti*) was more vulnerable to predation by *M. viridis* than *Cx. pipiens*, despite the larger head capsule width of *Ae. aegypti*. Higher predation efficiency against *Aedes* than against *Culex* may be due to differences in larval anatomy and activity patterns. Previous work has attributed higher survival of *Culex* larvae to lower levels of motility, and to their long bristles, or spines, that either prevent copepod attacks from being successful, or deter attacks entirely by creating the illusion of larger size (Dieng et al., 2003, Marten and Reid, 2007, Soumare and Cilek, 2011). A more recent study of *M. albidus* and *M. viridis* from Northern Ireland as predators of both *Paramecium caudatum* and *Cx. pipiens* reported that *M. viridis* consumed more prey organisms overall than *M. albidus* (Cuthbert et al., 2019).

The larger size of *M. viridis* contributes to the higher predation efficiency observed among that species against *Ae. albopictus* (Fig. 3b). When the binary copepod species variable (Table 1, Table S2) was replaced with a continuous copepod body mass variable (Table 2, Table S3), the adjusted R-squared values increased, and the AICs decreased. The linear regression model with the highest adjusted R-squared value, 16%, was the model with copepod body mass as the sole predictor of predation efficiency (Table S3). This adjusted R-squared value

is still low, indicating substantial variation within the predation interaction. The positive relationship we observed between copepod body mass and predation efficiency (Tables 2 & S3, Fig. 3b) is consistent with the findings of a previous meta-analysis of crustacean predation of immature fish, which showed that the predation rate was negatively related to the prey/predator size ratio (Paradis et al., 1996). According to the theory that, at equilibrium, "the rate of food intake is equal to the rate at which food is leaving the gut" (Charnov and Orians, 1973), our results suggest that *M. viridis* may have a higher gut clearance rate than *M. albidus*, possibly due to its larger size.

Although higher predation efficiency was observed among *M. viridis* (Tables 1 & S2, Fig. 3), there were no significant differences between the two copepod species in their functional response parameter estimates (Fig. 2), perhaps because the predation efficiency experiment had a larger sample size of observations for each combination of predictors, and therefore more power to detect differences. In addition, while the size difference between *M. albidus* and *M. viridis* was significant in both experimental designs (Supplementary Material, Fig. S4), there was a greater difference in size due to species among the copepods used in the predation efficiency experiment than among the copepods used in the functional response experiment.

Although we did not find any difference in functional response parameter estimates or predation efficiency due to temperature, the temperature at which copepods are cultured impacts their size (Laybournparry et al., 1988), and our results show that copepod size is a determinant of their predation efficiency. A previous study, in which UK *M. albidus* and *M. viridis* were cultured at six different temperatures between 5 and 20°C, showed a consistent negative relationship between adult body mass of both species and culturing temperature (Laybournparry et al., 1988). Although cultures tend to have higher rates of reproduction at higher temperatures (Laybournparry et al., 1988), we recommend that the importance of individual body mass be taken into consideration when determining the optimal temperature for mass copepod culturing. Smaller cyclopoid copepod species tend to have shorter development times, but larger species of cyclopoid copepod, such as *M. viridis*, tend to exhibit greater resistance to starvation (Dieng et al., 2003). For example, *M. viridis* from Nagasaki, Japan can live for an average of 47 days when provided with only tap water, and for more than 70 days on average when provided with either mosquito larvae or *Paramecium caudatum* as prey (Dieng et al., 2003). Further research on population dynamics of *M. viridis* and *M. albidus* copepods and body size in tires is needed before recommending that *M. viridis* be used instead of *M. albidus*.

As the invasion of *Ae. albopictus* into the UK progresses, it may become more relevant to conduct predation experiments on mosquito larvae that are hatched from colonies acclimated to lower temperatures. In our predation efficiency and functional response experiments, the *Ae. albopictus* larvae were the product of a colony that was reared under conditions experienced on warm summer days in Montpellier, France. This approach is currently valid because *Ae. albopictus* has not yet established in the UK and eggs that could be introduced via used tire shipments would be naïve to UK weather conditions. However, in future decades, it may be more appropriate to use *Ae. albopictus* larvae from a colony that was reared under a temperature regime reflective of the diurnal temperature range experienced in the southern UK.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Flora Dickie, Maria Holyńska, and Ross Cuthbert for their advice and assistance. This project has received resources funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No 731060 (Infravec2). This work was primarily funded by a President's PhD Scholarship from Imperial College London to Marie C. Russell.

Author Contributions

Lauren J. Cator and Marie C. Russell conceived the ideas and designed the methodology of the predation experiments; Alima Qureshi, Lauren J. Cator, and Marie C. Russell collected the data; Christopher G. Wilson provided critical advice on cultivating the copepods; Alima Qureshi improved the *Ae. albopictus* hatching procedure; Marie C. Russell analyzed the data and led the writing of the manuscript. All authors contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval for publication.

References

ABBOTT, W. S. 1987. A method of computing the effectiveness of an insecticide. 1925. *J Am Mosq Control Assoc,* 3**,** 302-3.

ALCARAZ, M. & STRICKLER, J. R. 1988. LOCOMOTION IN COPEPODS - PATTERN OF MOVEMENTS AND ENERGETICS OF CYCLOPS. *Hydrobiologia,* 167**,** 409-414.

AWASTHI, A. K., WU, C. H., TSAI, K. H., KING, C. C. & HWANG, J. S. 2012. How Does the Ambush Predatory Copepod Megacyclops formosanus (Harada, 1931) Capture Mosquito Larvae of Aedes aegypti? *Zoological Studies,* 51**,** 927-936.

BALDACCHINO, F., BRUNO, M. C., VISENTIN, P., BLONDEL, K., ARNOLDI, D., HAUFFE, H. C. & RIZZOLI, A. 2017. Predation efficiency of copepods against the new invasive mosquito species Aedes koreicus (Diptera: Culicidae) in Italy. *European Zoological Journal,* 84**,** 43-48.

BALDACCHINO, F., CAPUTO, B., CHANDRE, F., DRAGO, A., DELLA TORRE, A., MONTARSI, F. & RIZZOLI, A. 2015. Control methods against invasive Aedes mosquitoes in Europe: a review. *Pest management science,* 71**,** 1471-1485.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE, C. & PREVENTION 2017. Surveillance and Control of Aedes aegypti and Aedes albopictus in the United States.

CHARNOV, E. & ORIANS, G. 1973. *Optimal Foraging: Some Theoretical Explorations*.

COELHO, P. & HENRY, R. 2017. *Copepods Against Aedes Mosquitoes: A Very Risky Strategy*.

CUTHBERT, R. N., CALLAGHAN, A. & DICK, J. T. A. 2018a. Dye another day: the predatory impact of cyclopoid copepods on larval mosquito Culex pipiens is unaffected by dyed environments. *Journal of Vector Ecology,* 43**,** 334-336.

CUTHBERT, R. N., CALLAGHAN, A. & DICK, J. T. A. 2019. The Effect of the Alternative Prey, Paramecium caudatum (Peniculida: Parameciidae), on the Predation of Culex pipiens (Diptera: Culicidae) by the Copepods Macrocyclops albidus and Megacyclops viridis (Cyclopoida: Cyclopidae). *Journal of Medical Entomology,* 56**,** 276-279.

CUTHBERT, R. N., DICK, J. T. A., CALLAGHAN, A. & DICKEY, J. W. E. 2018b. Biological control agent selection under environmental change using functional responses, abundances and fecundities; the Relative Control Potential (RCP) metric. *Biological Control,* 121**,** 50-57.

DAANE, K. M., YOKOTA, G. Y., ZHENG, Y. & HAGEN, K. S. 1996. Inundative release of common green lacewings (Neuroptera: Chrysopidae) to suppress Erythroneura variabilis and E-elegantula (Homoptera: Cicadellidae) in vineyards. *Environmental Entomology,* 25**,** 1224-1234.

DIENG, H., BOOTS, M., TUNO, N., TSUDA, Y. & TAKAGI, M. 2003. Life history effects of prey choice by copepods: Implications for biocontrol of vector mosquitoes. *Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association,* 19**,** 67-73.

DUSSART, B. 1969. *Les copépodes des eaux continentales d'Europe Occidentale. 2: Cyclopoïdes et Biologie,* Paris, Editions N Boubée & Cie.

DUSSART, B. H. & DEFAYE, D. 2001. *Introduction to the Copepoda,* Leiden, Backhuys Publishers.

EINSLE, U. 1993. *Crustacea: Copepoda: Calanoida und Cyclopoida*, Gustav Fischer.

EINSLE, U. K. 1988. TAXONOMY OF THE GENUS MEGACYCLOPS (CRUSTACEA, COPEPODA) - MORPHOMETRY AND THE USE OF ENZYME ELECTROPHORESIS. *Hydrobiologia,* 167**,** 387-391.

ERITJA, R., ESCOSA, R., LUCIENTES, J., MARQUES, E., MOLINA, R., ROIZ, D. & RUIZ, S. 2005. Worldwide invasion of vector mosquitoes: present European distribution and challenges for Spain. *Biological Invasions,* 7**,** 87-97.

EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR DISEASE, P. & CONTROL. 2019. *Aedes albopictus - current known distribution: January 2019*.

FRYER, G. 1957a. The feeding mechanism of some freshwater cyclopoid copepods. *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London,* 129.

FRYER, G. 1957b. The food of some freshwater cyclopoid copepods and its ecological significance. *Journal of Animal Ecology,* 26**,** 263-286.

GRIGALTCHIK, V. S., WARD, A. J. W. & SEEBACHER, F. 2012. Thermal acclimation of interactions: differential responses to temperature change alter predator-prey relationship. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences,* 279**,** 4058-4064.

HOLLING, C. S. 1959. Some Characteristics of Simple Types of Predation and Parasitism. *The Canadian Entomologist,* 91**,** 385-398.

HOLLING, C. S. 1966. The Functional Response of Invertebrate Predators to Prey Density. *Memoirs of the Entomological Society of Canada,* 98**,** 5-86.

JULIANO, S. A. 2001. Non-linear curve fitting: predation and functional response curves. *In:* SCHEINER, S. M. & GUREVITCH, J. (eds.) *Design and Analysis of Ecological Experiments.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

JULIANO, S. A. & LOUNIBOS, L. P. 2005. Ecology of invasive mosquitoes: effects on resident species and on human health. *Ecology Letters,* 8**,** 558-574.

KAY, B. H., NAM, V. S., VAN TIEN, T., YEN, N. T., PHONG, T. V., DIEP, V. T. B., NINH, T. U., BEKTAS, A. & AASKOV, J. G. 2002. 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,* 66**,** 40-48.

KIEFER, F. 1960. *Ruderfußkrebse (Copepoden),* Stuttgart, Kosmos-Verlag Franckh.

KLEKOWSKI, R. Z. & SHUSHKINA, E. A. 1966. *Ernährung, Atmung, Wachstum und Energie-Umformung in Macrocyclops albidus Jurine*.

KRAEMER, M. U. G., REINER, R. C., JR., BRADY, O. J., MESSINA, J. P., GILBERT, M., PIGOTT, D. M., YI, D., JOHNSON, K., EARL, L., MARCZAK, L. B., SHIRUDE, S., DAVIS WEAVER, N., BISANZIO, D., PERKINS, T. A., LAI, S., LU, X., JONES, P., COELHO, G. E., CARVALHO, R. G., VAN BORTEL, W., MARSBOOM, C., HENDRICKX, G., SCHAFFNER, F., MOORE, C. G., NAX, H. H., BENGTSSON, L., WETTER, E., TATEM, A. J., BROWNSTEIN, J. S., SMITH, D. L., LAMBRECHTS, L., CAUCHEMEZ, S., LINARD, C., FARIA, N. R., PYBUS, O. G., SCOTT, T. W., LIU, Q., YU, H., WINT, G. R. W., HAY, S. I. & GOLDING, N. 2019. Past and future spread of the arbovirus vectors Aedes aegypti and Aedes albopictus. *Nat Microbiol,* 4**,** 854-863.

KRUSE, P. D., TOFT, S. & SUNDERLAND, K. D. 2008. Temperature and prey capture: opposite relationships in two predator taxa. *Ecological Entomology,* 33**,** 305-312.

LAYBOURNPARRY, J., ABDULLAHI, B. A. & TINSON, S. V. 1988. Temperature-Dependent Energy Partitioning in the Benthic Copepods Acanthocyclops-Viridis and Macrocyclops-Albidus. *Canadian Journal of Zoology-Revue Canadienne De Zoologie,* 66**,** 2709-2714.

LOUNIBOS, L. P. 2002. Invasions by insect vectors of human disease. *Annual Review of Entomology,* 47**,** 233-266.

MARTEN, G. G. 1990a. Elimination of Aedes-Albopictus from Tire Piles by Introducing Macrocyclops-Albidus (Copepoda, Cyclopidae). *Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association,* 6**,** 689-693.

MARTEN, G. G. 1990b. Issues in the development of cyclops for mosquito control. *Arbovirus Research in Australia,* 5**,** 159-164.

MARTEN, G. G. & REID, J. W. 2007. Cyclopoid copepods. *Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association,* 23**,** 65-92.

MEDLOCK, J. M., AVENELL, D., BARRASS, I. & LEACH, S. 2006. Analysis of the potential for survival and seasonal activity of Aedes albopictus (Diptera : Culicidae) in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Vector Ecology,* 31**,** 292-304.

MEDLOCK, J. M., VAUX, A. G. C., CULL, B., SCHAFFNER, F., GILLINGHAM, E., PFLUGER, V. & LEACH, S. 2017. Detection of the invasive mosquito species Aedes albopictus in southern England. *Lancet Infectious Diseases,* 17**,** 140.

METELMANN, S., CAMINADE, C., JONES, A. E., MEDLOCK, J. M., BAYLIS, M. & MORSE, A. P. 2019. The UK's suitability for Aedes albopictus in current and future climates. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface,* 16.

MURDOCK, C. C., EVANS, M. V., MCCLANAHAN, T. D., MIAZGOWICZ, K. L. & TESLA, B. 2017. Fine-scale variation in microclimate across an urban landscape shapes variation in mosquito population dynamics and the potential of Aedes albopictus to transmit arboviral disease. *Plos Neglected Tropical Diseases,* 11**,** e0005640.

NOVICH, R. A., ERICKSON, E. K., KALINOSKI, R. M. & DELONG, J. P. 2014. The temperature independence of interaction strength in a sit-and-wait predator. *Ecosphere,* 5.

PARADIS, A. R., PEPIN, P. & BROWN, J. A. 1996. Vulnerability of fish eggs and larvae to predation: Review of the influence of the relative size of prey and predator. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences,* 53**,** 1226-1235.

POOLE, A. E., STILLMAN, R. A., WATSON, H. K. & NORRIS, K. J. 2007. Searching efficiency and the functional response of a pause-travel forager. *Functional Ecology,* 21**,** 784-792.

PRITCHARD, D. W., PATERSON, R. A., BOVY, H. C. & BARRIOS-O'NEILL, D. 2017. FRAIR: an R package for fitting and comparing consumer functional responses. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution,* 8**,** 1528-1534.

ROSENBAUM, B. & RALL, B. C. 2018. Fitting functional responses: Direct parameter estimation by simulating differential equations. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution,* 9**,** 2076-2090.

RUSSELL, B. M., MUIR, L. E., WEINSTEIN, P. & KAY, B. H. 1996. Surveillance of the mosquito Aedes aegypti and its biocontrol with the copepod Mesocyclops aspericornis in Australian wells and gold mines. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology,* 10**,** 155-160.

SOUMARE, M. K. F. & CILEK, J. E. 2011. The Effectiveness of Mesocyclops Longisetus (Copepoda) for the Control of Container-Inhabiting Mosquitoes in Residential Environments. *Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association,* 27**,** 376-383.

SUAREZ, M. F., MARTEN, G. G. & CLARK, G. G. 1992. A Simple Method for Cultivating Fresh-Water Copepods used in Biological-Control of Aedes-Aegypti. *Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association,* 8**,** 409-412.

TWARDOCHLEB, L. A., NOVAK, M. & MOORE, J. W. 2012. Using the functional response of a consumer to predict biotic resistance to invasive prey. *Ecological Applications,* 22**,** 1162-1171.

VERONESI, R., CARRIERI, M., MACCAGNANI, B., MAINI, S. & BELLINI, R. 2015. Macrocyclops Albidus (Copepoda: Cyclopidae) for the Biocontrol of Aedes Albopictus and Culex Pipiens in Italy. *Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association,* 31**,** 32-43.

ZIDON, R., TSUEDA, H., MORIN, E. & MORIN, S. 2016. Projecting pest population dynamics under global warming: the combined effect of inter- and intra-annual variations. *Ecol Appl,* 26**,** 1198-210.

Supplementary Material

Materials and methods

Collection of field temperature data:

In late February and early March of 2018, six empty car tires, each leaning on a wooden crate, were placed in six different locations (Fig. S1), spread between two main sites: South Kensington (London, UK) and Silwood Park (Berkshire, UK). Each tire was surveyed once a week from the 16th of April until the 30th of October between 11am and 5pm, which matches the time period of predation for both our functional response and predation efficiency experiments. If water was present in a tire, the water temperature was taken using a hand-held Hanna Instruments thermometer (model name: "Checktemp 1"). Temperature data from Silwood Park and South Kensington were recorded from May through September of 2018 (Fig. S2), the months of predicted *Ae. albopictus* adult activity (Medlock et al., 2006). There were 105 observations in total; 16 temperature recordings were missing because the tire was dry, and two were excluded because they were recorded outside the time period of 11am to 5pm.

Fig. S1. Tire locations



Fig. S2. May through September of 2018 weekly tire water temperatures (Dotted lines represent the three temperatures tested in the functional response and predation efficiency experiments.)



Fig. S3. Experimental design for functional response (a), repeated six times, once for each combination of predator species and temperature; and predation efficiency (b), repeated three times, once for each temperature (Source of copepod silhouette accessed August 2019: http://phylopic.org/name/f79c5b86-7b73-468a-9ad4-995646398f99)

Ae. albopictus hatching procedure for functional response and predation efficiency experiments:

Ae. albopictus eggs were collected from the colony on filter papers and stored in plastic bags containing damp paper towels to maintain humidity. 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*. The eggs were left in this solution at 27 ± 1°C for 12 h (Hanson and Craig, 1994) before the newly-hatched larvae were counted (Fig. 1). The hatching temperature was kept high, relative to the experimental temperatures (15-25°C), in order to maximize the hatch rate over a short, semi-synchronous time period, especially since *Ae. albopictus* often hatch in multiple installments (Hanson and Craig, 1994). The larval densities used in the functional response experiments were chosen based on previous studies (Cuthbert et al., 2018, Cuthbert et al., 2019).

Predation efficiency linear regression models:

The following linear regression model was fitted to test temperature setting and copepod species as predictors of predation efficiency:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Species}) + \beta_2(\text{Temperature}_{20}) + \beta_3(\text{Temperature}_{25}) + \varepsilon \qquad \text{eqn S1}$$

where Y represents the predation efficiency; β_0 is the Y-intercept; Species is a binary variable denoted as 0 for *M. albidus* and 1 for *M. viridis*; Temperature_{20} is a binary variable denoted as 0 for 15°C and 1 for 20°C; Temperature_{25} is a binary variable denoted as 0 for 15°C and 1 for 25°C; and ε is a random error term, assumed $\sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. Forty-seven observations were included in the model; one was excluded because the copepod predator (*M. viridis* at 25°C) was found to have died at some point during the 6 h predation period. The statistical significance of each independent parameter estimate was analyzed at $\alpha = 0.05$.

An additional linear regression model was fitted to test temperature setting and copepod body mass as predictors of predation efficiency:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Mass}) + \beta_2(\text{Temperature}_{20}) + \beta_3(\text{Temperature}_{25}) + \varepsilon \qquad \text{eqn S2}$$

where Mass is a continuous variable referring to each copepod's body mass in mg; and all other notation is identical to that used in the previous model.

Both linear regression models above were also fitted without any temperature predictors. Akaike information criterion (AIC) values were calculated for model selection, and the Shapiro-Wilk test was used to confirm that the residuals of each model were normally distributed.

Results

Table S1. Results of logistic regression of proportional consumption data as a function of initial prey density using the "frair_test" function

Species	**Temperature (°C)**	**n[a]**	**First Order Term[b]**	**p - value**
M. albidus	15	28	-0.06	<0.0001
M. albidus	20	28	-0.08	<0.0001
M. albidus	25	25	-0.04	0.0007
M. viridis	15	27	-0.09	<0.0001
M. viridis	20	28	-0.08	<0.0001
M. viridis	25	25	-0.09	<0.0001

1.) Controls are not included for determining the type of functional response.
2.) The response is classified as "type II" when there is a significant negative first-order term.

Table S2. Linear regression of predation efficiency by copepod species (n = 47)

Parameter	**Estimate**	**Standard Error**	**p-value**	**Adjusted R^2**	**AIC**
Intercept	19.97	2.314	4.25×10^{-11}	0.081	365.6
Species (*M. viridis*, ref = *M. albidus*)	7.42	3.308	0.0299		

Table S3. Linear regression of predation efficiency by copepod body mass (n = 47)

Parameter	**Estimate**	**Standard Error**	**p-value**	**Adjusted R^2**	**AIC**
Intercept	11.19	4.33	0.0130	0.156	361.5
Body Mass (mg)	34.75	11.26	0.0035		

Copepod body sizes by experimental design and species:

The ten gravid female copepods of each species that were measured as a validation set for the size of adult females included in the functional response experiments ranged from 1.2 to 1.7 mm for *M. albidus*, and from 1.4 to 2.3 mm for *M. viridis*. The non-gravid copepods used as predators in these experiments ranged from 1.2 to 1.9 mm (n = 81) for *M. albidus*, and from 1.4 to 2.5 mm (n = 80) for *M. viridis*. The eighty-one *M. albidus* copepods included in the functional response curve experiments ranged from 0.09 to 0.32 mg in body mass (median = 0.20 mg), and the eighty *M. viridis* copepods included in the functional response curve experiments ranged from 0.14 to 0.67 mg in body mass (median = 0.32 mg). Results of the Shapiro-Wilk test showed that the distribution of body masses included in the functional response experiments was significantly different from a normal distribution for both *M. albidus* (p-value = 0.0019) and *M. viridis* (p-value = 0.0001). The results of a Wilcoxon rank sum test showed that *M. viridis* used in the functional response experiments were generally larger than *M. albidus* used in the same experiments (p-value < 0.0001, Fig. S4).

Twenty-four *M. albidus* copepods were used as predators in the predation efficiency experiments, ranging in body mass from 0.14 to 0.36 mg (mean = 0.24 mg, standard deviation = 0.06 mg), and 23 *M. viridis* were used, ranging in body mass from 0.23 to 0.67 mg (mean = 0.48 mg, standard deviation = 0.10 mg). Results of the Shapiro-Wilk test showed that the distribution of body masses included in the predation efficiency experiments was not significantly different from a normal distribution for both *M. albidus* (p-value = 0.0665) and *M. viridis* (p-value = 0.2128). The results of a Welch two sample t-test for samples of unequal variance showed that *M. viridis* used in the predation efficiency experiments were significantly larger than *M. albidus* used in the same experiments (p-value < 0.0001, Fig. S4).

The Wilcoxon rank sum test was used to identify differences in copepod body mass by experimental design, controlling for species. Copepods used in the predation efficiency experiment were generally larger than those used in the functional response experiment for both *M. albidus* (p-value = 0.0008) and *M. viridis* (p-value = 0.0003).



Fig. S4. Boxplot of copepod body mass by experimental design. Sample sizes: Functional response, *M. albidus* = 81; Functional response, *M. viridis* = 80; Predation efficiency, *M. albidus* = 24; Predation efficiency, *M. viridis* = 23.

Literature Cited

CUTHBERT, R. N., CALLAGHAN, A. & DICK, J. T. A. 2018. Dye another day: the predatory impact of cyclopoid copepods on larval mosquito Culex pipiens is unaffected by dyed environments. *Journal of Vector Ecology*, 43**,** 334-336.

CUTHBERT, R. N., CALLAGHAN, A. & DICK, J. T. A. 2019. The Effect of the Alternative Prey, Paramecium caudatum (Peniculida: Parameciidae), on the Predation of Culex pipiens (Diptera: Culicidae) by the Copepods Macrocyclops albidus and Megacyclops viridis (Cyclopoida: Cyclopidae). *Journal of Medical Entomology*, 56**,** 276-279.

HANSON, S. M. & CRAIG, G. B., JR. 1994. Cold acclimation, diapause, and geographic origin affect cold hardiness in eggs of Aedes albopictus (Diptera: Culicidae). *J Med Entomol*, 31**,** 192-201.

MEDLOCK, J. M., AVENELL, D., BARRASS, I. & LEACH, S. 2006. Analysis of the potential for survival and seasonal activity of Aedes albopictus (Diptera : Culicidae) in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Vector Ecology*, 31**,** 292-304.