



This document is the Accepted Manuscript version of a Published Work that appeared in final form in *Systematic & Applied Acarology*, copyright © Systematic & Applied Acarology Society after peer review and technical editing by the publisher. To access the final edited and published work see <https://doi.org/10.11158/saa.24.11.5>

Document downloaded from:



1 **Intraguild aggressiveness between an alien and a native predatory mite**

2

3 Escudero-Colomar, L.A. ^{(1)*}; Creus, E. ⁽¹⁾; Chorąży, A. ⁽²⁾; Walzer, A. ⁽³⁾

4

5 ⁽¹⁾ IRTA-Sustainable Plant Protection (Entomology). Mas Badia Experimental
6 Station. Canet de la Tallada S/N- 17134 Girona, Spain.*email:

7 adriana.escudero@irta.cat

8 0000-0002-2451-962X

9 ⁽²⁾ Department of Applied Entomology, Warsaw University of Life Sciences –
10 SGGW, Warsaw, Poland

11 ⁽³⁾ Division of Plant Protection, Department of Crop Sciences, University of
12 Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Peter Jordan Strasse 82, 1190 Vienna, Austria

13 0000-0002-8346-581X

14 **Abstract**

15 The predatory mite *Amblydromalus limonicus*, non-native in Europe, can be used
16 legally in several European countries as greenhouse biocontrol agent against thrips
17 species, although this species is also able to feed on whiteflies and gall mites. The first
18 record of the unintended occurrence of *A. limonicus* in apple orchards in Europe comes
19 from Catalonia (Spain), where *A. limonicus* is well established in the native predatory
20 mite community since 2011. The dominant species in this community is *Amblyseius*
21 *andersoni*, which has a similar life-style as *A. limonicus* (large, aggressive predator with
22 broad diet range) making intraguild (IG) interactions between the two predators likely.
23 Thus, we tested the IG aggressiveness of native and alien female predators, when
24 provided with IG prey (larvae). Alien females of *A. limonicus* proved to be highly
25 aggressive IG predators against native larvae of *A. andersoni*, which were attacked
26 earlier and more frequently than alien larvae by the native predator. Nearly all attacks
27 by the alien predator resulted in the death of native IG prey, whereas about 10% of the
28 alien intraguild prey escaped the attacks of the native predator. Additionally, native IG
29 prey is smaller than alien prey, which should facilitate the overwhelming by the alien
30 predator. We argue that the strong aggressive intraguild behavior of *A. limonicus* is
31 contributing to its establishment success in the native predatory mite community.

32

33 **Keywords:** Biological control, *Amblydromalus limonicus*, *Amblyseius andersoni*,
34 intraguild predation, invasive species, Phytoseiidae

35 Introduction

36

37 Life-history traits, habitat and diet range of alien species are commonly used to predict
38 their establishment opportunities in novel environments (Kolar and Lodge 2001;
39 Colautti *et al.* 2006; Hayes and Barry 2008), whereas behavioral traits have been
40 seldom considered (Chapple *et al.* 2011). Behavior, however, mediates how an alien
41 species interact with novel resources and native species and should therefore play a
42 pivotal role in the establishment opportunities of alien species (Holway and Suarez
43 1999; Chapple *et al.* 2011). A characteristic feature of successful established alien
44 species is their highly aggressive behavior against native species (Chapple *et al.* 2011)
45 resulting in the superiority of alien species in competitive interactions such as resource
46 competition [alien Argentine ant *Linepithema humile* Mayr versus native tyrant ant
47 *Iridomyrmex bicknelli* Emery (Rowles and O'Dowd 2007; Carpintero and Reyes-López
48 2008)], shelter competition [alien crayfish *Pacifastacus leniusculus* Dana versus native
49 crayfish *Cambaroides japonicus* (De Haan) (Usio *et al.* 2001)], and nest site
50 competition [alien European starling *Sturnus vulgaris* Linnaeus versus native house
51 wrens *Troglodytes aedon* (Vieillot) (Weitzel 1988)].

52 When an alien predator encounters a native predator guild sharing similar prey
53 resources, intraguild (IG) aggressiveness among the invader and its native opponents is
54 a frequent observed event. The degree of IG aggressiveness strongly influences not only
55 the outcome of resource competition, but also the strength and direction of intraguild
56 predation (IGP) (Polis *et al.* 1989; Snyder and Evans 2006; Wang *et al.* 2013). For
57 example, the Asian ladybeetle *Harmonia axyridis* Pallas, initially used as alien
58 biological control agent against greenhouse aphids in France, has
59 immigrated and established in native European ladybeetle communities (Slogett 2012).
60 The alien ladybeetle exhibited high IG aggressiveness against the native ladybeetles
61 *Coccinella septempunctata* (Linnaeus) and *Adalia bipunctata* (Linnaeus). Therefore, *H.*
62 *axyridis* was also superior in IGP, which is assumed a major cause for the successful
63 establishment of *H. axyridis* in European ladybeetle communities (Raak-van den Berg
64 *et al.* 2012).

65 The plant-inhabiting predatory mite *Amblydromalus limonicus* (Garman and
66 McGregor) (Acari: Phytoseiidae), alien in Europe, is used in some European countries
67 such as Belgium, France, Germany, The Netherlands, Poland and Austria, as natural
68 enemy against greenhouse thrips species (Garman and McGregor 1956; Moraes *et al.*
69 1994; Chant and McMurtry 2005; Knapp *et al.* 2013). In 2011, the alien predator was
70 detected for the first time on apple trees in Catalonia (Spain) (Escudero-Colomar and
71 Chorąży 2012), where the commercial use of *A. limonicus* as biocontrol agent is not
72 permitted. In this region the native predatory mite guild in apple orchards frequently
73 consists of the species *Amblyseius andersoni* (Chant), *Neoseiulus californicus*
74 McGregor and *Euseius stipulatus* (Athias-Henriot) (Acari: Phytoseiidae) sharing
75 herbivorous mites, small insects and pollen as food resource (Costa-Comelles *et al.*
76 1986, Costa-Comelles *et al.* 1990, Avilla *et al.* 1993). These native predators provide an
77 important ecosystem service by the natural control of pest species such as spider mites
78 (*Tetranychus urticae* Koch, *T. turkestanii* Ugarov y Nikolski, *Panonychus ulmi* (Koch))
79 (Costa-Comelles *et al.* 1994,) and gall mites (*Aculus schlechtendali* (Nalepa)) (Duso C
80 and Pasini M 2003). Although all three species are able to use a broad range of food
81 items allowing development, reproduction and survival, their different feeding
82 preferences result in resource partitioning and reduce intraguild aggression among them.
83 *Neoseiulus californicus* is a selective predator of spider mites producing dense webbing,
84 which can also serve as shelter against IG predators. *Euseius stipulatus* is a pollen-

85 feeding generalist predator, whereas *A. andersoni* is a generalist predator, feeding and
86 reproducing on a wide range of animal and non-animal food without specific
87 preferences (McMurtry *et al.* 2013). The numerical dominant species in this guild on
88 apple trees is *A. andersoni*, a large, aggressive predator (Walzer and Schausberger
89 2011a, b, 2013), which is responsible for the successful suppression of the spider mite
90 *Panonychus ulmi* (Koch) (Vilajeliu *et al.*, 1994). The now established alien predator *A.*
91 *limonicus*, however, has a very similar life-style as the native predator *A. andersoni*
92 (McMurtry *et al.* 2013). Thus, the two predator species are currently sharing both space
93 and prey increasing the likelihood of aggressive IG encounters. Consequently, the
94 objective of this study is to evaluate the IG aggressiveness potential between them.
95 These data should provide first indications, whether the native or alien predator is
96 superior in IGP over the other.

97 **Material and methods**

98 *Mite cultures*

99
100 The predatory mites were collected in September 2015 from apple leaves of organically
101 managed orchards located at the Mas Badia Experimental Station, in La Tallada
102 d'Emporda (42.0541°N, 3.0614°E), near Girona, Spain. About 100 specimens of
103 *Amblydromalus limonicus* and *Amblyseius andersoni* were used to initiate lab
104 populations, which were reared on separate arenas consisting of plastic tiles (13 cm x 13
105 cm) resting on water-saturated foam cubes (14 cm x 14 cm x 3.5 cm) in plastic boxes
106 (20 cm x 20 cm x 4 cm) half-filled with water. The edges of the arenas were covered
107 with filter paper strips. Stripes of cloth of 1 cm width were placed on the filter paper in
108 such a way that they had in direct contact with the water of the plastic box to keep the
109 filter paper moisturized. A barrier of fruit tree grease (Vitax Ltd, Leicestershire, UK)
110 was placed around the complete perimeter of the arena. Consequently, the mites were
111 provided with access to water without a risk of escaping from the arena. Small,
112 transparent plastic pieces and cotton wool threads were distributed on the surface of the
113 arena to provide shelter and egg deposition sites for the predatory mites. The predatory
114 mites were fed with a mix of stages of *T. urticae* and *Typha latifolia* pollen ad libitum
115 three times per week. Rearings of *A. limonicus* and *A. andersoni* were kept in climatic
116 chambers at 25°C±1°C, 70±10% RH and 16:8 L:D (Light:Dark).

117 *Experimental units*

118
119 The experiment was conducted using lockable cages consisting of acrylic plates (80 x
120 35 x 3 mm) with a 15 mm diameter hole. Each hole was closed in one side with a fine
121 mesh screen at the bottom, which provided mites with adequate ventilation. The other
122 side of the cage was covered with a microscope slide secured with rubber bands
123 (Schausberger 1997). Cages were kept in a climatic chamber SANYO at 25°C ± 1°C,
124 70 ± 10% RH and a photoperiod of 16:8 L:D (Light:Dark).

125 *IG predator and prey behavior*

126
127 IGP is a common interaction among phytoseiid mites, which is asymmetric with respect
128 to size. Small/younger juveniles are usually preyed upon by larger/older juveniles
129 and/or adult females, whereas adult females and eggs are relatively invulnerable to IGP
130 (Walzer and Schausberger 2011a). Consequently, large females and small larvae were
131 used as IG predators and IG prey, respectively.

132 Single IG predator females of *A. limonicus* and *A. andersoni* were isolated and starved
133 for 24 hours in the lockable cages. Only females that laid eggs during this period were
134


135 used in the experiments. A single IG prey was placed in the cage together with a single
136 IG predator. 67 to 71 replicates per treatment were conducted. The behavior of IGP
137 predator and IGP prey was observed and recorded every 10 minutes for 6 hours (360
138 minutes in total) using a chronometer Fisherbrand™ (Fisher Scientific SL, Madrid) to
139 evaluate the following parameters: (1) attack time of the IG predator, (2) the attack
140 success (if the attack results in the death of the prey or not), (3) activity of the IG
141 predator and IG prey (moving or not).

142

143 *IG predator and prey body sizes*

144 All females used in the experiment were measured and 50 larvae of each species were
145 randomly caught from the rearing boxes. Females and larvae were mounted on
146 microscopic slides using Heinze polyvinyl alcohol (PVA Heinze) (Heinze 1952; Colloff
147 2009). The distances between the bases of eight and six setae, i.e. j3, s4, S4, Z5 and j3,
148 s4 and Z5 at both sides of the dorsal shield were measured for IG predator females and
149 IG prey larvae of both predatory mites, respectively (Croft *et al.* 1999) (Fig. 1). The
150 calculated perimeter is a suitable approximation to body size, because it integrates both
151 body length and width and corresponds to 85- 90% of the total perimeter of the dorsal
152 shield. The pictures of the figures were taken using a Leica DMRXA Direct
153 microscope equipped with a digital camera Pointgrey Flea3 of 12MPx. The
154 measurements were done using the Nikon Eclipse 50i microscope using the software
155 NIS-D Elements 3.20 (Nikon Corporation, Japan).

156



157

158

159 **Fig 1** Body size measurements a) females (*A. limonicus*) and b) larvae (*A. andersoni*).
160 The distances between the bases of eight (j3-j3, j3-s4, s4-S4, S4-Z5, Z5-Z5) and six (j3-
161 j3, j3-s4, s4-Z5, Z5-Z5) setae on the dorsal shield were measured for the females (IG
162 predators) and larvae (IG prey), respectively. The calculated perimeter of the dorsal
163 shields was used as proxy for body size

164

165

166

167 *Data analysis*

168 SPSS 21.0.1 (SPSS Inc., 2012) was used for all statistical analyses. Kaplan-Meier
169 analysis with successive Breslow tests was used to compare the IG aggressiveness
170 functions of the predators (combination of cumulative attacks and attack time) (Bewick
171 et al. 2004). Generalized linear models (GLMs) with chi-square statistics (Wald-tests)
172 were used to analyze the effects of IG predator species on the predator activity, prey
173 activity (moving or not), IGP success (prey killed or not), IG prey survival (yes/no)
174 (binomial distribution, logit link function). Additionally, the differences between the
175 two species with respect to the predator body size (females), the prey body size (larvae)
176 and the IG predator/prey body size ratio were analyzed using GLM's (normal
177 distribution, identity link function).

178

179

180 **Results**

181

182 *IG predator and prey behavior*

183 The IG aggressiveness functions of the IG predators differed significantly between the
184 two predator species (Kaplan-Meier analysis, Breslow tests: $\chi^2_1 = 10.834$, $p = 0.001$).
185 The alien IG predator *A. limonicus* was more aggressive than the native predator *A.*
186 *andersoni*, which was reflected in earlier attacks (mean attack times of *A. limonicus*:
187 $48.31 \text{ min} \pm 5.55 \text{ SE}$ versus *A. andersoni*: 103.78 ± 5.55) and more frequent attacks on
188 IG prey larvae (Fig. 2).


189 Both IG predator ($\chi^2_1 = 0.142$, $p = 0.706$) and prey activity ($\chi^2_1 = 0.723$, $p =$
190 0.395) were not influenced by species affiliation (Fig. 3). Contrary, IGP success ($\chi^2_1 =$
191 4.569 , $p = 0.033$) of the alien predator was higher than for the native predator. First,
192 almost all alien IG predators were observed to attack the IG prey within 360 min in
193 contrast to the native IG predators (alien *A. limonicus*: 69 out of 71; native *A. andersoni*:
194 58 out of 67). Second, nearly all attacked native IG prey larvae were killed by the alien
195 predator females, whereas about 10% of the alien IG prey larvae survived the attacks of
196 the native IG predator females. Thus, the survival probabilities of the native IG prey
197 were negligible in contrast to the alien IG prey ($\chi^2_1 = 9.500$, $p = 0.002$) (Fig. 3).

198

199 *IG predator and prey body sizes*


200 The IG predator females of *A. limonicus* and *A. andersoni* were similarly sized ($\chi^2_1 =$
201 0.402 , $p = 0.526$); however, IG larval prey sizes differed between the alien and native
202 species ($\chi^2_1 = 13.343$, $p < 0.001$). The alien IG prey was larger than the native IG prey
203 (Fig. 3). Consequently, also the IG predator/prey body size ratio of the alien predator
204 and native prey was larger than the corresponding data of the native predator and alien
205 prey (Fig. 4).

206




207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214

Fig 2 Attack functions (combination of the proportion of attacking predators and the time elapsed until an attack occurred) of singly caged native IG predators females of *A. limonicus* (black line) and *A. andersoni* (grey line), when offered single IG prey larvae over 360 min



215
216
217
218
219

Fig 3 IG predator activity (A), IG prey activity (B), IG predation success (C) and IG prey survival (D) of *A. limonicus* (black bars) and *A. andersoni* (grey bars), when acting as IG predator (female) or IG prey (larva) over 360 min. Different lower-case indicate significant effects between the species based on pairwise LSD-tests



220
 221 **Fig 4** Body size of *A. limonicus* (black bars) and *A. andersoni* (grey bars) as IG predator
 222 (females) or IG prey (larvae), and the predator/prey body size ratios. Different lower-
 223 case indicate significant effects between the species based on pairwise LSD-tests
 224

225
 226 **Discussion**
 227

228 Alien females of *A. limonicus* proved to be highly aggressive IG predators against
 229 native larvae of *A. andersoni*, which were attacked earlier and more frequently than
 230 alien IG prey by the native predators. Additionally, nearly all attacks by the alien
 231 predator resulted in the death of native IG prey, whereas about 20% of the alien IG prey
 232 survived in the presence of native predators.

233 Both predator and prey traits may explain the proximate reasons for these

234 results. A specific feature of *A. limonicus* females, not known for *A. andersoni* females,
235 is their capability to overwhelm and kill 2nd instar thrips larvae (Van Houten *et al.*
236 1993), which are about double as large as the predator (Schuster and Pritchard 1963;
237 Van Houten *et al.* 1993). In concert with our results, these findings indicate that alien *A.*
238 *limonicus* females have a higher tendency to attack heterospecific individuals than
239 native *A. andersoni* females. Second, the IG predators are similarly sized, but not IG
240 prey. The native IG larval prey is smaller than the alien IG prey, which facilitates the
241 overwhelming of the former by the alien predator. Additionally, the alien larvae are
242 obligatory feeders (Walzer, personal observation), whereas native larvae are facultative
243 feeders (Schausberger and Croft 1999a). Thus, alien *A. limonicus* larvae might be more
244 successful in defending themselves against IG predator attacks than the native *A.*
245 *andersoni* larvae.

246 High interspecific aggressiveness is often correlated with foraging behavior (Sih
247 *et al.* 2004), whereas more aggressive species are strong food competitors or superior
248 IG predators compared to less aggressive species (Schausberger and Croft 1999b,
249 2000a; Drescher *et al.* 2011). Dominance in IGP offers three adaptive benefits for the
250 alien *A. limonicus*: (1) the killing of juvenile native IG prey reduces the number of
251 potential adult IG predators and consequently increases the survival probabilities of
252 alien offspring; (2) the consumption of native predatory mites probably offers an
253 additional high-quality food resource for the generalist predator in the novel habitat
254 (Schausberger and Croft 2000b); and (3) the decimation of a native food competitor
255 alleviates the access to extraguild prey.

256 We assume that the implications of the high interspecific aggressiveness of *A.*
257 *limonicus* are strongly dependent on the context. For example, acting as biocontrol
258 agent against greenhouse thrips species, the aggressive predation behavior of *A.*
259 *limonicus* observed in the present study should have benefits, because *A. limonicus* can
260 kill a higher proportion and larger individuals of the target pest than other phytoseiid
261 mites (Van Houten *et al.* 1995). However, when acting as alien IG predator in the case
262 of escape from greenhouses to novel environments, high IG aggressiveness may allow
263 *A. limonicus* to become established in native predatory mite communities. Additionally,
264 the capacity for population increase of *A. limonicus* is among the highest values
265 reported for phytoseiid mites (Sabelis 1985; Steiner *et al.* 2003) and clearly exceeds the
266 corresponding values of *A. andersoni* (Lorenzon *et al.* 2012). Nonetheless, so far the
267 alien predator *A. limonicus* was not able to eliminate the native predator *A. andersoni* on
268 apple trees in Catalonia. In contrast, alien and native predatory mites still co-exist since
269 the detection of *A. limonicus* in 2011. Five non-mutually exclusive causes may be put
270 forward to explain these findings. First, the availability of alternative food resources and
271 high structural habitat complexity may lower the potential detrimental effects of IGP on
272 the native species, as it was demonstrated in two other phytoseiid mite species
273 (Pozzebon *et al.* 2015). Second, strong egg cannibalism of the alien predator species is a
274 well-documented phenomenon, which seems not dependent on the quality of available
275 food resources (Vangansbeke *et al.* 2014). Such a behavior should reduce the capacity
276 for population increase, so that *A. limonicus* is not able to build up sufficient high
277 population densities to outcompete native species. Third, the local climatic conditions
278 may negatively influence the population growth and dispersal abilities of the alien
279 predator. The relative humidity can be very low during the vegetation period in the
280 apple producing area of the extreme NE of Catalonia (Ninyerola *et al.* 2001).
281 *Amblydromalus limonicus* is a species with high moisture requirements, being a
282 determining factor for the hatching success of their larvae (Bakker *et al.* 1993; Van
283 Houten *et al.* 1995). For example, in contrast to *A. andersoni*, the densities of *A.*

284 *limonicus* were very low on apple trees in the dry-hot summer 2012 in Catalonia
285 (Escudero-Colomar, personal observation), which could be caused by high egg
286 mortality of the alien predator. In California, native *A. limonicus* populations were
287 found only along the shore, but not in the drier inland regions (McMurtry and Scriven
288 1965; McMurtry *et al.* 1971). Along the same line, alien *A. limonicus* populations were
289 only sampled in high densities near to the seacoast in Catalonia (Choraży *et al.* 2016).
290 Thus, the sensitivity of *A. limonicus* against dry-hot conditions may restrict its dispersal
291 potential to the coastal areas in Mediterranean countries. Fourth, the leaf morphology of
292 plants shared by *A. limonicus* and the native predatory mites may affect the strength of
293 their IG interactions (Seelmann *et al.* 2007). The alien predator *A. limonicus* is known to
294 avoid pubescent leaves (Lee and Zhang 2018), whereas *A. andersoni* is often found on
295 pubescent leaves (Overmeer and Van Zon 1984; Duso and Pasini 2003). Such
296 differential habitat selection should reduce encounters between the native and alien
297 predator. Finally, our results suggest that potential IG interactions between the alien
298 predator *A. limonicus* and the native predator *A. andersoni* could be mainly
299 unidirectional with *A. limonicus* as predator and *A. andersoni* as prey. Thus, the
300 selection pressure to cope with IG interactions should be lower on predator than on
301 prey, because it is less costly to miss a meal (in the case of the predator) as to be one (in
302 the case of the prey). Therefore, the native predator *A. andersoni* may have evolved
303 adaptive anti-predator strategies to cope with the presence of the aggressive alien IG
304 predator. A common behavior in predatory mites is the spatiotemporal avoidance of
305 leaves occupied by high-risk IG predators (Walzer *et al.* 2006; Walzer *et al.* 2009),
306 which is often optimized by learning (Walzer and Schausberger 2011a, 2012). It
307 remains an open question, whether experienced *A. andersoni* females respond in a
308 similar manner to alien IG predator cues.

309

310 **Acknowledgement**

311 LAEC and EC were funded by the Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness in the
312 context of the project Integrated Pest Control in Horticultural Crops (AGL2013-49164-
313 C2-2-R); AC wants to thank to Dean of Faculty of Horticulture, Biotechnology and
314 Landscape Architecture, Prof. Katarzyna Niemirowicz-Szczytt for financial support
315 during the study. AW was funded by the Austrian Climate and Energy Fund in the
316 context of the research project CLIMITE (KR13AC6K11154) implemented under the
317 program ACRP6. Authors thank to the Electronic and Optical Microscope Unit of the
318 University of Girona.

319

320 **References**

321

322 Avilla J, Bosch D, Sarasua MJ, Costa-Comelles J. 1993 Biological control of
323 *Panonychus ulmi* in apple orchards in Lleida (NE of Spain). *Acta Horticulturae*
324 347:267-272 DOI: 10.17660/ActaHortic.1993.347.30

325 Bakker FM, Klein ME, Mesa NC, Braun AR (1993) Saturation deficit tolerance spectra
326 of phytophagous mites and their phytosiid predators on cassava. *Experimental and*
327 *Applied Acarology* 17:97-113. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00156947>

328 Ben-David T, Ueckermann EA and Gerson U (2013) An annotated list of the spider
329 mites (Acari: Prostigmata: Tetranychidae) of Israel. *Israel Journal of entomology*
330 43:125-148. <http://www.entomology.org.il/sites/default/files/pdfs/Ben-David.pdf>

331 Bewick V, Cheek L, Ball J (2004) Statistics review 12: survival analysis. *Critical Care*
332 8: 389. Carpintero S, Reyes-Lopez J (2008) The role of competitive dominance in the

- 333 invasive ability of the Argentine ant (*Linepithema humile*). *Biological Invasions* 10:25–
334 35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-007-9103-3>
- 335 Chant DA, McMurtry JA. (2005) A review of the subfamily Amblyseiiinae Muma
336 (Acari: Phytoseiidae): Part VI. The tribe Euseiini n. tribe, subtribes Typhlodromalina n.
337 subtribe, Euseiina n. subtribe, and Ricoseiina n. subtribe. *International Journal of*
338 *Acarology* 31:187-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01647950508684412>
- 339 Chapple DG, Simmonds SM, Wong BBM (2011) Can behavioral and personality traits
340 influence the success of unintentional species introductions. *Trends in Ecology and*
341 *Evolution* 27:57-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.09.010>
- 342 Chorąży A, Kropczyńska-Linkiewicz D, Sas D, Escudero-Colomar LA (2016)
343 Distribution of *Amblydromalus limonicus* in northeastern Spain and diversity of
344 phytoseiid mites (Acari: Phytoseiidae) in tomato and other vegetable crops after its
345 introduction. *Experimental and Applied Acarology* 69:465–478.
346 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10493-016-0050-5>
- 347 Colautti RI, Grigorovich IA, MacIsaac HJ (2006) Propagule pressure: a null model for
348 biological invasions. *Biological Invasions* 8:1023–1037.
349 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-005-3735-y>
- 350 Colloff MJ (2009) Dust mites 1 ed. CSIRO Publishing and Springer Science, Dordrecht,
351 The Netherlands. 583 pp. ISBN 978-9-481-2223-3
- 352 Costa-Comelles, J., Ferragut, F., García-Marí, F., Laborda, R. and Marzal, C. 1986.
353 Abundancia y dinámica poblacional de las especies de ácaros que viven en los
354 manzanos de Lérida. *Agrícola Vergel*, 51: 176-191.
355 [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269878260_Abundancia_y_dinamica_poblaci
356 onal_de_las_especies_de_acaros_que_viven_en_los_manzanos_de_Lerida-
357 Abundance_and_population_dynamics_of_mite_species_living_on_Lerida_apple_orc
358 hards_in_Spanish](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269878260_Abundancia_y_dinamica_poblacional_de_las_especies_de_acaros_que_viven_en_los_manzanos_de_Lerida-Abundance_and_population_dynamics_of_mite_species_living_on_Lerida_apple_orchards_in_Spanish)
- 359 Costa-Comelles J, Santamaria A, Garcia-Mari F, Laborda R, Soto A (1990) Aplicación
360 del control integrado del acaro rojo *Panonychus ulmi* (Koch) en parcelas comerciales de
361 manzano. *Boletín de Sanidad Vegetal Plagas* 16: 317-331.
362 <https://www.miteco.gob.es/ministerio/pags/biblioteca/plagas/bsvp-16-01-317-331.pdf>
- 363 Costa-Comelles J, Santamaria A, Ferragut F, Garcia-Mari F (1994) Poblaciones de
364 ácaros en la cubierta vegetal de huertos de manzanos. *Boletín de Sanidad Vegetal*
365 *Plagas* 20:339-355 [https://www.miteco.gob.es/ministerio/pags/biblioteca/plagas/BSVP-
366 20-02-339-355.pdf](https://www.miteco.gob.es/ministerio/pags/biblioteca/plagas/BSVP-20-02-339-355.pdf)
- 367 Croft, B.A.; Luh, H.-K.; Schausberger, P. 1999. Larval size relative to larval feeding,
368 cannibalism of larvae, egg or adult female size and larval–adult setal patterns among 13
369 phytoseiid mite species. *Experimental and Applied Acarology* 23: 599–610.
370 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006236310613>
- 371 Drescher J, Feldhaar H, Blüthgen initial? (2011) Interspecific aggression and resource
372 monopolization of the invasive ant *Anoplolepis gracilipes* in Malaysian Borneo.
373 *Biotropica* 43: 93-99. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2010.00662.x>
- 374 Duso C, Pasini M (2003) Distribution of the predatory mite *Amblyseius andersoni*
375 Chant (Acari: Phytoseiidae) on different apple cultivars. *Journal of Pest Science* 76, 33-
376 40. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1439-0280.2003.03003.x>

377 Escudero-Colomar L-A, Chorąży A (2012) First record of *Amblydromalus limonicus*
378 (Acari:Phytoseiidae) from Spain. *International Journal of Acarology* 38:545-546.
379 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01647954.2012.699101>

380 Garman P, McGregor EA (1956). Four new predaceous mites (Acarina: Phytoseiidae).
381 *Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Sciences* 55:7–13. Available at:
382 <https://scholar.oxy.edu/scas/vol55/iss1/3>

383 Hayes KR, Barry, SC (2008) Are there any consistent predictors of invasion success?
384 *Biological Invasions* 10:483–506. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-007-9146-5>

385 Heinze K (1952) Polyvinylalkohol-Lactophenol-Gemisch als Einbettungsmittel für
386 Blattläuse. *Naturwissenschaften* 12:285–286. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00591256>

387 Knapp, M., Van Houten, Y., Hoogerbrugge, H. and Bolckmans, K. (2013)
388 *Amblydromalus limonicus* (Acari: Phytoseiidae) as a biocontrol agent: Literature review
389 and new findings. *Acarologia* 53: 191-202. <https://doi.org/10.1051/acarologia/20132088>

390 Kolar C, Lodge DM (2001) Progress in invasion biology: predicting invaders. *Trends in*
391 *Ecology and Evolution* 16:199-204. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(01\)02101-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(01)02101-2)

392 Holway DA, Suarez AV (1999) Animal behavior: an essential component of invasion
393 biology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 14:328-330. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(99)01636-5)
394 [5347\(99\)01636-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(99)01636-5)

395 Lee, M.H. and Zhang, Z.-H. (2018) Assessing the augmentation of *Amblydromalus*
396 *limonicus* with the supplementation of pollen, thread, and substrates to combat
397 greenhouse whitefly populations. *Scientific Reports* 8: 12189.
398 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-30018>

399 Lorenzon M, Pozzebon A Duso C (2012) Effects of potential food sources on biological
400 and demographical parameters of the predatory mites *Kampimodromus aberrans*,
401 *Typhlodromus pyri* and *Amblyseius andersoni*. *Experimental and Applied Acarology*
402 58:259-278. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10493-012-9580-7>

403 McMurtry JA, Moraes GJD, Sourassou NF (2013) Revision of the lifestyles of
404 phytoseiid mites (Acari: Phytoseiidae) and implications for biological control strategies.
405 *Systematic and Applied Acarology* 18:297–320. <http://dx.doi.org/10.111158/saa.18.4.1>

406 McMurtry JA, Oatman ER, and Fleschner CA. (1971) Phytoseiid mites on some tree
407 and row crops and adjacent wild plants in southern California. *Journal of Economic*
408 *Entomology* 64:405-408. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/64.2.405>

409 McMurtry JA, Scriven GT (1965) Life-history studies of *Amblyseius limonicus*, with
410 comparative observations on *Amblyseius hibisci* (Acarina: Phytoseiidae). *Annals of the*
411 *Entomological Society of America* 58:106-111. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aesa/58.1.106>

412 Moraes GJD, Mesa NC, Braun A, Melo EL (1994) Definition of the *Amblyseius*
413 *limonicus* species group (Acari: Phytoseiidae), with descriptions of two new species and
414 new records. *International Journal of Acarology* 20:209–217.
415 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01647959408684019>

416 Ninyerola M, Pons X, Roure JM (2001) Atlas climàtic digital de Catalunya (ACDC).
417 Unitat de Botànica. Departament de Geografia de la Universitat Autònoma de
418 Barcelona. Servei Meteorològic de Catalunya i Departament de Medi Ambient i
419 Habitatge (Generalitat de Catalunya). Available online
420 <http://www.opengis.uab.cat/acdc/catala/presentacio.htm>

- 421 Overmeer WPJ, van Zon AQ (1984) The preference of *Amblyseius potentillae* (Garman)
 422 (Acarina: Phytoseiidae) for certain plant substrates. In *Proceedings of the VIth*
 423 *International Congress of Acarology*, D.A. Griffiths and C.E. Bowman (eds) pp. 591-
 424 596. Ellis Horwood, Chichester Edinburgh. ISBN 0 853126038
- 425 Pozzebon A, Loe GM, Duso C (2015) Role of supplemental foods and habitat structural
 426 complexity in persistence and coexistence of generalist predatory mites. *Scientific*
 427 *Reports* 5:14997. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep14997>
- 428 Polis GA, Myers CA, Holt RD (1989) The ecology and evolution of intraguild
 429 predation: potential competitors that eat each other. *Annual Review of Ecology,*
 430 *Evolution, and Systematics* 20:297-330.
 431 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.20.110189.001501>
- 432 Raak-van den Berg CL, De Lange HJ, Van Lenteren JC (2012) Intraguild predation
 433 behaviour of ladybirds in semi-field experiments explains invasion success of
 434 *Harmonia axyridis*. *PLoS ONE* 7: e40681.
 435 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0040681>
- 436 Rowles AD, O'Dowd DJ (2007) Interference competition by Argentine ants displaces
 437 native ants: implications for biotic resistance to invasion. *Biological Invasions* 9:73–85.
 438 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-006-9009-5>
- 439 Sabelis MW (1985) Capacity for population increase. In: Helle W, Sabelis MW, editors.
 440 Spider mites. Their biology, natural enemies and control, vol. 1B. Elsevier Amsterdam.
 441 ISBN: 9780444423740
- 442 Schausberger P (1997) Inter- and intraspecific predation on immatures by adult females
 443 in *Euseius finlandicus*, *Typhlodromus pyri* and *Kampimodromus aberrans* (Acari:
 444 Phytoseiidae). *Experimental and Applied Acarology* 21:131–150.
 445 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018478418010>
- 446 Schausberger P, Croft BA (1999a) Activity, feeding, and development among larvae of
 447 specialist and generalist phytoseiid mite species (Acari: Phytoseiidae). *Environmental*
 448 *Entomology* 28:322-329. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ee/28.2.322>
- 449 Schausberger P, Croft BA (1999b) Predation and discrimination between con- and
 450 heterospecific eggs among specialist and generalist phytoseiid mites (Acari:
 451 Phytoseiidae). *Environmental Entomology* 28:523-528.
 452 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ee/28.3.523>
- 453 Schausberger P, Croft BA (2000a) Cannibalism and intraguild predation among
 454 phytoseiid mites: are aggressiveness and prey preference related to diet specialization?
 455 *Experimental and Applied Acarology* 24:709-725.
 456 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010747208519>
- 457 Schausberger P, Croft BA (2000b) Nutritional benefits of intraguild predation and
 458 cannibalism among generalist and specialist phytoseiid mites. *Ecological Entomology*
 459 25:473-480. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2311.2000.00284.x>
- 460 Schuster RO, Pritchard AE (1963) Phytoseiid mites of California. *Hilgardia* 34:191-
 461 285. DOI: 10.3733/hilg.v34n07p191
- 462 Seelmann L, Auer A, Hoffmann D, Schausberger P (2007) Leaf pubescence mediates
 463 intraguild predation between predatory mites. *Oikos* 116: 807-817.
 464 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0030-1299.2007.15895.x>

- 465 Sih A, Bell A, Johnson JC (2004) Behavioral syndromes: an ecological and
 466 evolutionary overview. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 19: 372-378.
 467 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2004.04.009>
- 468 Sloggett JJ (2012) *Harmonia axyridis* invasions: deducing evolutionary causes and
 469 consequences. *Entomological Science* 15:261-273. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1479-8298.2012.00519.x>
- 471 Snyder WE, Evans, EW (2006) Ecological effects of invasive arthropod generalist
 472 predators. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 37:95-122.
 473 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.37.091305.110107>
- 474 Steiner MW, Goodwin S, Wellham TT, Barchia IM, Spohr LJ (2003) Biological studies
 475 of the Australian predatory mite *Typhlodromalus lailae*. *Australian Journal of*
 476 *Entomology* 42:131-137. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1440-6055.2003.00344.x>
- 477 Usio N, Konishi M, Nakano S (2001) Species displacement between an introduced and
 478 a 'vulnerable' crayfish: the role of aggressive interactions and shelter competition.
 479 *Biological Invasions* 3:179–185. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014573915464>
- 480 Vangansbeke, D., Nguyen, D.T., Audenaert, J., Verhoeven, R., Deforce, K., Gobin, B.,
 481 Tirry, L., and De Clercq, P. (2014a) Diet-dependent cannibalism in the omnivorous
 482 phytoseiid mite *Amblydromalus limonicus*. *Biological Control*, 74, 30–35.
 483 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2014.03.015>
- 484 Van Houten YM, van Rijn PCJ, Tanigoshi L. K, van Stratum P (1993) Potential of
 485 phytoseiid predators to control Western Flower Thrips in greenhouse crops, in particular
 486 during the winter period. *IOBC/WPRS Bulletin* 16 (8):98-101. ISBN 92-9067-055-X
- 487 Van Houten YM, van Rijn PCJ, Tanigoshi LK, van Stratum P, Bruin J (1995)
 488 Preselection of predatory mites to improve year-round biological control of western
 489 flower thrips in greenhouse crops. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* 74(3):225–
 490 234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1570-7458.1995.tb01895.x>
- 491 Vilajeliu, M, Bosch D, Lloret P, Sarasúa MJ, Costa-Comelles J, Avilla J (1994) Control
 492 biológico de *Panonychus ulmi* (Koch) mediante ácaros fitoseidos en plantaciones de
 493 control integrado de manzano en Cataluña. *Boletín de Sanidad Vegetal Plagas*, 20: 173-
 494 185.
 495 <https://www.mapa.gob.es/ministerio/pags/Biblioteca/Revistas/pdf%5Fplagas%2FBSVP%2D20%2D01%2D173%2D185%2Epdf>
- 497 Walzer A, Paulus HF, Schausberger P (2006) Oviposition behavior of interacting
 498 predatory mites: response to the presence of con- and heterospecific eggs. *Journal of*
 499 *Insect Behavior* 19:305-320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10905-006-9025-4>
- 500 Walzer A, Moder K, Schausberger P (2009) Spatiotemporal within-plant distribution of
 501 the spider mite *Tetranychus urticae* and associated specialist and generalist predators.
 502 *Bulletin of Entomological Research* 99:457-466.
 503 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007485308006494>
- 504 Walzer A, Schausberger P (2011a) Threat-sensitive anti-intraguild predation behaviour:
 505 maternal strategies to reduce offspring predation risk in mites. *Animal Behavior* 81:177-
 506 184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.09.031>
- 507 Walzer A, Schausberger P (2011b) Sex-specific developmental plasticity of generalist
 508 and specialist predatory mites (Acari: Phytoseiidae) in response to food stress.

- 509 *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 102:650-660. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095->
510 [8312.2010.01593.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8312.2010.01593.x)
- 511 Walzer A, Schausberger P (2012) Integration of multiple intraguild predator cues for
512 oviposition decisions by a predatory mite. *Animal Behavior* 84:1411-1417.
513 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.09.006>
- 514 Walzer A, Schausberger P (2013) Phenotypic plasticity in anti-intraguild predator
515 strategies: mite larvae adjust their behaviours according to vulnerability and predation
516 risk. *Experimental and Applied Acarology* 60:95-115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10493->
517 [012-9624-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10493-012-9624-z)
- 518 Wang W, Feng X, Chen X (2013) Biological invasion and coexistence in intraguild
519 predation. *Journal of Applied Mathematics* Article ID 925141.
520 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/925141>
- 521 Weitzel N.H. (1988) Nest-site competition between the European starling and native
522 breeding birds in Northwestern Nevada. *The Condor: Ornithological Applications*
523 90(2):515-517. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1368590>