PRIFYSGOL BANGOR / BANGOR UNIVERSITY

PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

The use of environmental DNA metabarcoding and quantitative PCR for molecular detection of marine invasive non-native species associated with artificial structures

Gargan, Laura ; Dublin, University; Vye, Siobhan; Ironside, Joseph ; Jenkins, Stuart; Dublin, University; Dublin, University

Biological Invasions

DOI:
10.1007/s10530-021-02672-8

Published: 01/03/2022

Peer reviewed version

Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):
Gargan, L., Dublin, U., Vye, S., Ironside, J., Jenkins, S., Dublin, U., & Dublin, U. (2022). The use of environmental DNA metabarcoding and quantitative PCR for molecular detection of marine invasive non-native species associated with artificial structures. *Biological Invasions*, *24*, 635-648. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-021-02672-8

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
• You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
• You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

16. Nov. 2023

1 **The use of environmental DNA metabarcoding and quantitative PCR for molecular**
2 **detection of marine invasive non-native species associated with artificial structures.**
3

4 **Authors**: Laura M. Gargan[1], Paul R. Brooks[2], Siobhan R. Vye[3], Joseph E. Ironside[3], Stuart R
5 Jenkins[4], Tasman P. Crowe[2], Jens Carlsson[1*]
6

7 [1]Area 52 Research Group, Earth Institute and School of Biology and Environmental Science,
8 University College Dublin, Dublin 4, Ireland

9 [2] UCD Earth Institute and School of Biology and Environmental Science, University College
10 Dublin, Dublin 4, Ireland

11 [3]Institute of Biological, Environmental and Rural Sciences, Aberystwyth University, UK

12 [4]School of Ocean Sciences, Bangor University, LL59 5AB, Anglesey, UK

13 *Corresponding author: jens.carlsson@ucd.ie
14

15 **ORICD IDs**

16 LMG: 0000-0001-6034-4858, PRB: 0000-0002-8105-0813, SRV:0000-0001-8250-5181, JEI:
17 0000-0001-6292-4768, SRJ: 0000-0002-2299-6318, TPC: 0000-0001-9583-542X, JC: 0000-
18 0002-9262-5627
19

Acknowledgements:

Thanks to Jen Coughlan and Gary Gillespie from UCD for field assistance, and to marina management and staff for access, during sample collection. Further, we thank the Conwy Harbour master and Holyhead Port Authority, Hannah Earp & Holly Date for assistance with sampling.

Abstract

Artificial coastal structures associated with coastal defences, energy generation, ports, marinas and other developments, are known to support lower levels of biodiversity than natural coastal environments and tend to be hotspots of invasive non-native species (INNS). In the present study, we attempted to detect INNS through both quantitative (q)PCR and metabarcoding of environmental (e)DNA from seawater samples. A mitochondrial COI based species-specific qPCR assay was developed and deployed to detect *Didemnum vexillum*, a colonial tunicate that has successfully become established at coastal sites across Europe. Our targeted qPCR assay was able to detect *D. vexillum* in eDNA seawater samples from all sampled sites where it is currently found in Ireland and Wales. Through metabarcoding of the same eDNA samples, we detected an established INNS at all sites but not *D. vexillum* even in locations were it is present. We conclude that our qPCR approach is effective for sensitive and targeted screening for specific INNS at coastal sites including those with artificial structures, and while metabarcoding is a less sensitive approach it is a valuable tool to detect a broad taxonomic range of native and non-native species.

Keywords: *Didemnum vexillum*; genetic markers; high throughput sequencing; INNS; Irish Sea; qPCR

44 **Declarations**

45 Funding (information that explains whether and by whom the research was supported): This
46 research was completed as part of the Ecostructure project (part-funded by the European
47 Regional Development Fund through the Ireland Wales Cooperation Programme 2014–
48 2020).

49

50 Conflicts of interest/Competing interests (include appropriate disclosures): The authors
51 declare that they have no conflicting/competing interests.

52

53 Availability of data and material (data transparency): Raw sequences will be made available
54 on Zenodo. These data are also stored in University College Dublin data repositories and will
55 be made available on request from the corresponding author.

56

57 Code availability (software application or custom code): N/A

58

59 Authors' contributions (optional: please review the submission guidelines from the journal
60 whether statements are mandatory): LMG assisted in study design, performed genetic
61 benchwork, undertook genetic and statistical analyses and wrote the draft manuscript. LMG,
62 PRB and SRV performed fieldwork and secured samples. JC was the main lead for the study
63 and conceived the study with input from LMG, PB, SV, SRJ and TC. All authors (LGM,
64 PRB, SRV, JEI, SRJ, TPC and JC) assisted in planning, critically analysis and development
65 of all drafts and the final manuscript.

Additional declarations for articles in life science journals that report the results of studies involving humans and/or animals: N/A

Ethics approval (include appropriate approvals or waivers): Work only involved animal byproducts or archived samples (of the chordate *Didemnum vexillum*).

Consent to participate (include appropriate statements): All authors have consented to participate.

Consent for publication (include appropriate statements): All authors have approved the manuscript and agree with its submission to Biological Invasions.

79 **Introduction:**

80 Artificial structures in the coastal zone are essential to facilitate transport, recreation,
81 aquaculture, renewable energy and defence against storms and erosion. They can include
82 fixed structures such as sea walls and rock armour breakwaters, removable structures on the
83 seabed such as aquaculture trestles and floating structures such as pontoons and buoys
84 (Airoldi and Beck 2007; Bulleri and Chapman 2010; Kittinger and Ayers 2010; Firth et al.
85 2013). Artificial structures can support communities of marine organisms, but their relatively
86 smooth surfaces tend to provide less habitat heterogeneity than natural rocky shores (Firth et
87 al. 2016). There is a paucity of the natural crevices and pools that would normally facilitate
88 water retention (Firth et al. 2013), as well as a lack of variable textures and overhangs to act
89 as refugia and support diverse species assemblages (Connell, 1972; Strain et al. 2018; Evans
90 et al. 2019, Evans et al. 2021). For these reasons, there are major differences in the
91 composition of biological communities associated with coastal environments containing
92 artificial structures and those that occur on natural rocky shores. For example, communities
93 associated with artificial structures have been shown to exhibit lower biodiversity (Chapman
94 & Bulleri, 2003; Bulleri & Chapman, 2004; Garcia et al. 2007; Vaselli et al. 2008; Pister,
95 2009) and support a higher proportion of invasive non-native species (INNS) (Airoldi &
96 Bulleri, 2011; Firth et al. 2011; Mineur et al. 2012). The prevalence of the latter may in part
97 be due to the urbanisation of estuarine habitats, with installation of artificial structures
98 creating hard substrates where none have previously existed (Ruiz et al. 1997; Bacchiocchi &
99 Airoldi 2003). These installations are often associated with shipping and aquaculture, and
100 represent entry points for invasion, enhancing the spread and establishment of INNS at these
101 locations (Glasby et al. 2007).

102 In recent years, research efforts have been focused on increasing the heterogeneity and water
103 retention of artificial structures through ecologically sensitive engineering in coastal areas

104 (Chapman & Blockley, 2009; Browne & Chapman, 2011; Firth et al. 2014; Evans et al.
105 2015). Trials have indicated that measures such as the installation of artificial concrete rock
106 pools (Hall et al. 2019), and the drilling of pits into existing structures (Evans et al. 2015) can
107 provide opportunities for colonisation by a wide variety of species. However, the challenge
108 remains to implement effective methods to assess and identify the species that are found at
109 coastal locations containing artificial structures, and to detect the presence of INNS that may
110 also potentially displace native biodiversity that exists in these regions.

111 Environmental DNA (eDNA) is a survey methodology that relies on the detection of taxa
112 from extracellular and intracellular material that is deposited into the environment. Following
113 isolation of this material from the environmental sample (such as water, air or soil; Taberlet
114 et al. 2012) it can be interrogated in different ways. Targeted species detection can be
115 undertaken through quantitative (q)PCR using specifically designed primers and probes (e.g.
116 Ficetola et al. 2008; Jerde et al. 2011; Gustavson et al. 2015; Gargan et al. 2017), whereas a
117 more general approach focusing on detection of multiple species is achieved using High
118 Throughput Sequencing (HTS) and metabarcoding (e.g. Thomsen et al. 2012; Hänfling et al.
119 2016; Holman et al. 2019).

120 Due to the non-invasive genetic methods employed by eDNA studies, such approaches are
121 increasingly used for invasive or cryptic species detection in marine ecosystems (Zaiko et al.
122 2015; Borrell et al. 2018; Holman et al. 2019). This is especially true where such species may
123 exist in low abundance and may be difficult to detect using conventional survey methods (e.g.
124 visual observation, netting or trawling etc.) or where conventional surveys are logistically
125 complex and resource intensive. Taking water samples for eDNA surveys is more
126 staightforward compared to expensive and complicated dive/ROV/camera sledge surveys
127 which require highly qualified personal and dedicated vessels.

128 Early detection and intervention is particularly important for INNS such as the colonial
129 ascidian *Didemnum vexillum* (Sambrook et al. 2014). This species is associated with artificial
130 structures in ports and marinas, where it can rapidly spread and foul a wide variety of
131 surfaces including coastal structures, aquaculture facilities and the hulls of ships (Bullard et
132 al. 2007). Invasion by *D. vexillum* can lead to both ecological and economic impacts.
133 Competition with native species can cause changes in habitat complexity and ecosystem
134 function (Cordell et al. 2013), and rapid growth in aquaculture facilities and marinas can be
135 problematic. Although it is native to the coastal waters of Japan (Stefaniak et al. 2012), *D.*
136 *vexillum* has been spreading worldwide in recent decades, becoming successfully established
137 in New Zealand, the east and west coasts of the United States, Canada, throughout the
138 Mediterranean and northern Europe (Lambert 2009; Stefaniak et al. 2009; Tagliapietra et al.
139 2012; Vercaemer et al. 2015; Ordóňez et al. 2015; Fletcher et al. 2018). It was first identified
140 in marinas in Ireland in 2006 (Minchin & Sides, 2006) and Wales in 2008 (Griffith et al.
141 2009), as well as other UK locations such as the southern English coast (Bishop et al. 2015)
142 and Scotland (Beveridge et al. 2011). Once established, *D. vexillum* is very difficult to
143 eradicate even in cases of relatively small, localised infestations as evidenced by two failed
144 eradication attempts at Holyhead Marina, North Wales (Sambrook et al. 2014).

145 We assessed the utility of different eDNA approaches to determine the presence of INNS at
146 natural and artificial coastal sites using *D. vexillum* as a model species. Simpson et al. (2017)
147 previously developed and tested a qPCR assay for detection of this species in Australian
148 waters. However, to date there have been no published studies implementing qPCR analysis
149 of eDNA for the detection of the more genetically diverse populations of *D. vexillum* found in
150 European waters (Graham et al. 2015). The effectiveness of metabarcoding analysis of eDNA
151 samples as a monitoring tool for detecting established and newly introduced INNS species
152 has been demonstrated at marinas on the English and Welsh coastlines (Holman et al. 2019).

153 Here we compare the effectiveness of both the general approach (metabarcoding) and specific
154 targeted approach (qPCR) to detect *D. vexillum*. We also make a general assessment of the
155 use of metabarcoding in detecting INNS by screening the resulting sequences against a list of
156 other regionally targeted INNS.

157

158 **Materials and Methods:**

159 *Site selection and water sampling:*

160 A total of six sites were selected for this study, comprising three sites on the east coast of
161 Ireland and three sites in North Wales (Figure 1). These sites represent three different study
162 site types. The first two types are sites that contain permanent large intertidal and floating
163 artificial structures such as floating pontoons, pilings and rock armour, either set in estuarine
164 conditions in an enclosed bay subject to high flushing and water retention during tidal cycles
165 (hereafter called "closed artificial" for simplicity) or set in fully marine coastal conditions
166 ("open artificial"). We also included a more natural coastal site type, where there are few
167 artificial structures present in the sampling area ("natural"). These sites were used as a
168 control for assessing the presence of INNS.

169

170 Sampling was carried out between late September and early October 2018. Water samples
171 were collected from three locations within each site; close to the coastline or marina, mid-
172 channel, and in the outer reaches of each site (see Table S1 for sampling locations). All water
173 samples were collected during ebb tide, to capture the broadest possible representation of
174 eDNA from our sample locations and minimise offshore influence. Each water sample
175 consisted of 2 L of seawater and samples were collected in triplicate (total n=9 samples for
176 each site). At Holyhead Marina where *D. vexillum* is known to be, an additional set of

177 samples was taken from within 1, of the pontoon sides (total *n*=12 samples for this sample
178 location). At all sites, water samples were taken from the side of a boat using gloved hands
179 and single-use plastic water bottles which had never previously contained seawater. Each
180 sample site also included a field control sample containing 2 L of shop-bought water, which
181 was opened momentarily during field work, stored and processed alongside eDNA samples
182 and used to test for contamination in the field. After sampling each site, water samples were
183 stored at 4°C and processed in the lab within 24 hours of collection. Samples were vacuum
184 filtered through sterile Whatman 47 mm diameter, 0.45 µm pore size nylon filters. A
185 laboratory blank sample containing 1 L of ddH2O was filtered and processed along with the
186 eDNA samples to detect potential contamination during the filtering process. Filters were
187 stored in foil and frozen at -20°C until DNA extraction.

188 In order to ensure the efficacy of our novel qPCR assay, an additional set of 2 L water
189 samples was taken from Malahide Marina (n=3) directly beside a colony of *D. vexillum* in
190 September 2019. This set of samples (including field, filtration and extraction control
191 samples), was processed in the same way as all other eDNA samples.

192

193 *Extraction of eDNA:*

194 DNA was extracted from half filters using QIAshredder (Qiagen; to homogenise the DNA
195 found on the filter) followed by the DNeasy Blood & Tissue Kit (Qiagen) according to the
196 manufacturer's instructions and eluted in a final volume of 50 µl AE buffer (supplied with
197 kit). eDNA concentrations were determined using spectrophotometry (Biodrop µLite,
198 Biodrop; see Table S1). To decrease the risk of contamination, sterile filtering equipment,
199 multiple-glove changes, and separate dedicated lab spaces for eDNA extraction, pre-PCR and
200 post-PCR processing were employed. Samples from each site (including their respective field

and filtration blank samples) were processed as separate sets of samples in the lab, and each set of samples included an extraction blank to test for contamination during the extraction process.

qPCR assay development:

A qPCR analysis of our water samples was implemented to specifically screen for *D. vexillum.* This species was observed (through conventional survey methods) to have been present at three of the study sites for over a decade (i.e. Malahide Marina and Carlingford Lough (Minchin 2007) and Holyhead Marina (Griffith *et al.* 2009)) and was observed to be still present at the study sites within 18 months of water sampling (Ireland: Personal observations by authors and Malahide marina staff; Wales: Holt (2019).

Sequences of the mitochondrial *COI* region for European *D. vexillum* individuals, publicly available on GenBank, were visualised in Geneious (R8, Biomatters Limited). A consensus sequence was generated for the target species incorporating any intraspecific variability for the *COI* region (see Table S2 for accession numbers of unique sequences used to generate the consensus sequence).

A qPCR assay for *D. vexillum* detection has previously been developed and tested in Australia (Simpson *et al.* 2017). The primers and probes from this assay were checked against the sequences of *D. vexillum* occurring in European waters. Due to the intraspecific diversity occurring in *D. vexillum*, there was a mismatch between some individuals of European *D. vexillum* and the previously published assay, which necessitated designing a new assay for use in our study. Amending the existing assay would have entailed incorporating degeneracy in the probe that may have compromised assay specificity and/or efficiency (see Figure S1). Therefore, it was necessary to design new primers and probes

225 based on sequences from those individuals occurring throughout Europe. The novel assay
226 designed for this study comprises forward (*Dvex-F1* 5'-TGA GCT GCT ATA GTT MGA
227 GCT AGA TTT AGT-3') and reverse (*Dvex-R1* 5'- TTC AAA CGR GGA AAA GCT ATA
228 TC-3') primers, and a minor-groove binding (MGB) probe incorporating a 5' reporter dye
229 and a 3' nonfluorescent quencher (*Dvex-PR* 5'-ATA ATT TTG TTA TCA CGG CTC AT-
230 3'). The assay was designed using Primer Express (V3.0, Life Technologies) and targets a
231 221 bp region of the mitochondrial *COI* gene. The specificity of the generated primers and
232 probe were checked against the NCBI (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/) nucleotide database.
233 An overview of primers used in this study is available in Table S5.

234

235 *qPCR analysis:*

236 Assay optimisation was carried out using tissue-extracted DNA from *D. vexillum* colonies
237 collected in Ireland and Wales. The qPCR consisted of a 30 µl reaction volume containing 15
238 µl of TaqMan® Environmental Master Mix 2.0 (Life Technologies, Applied Biosystems,
239 Foster City, CA), 3 µl of each primer (final concentration of 2 µM), probe (final
240 concentration of 2 µM), 6 µl DNA template and ddH2O. The PCR program consisted of 95°C
241 for 10 min, followed by 45 cycles of 95°C for 15 s and 55°C for 90 s. All qPCR reactions
242 were carried out using the QuantStudio™ 7 Flex Real-Time PCR System (Life Technologies,
243 Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA). Once assay optimisation was complete, eDNA
244 samples were run in triplicate in the qPCR assay, along with technical blanks and a 7-point
245 serial dilution (10:1) of tissue-extracted DNA from *D. vexillum* colony samples.
246 Concentrations for the serial dilution ranged from 180 ng to 180 x 10^{-6} ng (or 0.18 pg) of
247 DNA in each reaction based on spectrophotometer quantification (Biodrop). The standard
248 curve for our *D. vexillum* assay ($y = -3.413x+25.904$, $r^2 = 0.998$, efficiency = 96%) was

249 generated using 6 µl of template in a total reaction volume of 30 µl. A positive detection was
250 established to be any sample that amplified in at least two out of three technical replicates and
251 was further verified by Sanger sequencing of the PCR product (the highest Ct 40.8) . Where
252 possible, positive detections were quantified based on the standard curve. However, for the
253 scope of the current study, presence versus absence of the target species was deemed
254 sufficient to determine if the species was found at our study sites.

255 Sanger sequencing of product from positive qPCR reactions was carried out to verify
256 detections. PCR product from one replicate of each of the positive samples was purified
257 (using ExoSAP-IT™, according to manufacturer's guidelines). Sanger sequencing took place
258 at a commercial facility (Macrogen, Europe), in both forward and reverse directions. The
259 resulting sequences were aligned against a reference consensus *COI* sequence in Geneious
260 and checked by eye for any ambiguous or erroneous base calls. Sequences were then checked
261 against the NCBI database.

262

263 *Metabarcoding tag design and primer selection:*

264 Unique identification tags were generated for each sample using the program OligoTag
265 (Coissac 2012), specifying a length of 8bp, a minimum hamming distance of 3 and containing
266 no homopolymers. These tags were designed in order to facilitate downstream demultiplexing
267 of each sample that was sequenced in the final library. Primers were ordered with the tags
268 incorporated on the 5' end (on both forward and reverse primers). The *COI* gene is widely
269 used as the barcoding marker of choice for animals (Hebert et al. 2003), and one of the main
270 advantages of using *COI* for eDNA metabarcoding is the existence of growing reference
271 databases and initiatives for this marker (e.g. The Consortium for the Barcode of Life
272 (CBOL, http://www.barcodinglife.org)). The primers selected for his study included

273 degenerate primers to enable amplification of a wide range of marine organisms from our
274 eDNA samples. The primers chosen were jgHCO2198 and jgLCO1490 (Geller et al. 2013)
275 and LoboF1 and LoboR1 (Lobo et al. 2013). Primer sequences from both primer sets were
276 mapped to the existing full mitochondrial genomes on GenBank (accession numbers:
277 KM259616, KM259617 and NC026107) using Geneious (default settings). Primer sequences
278 for primers used in this study are available in Table S5.

279

280 *PCR and sequencing preparation:*

281 Each sample was amplified using a designated unique set of tagged primers. PCR was carried
282 out in triplicate for each sample and these PCR reactions consisted of 12.5 µl of Qiagen
283 Multiplex PCR Master Mix (Qiagen), 5 µl of 10x primer mix (Integrated DNA Technologies,
284 Inc.) and 2 µl of template DNA in a total volume of 25 µl. The 10x primer mix was created
285 for each individually tagged primer set and consisted of equimolar concentrations (0.2 µM)
286 of primers, according to the manufacturer's instructions. PCR was carried out under the
287 following cycling conditions: initial denaturation at 95°C for 15 min followed by 35 cycles of
288 94°C for 30 s, annealing at 60°C for 90 s and extension at 72°C for 90 s. A final extension
289 step was carried out at 72°C for 10 min. PCR products were visualised on a 1% agarose gel
290 stained with SYBR® Safe (Life Technologies) and a 1kb ladder (Solis BioDyne).

291 PCR replicates were pooled prior to purification and quantification. PCR product was cleaned
292 using ExoSAP-IT™ (ThermoFisher Scientific), according to manufacturer's instructions. The
293 concentrations of PCR products were individually measured by fluorometry (Qubit,
294 ThermoFisher Scientific), and then each sample was added to the final library in equimolar
295 concentration.

296 For this study, a total of 57 eDNA samples were included in the metabarcoding effort.
297 Control samples originating from field, filtration and extraction blanks were also subjected to
298 PCR, pooled and sequenced along with NTCs from PCR multiplexing. All samples were
299 combined in a single library and sequenced using Illumina MiSeq V3 2 x 300bp chemistry.
300 Final library preparation and sequencing was carried out by a commercial facility (Fasteris,
301 Switzerland) using the MetaFast protocol (https://www.fasteris.com/dna/?q=content/metafast-
302 protocol-amplicon-metagenomic-analysis).

303

304 *Bioinformatics and statistical analysis of metabarcoding data:*

305 The sequenced library was demultiplexed using cutadapt (version 1.7.1; Martin 2011), with a
306 maximum of one error allowed per tag (each tag differed by at least three nucleotides). The
307 quality of the demultiplexed samples was determined using FastQC (version 0.11.9; available
308 at http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/), at which point it was
309 determined that the majority of reverse reads were of poor quality. Therefore, only the
310 forward reads from our sequencing effort were retained for downstream analysis. The
311 majority of downstream bioinformatics was carried out using Qiime2 (version 2019.10.0;
312 Boylen *et al.* 2019). The forward reads from demultiplexed samples were trimmed, denoised,
313 and dereplicated into unique Amplicon Sequence Variants (ASV's, constituting 100%
314 identity between sequences) using DADA2 (Callahan *et al.* 2016). In this step, primers were
315 trimmed from the 5' end of the reads. In addition, only those reads with a maximum of two
316 expected errors were retained. Sequences identified as chimeric and sequences represented by
317 a single read (singletons) were also discarded at this stage of the analysis. The dereplicated
318 representative sequences (each constituting an ASV) and resulting ASV table were used for

319 taxonomic assignment. At this stage, we employed a conservative approach and any ASV
320 that was detected in our control samples were also removed from the eDNA samples.

321 For taxonomic assignment, replicate eDNA samples were combined into site-level samples,
322 resulting in a total of six samples representing each study site. Taxonomy was assigned to
323 sequences (qiime feature-classifier) using Qiime2. We implemented the 'classify-consensus-
324 blast' method, which performs BLAST+ local alignment between query and reference reads.
325 Taxonomic assignment was accepted only where there was percent identity between query
326 and reference reads of >97%, query coverage of >90%, and choosing the consensus among
327 the top ten hits in our reference database. In this study, we used the MIDORI_UNIQ
328 reference database for *COI* (Machida *et al.* 2017) as this contains a curated taxonomy and
329 reference sequences from GenBank. Species-level taxonomic assignments were compared
330 with species lists from previously published rapid assessment survey (RAS) data from our
331 artificial sites in Ireland and Wales (Minchin 2007; Wood et al. 2015), where fouling
332 assemblages on harbour structures were visually inspected for targeted INNS. See Table S3
333 for the list of INNS reported at these sites from RAS (Minchin, 2007) and NBN surveys (i.e.
334 NBN Atlas, https://nbnatlas.org/). We also compared taxonomic assignments to online
335 databases, World Register of Marine Species (WoRMS; http://www.marinespecies.org/) and
336 AlgaeBase (https://www.algaebase.org/) to determine the establishment status of each species
337 in Ireland and the UK.

338

339 **Results:**

340 *qPCR detection of Didemnum vexillum:*

341 A total of 60 eDNA samples were analysed using the qPCR assay (*n*=57 from samples taken
342 across six sample locations in 2018 and *n*=3 taken from directly beside a *D. vexillum* colony

343 at Malahide in 2019). Of these 60 samples, 14 were positive for *D. vexillum* detection using
344 the qPCR assay. This included positive detection in samples taken in 2018 at Malahide (six
345 detections/nine samples), Carlingford Lough (four detections/nine samples) and Holyhead
346 (one detection/12 samples) (Table1). In the case of Holyhead samples, positive qPCR
347 detections were found in a single sample taken from within 1m of the pontoons. All samples
348 that were taken from directly beside *D. vexillum* colonies at Malahide in 2019 were positive
349 for detection of the target species (three detections/three samples). No detections were found
350 at Port Oriel, Conwy and Porth Dinllaen. None of the negative control samples (field,
351 laboratory filter, extraction or technical) resulted in any detectable amplification.

352

353 **Table 1:** Details of sample sites that were included in this study, including site type (where
354 open artificial and open natural describe coastal sites with and without artificial structures,
355 respectively, and closed sites are estuarine) and whether *Didemnum vexillum* was detected
356 using qPCR or metabarcoding of eDNA samples. See Figure 1 for location of sample sites.

Site name	Site type	Country	No. eDNA samples	Known *D. vexillum* presence	*D. vexillum* detection with qPCR	*D. vexillum* detection with metabarcoding
Port Oriel	Open natural	Ireland	9	No	No	No
Porth Dinllaen	Open natural	Wales	9	No	No	No
Carlingford Lough	Open artificial	Ireland	9	Yes	Yes	No
Holyhead Marina	Open artificial	Wales	12	Yes	Yes	No
Malahide Marina	Closed artificial	Ireland	9	Yes	Yes	No
Conwy	Closed artificial	Wales	9	No	No	No

357

358 At Malahide, where water samples were taken from directly beside *D. vexillum* colonies in
359 2019, all samples fell within our dynamic range and the average concentration of target DNA
360 in the analysed samples determined by qPCR was 36.7 pg (SD 23.3). For those samples taken
361 around the wider Malahide site in 2018, the average concentration determined by qPCR was
362 2.04 pg (SD 0.86). A single eDNA sample from Carlingford Lough contained an average
363 concentration of 0.31 pg of target DNA. We were unable to accurately quantify the amount of
364 *D. vexillum* DNA that was found in all positive samples as amplification fell outside of our
365 dynamic range. A sample from Holyhead displayed late amplification at an average *Cq*=42
366 and was outside of the dynamic range for quantification but was considered indicative of
367 species presence in that location. Sanger sequencing of PCR product from positive detections
368 showed ≥97% identity to *D. vexillum* when compared against the NCBI database, including
369 the sample from Holyhead that showed late amplification according to our qPCR analysis.

370

371 *Metabarcoding results:*

372 Between one and four mismatches were detected when mapping the COI primers used for
373 metabarcoding to existing full mitochondrial genomes for *D. vexillum* from GenBank.
374 (Figure S2). Our HTS metabarcoding effort resulted in a total of 24,295,984 raw reads.
375 Following demultiplexing using cutadapt, 10,897,666 reads remained. After trimming,
376 filtering, denoising, and chimera screening of forward reads using DADA2, 4,380,642 clean
377 reads (18.03% of raw reads) of 230bp in length were retained for further analysis. Of these
378 reads, 4,069,704 (~93%) reads were assigned to the 57 eDNA samples, with an average
379 number of 71,398 (SD 35,850) reads per sample. The remaining number of reads were
380 assigned across the control samples (consisting of PCR NTC, field, filter and extraction blank
381 samples; total number of reads 304,689 or ~7% of total clean reads). Removal of all reads

382 belonging to ASV's that were found in the control samples from the eDNA samples, resulted
383 in a total of 2,077,075 reads remaining for downstream analysis and taxonomic assignment
384 (average of 36,439 (SD 20,395) reads per sample). Following removal of those ASV's found
385 in control samples, the minimum number of reads per sample was 4,418.

386 Pooling of samples from each location into the six site-level samples resulted in an average of
387 346,179 (SD 57,351) reads per site (Conwy 435,451, Holyhead 350,107, Porth Dinllaen
388 356,223, Malahide 262367, Carlingford 360,411 and Port Oriel 312,516, respectively) and an
389 average of 5,977 ASV's detected at each site (total 12,703 unique ASV's across all samples),
390 to which we attempted to assign taxonomy. The highest number of ASV's were detected at
391 Conwy in Wales (8,555 ASV's), with the lowest number found at Malahide in Ireland (3,864
392 ASV's). Taxonomy was successfully assigned to 131 ASV's across all samples, with 47
393 unique species identified. This corresponds to ~1% of all ASV's being assigned to species-
394 level taxonomy from our dataset. Of these taxonomic assignments, all were deemed to be
395 marine-dwelling organisms (with taxonomic assignment checked against online databases
396 outlined in the materials and methods). The two closed artificial sites showed the lowest
397 number of species per sequence (Conwy and Malahide 2.30 and 3.43 species per 100k
398 sequences, respectively), while the open artificial sites showed intermediate numbers
399 (Holyhead and Carlingford 4.28 and 3.61 species per 100k sequences, respectively) and the
400 natural sites the highest (Port Oriel and Porth Dinllaen 8.96 and 4.77 species per 100k
401 sequences, respectively).

402 A total of 14 distinct phyla were identified across sample sites (Figure 2) with the greatest
403 number of phyla identified at Port Oriel and Porth Dinllaen. The most diverse phylum (in
404 terms of number of ASV's detected) was the phylum Mollusca, comprising 10 different
405 species in our dataset across all sites. A number of widespread native species associated with
406 Irish and Welsh coastal sites were identified, for example the sponge *Halichondria panicea*,

407 the polychaete worm *Sabellaria spinulosa*, the barnacle *Semibalanus balanoides* and the
408 ascidian *Ascidiella aspersa*. The full species list of taxonomic assignments and number of
409 reads per site is available in Supplementary Information Table S4.

410 The taxonomic assignments per site were compared with published lists from RAS for INNS
411 at our study sites (Minchin, 2007; Wood et al. 2015, Table S3), and we were able to identify
412 one known INNS at our study sites. We detected the non-native barnacle *Austrominius*
413 *modestus* at all sample sites. This species is found throughout Irish and UK waters (Crisp,
414 1958; O'Riordan, 1996; Minchin, 2007; Wood et al. 2015). We did not detect *D. vexillum* at
415 any of the study sites through metabarcoding, despite the fact that *D. vexillum* colonies are
416 found at Malahide Marina, Carlingford Lough and Holyhead Marina, and this species was
417 detected in our targeted qPCR assay at those sites (Table 1).

418

419 **Discussion:**

420 In this study, we aimed to determine the potential of eDNA methods (qPCR and
421 metabarcoding) for detection of marine INNS at marina and non-marina coastal sites. We
422 found that qPCR was effective at detecting our target INNS, *D. vexillum*, where it was known
423 to occur, whereas metabarcoding did not detect *D. vexillum*. However, metabarcoding did
424 enable us to detect common marine species found around the coasts of Ireland and the UK as
425 well as the established non-native barnacle *A. modestus.* Thus metabarcoding approaches are
426 potentially useful at detecting multiple INNS in a single analysis and are therefore useful for
427 early detection and as supplementary survey tools. Further, metabarcoding detected the
428 greatest numbers of species at natural sites and the fewest species at closed artificial sites,
429 while intermediate numbers of species were detected at open artificial sites. This eDNA study
430 therefore supports the general conclusion from ecological surveys that biodiversity associated

431 with artificial shores tends to be lower than on natural rocky shores (Chapman & Bulleri,
432 2003; Bulleri & Chapman, 2004; Garcia et al. 2007; Vaselli et al. 2008; Pister, 2009).

433

434 For targeted detection of *D. vexillum* with qPCR, we developed and tested a novel assay for
435 specific detection of this species in Irish and Welsh seawater samples. We ground-truthed our
436 approach by testing water samples taken from directly beside a *D. vexillum* colony at
437 Malahide Marina. These samples, plus those taken from sites where *D. vexillum* is known to
438 occur (Malahide Marina, Carlingford Lough and Holyhead Marina), all provided positive
439 results, while we did not detect *D. vexillum* at those locations where it has not been
440 previously observed (i.e. Port Oriel, Conwy and Porth Dinllaen). While we did not directly
441 check for the potential for cross species amplification of other species found in the Irish Sea,
442 all positive amplifications were subjected to Sanger sequencing which verified that the
443 amplicon corresponded to *D. vexillium* in all tests. Future studies using the assay outside the
444 sampling area used in the current study should either test for cross amplification with local
445 species or Sanger sequence amplicons to verify the species identity.

446 In some cases eDNA approaches can be used to give some indication of relative abundance
447 of target species (c.f. Bracken et al. 2018). However, in our case qPCR was not effective at
448 quantifying *D. vexillum* DNA for some of our samples from 2018. This is unsurprising as we
449 sampled a wide area and eDNA may be heterogeneously dispersed in aquatic ecosystems
450 (Takahara et al. 2012; Pilliod et al. 2013). This coupled with the lack of knowledge about
451 tunicate DNA shedding rates in relation to seasonality and environment, may also influence
452 reliable quantitative estimates. However, it is likely that determination of presence versus
453 absence (too low DNA concentrations for detection) is sufficient to achieve the goals of
454 INNS early detection monitoring. We used only publicly available European *D. vexillum*

455 sequences to design the assay, but it should be possible to design other assays for haplotypes
456 found in other locations (which has previously been done in Australia by Simpson et al.
457 (2017)). As with all other qPCR assays used for eDNA studies, we are limited by the
458 availability of existing samples and sequences taken from public repositories. For this reason,
459 we recommend that representatives for populations of *D. vexillum* throughout its invasive
460 range are sequenced to increase our knowledge of the markers targeted (notably *COI*) for
461 detection of this species using eDNA-based approaches.

462 Converse to the qPCR results, we did not detect *D. vexillum* through the metabarcoding
463 approach. Primer bias is one possible reason why we failed to detect this species. Primer
464 choice plays an important role in species detection, and it is now accepted that 'general
465 primers' are not truly universal across taxonomic groups (e.g. Piñol et al. 2015;
466 Krehenwinkel et al. 2017). While we attempted to mitigate this by utilising two sets of
467 degenerate primers in a multiplex PCR, our data suggests that these primers preferentially
468 amplified other, potentially more abundant DNA that was present in the complex mix of
469 environmental DNA. It is also possible that our dataset contained sequences originating from
470 *D. vexillum* that may have been lost due to denoising and removal of singleton reads. Another
471 potential reason for lack of *D. vexillum* detection could be removal of sequences found in
472 negative control samples from the analysis. However inspection of those sequences revealed
473 that none were taxonomically assigned to *D. vexillum* or any of the other INNS identified in
474 previous visual (RAS) surveys. It might be that, the competitive nature of PCR,
475 concentrations of *D. vexillum* was too low for metabarcoding to detect the presence and
476 qPCR as it is species specific, could detect lower concentrations of the target species.. A
477 potential approach to increase the detection potential using metbarcoding could be to design
478 and deploy taxon specific primers. However, this approach might require a large number of

479 primers and it might be, as in our case, that qPCR single species assays are more sensitive for
480 detection of specific INNS.

481 A limitation of metabarcoding of marine waters identified in this study, and likely
482 problematic in other marine studies as well, was that taxonomic assignment was only possible
483 for a small fraction of the sequences produced. We were unable to assign taxonomy to ~99%
484 of our ASV's, suggesting that there are considerable gaps in the current reference barcode
485 database. We observed that the reference database used in this study (MIDORI_UNIQ;
486 Machida et al. 2017) contained one or more reference sequences for the majority of INNS
487 identified in Irish and Welsh RAS efforts. However, there were no reference sequences for
488 the colonial ascidian *Aplidium cf. glabrum* and the bryozoan *Solidobalanus fallax*. We
489 recommend that efforts should be made to increase the availability of commonly used
490 markers (*COI*, *12s*, etc.) for species in the Irish Sea and elsewhere to improve the proportion
491 of ASVs that can be assigned to a species (similar to barcoding initiatives such as the
492 International Barcode of Life (iBOL) project), and particularly for potentially invasive or
493 cryptic species. While there are no currently published studies of eDNA metabarcoding in
494 Irish marine waters, eDNA metabarcoding of seawater samples for INNS detection has been
495 carried out previously in the UK, with sampling sites including Wales (Holman et al. 2019).
496 Though, the specific study site details were not published by Holman et al. (2019) and
497 differences in methodologies precludes direct comparison with our results, their study of
498 INNS at marinas in the UK demonstrated a much higher prevalence of identified INNS. For
499 example, using a 313 bp fragment of *COI,* the authors were able to identify seven out of 21
500 INNS previously detected during RAS. Further, in an eDNA metabarcoding study of ports in
501 the Bay of Biscay, Borrell et al. (2017) identified three INNS that had been previously
502 recorded at their study sites. However, they utilised two different genetic markers, *COI* and
503 *18s* rDNA, and found that the INNS were detected only in the *18s* rDNA dataset. Grey et al.

504 (2018) also carried out a metabarcoding study of commercial ports using the same two
505 markers, and found *COI* was more effective for identifying known INNS in the sampling
506 areas, but that 18s rDNA was more effective at detecting unrecorded potential INNS.
507 Combined this suggests that availability of well curated sequence repositories and marker
508 choice plays a particularly important role in detecting INNS and that the use of multiple
509 markers may be required to optimally capture the INNS and overall biodiversity present in
510 the environment.

511 The findings of our study demonstrate that metabarcoding can be a useful tool for detecting
512 an established INNS but may also miss species that are present in low abundance, that occur
513 in high flushing locations or that remain undetected in a sample due to bias arising from
514 sampling protocols, PCR competition, sequencing errors or primer mismatches. We agree
515 with other authors that metabarcoding can complement conventional survey techniques
516 (Kelly et al. 2017; Djurhuus et al. 2018), rather than act as a direct proxy for visual survey
517 methods. In conclusion, metabarcoding might be less suitable than single species assays for
518 detecting INNS and for future studies and for biosecurity surveillance of specific nuisance
519 INNS like *D. vexillum*, we recommend that the qPCR-based tool presented here can be
520 implemented as it might provide a more sensitive and specific method of detection. However,
521 it should be noted that while qPCR might have higher sensitivity at low DNA concentrations
522 than metabarcoding, too low concentrations could lead to false negative detection. To
523 increase the chances of detection, we recommend sampling close to where the INNS is
524 suspected to occur and to carry out routine temporal sampling to monitor for species
525 presence.

526

527 **References:**

528 Airoldi L, Beck MW (2007) Loss, status and trends for coastal marine habitats of Europe.
529 Oceanogr Mar Bio 45:357-417

530 Airoldi L, Bulleri F (2011) Anthropogenic disturbance can determine the magnitude of
531 opportunistic species responses on marine urban infrastructures. PLoS One 6 e229857.
532 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0022985

533 Bacchiocchi F, Airoldi L (2003) Distribution and dynamics of epibiota on hard structures for
534 coastal protection. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 56:1157-1166. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-
535 7714(02)00322-0

536 Bishop JDD, Wood CA, Yunnie ALE, Griffiths CA (2015) Unheralded arrivals: non-native
537 sessile invertebrates in marinas on the English coast. Aquat Invasions 10:249–264.,
538 https://doi.org/10.3391/ai.2015.10.3.01

539 Beveridge C, Cook EJ, Brunner L, MacLeod A, Black K, Brown C, Manson FJ (2011) Initial
540 response to the invasive carpet sea squirt, *Didemnum vexillum*, in Scotland, *S*cottish Natural
541 Heritage. Commissioned Report No 413. Scottish Natural Heritage, Inverness, UK, 24 pp.

542 Borrell YJ, Miralles L, Do Huu H, Mohammed-Keba K. Garcia-vazquez E (2017) DNA in a
543 bottle — Rapid metabarcoding survey for early alerts of invasive species in ports. PLoS ONE
544 12:e0183347. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0183347

545 Bolyen E, Rideout JR, Dillon MR, Bokulich NA, Abnet CC, Al-Ghalith GA, Alexander H,
546 Alm EJ, Arumugam M, Asnicar F, Bai Y (2019) Reproducible, interactive, scalable and
547 extensible microbiome data science using QIIME 2. Nat Biotechnol 37:852–857.
548 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-019-0209-9

549 Bracken FS, Rooney SM, Kelly-Quinn M, King JJ, Carlsson J (2019) Identifying spawning
550 sites and other critical habitat in lotic systems using eDNA “snapshots”: A case study using
551 the sea lamprey *Petromyzon marinus* L. Ecol Evol 9:553-567.
552 https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4777

553 Browne MA, Chapman MG (2011) Ecologically informed engineering reduces loss of
554 intertidal biodiversity on artificial shorelines. Environ Sci Technol 45: 8204–8207.
555 https://doi.org/10.1021/es201924b

556 Bullard SG, Lambert G, Carman MR, Byrnes J, Whitlatch RB, Ruiz G, Miller RJ, Harris L,
557 Valentine PC, Collie JS, Pederson J (2007) The colonial ascidian *Didemnum* sp. A: current
558 distribution, basic biology and potential threat to marine communities of the northeast and
559 west coasts of North America. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 342:99–108.
560 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2006.10.020

561 Bulleri F, Chapman MG (2004) Intertidal assemblages on artificial and natural habitats in
562 marinas on the north-west coast of Italy. Mar Biol 145:381-391.
563 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-004-1316-8

564 Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ, Rosen MJ, Han AW, Johnson AJ, Holmes SP (2016) DADA2:
565 high-resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. Nat Methods 13:581–583.
566 https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3869

567 Chapman, M.G. & Bulleri, F. (2003) Intertidal seawalls - new features of landscape in
568 intertidal environments. Landsc Urban Plan 62:159–172. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-
569 2046(02)00148-2

570 Chapman MG, Blockley DJ (2009) Engineering novel habitats on urban infrastructure to
571 increase intertidal biodiversity. Oecologia 161:625–635. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-009-
572 1393-y

573 Connell JH (1972) Interactions on marine rocky intertidal shores. Annu Rev Ecol Syst 3:
574 169–192. https:/doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.03.110172.001125

575 Coissac E (2012) OligoTag: a program for designing sets of tags for next-generation
576 sequencing of multiplexed samples. In: Data production and analysis in population genomics.
577 Humana Press, Totowa, NJ, pp 13-31

578 Cordell JR, Levy C, Toft JD (2013) Ecological implications of the invasive tunicates
579 associated with artificial structures in Puget Sound, Washington, USA. Biol Invasions 15:
580 1303–1318. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-012-0366-y

581 Crisp DJ (1958) The spread of *Elminius modestus* Darwin in north-west Europe. J Mar Biol
582 Assoc UK 37:483-520. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315400023833

583 Djurhuus A, Port J, Closek CJ, Yamahara KM, Romero-Maraccini O, Walz KR, Goldsmith
584 DB, Michisaki R, Breitbart M, Boehm AB, Chavez FP 2017) Evaluation of filtration and
585 DNA extraction methods for environmental DNA biodiversity assessments across multiple
586 trophic levels. Front Mar Sci 4:314. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2017.00314

587 Evans AJ, Firth LB, Hawkins SJ, Morris ES, Goudge H, Moore PJ (2015) Drill-cored rock
588 pools: an effective method of ecological enhancement on artificial structures. Mar Freshw
589 Res 67:123–130. https://doi.org/10.1071/MF14244

590 Evans AJ, Firth LB., Hawkins SJ, Hall AE, Ironside JE, Thompson RC, Moore PJ (2019)
591 From ocean sprawl to blue-green infrastructure–A UK perspective on an issue of global
592 significance. Environ Sci Policy 91:60-69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2018.09.008

593 Evans AJ, Lawrence PJ, Natanzi AS, Moore PJ, Davies AJ, Crowe TP, McNally C,
594 Thompson B, Dozier AE, Brooks PR (2021) Replicating natural topography on marine
595 artificial structures–A novel approach to eco-engineering. Ecol Eng 160:106144.
596 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2020.106144

597 Ficetola GF, Miaud C, Pompanon FO, Taberlet P (2008) Species detection using
598 environmental DNA from water samples. Biol Lett 4:423–425.
599 https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2008.0118

600 Firth LB, Knights AM, Bridger D, Evans AJ, Mieszkowska N, Moore P, O'Connor N,
601 Sheehan E, Thompson RC, Hawkins SJ (2016) Ocean sprawl: challenges and opportunities
602 for biodiversity management in a changing world. In: Hughes RN, Hughes DJ, Smith IP,
603 Dale AC (eds.) Oceanography and Marine Biology: an annual review. Taylor & Francis, pp.
604 193-269.

605 Firth LB, Knights AM, Bell SS (2011) Air temperature and winter mortality: implications for
606 the persistence of the invasive mussel, *Perna viridis* in the intertidal zone of the south-eastern
607 United States. J Exp Mar Bio Ecol 400:250–256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2011.02.007

608 Firth LB, Thompson RC, White FJ, Schofield M, Skov MW, Hoggart SP, Jackson J, Knights
609 AM, Hawkins SJ (2013) The importance of water-retaining features for biodiversity on
610 artificial intertidal coastal defence structures. Divers Distrib 19:1275–1283.
611 https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12079

612 Firth LB, Thompson RC, Bohn K, Abbiati M, Airoldi L, Bouma TJ, Bozzeda F, Ceccherelli
613 VU, Colangelo MA, Evans A, Ferrario F (2014) Between a rock and a hard place:
614 Environmental and engineering considerations when designing coastal defence structures.
615 Coast Eng 87:122–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2013.10.015

616 Fletcher LM, Atalah J, Forrest BM (2018) Effect of substrate deployment timing and
617 reproductive strategy on patterns in invasiveness of the colonial ascidian *Didemnum vexillum*.
618 Mar Environ Res 141:109–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2018.08.006

619 Garcia E, Satt MP, Martin D (2007) Low crested coastal defence structures on the Catalan
620 coast of the Mediterranean Sea: how they compare with natural rocky shores. Sci Mar 71:
621 259–267. http://dx.doi.org/10.3989/scimar.2007.71n2259

622 Gargan LM. Morato T, Pham CK, Finarelli JA, Carlsson JEL, Carlsson J (2017)
623 Development of a sensitive detection method to survey pelagic biodiversity using eDNA and
624 quantitative PCR: a case study of devil ray at seamounts. Mar Biol 164:112.
625 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-017-3141-x

626 Geller J, Meyer C, Parker M, Hawk H (2013) Redesign of PCR primers for mitochondrial
627 cytochrome c oxidase subunit I for marine invertebrates and application in all-taxa biotic
628 surveys. Mol Ecol Resour 13:851–861. https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12138

629 Glasby TM, Connell SD, Holloway MG, Hewitt CL (2007) Nonindigenous biota on artificial
630 structures: could habitat creation facilitate biological invasions? Mar Biol 151:887–895.
631 http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00227-006-0552-5

632 Graham J, Collins C, Lacaze JP, Brown L, McCollin T (2015) Molecular identification of
633 *Didemnum vexillum* Kott, 1982 from sites around the UK coastline. Bioinvasions Rec 4(3).

634 Grey EK, Bernatchez L, Cassey P, Deiner K, Deveney M, Howland KL, Lacoursière-Roussel
635 A, Leong SC, Li Y, Olds B, Pfrender ME (2018) Effects of sampling effort on biodiversity
636 patterns estimated from environmental DNA metabarcoding surveys. Sci Rep 8:2–11.
637 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-27048-2

638 Griffith K, Mowat S, Holt RH, Ramsay K, Bishop JD, Lambert G, Jenkins SR (2009) First
639 records in Great Britain of the invasive colonial ascidian *Didemnum vexillum* Kott, 2002.
640 Aquat Invasions 4:581–590. https://doi.org/10.3391/ai.2009.4.4.3

641 Gustavson MS, Collins PC, Finarelli JA, Egan D, Conchúir RÓ, Wightman GD, King JJ,
642 Gauthier DT, Whelan K, Carlsson JE, Carlsson J (2015) An eDNA assay for Irish
643 *Petromyzon marinus* and *Salmo trutta* and field validation in running water. J Fish Biol
644 87:1254–1262. https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.12781

645 Hänfling B, Lawson Handley L, Read DS, Hahn C, Li J, Nichols P, Blackman RC, Oliver A,
646 Winfield IJ (2016) Environmental DNA metabarcoding of lake fish communities reflects
647 long-term data from established survey methods. Mol Ecol 25:3101– 3119.
648 https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.13660

649 Hall AE, Herbert RJH, Britton JR, Boyd IM, George NC (2019) Shelving the Coast With
650 Vertipools : Retrofitting Artificial Rock Pools on Coastal Structures as Mitigation for Coastal
651 Squeeze, Front Mar Sci 6:456. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00456

652 Hebert PD, Cywinska A, Ball SL, Dewaard JR (2003) Biological identifications through
653 DNA barcodes. Proc Royal Soc B 270:313-321. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2002.2218

654 Holman LE, de Bruyn M, Creer S, Carvalho G, Robidart J, Rius M (2019) Detection of
655 introduced and resident marine species using environmental DNA metabarcoding of sediment
656 and water. Sci Rep 9:1-0. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-47899-7

657 Holt RHF (2019) *Didemnum vexillum*: survey of distribution and extent in Holyhead Harbour
658 after storm Emma, October 2018. NRW Evidence report no 306. 48 pp

659 Jerde CL, Mahon AR, Chadderton WL, Lodge DM (2011) “Sight-unseen” detection of rare
660 aquatic species using environmental DNA. Conserv Lett 4(2):150–157.
661 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2010.00158.x

662 Kelly RP, Closek CJ, O'Donnell JL, Kralj JE, Shelton AO, Samhouri JF (2017) Genetic and
663 manual survey methods yield different and complementary views of an ecosystem. Front Mar
664 Sci 3:283. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2016.00283

665 Kittinger JN, Ayers AL (2010) Shoreline armoring, risk management, and coastal resilience
666 under rising seas. Coast Manage 38:634-653. https://doi.org/10.1080/08920753.2010.529038

667 Krehenwinkel H, Wolf M, Lim JY, Rominger AJ, Simison WB, Gillespie RG (2017)
668 Estimating and mitigating amplification bias in qualitative and quantitative arthropod
669 metabarcoding. Sci Rep 7:1-2. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-17333-x

670 Lambert G (2009) Adventures of a sea squirt sleuth: unravelling the identity of *Didemnum*
671 *vexillum*, a global ascidian invader. Aquat Invasions 4:5–28.
672 https://doi.org/10.3391/ai.2009.4.1.2

673 Lobo J, Costa PM, Teixeira MA, Ferreira MS, Costa MH, Costa FO (2013) Enhanced
674 primers for amplification of DNA barcodes from a broad range of marine metazoans. BMC
675 Ecol 13:34. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6785-13-34

676 Machida RJ, Leray M, Ho SL, Knowlton N (2017) Metazoan mitochondrial gene sequence
677 reference datasets for taxonomic assignment of environmental samples. Sci Data 4:170027.
678 https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2017.27

679 Martin M (2011) Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing
680 reads. EMBnet.journal 17:10-12. https://doi.org/10.14806/ej.17.1.200

681 Minchin D, Sides E (2006) Appearance of a cryptogenic tunicate, a *Didemnum* sp. fouling
682 marina pontoons and leisure craft in Ireland. Aquat Invasions 1:143-147.
683 https://doi.org/10.3391/ai.2006.1.3.8

684 Minchin D (2007) Rapid coastal survey for targeted alien species associated with floating
685 pontoons in Ireland. Aquat Invasions 2:63–70. https://doi.org/10.3391/ai.2007.2.1.8

686 Mineur F, Cook EJ, Minchin D, Bohn K, MacLeod A, Maggs CA (2012) Changing coasts:
687 marine aliens and artificial structures. Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual
688 Review 50:189–234.

689 Ordóñez V, Pascual M, Fernández-Tejedor M, Pineda MC, Tagliapietra D, Turon X (2015)
690 Ongoing expansion of the worldwide invader *Didemnum vexillum* (Ascidiacea) in the
691 Mediterranean Sea: high plasticity of its biological cycle promotes establishment in warm
692 waters. Biol Invasions 17:2075–2085. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-015-0861-z

693 O'Riordan RM (1996) The current status and distribution of the Australian barnacle *Elminius*
694 *modestus* Darwin in Ireland. In: Keegan BF, O'Connor R (eds) Proceedings of the Irish
695 Marine Science Symposium 1995. Galway University Press, Galway, pp 207-218

696 Pilliod DS, Goldberg CS, Arkle RS, Waits LP (2013) Estimating occupancy and abundance
697 of stream amphibians using environmental DNA from filtered water samples. Can J Fish
698 Aquat70:1123-1130. https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2013-0047

699 Piñol J, Mir G, Gomez-Polo P, Agustí N (2015) Universal and blocking primer mismatches
700 limit the use of high-throughput DNA sequencing for the quantitative metabarcoding of
701 arthropods. Mol Ecol Resourc 15:819-830. https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12355

702 Pister B (2009) Urban marine ecology in southern California: the ability of riprap structures
703 to serve as rocky intertidal habitat. Mar Biol 156:861-873. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-
704 009-1130-4

705 Ruiz GM, Carlton JT, Grosholz ED, Hines AH (1997) Global invasions of marine and
706 estuarine habitats by non-indigenous species: mechanisms, extent, and consequences. Am
707 Zool 37:621-32. https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/37.6.621

708 Sambrook K, Holt RH, Sharp R, Griffith K, Roche RC, Newstead RG, Wyn G, Jenkins SR
709 (2014) Capacity, capability and cross-border challenges associated with marine eradication
710 programmes in Europe: the attempted eradication of an invasive non-native ascidian,
711 *Didemnum vexillum* in Wales, United Kingdom. Mar Pol 1:51-58.
712 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.03.018

713 Simpson TJ, Dias PJ, Snow M, Muñoz J, Berry T (2017) Real-time PCR detection of
714 *Didemnum perlucidum* (Monniot, 1983) and *Didemnum vexillum* (Kott, 2002) in an applied
715 routine marine biosecurity context. Mol Ecol Resourc 17:443-453.
716 https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12581

717 Stefaniak L, Lambert G, Gittenberger A, Zhang H, Lin S, Whitlatch RB (2009) Genetic
718 conspecificity of the worldwide populations of *Didemnum vexillum* Kott, 2002. Aquat
719 Invasions 4:29-44.

720 Stefaniak L, Zhang H, Gittenberger A, Smith K, Holsinger K, Lin S, Whitlatch RB (2012)
721 Determining the native region of the putatively invasive ascidian *Didemnum vexillum* Kott,
722 2002. J Exp Mar Bio Ecol 1:422:64-71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2012.04.012

723 Strain EM, Olabarria C, Mayer-Pinto M, Cumbo V, Morris RL, Bugnot AB, Dafforn KA,
724 Heery E, Firth LB, Brooks PR, Bishop MJ (2018) Eco-engineering urban infrastructure for
725 marine and coastal biodiversity: which interventions have the greatest ecological benefit? J
726 Appl Ecol 55:426-441. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12961

727 Taberlet P, Coissac E, Hajibabaei M, Rieseberg LH (2012) Environmental DNA. Mol Ecol
728 21:1789–1793. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2012.05542.x

729 Tagliapietra D, Keppel E, Sigovini M, Lambert G (2012) First record of the colonial ascidian
730 *Didemnum vexillum* Kott, 2002 in the Mediterranean: Lagoon of Venice (Italy). Bioinvasions
731 Rec 1:247-254. https://doi.org/10.3391/bir.2012.1.4.02

732 Takahara T, Minamoto T, Yamanaka H, Doi H, Kawabata ZI (2012) Estimation of fish
733 biomass using environmental DNA. PloS one. 7:e35868.
734 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0035868

735 Thomsen PF, Kielgast J, Iversen LL, Møller PR, Rasmussen M, Willerslev E (2012)
736 Detection of a diverse marine fish fauna using environmental DNA from seawater samples.
737 PLoS one 7:e41732. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0041732

738 Vaselli S, Bulleri F, Benedetti-Cecchi L (20058) Hard coastal-defence structures as habitats
739 for native and exotic rocky-bottom species. Mar Environ Res 66:395–403.
740 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2008.06.002

741 Vercaemer B, Sephton D, Clément P, Harman A, Stewart-Clark S, DiBacco C (2015)
742 Distribution of the non-indigenous colonial ascidian *Didemnum vexillum* (Kott, 2002) in the
743 Bay of Fundy and on offshore banks, eastern Canada. Manag Biol Invasion 6:385.
744 https://doi.org/10.3391/mbi.2015.6.4.07

745 Wood C, Bishop J, Yunnie A (2015) Comprehensive Reassessment of NNS in Welsh
746 marinas. Welsh Government Resilient Ecosystems Fund (REF) project report., (January).

747 Zaiko A, Samuiloviene A, Ardura A, Garcia-Vazquez E (2015) Metabarcoding approach for
748 nonindigenous species surveillance in marine coastal waters. Mar Pollut Bull 100:53–59.
749 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.09.030

750

751

752



753

754

755 **Figure 1:** Map showing the location of sample sites in Ireland and Wales that were included
756 in this study. Site type is indicated by label shape (see Legend).

757

758



759

760

761 **Figure 2**: Bar plot showing the proportion of ASV's which were assigned to the taxonomic
762 level of phylum for each sample site. Percentages of sequence reads that could be assigned
763 are listed in the location name.

764

765

766