

Mid Atlantic Mosquito Control Association

2013 Conference Notes

Student Presentation: Testing Hypotheses for *Aedes japonicus* Invasion Using

Community Ecology – T. Zachary Freed

- a) Assumes non-equal competition
- b) Applied to container breeding larvae
- c) *Aedes albopictus* is a superior competitor
- d) Hypotheses for coexistence
 - i) Keystone predation
 - (1) *Toxorhynchites rutilus* feeds disproportionately on the superior competitor
 - (2) Relieves effects of competition
 - ii) Spatial segregation - Ives 1988
 - (1) Patch segregation - refuges
 - (2) Intraspecific aggregation is greater than interspecific aggregation
 - iii) Fluctuating resources
 - (1) Highly variable spatial or temporal inputs of resources relieve competition
 - (2) Refuges provided for inferior competitors
- e) Methodology
 - i) Lab experiment
 - (1) Varying densities of *Ae japonicus* and competitor
 - (2) Presence or absence of *Tx rutilus* larva
 - (3) 3 replicates
 - (4) Measured per capita rate of population increase and contributing fitness correlates
 - ii) Field survey
 - (1) Two habitat types
 - (a) Tree holes - 5 sites
 - (b) Used tires - 6 sites
 - (2) Controlled for edge effects
 - (3) Recorded abundances of
 - (a) *Ae japonicus*
 - (b) *Ae albopictus*
 - (c) *Oc triseriatus*
 - (d) Presence of *Tx rutilus*
 - (4) Recorded resource amounts
 - (5) Calculated aggregation at the individual container level
- f) Results
 - i) Keystone predation
 - (1) Predation negatively affected both species
 - (2) *Japonicus* is an inferior competitor to *albopictus*
 - (3) With *albopictus* present, *Tox* did not positively impact *japonicus* - NOT Keystone predation
 - ii) Mosquito abundance by field site
 - (1) Tires produced more mosquitoes than tree holes

- (2) Japonicus does not do well in tires that contain albopictus
- (3) Indirect support for fluctuating resource hypothesis
- iii) Aggregation
 - (1) Both species clump around some kind of distribution
 - (2) Low amount of interspecific aggregation
 - (3) Provides strong observational evidence for aggregation
- g) Conclusions
 - i) Albopictus is a superior competitor
 - ii) Keystone predation hypothesis does not hold
 - iii) Japonicus and albopictus aggregate separately - sufficient for coexistence
 - iv) Tox may be a greater barrier to invasion than competition by albopictus
 - v) Oc triseriatus and Ae japonicus have equal competition so can coexist