1 **Crayfish plague affects juvenile survival and adult behaviour of invasive signal crayfish**

2

3 Running title: Crayfish plague negatively affects signal crayfish

4

5 John Rhidian Thomas[a], Chloe V Robinson[b], Agata Mrugała[c], Amy R Ellison[a*], Emily

6 Matthews[a], Siân W Griffiths[a], Sofia Consuegra[b], Jo Cable[a]

7

8 [a]Corresponding author. Thomasjr6@cardiff.ac.uk. School of Biosciences, Cardiff University,

9 Museum Avenue, CF10 3AX, U. K.

10 [b]Department of Biosciences, Swansea University, Singleton Park, Swansea, SA2 8PP, U. K.

11 [c]Department of Ecology, Faculty of Science, Charles University, Viničná 7, Prague 2 CZ-

12 12844, Czech Republic

*Present address: Bangor University, School of Natural Sciences, Environment Centre Wales,

Bangor, LL57 2UW, U. K.

Abstract

The spread of invasive, non-native species is a key threat to biodiversity. Parasites can play a significant role by influencing their invasive host's survival or behaviour, which can subsequently alter invasion dynamics. The North American signal crayfish (*Pacifastacus leniusculus*) is a known carrier of *Aphanomyces astaci*, an oomycete pathogen that is the causative agent of crayfish plague and fatal to European crayfish species, whereas North American species are considered to be largely resistant. There is some evidence, however, that North American species, can also succumb to crayfish plague, though how *A. astaci* affects such 'reservoir hosts' is rarely considered. Here, we tested the impact of *A. astaci* infection on signal crayfish, by assessing juvenile survival and adult behaviour following exposure to *A. astaci* zoospores. Juvenile signal crayfish suffered high mortality 4-weeks post-hatching, but not as older juveniles. Furthermore, adult signal crayfish with high infection levels displayed altered behaviours, being less likely to leave the water, explore terrestrial areas and exhibit escape responses. Overall, we reveal that *A. astaci* infection affects signal crayfish to a much greater extent than previously considered, which may not only have direct consequences for invasions, but could substantially affect commercially harvested signal crayfish stocks worldwide.

Keywords: crayfish plague; *Aphanomyces astaci*; behaviour; invasive species; signal crayfish; reservoir hosts

35   Key findings

36   • Juvenile signal crayfish suffered mortality after exposure to *A. astaci*

37   • Adult signal crayfish exhibited altered behavioural responses following exposure

38   • Susceptibility to *A. astaci* could affect signal crayfish population management

1. Introduction

Parasites have a significant impact on communities and ecosystems by directly affecting host fitness, with subsequent impacts on population dynamics and overall biodiversity (Hudson et al., 2006; Tompkins et al., 2011; Cable et al., 2017). Despite this, parasites are a fundamental component of healthy ecosystems with wide reaching impacts, from influencing the cycle of biogeochemical nutrients to regulating host density and functional traits (Hatcher et al., 2014; Preston et al., 2016). Parasites can also influence their host's behaviour, which can in turn alter the outcome of competitive interactions, reproductive behaviour and dispersal ability (Bakker et al., 1997; Macnab and Barber, 2012; Barber et al., 2017). During invasions by non-native species to new areas, parasites can play a key role facilitating or hindering the successful spread of invaders, while potentially having catastrophic effects on other related native species (Vilcinskas, 2015).

Crayfish are freshwater crustaceans that are commercially harvested in many countries, but can also reach high densities and exert a significant impact on ecosystems, with several species having become widespread, damaging invaders (Holdich et al., 2014; James et al., 2014; Ercoli et al. 2015). For example, in Great Britain, the North American signal crayfish (*Pacifastacus leniusculus*) has become the most common crayfish species, having largely replaced the native white clawed crayfish (*Austropotamobius pallipes,* see Holdich et al., 2014; James et al., 2014). Crayfish are hosts to many parasites and symbionts, including viruses, bacteria, fungi and helminths that can cause chronic, long-term infections (Longshaw et al., 2012; Kozubíková-Balcarová et al., 2013). One such parasite, the oomycete *Aphanomyces astaci*, the causative agent of crayfish plague, is a key threat to crayfish biodiversity worldwide (Svoboda et al., 2017), having eradicated many populations of native European crayfish (Filipová et al., 2013; Kozubíková-Balcarová et al., 2014) and recent evidence suggests it may have also caused a decline in commercially harvested North American crayfish stocks (Edsman

et al., 2015; Jussila et al., 2015). This obligate parasitic oomycete penetrates host tissues (Söderhäll et al., 1978) and produces motile reproductive zoospores (Cerenius and Söderhäll, 1984), which can reach high densities (up to several hundred zoospores per litre) during a crayfish plague outbreak (Strand et al., 2014). An infected individual can release about 2700 zoospores per week (Strand et al., 2012), and this number can be much higher when the crayfish is dying or moulting (Makkonen et al., 2013; Svoboda et al., 2013).

Generally, North American crayfish species which have co-evolved with *Aphanomyces astaci*, are considered to be chronic but largely asymptomatic carriers. They combat *A. astaci* through consistent production of prophenoloxidase, which activates a melanisation cascade resulting in melanisation of hyphae that prevents their invasion into host soft tissues (Cerenius et al., 1988). Most native European crayfish, on the other hand, apparently only produce prophenoloxidase only in response to infection, which is too slow to effectively melanise the hyphae that then spread into host tissues leading to paralysis and death (Cerenius et al., 2003). The Australian yabby (*Cherax destructor*) also suffers high mortality as a result of crayfish plague, though this species shows some resistance to less virulent strains and survives longer when exposed to highly virulent strains compared to highly susceptible species (Mrugała et al., 2016). In infected European crayfish, severe behavioural changes before death include a lack of coordination and paralysis (Gruber et al., 2014), though to what extent carrier crayfish exhibit behavioural changes is largely unknown and this could play a vital role during new invasions and in commercial crayfish farms. Highly infected crayfish, for example, might be less likely to disperse, which would alter invasion success and introduction to new habitats.

Few studies have directly assessed the effect of the *A. astaci* on North American species, although there is some evidence that they can succumb to the disease and display altered behaviour if also stressed by other factors (Cerenius et al., 1988; Aydin et al., 2014; Edsman et al., 2015). Co-infection of *A. astaci* and *Fusarium* spp., for example, results in

89 Eroded Swimmeret Syndrome (ESS) in signal crayfish, which causes females to carry fewer

90 eggs (Edsman et al., 2015). Mortality of adult signal crayfish has also been observed in

91 experimental settings, though only when crayfish were exposed to very high zoospore numbers

92 (Aydin et al., 2014). Furthermore, vertical transmission of *A. astaci* (from adults to eggs) has

93 been reported (Makkonen et al., 2010), and little is known on how *A. astaci* might affect

94 juvenile North American crayfish.

95   Here, we addressed two key issues regarding the effects of *A. astaci* on signal crayfish.

96 First, we tested the hypothesis that juvenile signal crayfish would suffer high mortality upon

97 infection by *A. astaci* zoospores, as it has previously been suggested that juvenile crayfish may

98 be more susceptible to infection compared to adults (Mrugała et al., 2016). Additionally, we

99 assessed the effect of *A. astaci* on adult signal crayfish, hypothesising that even if adults may

100 not suffer significant mortality, behavioural changes would be apparent.

101

102 **2. Materials and Methods**

103 *2.1 Signal crayfish trapping*

104 All adult signal crayfish were collected in February and March 2017 using cylindrical traps

105 ('Trappy Traps', Collins Nets Ltd., Dorset, UK) baited with cat food and checked daily

106 (trapping licence: NT/CW081-B-797/3888/02). The crayfish were collected from a population

107 displaying negligible levels of infection (maximum agent level A1) when assessed in 2014

108 (Derw Farm pond, Powys, Wales, SO 13891 37557; James et al., 2017). A small subset of

109 individuals (n = 3) re-tested by qPCR (see 2.2) before the experiments began in May 2017 all

110 revealed low levels of infection by *A. astaci*, although elevated compared to 2014 (agent level

111 A2/A3). After removal from traps, crayfish were transferred to individual containers with 500

112 mL of pond water and transported to the Cardiff University Aquarium (holding licence: W C

113 ILFA 002), where they were maintained individually in 20 L aquaria containing a plant pot

refuge, gravel and air supply delivered via an airstone. The crayfish were held at 13±1°C under

a 12 h light: 12 h dark lighting regime and fed a mixture of frozen peas and *Tubifex* bloodworm

(Shirley Aquatics, Solihull, West Midlands, U.K.) once every 2 days. A 50% water change was

conducted 1 h after feeding to maintain water quality and remove excess food. Crayfish were

acclimatised to the laboratory for at least 4 weeks before the experiments began. Four females

were carrying eggs, and upon hatching, the offspring were mixed, moved to 120 L communal

aquaria and used in the juvenile infection experiment. Only male crayfish were used in the

adult behavioural tests; since a relatively low number of females (n = 6) were caught and

therefore it was not possible to test an equal number of males and females in this experiment.

2.2 *Aphanomyces astaci* culture and quantification

Crayfish in the present study were exposed to a Group B strain (Pec14) of *Aphanomyces astaci*

provided by Charles University in Prague. This strain was isolated from dead *Astacus astacus*

from a crayfish plague outbreak in the Černý Brook, Czech Republic (Kozubíková-Balcarová

et al., 2014) and demonstrated similarly high virulence towards European *A. astacus* (see

Becking et al., 2015) as the strains from Group B (PsI) used in other experimental studies

(Makkonen et al., 2012; Jussila et al., 2013). The culture was maintained in Petri dishes of

RGY agar (Alderman, 1982; Becking et al., 2015; Mrugała et al., 2016) and zoospores were

produced according to the methodology of Cerenius et al. (1988). Briefly, 2-4 agar culture

plugs (~2 mm^2) were cut from an RGY culture and placed in flasks containing 200 mL of liquid

RGY-medium. Multiple replicates were done each time in order to produce a sufficient number

of zoospores. These cultures were allowed to grow at 16°C for 2-4 days on a shaker. Once

sufficient mycelial growth had occurred, the cultures were washed to induce sporulation and

transferred to separate flasks (containing 500 mL of distilled water). The washing was repeated

in distilled water 3-4 times over ~8 h. Then, the cultures were incubated at 13±1°C for 24-36

139   h until motile zoospores were produced. The number of zoospores was quantified using a

140   haemocytometer.

141   Following both experiments, crayfish were euthanized by freezing at -20°C for 1 h. For

142   juveniles, the whole crayfish was lysed (TissueLyser, Qiagen) and DNA extracted using a

143   Qiagen DNeasy extraction kit (Qiagen). For adult crayfish, a section of tail-fan and soft-

144   abdominal tissue was removed by dissection, lysed (TissueLyser, Qiagen), and both tissues

145   were pooled (~ 20 mg total), and the DNA extracted using the same kits. Infection intensity

146   was estimated based on the number of PCR-forming units (PFU) determined by qPCR using

147   TaqMan MGB probes and expressed using the semi-quantitative levels A0-A7 for adults (as

148   described by Vrålstad et al., 2009); with slight modification of the protocol as in Svoboda et

149   al. (2014). For juveniles, infection intensity was expressed as number of PCR forming units

150   because a direct comparison cannot be made here between juvenile (whole body) and adult

151   (sample body) infection levels.

152

153   *2.3 Juvenile crayfish infection*

154   Here, we monitored the survival of juvenile signal crayfish that hatched in the laboratory when

155   exposed either to *A. astaci* at 1, 10 or 100 zoospores mL^{-1} or to a sham treatment (control). All

156   crayfish used in this experiment hatched within a 3-day period in May 2017. The infection was

157   conducted twice in separate experiments, the first time approximately 4 weeks after the crayfish

158   hatched (n = 25 crayfish per zoospore treatment) and the second time after 10 weeks with

159   different crayfish (n = 17 individuals per zoospore treatment). When the experiment began,

160   crayfish were housed individually in 1 L pots containing distilled water with a gravel substrate

161   for 48 h. After this acclimatisation period, the pots were spiked with 1, 10 or 100 zoospores

162   mL^{-1} (the control treatment was given a 20% water change). After a 24 h infection period, 80%

163   of the water in all pots was changed. The crayfish were fed crushed algae wafers and frozen

164   *Tubifex* bloodworm (Shirley Aquatics, Solihull, West Midlands, U.K.) once every 2 days. A

165   50% water change was conducted 1 h after feeding to maintain water quality. For 14 days, we

166   recorded crayfish deaths and any moults daily. Crayfish and moulted carapaces were stored in

167   ethanol at -20°C until DNA was extracted.

168

169   *2.4 Adult crayfish behaviour*

170   Male crayfish behaviour was tested in an arena (Fig. 1) consisting of a tank (L 100 cm x H 53

171   cm x W 48 cm) with access to a terrestrial area (L 120 cm x H 20 cm x W 20 cm). At the start

172   of the experiment, crayfish were divided into two groups: those destined for 'high infection'

173   and those to be kept at 'low infection' levels. Those destined for the 'high-infection' group (n

174   = 15, mean carapace length 52.2 mm, sd = 4.44) were individually exposed to a dose of 1000

175   zoospores mL^{-1} in 500 mL of water for 24 h. Simultaneously, the 'low-infection' crayfish (n =

176   17, mean carapace length 53.1 mm, sd = 4.66) were sham-infected by adding the same amount

177   of distilled water instead of spore-containing water. After the 24 h period, all crayfish were

178   returned to their individual tanks, where they were held for 1 week before their behaviour was

179   assessed. Individual crayfish were placed into the behavioural arena (Fig. 1) and left to

180   acclimatise overnight. Then, at 09:00 h the next day, their behaviour was recorded using an

181   infrared CCTV camera (Sentient Pro HDA DVR 8 Channel CCTV, Maplin, Rotherham, UK)

182   for 24 h (09:00 – 21:00 light and 21:00 – 09:00 dark). During video analysis, the time spent

183   engaged in each of the following four behaviours was recorded for each crayfish: actively

184   walking in water, in a refuge, stationary out of the refuge and moving out of water.

185   Following this, each crayfish was moved to an aquarium (W 30 cm x L 61 cm x D 37

186   cm) with covered sides and allowed to settle for 30 min before their response to being gently

187   touched on the rostrum for 10 s was tested. Crayfish typically reacted by raising their chelae

188   (an aggressive, threatening response) and/or retreating using a characteristic 'tail-flip'

189   response. If a crayfish retreated, the glass rod was immediately moved again to touch the

190   rostrum. This test was repeated three times with 5 min intervals. Whether the crayfish reacted

191   with a 'tail-flip' and/or raised its chelae to attack was recorded. These responses were recorded

192   since behavioural changes that affect a crayfish's ability to retreat or interact with conspecifics

193   may have subsequent effects on competitive ability, resource acquisition, and ultimately,

194   survival.

195   Following behavioural tests, crayfish were euthanized and *A. astaci* infection levels

196   were quantified as described in section 2.2.

197

198   *2.5 Statistical analysis*

199   All statistical analyses were performed in R version 3.5.1 (R Core Team, 2018). For the

200   juvenile crayfish experiment, Kaplan-Meier survival analyses were performed using the

201   'survival' package in R (Therneau, 2018) with separate models run for both time points (4- and

202   10-weeks post-hatching). Both models included spore concentration and carapace length as

203   independent variables. Model selection was based on AIC. It was not possible to statistically

204   assess the effect of moulting on mortality as an insufficient number of moulting events were

205   recorded.

206   For the adult crayfish, the time spent moving (active), in shelter, stationary (outside of

207   a shelter) or out of the water was quantified over 24 h for each individual. Generalised Additive

208   Models for Location, Scale and Shape (GAMLSS) models (Stasinopoulos et al., 2008) with

209   appropriate distributions (see Table 1) were used to determine whether 'treatment' (i.e. high or

210   low infection) or carapace length (mm) influenced the proportion of time crayfish spent

211   moving, in shelter, out of water or stationary. In the GAMLSS with beta inflated or beta zero

212   inflated distributions, the μ parameter refers to the average amount of time spent engaging in a

213   particular behaviour, whilst ν relates to the likelihood of a behaviour not occurring

214 (Stasinopoulos et al., 2008). To assess the response of crayfish to a touch stimulus, threatening

215 or tail flip escape responses were scored separately. The crayfish were tested three times, and

216 it was noted whether they retreated by tail flipping and/or threatened by raising the chelae at

217 least once during the three tests. These data were analysed in binomial models (i.e., threat/no

218 threat, tail flip/no tail flip), using GAMLSS. Treatment group and carapace length were

219 included as independent variables.

220

221 **3. Results**

222

223 *3.1 Juvenile crayfish infection*

224 At 4-weeks old, zoospore concentration significantly affected survival of juvenile signal

225 crayfish ($z = 5.971$, $p < 0.001$), with almost all crayfish dying in both the 10 and 100 zoospore

226 mL^{-1} treatments after the 14-day experimental period (Fig. 2). Around half of the crayfish died

227 in the 1 zoospore mL^{-1} treatment, whilst 92% of control treatment crayfish survived. Carapace

228 length also had a significant effect on the survival of these crayfish, with larger individuals

229 surviving longer ($z = -4.387$, $p < 0.001$). In contrast, survival of crayfish exposed to the same

230 infection doses at 10 weeks of age was not significantly affected by the zoospore treatment; all

231 crayfish in the control and 1 zoospore mL^{-1} treatments survived, whilst 88% and 82% of those

232 in the 10 and 100 zoospore mL^{-1} treatments survived. All juvenile crayfish that were tested

233 (Fig. 2) were previously infected (as they were descended from infected females), although

234 those that were exposed to zoospores exhibited significantly elevated infection levels (subset

235 tested for *A. astaci* infection using qPCR; Kruskal-Wallis $X^2 = 9.7534$, df = 3, $p = 0.021$; Fig.

236 2).

237

238 *3.2 Adult crayfish behaviour*

239

240 All crayfish in the 'high-infection' group displayed agent levels A4-A6 (median number of

241 PFU = 23,050; n[A4] = 3; n[A5] = 13; n[A6] = 1), whilst all crayfish from the 'low-infection'

242 group remained at very low (n[A2] = 9) to low (n[A3] = 6) infection levels (median number of

243 PFU = 43). As such, for all analyses, crayfish behaviour was compared in terms of high and

244 low infection.

245

246 Adults exposed to *A. astaci* zoospores (high-infection: 1000 zoospores mL^{-1}) were significantly

247 less likely to leave the water and spent on average 1.3% (range: 0 - 3.8%) of the 24 h period in

248 the terrestrial arena compared to those in the low infection-group (sham-infected), which spent

249 3.5% (range: 0.3 - 9.2%) out of water (GAMLSS, ν, LRT = 5.671, p = 0.017). In terms of the

250 other behaviours, there was no significant difference between crayfish from both the high and

251 low-infection groups, which spent 31.8 (standard deviation ± 9.1%) of the time active, 47.2 ±

252 25% stationary outside of a shelter and 18.6 ± 26% in a shelter (Table 1; Appendix Table 2).

253

254 Crayfish from the high-infection group were also significantly less likely to mount a tail-flip

255 response to tactile stimulation (GAMLSS, μ, LRT = 4.036, p = 0.045), where 35% of those in

256 the high-infection group initiated a tail-flip response at least once compared to 75% of those

257 from the low-infection group. Overall, though there was no significant difference between the

258 two treatment groups, larger crayfish were more likely to display a threat response (GAMLSS,

259 μ, LRT = 4.758, p = 0.029), spend less time in a shelter (GAMLSS, ν, LRT = 5.514, p = 0.019)

260 and more time stationary outside of a shelter (GAMLSS, ν, LRT = 5.730, p = 0.017) compared

261 to smaller crayfish.

262

263 **4. Discussion**

264   Here, we show that *A. astaci* can cause almost total mortality in juvenile signal crayfish at

265   ecologically relevant zoospore densities (Strand et al., 2012, 2014), though larger, older

266   individuals were less affected. Additionally, we show that a high *A. astaci* burden affects the

267   behaviour of adult crayfish, making them almost half as likely to spend time on land and to

268   escape from tactile stimulation compared to less infected individuals. The low infection levels

269   of our control crayfish did not differ from those frequently observed in *P. leniusculus*

270   populations across Europe (Kozubíková et al., 2011; Filipová et al., 2013; Tilmans et al., 2014)

271   and in Japan (Mrugała et al., 2017); although slightly higher infection levels (A2-A5) were

272   reported in the UK (James et al., 2017). Thus, the high infection group in our study represents

273   the outbreak of a highly virulent strain. Whilst signal crayfish are a highly successful invasive

274   species in Europe that continue to spread (Peay et al., 2010; Holdich et al., 2014; James et al.,

275   2014), the negative impacts of crayfish plague reported here, especially in terms of juvenile

276   mortality, could have consequences for commercially harvested stocks by reducing recruitment

277   and possibly resulting in population crashes. This also supports previous studies which have

278   shown that commercially harvested signal crayfish populations can decline when *A. astaci* is

279   present (Jussila et al., 2016). Furthermore, these results add to growing evidence that *A. astaci*

280   could play a more significant role in regulating invasive signal crayfish population dynamics

281   than previously considered, which could play a role in determining invasion success (Jussila et

282   al., 2015).

283   In North American crayfish species, *A. astaci* can grow within the carapace, though

284   constant host melanisation of new hyphae prevents spore penetration to soft tissues (Unestam

285   & Weiss, 1970; Nyhlén & Unestam, 1975; Cerenius et al., 2003). In the present study, juvenile

286   signal crayfish suffered extensive dose-dependent mortality when exposed to *A. astaci*

287   zoospores around 4-weeks post-hatching. Slightly older (and therefore larger) crayfish,

288   however, avoided this cost. Many juvenile crayfish studied here probably became infected

289 rapidly after hatching, having acquired an infection from their mothers via horizontal

290 transmission. Older and larger crayfish possibly have a better-developed immune response,

291 capable of efficiently melanising hyphae. It has been suggested that the immune response of

292 juvenile crayfish to *A. astaci* infection is generally reduced compared to adults (Mrugała et al.,

293 2016), which seems to be the case in the present study. In other invertebrates too, younger

294 individuals exhibit lower immune responses, for instance, snails showing greater susceptibility

295 to schistosome parasites (Dikkeboom et al., 1985). It has also been hypothesised, however, that

296 juvenile crayfish could be less affected due to their higher moulting frequency compared to

297 adults (Reynolds, 2002), allowing them to shed the growing hyphae and lower their *A. astaci*

298 burden. Further research comparing the immunological capacity of juvenile and adult crayfish

299 is required to confirm this. By the 10-week time-point, particularly susceptible individuals may

300 have already succumbed to infection and therefore those used in the current experiment would

301 have been more resistant to the pathogen. This appears unlikely though, since high levels of

302 mortality were not observed in the communal holding tanks. Ecologically, the finding that

303 relatively young crayfish hatchlings are highly susceptible to high doses of zoospores could

304 have significant implications for signal crayfish recruitment and survival, especially in lentic

305 environments, where zoospores are less likely to be washed away from the maternal crayfish.

306   Adult crayfish suffering from higher *A. astaci* infection levels during the present study

307 exhibited a reduced tendency to leave the water. Although crayfish spend little time out of

308 water in general, this finding suggests that populations of invasive signal crayfish with high

309 burdens of *A. astaci* could be less likely to disperse overland to reach new aquatic habitats, a

310 behavioural trait that can contribute to the spread of invasive crayfish (Grey and Jackson, 2012;

311 Holdich et al., 2014; Puky, 2014; Ramalho and Anastácio, 2014). Other invertebrates are less

312 active when infected by parasites, potentially to avoid the associated fitness costs of dispersal.

313 Flat back mud crabs (*Eurypanopeus depressus*) infected with rhizocephalans, for example,

314 spend more time in shelter and are less active than uninfected crabs (Belgrad and Griffen,

315 2015), whilst sponge-dwelling snapping shrimp (*Synalpheus elizabethae*) infected by bopyrid

316 isopods show 50% lower activity levels compared to uninfected individuals (McGrew and

317 Hultgren, 2011). In other invertebrates, many studies have shown that parasites can influence

318 dispersal, though these studies focus on direct host manipulation, which does not seem to be

319 the case here as there is no evidence of *A. astaci* actively manipulating the host. In terms of

320 native European crayfish management, a lower tendency of infected individuals to disperse

321 overland might be beneficial, by reducing the transmission of *A. astaci* to new waterbodies.

322 Highly infected crayfish were also less likely to respond to tactile stimulation by

323 retreating in a characteristic 'tail-flip' manner. This reduced ability to escape could lead to

324 increased predation of highly infected crayfish. *A. astaci* zoospores largely penetrate soft

325 abdominal tissue (Vrålstad et al., 2009), and it is possible that the reduced escape response is

326 directly due to the general pathological effects of the parasite (Unestam & Weiss, 1970). Other

327 parasites, such as *Thelohania contejeani*, also penetrate crayfish tissues, parasitising the

328 muscles and reducing the ability of crayfish to predate and feed (Haddaway et al., 2012). It is

329 also possible that highly infected crayfish exhibit a reduced tendency to move on land to reduce

330 the risk of predation. In the same way, crustaceans become less active and tend to stay in a

331 refuge when moulting, during which they are vulnerable to predators and largely unable to

332 escape (Thomas, 1965; Cromarty et al., 2000).

333 The crayfish used in the current study were from a population previously considered to

334 be below the detection limit (n = 30 tested by James et al. (2017) exhibited A0-A1 levels).

335 However, given that infection levels A2-A3 were found both among crayfish tested before the

336 experiment began, as well as among those in the group not exposed to zoospores, it is evident

337 that this population has either become infected since 2014, that a previously very low

338 prevalence of *A. astaci* has since increased, or that crayfish present with A2-A3 infection levels

in 2014 were just not trapped by James et al. (2017). Signal crayfish in Europe are generally associated with the Group B strain of *A. astaci* (see Huang, Cerenius and Söderhäll, 1994; Grandjean et al., 2014), which has also been found infecting another Welsh population, approximately 45 miles away from the population studied here (James et al., 2017). Although not confirmed, the crayfish used in the present study were most likely initially infected with a Group B strain and subsequently exposed to another strain from the same group. It is also possible that the tested crayfish were locally adapted to their original *A. astaci* infection (Gruber et al., 2014; Jussila et al., 2015), and the observed behavioural effects resulted from the exposure to the new *A. astaci* strain. As observed by Jussila et al. (2013), even assumed identical *A. astaci* strains may differently affect their crayfish hosts; therefore, the experimental crayfish in the present study likely dealt with multiple infections of closely related *A. astaci* strains. Further research is required, to explicitly compare the behaviour and survival of infected and uninfected signal crayfish, as well as investigate the effects of different *A. astaci* strains (both in single and multiple infections) on the behaviour and survival of infected crayfish.

In summary, we have shown that high levels of *A. astaci* cause severe mortality in young juveniles and affect the behaviour of adult signal crayfish. Mounting evidence suggests that signal crayfish may succumb to *A. astaci* more often than previously considered, which could be having an impact on commercially harvested populations (Aydin et al., 2014; Edsman et al., 2015). The crayfish exposed to zoospores in the present study displayed relatively high plague agent levels of A4-A6 (A7 being the highest level of infection; Vrålstad et al., 2009). A longer period of infection, or higher infection dose, may induce further behavioural responses beyond those reported here, and in some cases even cause mortality as observed by Aydin et al. (2014), where signal crayfish were exposed to 10,000 zoospores mL^{-1}. Female crayfish suffering from ESS carry far fewer fertilised eggs than uninfected females (Edsman et al.,

364 2015) which, coupled with the high juvenile mortality documented in the present study, could

365 drastically reduce juvenile recruitment and result in population crashes. Similarly, crayfish

366 plague could also have implications for the further spread of signal crayfish by affecting

367 population dynamics, though this species has already successfully colonised large parts of

368 Europe (Holdich et al., 2014) and so the ecological impact may be negligible. Anecdotally, it

369 was assumed that most North American crayfish are infected with *A. astaci*, though molecular

370 methods have demonstrated that it is less prevalent than once thought. In France, for example,

371 just over half of the signal crayfish populations tested were found to be positive for crayfish

372 plague (Filipová et al., 2013), and in the UK the prevalence was 56.5% (James et al., 2017). It

373 is possible, therefore, that the population dynamics of uninfected invasive populations may be

374 affected when infected individuals are translocated and introduced.

375

376 **Financial Support**

380

381 **References**

382 **Alderman, DJ** (1982) *In vitro* testing of fisheries chemotherapeutants. *Journal of Fish*

383 *Diseases* **5**, 113-123. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2761.1982.tb00464.x

384 **Aydin, H, Kokko, H, Makkonen, J, Kortet, R, Kukkonen, H and Jussila, J** (2014) The

385 signal crayfish is vulnerable to both the As and the PsI-isolates of the crayfish plague.

386 *Knowledge and Management of Aquatic Ecosystems* **03**.

387 https://doi.org/10.1051/kmae/2014004

388 **Bakker, TCM, Mazzi, D, Zala, S** (1997) Parasite-induced changes in behavior and color make

389 *Gammarus pulex* more prone to fish predation. *Ecology* **78**, 1098-1104.

390 https://doi.org/10.2307/2265861

391 **Barber, I, Mora, AB, Payne, EM, Weinersmith, KL, Sih, A** (2017) Parasitism, personality

392 and cognition in fish. *Behavioural Processes* **141**, 205-219.

393 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2016.11.012

394 **Becking, T, Mrugała, A, Delaunay, C, Svoboda, J, Raimond, M, Viljamaa-Dirks, S,**

395 **Petrusek, A, Grandjean, F and Braquart-Varnier, C** (2015) Effect of experimental

396 exposure to differently virulent *Aphanomyces astaci* strains on the immune response of the

397 noble crayfish *Astacus astacus*. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology* **132**, 115-124.

398 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jip.2015.08.007

399 **Belgrad, BA, Griffen, BD** (2015) Rhizocephalan infection modifies host food consumption

400 by reducing host activity levels. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **466**,

401 70-75. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2015.02.011

402 **Cable, J, Barber, I, Boag, B, Ellison, AR, Morgan, ER, Murray, K, Pascoe, EL, Sait, SM,**

403 **Wilson, AJ and Booth, M** (2017) Global change, parasite transmission and disease control:

404 lessons from ecology. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B Biological Sciences*

405 **372**, 20160088. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0088

406 **Cerenius, L, Bangyeekhun, E, Keyser, P, Söderhäll, I and Söderhäll, K** (2003) Host

407 prophenoloxidase expression in freshwater crayfish is linked to increased resistance to crayfish

408 plague fungus, *Aphanomyces astaci*. *Cellular Microbiology* **5**, 353-357.

409 **Cerenius, L and Söderhäll, K** (1984) Repeated zoospore emergence from isolated spore cysts

410 of *Aphanomyces astaci*. *Experimental Mycology* **8**, 370-377. https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-

411 5975(84)90061-6

412 **Cerenius, L, Söderhäll, K, Persson, M and Ajaxon, R** (1987) The crayfish plague fungus

413 *Aphanomyces astaci* - diagnosis, isolation, and pathobiology. *Freshwater Crayfish* **7**, 131-143.

414 **Cromarty, SI, Mello, J and Kass-Simon, G** (2000) Molt-related and size-dependent

415 differences in the escape response and post-threat behavior of the American lobster, *Homarus*

416 *americanus*. *Biological Bulletin* **199**, 265-277. https://doi.org/10.2307/1543183

417 **Dikkeboom, R, Knaap, WPWVD, Meuleman, EA and Sminia, T** (1985) A comparative

418 study on the internal defence system of juvenile and adult *Lymnaea stagnalis*. *Immunology* **55**,

419 547-553.

420 **Edsman, L, Nyström, P, Sandström, A, Stenberg, M, Kokko, H, Tiitinen, V, Makkonen,**

421 **J and Jussila, J** (2015) Eroded swimmeret syndrome in female crayfish *Pacifastacus*

422 *leniusculus* associated with *Aphanomyces astaci* and *Fusarium* spp. infections. *Diseases of*

423 *Aquatic Organisms* **112**, 219-228. https://doi.org/10.3354/dao02811

424 **Ercoli, F, Ruokonen, TJ, Koistinen, S, Jones, RI and Hämäläinen, H** (2015) The introduced

425 signal crayfish and native noble crayfish have different effects on sublittoral macroinvertebrate

426 assemblages in boreal lakes. *Freshwater Biology* **60**, 1688-1698.

427 https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12601

428 **Filipová, L, Petrusek, A, Matasová, K, Delaunay, C and Grandjean, F** (2013) Prevalence

429 of the crayfish plague pathogen *Aphanomyces astaci* in populations of the signal crayfish

430 *Pacifastacus leniusculus* in France: evaluating the threat to native crayfish. *PLoS One* **8,**

431 e70157. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0070157

432 **Grandjean, F, Vrålstad, T, Diéguez-Uribeondo, J, Jelić, M, Mangombi, J, Delaunay, C,**

433 **Filipová, L, Rezinciuc, S, Kozubíková-Balcarová, E, Guyonnet, D, Viljamaa-Dirks, S and**

434 **Petrusek, A** (2014) Microsatellite markers for direct genotyping of the crayfish plague

435 pathogen *Aphanomyces astaci* (Oomycetes) from infected host tissues. Veterinary

436 Microbiology 170, 317-324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2014.02.020

437 **Grey, J and Jackson, MC** (2012) "Leaves and eats shoots": direct terrestrial feeding can

438 supplement invasive red swamp crayfish in times of need. *PLoS One* **7**, e42575.

439   https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0042575

440   **Gruber, C, Kortet, R, Vainikka, A, Hyvärinen, P, Rantala, M.J, Pikkarainen, A, Jussila,**

441   **J, Makkonen, J, Kokko, H and Hirvonen, H** (2014) Variation in resistance to the invasive

442   crayfish plague and immune defence in the native noble crayfish. *Annales Zoologici Fennici*

443   **51**, 371-389. https://doi.org/10.5735/086.051.0403

444   **Haddaway, NR, Wilcox, R.H, Heptonstall, REA, Griffiths, HM, Mortimer, RJG,**

445   **Christmas, M and Dunn, AM** (2012) Predatory functional response and prey choice identify

446   predation differences between native/invasive and parasitised/unparasitised crayfish. *PLoS*

447   *One* **7**, e32229. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0032229

448   **Hatcher, MJ, Dick, JTA and Dunn, AM** (2014) Parasites that change predator or prey

449   behaviour can have keystone effects on community composition. *Biological Letters* **10**.

450   https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2013.0879

451   **Holdich, DM, James, J, Jackson, C and Peay, S** (2014) The North American signal crayfish,

452   with particular reference to its success as an invasive species in Great Britain. *Ethology*

453   *Ecology & Evolution* **26**, 232-262. https://doi.org/10.1080/03949370.2014.903380

454   **Huang, TS, Cerenius, L and Söderhäll, K** (1994) Analysis of genetic diversity in the crayfish

455   plague fungus, *Aphanomyces astaci*, by random amplification of polymorphic DNA.

456   *Aquaculture* **126**, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/0044-8486(94)90243-7

457   **Hudson, PJ, Dobson, AP and Lafferty, KD** (2006) Is a healthy ecosystem one that is rich in

458   parasites? *Trends Ecology & Evolution* **21**, 381-385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2006.04.007

459   **James, J, Cable, J and Slater, F** (2014) A.L.I.E.N. databases: Addressing the lack in

460   establishment of non-natives databases. *Crustaceana* **87**, 1192-1199.

461   https://doi.org/10.1163/15685403-00003329

462   **James, J, Nutbeam-Tuffs, S, Cable, J, Mrugała, A, Viñuela-Rodriguez, N, Petrusek, A**

463   **and Oidtmann, B** (2017) The prevalence of *Aphanomyces astaci* in invasive signal crayfish

464 from the UK and implications for native crayfish conservation. *Parasitology* **144**, 411-418.

465 https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031182016002419

466 **Jussila, J, Kokko, H, Kortet, R, Makkonen, J** (2013) *Aphanomyces astaci* Ps1-genotype

467 isolates from different Finnish signal crayfish stocks show variation in their virulence but still

468 kill fast. *Knowledge and Management of Aquatic Ecosystems* **411**, 10.

469 https://doi.org/10.1051/kmae/2013077

470 **Jussila, J, Vrezec, A, Makkonen, J and Kortet, R** (2015) Invasive crayfish and their invasive

471 diseases in Europe with the focus on the virulence evolution of the crayfish plague. In Canning-

472 Clode J. (eds) *Biological Invasions in Changing Ecosystems Vectors, Ecological Impacts,*

473 *Management and Predictions.* DeGruyter Open Ltd, Warsaw/Berlin, pp. 183-204.

474 https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110438666-013

475 **Jussila, J, Tiitinen, V, Edsman, L, Kokko, H, Fotedar, R** (2016) Signal crayfish in Lake

476 Saimaa could be maladapted to the local conditions due to *Aphanomyces astaci* infection: a

477 seven-year study. *Freshwater Crayfish* **22**, 53-60. https://doi.org/10.5869/fc.2016.v22-1.53

478 **Kozubíková-Balcarová, E, Koukol, O, Martín, M.P, Svoboda, J, Petrusek, A and**

479 **Diéguez-Uribeondo, J** (2013) The diversity of oomycetes on crayfish: morphological vs.

480 molecular identification of cultures obtained while isolating the crayfish plague pathogen.

481 *Fungal Biology* **117**, 682-691.

482 **Kozubíková-Balcarová, E, Beran, L, Ďuriš, Z, Fischer, D, Horká, Svoboda, J, Petrusek,**

483 **A** (2015) Status and recovery of indigenous crayfish populations after recent crayfish plague

484 outbreaks in the Czech Republic. *Ethology Ecology & Evolution* **26**, 299-319.

485 https://doi.org/10.1080/03949370.2014.897652

486 **Longshaw, M, Bateman, KS, Stebbing, P, Stentiford, GD and Hockley, FA** (2012) Disease

487 risks associated with the importation and release of non-native crayfish species into mainland

488 Britain. *Aquatic Biology* **16**, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.3354/ab00417

489 **Macnab, V and Barber, I** (2012) Some (worms) like it hot: fish parasites grow faster in

490 warmer water, and alter host thermal preferences. *Global Change Biology* **18**, 1540-1548.

491 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02595.x

492 **Makkonen, J, Kokko, H, Henttonen, P and Jussila, J** (2010) Crayfish plague (*Aphanomyces*

493 *astaci)* can be vertically transferred during artificial incubation of crayfish eggs: preliminary

494 results. *Freshwater Crayfish* **17**, 151-153.

495 **Makkonen, J, Strand, DA, Kokko, H, Vrålstad, T and Jussila, J** (2013) Timing and

496 quantifying *Aphanomyces astaci* sporulation from the noble crayfish suffering from the

497 crayfish plague. *Veterinary Microbiology* **162**, 750-755.

498 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2012.09.027

499 **McGrew, M, Hultgren, KM** (2011) Bopyrid parasite infestation affects activity levels and

500 morphology of the eusocial snapping shrimp *Synalpheus elizabethae*. *Marine Ecology*

501 *Progress Series* **43**, 195-204. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps09123

502 **Mrugała, A, Veselý, L, Petrusek, A, Viljamaa-Dirks, S and Kouba, A** (2016) May *Cherax*

503 *destructor* contribute to *Aphanomyces astaci* spread in Central Europe? *Aquatic Invasions* **11**,

504 459-468. https://doi.org/10.3391/ai.2016.11.4.10

505 **Nyhlén, L and Unestam, T** (1975) Ultrastructure of the penetration of the crayfish integument

506 by the fungal parasite, *Aphanomyces astaci*, Oomycetes. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology* **26**,

507 353-366.

508 **Peay, S, Holdich, DM and Brickland, J** (2010) Risk assessments of non-indigenous crayfish

509 in Great Britain. *Freshwater Crayfish* **17**, 109-122. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00531-014-1002-

510 0

511 **Preston, DL, Mischler, JA, Townsend, AR and Johnson, PTJ** (2016) Disease ecology meets

512 ecosystem science. *Ecosystems* **19**, 737-748. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-016-9965-2

513 **Puky, M** (2014) Invasive crayfish on land: *Orconectes limosus* (Rafinesque, 1817) (Decapoda:

Cambaridae) crossed a terrestrial barrier to move from a side arm into the Danube River at Szeremle, Hungary. *Acta Zoologica Bulgarica* **66**, 143-146.

Ramalho, RO and Anastácio, PM (2014) Factors inducing overland movement of invasive crayfish (*Procambarus clarkii*) in a ricefield habitat. *Hydrobiologia* **746**, 135-146. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-014-2052-9

Söderhäll, K, Svensson, E and Unestam, T (1978) Chitinase and protease activities in germinating zoospore cysts of a parasitic fungus, *Aphanomyces astaci*, oomycetes. *Mycopathologia* **64**, 9-11.

Stasinopoulos, M, Rigby, RA and Akantziliotou, C (2008) Instructions on how to use the GAMLSS package in R, second edition. Available at: http://www.gamlss.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/gamlss-manual.pdf

Strand, DA, Jussila, J, Johnsen, SI, Viljamaa-Dirks, S, Edsman, L, Wiik-Nielsen, J, Viljugrein, H, Engdahl, F and Vrålstad, T (2014) Detection of crayfish plague spores in large freshwater systems. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **51**, 544-553. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12218

Strand, DA, Jussila, J, Viljamaa-Dirks, S, Kokko, H, Makkonen, J, Holst-Jensen, A, Viljugrein, H and Vrålstad, T (2012) Monitoring the spore dynamics of *Aphanomyces astaci* in the ambient water of latent carrier crayfish. *Veterinary Microbiology* **160**, 99-107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2012.05.008

Svoboda, J, Kozubíková-Balcarová, E, Kouba, A, Buřič, M, Kozák, P, Diéguez-Uribeondo, J, Petrusek, A (2013) Temporal dynamics of spore release of the crayfish plague pathogen from its natural host, American spiny-cheek crayfish (*Orconectes limosus*), evaluated by transmission experiments. *Parasitology* **140**, 792-801. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031182012002223

Svoboda, J, Mrugała, A, Kozubíková-Balcarová, E and Petrusek, A (2017) Hosts and

539 transmission of the crayfish plague pathogen *Aphanomyces astaci*: a review. *Journal of Fish*

540 *Diseases* **40**, 127-140. https://doi.org/10.1111/jfd.12472

541 **Svoboda, J, Strand, DA, Vrålstad, T, Grandjean, F, Edsman, L, Kozák, P, Kouba, A,**

542 **Fristad, RF, Koca, SB and Petrusek, A** (2014) The crayfish plague pathogen can infect

543 freshwater-inhabiting crabs. *Freshwater Biology* **59**, 918-929.

544 https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12315

545 **Terry, M and Therneau, M** (2018) Package "survival". https://CRAN.R-

546 project.org/package=survival

547 **Thomas, LR** (1965) Moulting behaviour of the western Australian crayfish *Panulirus cygnus*

548 George (Decapoda, Reptantia). *Crustaceana* **11**, 111-113.

549 **Tompkins, DM, Dunn, AM, Smith, MJ and Telfer, S** (2011) Wildlife diseases: from

550 individuals to ecosystems. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **80**, 19-38.

551 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2010.01742.x

552 **Unestam, T and Weiss, DW** (1970) The host-parasite relationship between freshwater

553 crayfish and the crayfish disease fungus *Aphanomyces astaci*: responses to infection by a

554 susceptible and a resistant species. *Journal of General Microbiology* **60**, 77-90.

555 https://doi.org/10.1099/00221287-60-1-77

556 **Vilcinskas, A** (2015) Pathogens as biological weapons of invasive species. *PLoS Pathogens*

557 **11**, 1-5. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1004714

558 **Vrålstad, T, Knutsen, AK, Tengs, T and Holst-Jensen, A** (2009) A quantitative TaqMan®

559 MGB real-time polymerase chain reaction based assay for detection of the causative agent of

560 crayfish plague *Aphanomyces astaci*. *Veterinary Microbiology* **137**, 146-155.

561 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2008.12.022

562

563

564   Fig. 1 – Experimental arena used to assess crayfish behaviour. The tank was filled with water

565   up to 3 cm below the level of the terrestrial area. The base of the arena, ramp (incline 30°) and

566   bridge were coated in 1-2 cm of pea gravel.

567

568   Fig. 2 – Survival (a, b) and infection levels (c, d) of juvenile signal crayfish infected with *A.*

569   *astaci* for two weeks. Infection treatments were sham-infection, 1, 10 and 100 zoospores mL^{-}

570   ^{1}; a & c) 4 weeks after hatching; b & d) 10 weeks after hatching. Note in b) sham-infection

571   treatment is identical to infection treatment 1 (grey / dashed grey). A subset of juvenile crayfish

572   from each treatment was tested using qPCR, c) sham-infection, 0 zoospores ml^{-1} [n = 5], 1 [n

573   = 6], 10 [n = 5], 100 [n = 4]; d) 0 [n = 3], 1 [n = 3], 10 [n = 5], 100 [n = 6]. See Appendix Table

574   1 for absolute values.

575

576 Table 1 – Results of GAMLSS (Generalised Additive Models for Location, Scale and Shape)
577 statistical analyses and mean proportion of time crayfish spent engaged in different behaviours
578 over 24 h. Significant results ($p < 0.05$) are highlighted in bold. BE = beta, BEZI = beta zero-
579 inflated, BEINF = beta inflated, BI = binomial, SD = standard deviation. * denotes proportion
580 of crayfish, not the mean.
581

Response variable	Infection treatment group	Mean (%)	Range (%)	GAMLSS Parameter	Family	Variable	DF	LRT	P-value
Proportion of time active	Low	31	21-49	μ	BE	Treatment	1, 28	0.016	0.898
	High	32	18-48			CL		0.024	0.876
Proportion of time out of water	Low	4	0-9	μ	BEZI	Treatment	1, 25	2.095	0.147
	High	1	0-4			CL		0.075	0.784
				ν		Treatment		5.671	**0.017**
						CL		0.125	0.724
Proportion of time in shelter	Low	21	0-55	μ	BEINF	Treatment	1, 24	0.046	0.830
	High	17	0-75			CL		2.478	0.116
				ν		Treatment		0.043	0.835
						CL		5.514	**0.019**
Proportion of time stationary	Low	44	11-76	μ	BEINF	Treatment	1, 26	0.383	0.536
	High	50	0-76			CL		5.730	**0.017**
Proportion of crayfish that tail flipped	Low	75%	na	μ	BI	Treatment	1, 26	4.036	**0.045**

	High	35%	na			CL	1.607	0.205
Proportion of crayfish that exhibited threat behaviour	Low	67%	na	μ	BI	Treatment	0.177	0.674
	High	65%	na			CL	4.758	**0.029**

582
583