

1 **SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF NON-NATIVE AND TRANSPLANTED AQUATIC MOLLUSC**
2 **SPECIES IN SOUTH AMERICA. WHAT DO WE REALLY KNOW?**

4 Alvar Carranza¹, Ignacio Agudo-Padrón², Gonzalo A. Collado³, Cristina Damborenea^{4*}, Alejandra Fabres⁵,
5 Diego E. Gutiérrez Gregoric⁴, Cesar Lodeiros⁶, Sandra Ludwig⁷, Guido Pastorino⁸, Pablo Penchaszadeh⁸,
6 Rodrigo B. Salvador⁹, Paula Spotorno¹⁰, Silvana Thiengo¹¹, Teofânia Vidigal¹², Gustavo Darrigran⁴

8 ¹Departamento de Ecología y Gestión Ambiental, Centro Universitario Regional Este (CURE), Sede
9 Maldonado, Universidad de la República, Uruguay; Área Biodiversidad y Conservación, Museo Nacional
10 de Historia Natural, 25 de mayo 582, Montevideo, Uruguay.

11 ²Projeto "Avulsos Malacológicos", Florianópolis, SC, Brazil.

12 ³Sociedad Malacológica Chile, SMACH, Santiago, Chile; Departamento de Ciencias Básicas, Facultad de
13 Ciencias, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chillán, Chile.

14 ⁴División Zoología Invertebrados, Museo de La Plata, FCNyM-UNLP, La Plata, Argentina. CONICET.

15 ⁵Sociedad Malacológica Chile, SMACH, Santiago, Chile; Laboratorio de Genética y Evolución,
16 Departamento de Ciencias Ecológicas, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile.

17 ⁶Grupo de Investigación en Biología y Cultivo de Moluscos, Dpto. de Acuicultura, Pesca y Recursos
18 Naturales Renovables, Facultad de Ciencias Veterinarias, Universidad Técnica de Manabí, Ecuador;
19 Instituto Oceanográfico de Venezuela. Universidad de Oriente, Venezuela.

20 ⁷Departamento de Genética, Ecologia e Evolução, Pós-Graduação em genética, Instituto de Ciências
21 Biológicas, Universidade Federal Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil.

22 ⁸Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales “Bernardino Rivadavia”, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires,
23 Argentina.

24 ⁹Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, Wellington, New Zealand.

25 ¹⁰Programa de Pós-Graduação em Oceanologia, Instituto de Oceanografia, Universidade Federal do Rio
26 Grande, FURG, Rio Grande, RS, Brazil

27 ¹¹Laboratório de Referencia Nacional para Esquistossomose - Malacologia, Instituto Oswaldo Cruz,
28 Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

29 ¹²Laboratório de Malacologia e Sistemática Molecular, Departamento de Zoologia, Instituto de Ciências
30 Biológicas; Lelf: Laboratório de Estudos de *Limnoperna fortunei*, Centro de Pesquisas Hidráulicas,
31 Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil.

33 *Corresponding author: Cristina Damborenea; cdambor@fcnym.unlp.edu.ar

36 **Author ORCIDS**

- 37 Alvar Carranza: ORCID 0000-0003-3016-7955
38 Ignacio Agudo-Padrón: ORCID 0000-0002-9073-9049
39 Gonzalo Collado: ORCID 0000-0001-9076-4255
40 Cristina Damborenea: ORCID 0000-0002-6411-1282
41 Alejandra Fabres: ORCID 0000-0002-8888-9320
42 Diego E. Gutiérrez Gregoric ORCID 0000-0002-8001-1062
43 César Lodeiros: ORCID 0000-0001-9598-2235
44 Sandra Ludwig: ORCID 0000-0003-0550-901X
45 Guido Pastorino: ORCID 0000-0003-3341-777X
46 Pablo E. Penchaszadeh ORCID 0000-0002-2043-8814
47 Rodrigo B. Salvador: ORCID 0000-0002-4238-2276
48 Paula Spotorno: ORCID 0000-0001-7771-3402
49 Silvana Thiengo ORCID 0000-0002-5547-206X
50 Teofânia Vidigal: ORCID 0000-0003-0385-6624
51 Gustavo Darrigran: ORCID 0000-0001-9512-8135

52 **ABSTRACT**

53 The impacts of biological invasions remain poorly known for some habitats, regions and taxa. To date,
54 there has been no comprehensive effort to review and synthesize the impacts of invasive mollusc
55 species in South America (SA). In this paper, we provide a synoptic view on what is known on
56 documented socio-ecological impacts of aquatic no-native mollusc species (NNMS) and transplanted
57 mollusc species (TMS) from SA. An expert group involving malacologists and taxonomists from different
58 countries, the “South America Alien Molluscs Specialists” (eMIAS), shared and summarized the scientific
59 literature, databases, and published and unpublished information on confirmed impacts of NNMS and
60 TMS in SA. Three broad categories, non-mutually exclusive were used as a framework: “Environmental /
61 Biodiversity impacts”, “Economic and social impacts”, and “Human health impacts”. Some 21 NNMS and
62 7 TMS have documented impacts on at least one of those three categories. We encourage targeting the
63 less known areas of research, such as economic valuation of human health (and veterinary) impacts
64 attributable to NNMS or TMS and expand our knowledge of environmental impacts for the species listed
65 in this study.

66

67 **Key words:** gastropods, bivalves, freshwater species, marine species, invasive species

68

69 **Acknowledgements:** Partial financial support was received by GD-CD-DEGG from Agencia Nacional de
70 Promoción Científica y Tecnológica (PICT-2019-01417); GD from Universidad Nacional de La Plata (UNLP
71 11/H949 and 11/N927) and GD-DEGG from Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas
72 (PIP 1966). Within the framework of a cooperation (TV) with Serra do Facão Energia S.A. (SEFAC) [06899-
73 2912/2016].

74

75

76 **INTRODUCTION**

77

78 Humans are completely dependent on the goods and services provided by Earth ecosystems, such as
79 food, water, disease management, climate regulation and even for the intrinsic value it provides such as
80 spiritual fulfilment and aesthetic enjoyment (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005). In the last 50
81 years, humans have changed ecosystems faster and more extensively than in any other comparable
82 period in human history, in large part to meet humans' demands for ecosystem services. The harmful
83 effects from that practice are causing a persistent decline in the ability of ecosystems to provide such
84 services (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005).

85 Biological invasions are a significant aspect of the Anthropocene (Campinha et al., 2015; Pyšek
86 et al., 2017) and a constant threat to biodiversity (IPBES, 2019). Humanity has introduced thousands of
87 species to areas outside their native ranges, and while most of these fails to establish viable populations,
88 invasive non-native species have been traditionally identified as one of the main drivers of biodiversity
89 loss worldwide, but their impacts on ecosystem services, sustainable development, and human well-
90 being are poorly quantified and understood (IPBES, 2019). Further, the magnitude of the threat to
91 endangered species is still controversial, due to a scarcity of empirical data and a high degree of
92 uncertainty (Dueñas et al., 2018; Gurevitch & Padilla, 2004). This knowledge gap is more pronounced for
93 some regions and taxa.

94 The impacts of invasive species have been studied, and reviewed more often for temperate
95 latitudes of the Northern hemisphere in comparison to the Southern hemisphere, for terrestrial rather
96 than aquatic ecosystems, and for plants and insects (together accounting for two-thirds of the studies),
97 in comparison with other taxa (Pyšek et al., 2008). Molluscs, the second most diverse metazoan phylum
98 (Darrigan et al., 2020) are no exception, and there is a direr situation concerning non-native mollusc
99 species (NNMS) in aquatic environments. Molluscs account for only 5% of global studies, and South
100 America is among the regions with fewer studies concerning this topic (Speziale et al., 2012; Thomsen et
101 al., 2014). For example, Thomsen et al. (2014) reported only 10 studies that quantified impacts of 13
102 aquatic non-native species from a review of 259 papers published between 1972–2012, but no
103 information on aquatic molluscs seems to be included. Similarly, a recent paper addressing the
104 economic cost of biological invasions worldwide (Diagne et al., 2021) found that 79% of the information
105 regarding impacts was gathered form studies performed in North America, Oceania and Europe. These
106 biases affect our understanding and management of this pressing issue.

107 Non-native aquatic molluscs play important roles in the ecosystems where they are introduced
108 (e.g., as consumers, competitors, hosts or prey). Despite their potential environmental importance, the
109 distribution patterns of NNMS in South America and their entry points have only recently been
110 documented by Darrigan et al. (2020), who listed 86 NNMS distributed in 152 (out of 189) terrestrial,

111 freshwater and marine ecoregions of South American continent. Of those, 30 were aquatic (16 in
112 freshwater and 14 in marine environments). More recently, 20 aquatic transplanted mollusc species
113 (TMS), i.e., native mollusc species introduced deliberately or accidentally beyond their natural range,
114 were recognised in South America (Darrigran et al., 2022).

115 To date, there have been no comprehensive efforts to review and synthesise the impacts of
116 NNMS and TMS in South American ecosystems, and thus a synoptic picture on the impacts of NNMS and
117 TMS in the region is still lacking. One of the underlying reasons is the greater attention given to
118 *Corbicula fluminea* (Müller, 1774) and *Limnoperna fortunei* (Dunker, 1857), which have been the subject
119 of numerous studies and important reviews (Penchaszadeh, 2005; Darrigran & Damborenea, 2006,
120 2009; Dreher Mansur et al., 2012; Boltovsky, 2015a). In this work, a synthesis of the known impacts
121 documented in South America for all registered NNMS and TMS is presented. Both *C. fluminea* and *L.*
122 *fortunei* are included, without claiming an exhaustive review of all published information. Such synthesis
123 aims to provide a better understanding of the present situation on the continent and grant insights for
124 future monitoring and policies, including limiting new introductions. Therefore, in this study we
125 synthesize and provide examples of socio-economic effects and environmental impacts of marine and
126 freshwater NNMS and TMS in South America, highlighting avenues for future research.

127

128

129 MATERIAL AND METHODS

130

131 An expert group involving malacologists and taxonomists from different countries of South America
132 (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela), the "South American Alien Molluscs
133 Specialists" (eMIAS; <https://emiasgroup.wixsite.com/emias>), reviewed and shared scientific literature
134 (including "grey" literature), collection data, databases and experiences on the subject through a virtual
135 forum. Additionally, the group compiled published information on confirmed impacts of non-native
136 mollusc species (NNMS) and transplanted mollusc species (TMS) in South America. The list of NNMS and
137 TMS was presented in previous contributions of the eMIAS (Darrigran et al., 2020, for NNMS; Darrigran
138 et al., 2022, for TMS). Each contributor provided information based on published evidence and/or
139 research experience according to their expertise, familiar taxa and region. The database on species and
140 impacts was completed with a literature search on Scopus and Google Scholar, with an open search
141 period. Keywords used in the search strategy include "species name," and "impacts" in English, Spanish
142 and Portuguese, identifying those publications relevant to the current study, according to the criteria
143 stated below.

144

145 Definitions

146 We define non-native mollusc species (NNMS) in South America as species introduced outside their
147 natural geographical range through human action, that are able to maintain a self-sustaining population
148 (Darrigran et al., 2020). Transplanted mollusc species (TMS) are defined as species native to South
149 America that underwent changes in their natural distribution within the continent, either through
150 human action or due to human-induced environmental factors (Darrigran et al., 2022). In our
151 discussion, if a given species has an evident impact on the environment and human well-being and
152 livelihoods, it is dubbed an “invasive species” (irrespectively of being a NNMS or a TMS). Cryptogenic
153 species *sensu* Carlton (1996) were not considered.

154 In the present study, an impact is considered to be a measurable change in the state of a given
155 indicator of an invaded ecosystem, which can be attributed to non-native or transplanted species
156 (Ricciardi, 2003). This definition of impact includes any change in ecological or ecosystem properties but
157 takes no position on whether a given impact is positive or negative value (Jeschke et al., 2014).
158 Therefore, only the effects on human well-being and livelihoods caused by invasive species are
159 considered either as positive or negative. Examples of ecosystem impacts include increased risk of
160 extinction of native species, changes in the genetic composition of native populations, modification of
161 the phylogenetic and functional diversity of invaded communities and food webs, changes in the
162 productivity of ecosystems, nutrient cycling and pollutants (e.g., Pyšek et al., 2020). We acknowledge,
163 however, that ecosystem impacts can also directly or indirectly affect human well-being (e.g., Martinez-
164 Juarez et al., 2015) and that species redistributions itself may impair economic development,
165 livelihoods, food security, human health and culture (Pecl et al., 2017).

166 There are several frameworks to assess the impacts or effects of aquatic non-native species
167 (e.g., Dextrase & Mandrak, 2006; Everard et al., 2009; Thomsen et al., 2014; Doherty-Bone et al., 2019;
168 Pyšek et al., 2020), which can be grouped into three broad and non-mutually exclusive categories:
169 “Environmental impacts or Ecological impacts” or “Biodiversity impacts” (i.e., impacts on “wild”
170 populations, communities, species or ecosystems). Similarly, effects on human well-being and
171 livelihoods are often divided in “Economic and social impacts” and “Human health impacts”. The latter
172 two pertain to different dimensions of human well-being and, although effects in human health can also
173 be considered Economic and Social impacts, we maintained these two categories separated (cf.
174 Martuzzi, 2005; Ebi et al., 2006; Zeimes et al., 2012; Pedersen et al., 2014).

175 Herein, we focused on the documented impacts and effects of invasive species in South
176 America, not considering possible risks and potential threats. Therefore, studies reporting range
177 expansion and first records of a given species in a certain area were not considered if they lack
178 significant observations on local impacts, even though those studies often include a list of potential
179 impacts based on what is known from elsewhere. Thus, we did not consider impacts that have been
180 reported from other continents where the same species has been introduced. When available, some

181 experimental results were included, although we did not necessarily affirm that the reported
182 interactions are occurring in nature.

183 For the category of environmental impacts, it may be argued that just by the arrival of a NNMS
184 or TMS there is a modification of the biogeographic distribution of native taxa, causing a change in
185 several community-level attributes, such as local species composition, diversity and evenness of local
186 communities. In this study, we focused mainly on conspicuous changes in local community structure
187 driven by the abundance of NNMS and TMS, and/or their incorporation into food webs. These effects
188 may be particularly relevant in human-modified ecosystems invaded by bivalves (Burlakova et al., 2022).
189 Other documented impacts may include changes on abiotic conditions directly attributable to the
190 presences of NNMS or TMS, or genetic interaction with local species (e.g., hybridization). Correlational
191 evidence for some impacts was accepted as a “documented” impact, but these cases clearly deserve
192 further experimental analysis to elucidate the underlying mechanisms or to confirm cause-effect
193 relationships.

194 Socio-economic effects include direct and indirect monetary costs associated with the action of
195 invasive species (Burlakova et al., 2022 and Adelino et al., 2021; Diagne et al., 2021, respectively). For
196 example, reduction or loss of profits due to the effect of mollusc-borne parasites in domestic cattle may
197 be particularly difficult to quantify or even estimate. We thus considered primarily those reports
198 highlighting the interaction of NNMS and TMS species with economic activities. Furthermore, some
199 species were introduced for the development of commercial aquaculture, and some accidentally
200 introduced species may also be commercially exploited.

201 Some NNMS can cause the spread of new and/or existing diseases acting as vectors of
202 pathogens. In the public health category, we were more liberal, so any reports documenting the
203 presence of a human or veterinary parasite or pathogen in a NNMS or TMS in South America were
204 considered. Other potential effects include allergic reaction, ingestion of toxins, loss of aesthetical value
205 or mechanical harms of several sorts (Mazza et al., 2013). Clearly, public health effects further include
206 an economic dimension, which should be considered elsewhere.

207

208 RESULTS

209 The information on confirmed impacts and effects of NNMS and TMS in South America is synthesised in
210 Tables 1 and 2. A total of 28 mollusc species was documented as having impacts in South America, 21 of
211 them are NNMS (nine freshwater and 12 marine) and seven are TMS (two freshwater and five marine).
212 All marine TMS are bivalves, *Leiosolenus aristatus* (Dillwyn, 1817), *Mytella strigata* (Hanley, 1843),
213 *Mytilopsis trautwineana* (Tryon 1866), *Argopecten purpuratus* (Lamarck, 1819) and *Tawera elliptica*
214 (Lamarck, 1818) and cause economic and social impacts. *A. purpuratus* is included on the basis of being
215 transplanted for commercial aquaculture. In the freshwater environment, *Anodontites trapesialis*

216 (Lamarck, 1819) causes economic and social effects. On the other hand, a species of gastropod,
217 *Pomacea canaliculata* (Lamarck, 1822) has documented impacts on the three categories (Biodiversity,
218 Economic and social effects, Human health effects). However, this species can also exhibit positive
219 effects as a potential control of the NNMS *Physa acuta* Draparnaud, 1805. Altogether, negative effects
220 are more commonly documented than positive effects. Finally, several NNMS are listed in more than
221 one category (see Tables 1 and 2). In the marine environment, nine NNMS cause Biodiversity impacts,
222 nine Economic and social effects and two Human health effects. In freshwater, seven NNMS cause
223 Biodiversity impacts, seven Economic and social effects, while three effects Human health.

224

225 DISCUSSION

226 Documented Impacts on Biodiversity

227 *Marine Ecosystems*

228 There are 14 aquatic NNMS that were intentionally introduced to develop commercial marine
229 aquaculture (Darrigran et al., 2020). However, only two of these species (the abalones *Haliotis discus*
230 Reeve, 1846 and *Haliotis rufescens* Swainson, 1822) are not established in natural environments, and
231 they have been highlighted as a threat to native and cultured species as a vector that facilitates the
232 spread of boring polychaetes (Moreno et al., 2006; Diez et al., 2011). The remaining 12 species are
233 currently distributed in coastal environments along South America, where they are at least modifying
234 species composition and relative abundances within communities, which can be viewed as a primary
235 impact on biodiversity. For some species, [e.g., *Perna viridis* (Linnaeus, 1758), *Isognomon bicolor*
236 (Adams, 1845), *Magallana gigas* (Thunberg, 1793) [=Crassostrea gigas (Thunberg, 1793)] and *Eualetes*
237 *tulipa* (Rousseau in Chenu, 1843)] there are studies quantifying densities or abundances, and that
238 provide a description of community structure after the arrival of NNMS. Often, those species that
239 increase the heterogeneity of native environments (e.g., *M. gigas* reefs on mudflats) cause shifts in the
240 occurrence and abundances of associated species (Melo et al., 2010; Ludwig et al., 2011; Mendez et al.,
241 2015), thus increasing alpha diversity at a local scale. Studies on some other encrusting, hard-bottom
242 species (e.g., *I. bicolor*) have likewise been carried out, and most include occurrence reports and
243 abundance estimates (Ignacio et al., 2010; Dias et al., 2013; Agostini & Ozorio, 2016; Oricchio et al.,
244 2019).

245 Other impacts at the functional level include the incorporation of NNMS in local food webs. For
246 example, *Rapana venosa* (Valenciennes, 1846) seems to be an important food item for Loggerhead
247 turtle, *Caretta caretta* (Linnaeus 1758), in the Río de la Plata estuary (Carranza et al., 2010a). Another
248 example is *I. bicolor* that has been shown to cause changes of food habit in the gastropod *Stramonita*
249 *haemastoma* (Linnaeus, 1758), which fundamentally preyed on the mussel *Perna perna* (Linnaeus,
250 1758), native species according to Darrigran et al. (2020), before the arrival of *Isognomon* (López et al.,

251 2010). There are other interactions reported, such as the massive fouling of *R. venosa* on green sea
252 turtles *Chelonia mydas* (Linnaeus, 1758) (Lezama et al., 2013), although the effects on individual fitness
253 are yet to be confirmed. Similarly, due to the predatory role and high local abundances of *R. venosa*, this
254 species could be significantly affecting some ecological properties of their intertidal habitat, such as
255 mussel coverage on rocky bottoms (Carranza et al., 2010b), but no studies have quantified the extension
256 of this presumably environmental impact.

257

258 **Freshwater Ecosystems**

259 Reports of biodiversity impacts of NNMS/TMS are available for only eight species in freshwater
260 environments. One of the best studied species is the golden mussel, *Limnoperna fortunei*, which is the
261 most aggressive aquatic invasive in South America. The rapid spread of *L. fortunei* populations in
262 hydrographic basins have been attributed to human-mediated dispersal (Belz et al., 2012; Boltovskoy,
263 2015b; Borges et al., 2017; Ludwig et al., 2021).

264 Populations of *L. fortunei* are found on virtually any natural hard surface available (e.g., logs,
265 water vegetation, and compact sandy silt), as well as any artificial structure and substrate (e.g., walls,
266 piers, pipes, glass, nylon) (Darrigran & Damborenea, 2005). De Lucía et al. (2023) recommend
267 conservation efforts given the constant advance of urbanization, with environmental impact studies
268 prior to coastal reforms, and implementation of density control strategies for *Limnoperna fortunei* in
269 protected areas. Considering the serious problems that it causes, it is astonishingly overlooked by
270 society and governments in South America. The golden mussel modifies environmental conditions of
271 invaded South American inland freshwater environments, altering both abiotic and biotic variables
272 affecting ecosystem services, with large environmental and socio-economic impacts (Darrigran &
273 Damborenea, 2011; Boltovskoy & Correa, 2015). Impacts of *Limnoperna fortunei* are difficult to interpret
274 due to the multiple interactions with the biotic and abiotic components and their dynamics and to the
275 regional environmental conditions. So, the impacts are variable in the medium and long terms, and in
276 both local and regional scale. The impacts and the effects are reflected in the high number of
277 publications. Boltovskoy (2015a) and Burlakova et al. (2022) summarized the scale and variety of the
278 environmental impacts and economic and human well-being effects caused by the golden mussel. In this
279 contribution we only have addressed the most conspicuous effects, such as fouling on native molluscs
280 and other macroinvertebrates (including *Anodontites trapesialis* and *C. fluminea* [Darrigran, 2002], the
281 crabs *Trichodactylus borellianus* [Rojas Molina & Williner, 2013] and *Aegla platensis*, and the gastropod
282 *Pomacea canaliculata* [Darrigran & Damborenea, 2005; Silva et al., 2021a], impacts on benthic
283 communities, fish communities, bioaccumulation of metals, impacts in water column, nutrient cycling,
284 and on plankton communities and cyanobacteria blooms (Table 1). In summary, *L. fortunei* is a very

285 effective ecosystem engineer, altering both the structure and function of the ecosystem (Darrigran &
286 Damborenea, 2011; Boltovskoy, 2015a).

287 Four NNMS of the genus *Corbicula* were recorded in South America [*C. fluminea*, *C. largillierti* (Philippi, 1844), *C. fluminalis* (Müller, 1774) and *Corbicula* sp.] (Mansur et al., 2011). Among these
288 species, *C. fluminea* causes a severe impact on the environment. This species invaded ecosystems
289 around the world, being present between 39° South and 53° North. In less than 100 years, it has invaded
290 all continents except Antarctica, being one of the most successful invasive species in aquatic ecosystems
291 (Crespo et al., 2015). In the hydrographic basins of South America, the macroinvertebrates assemblages
292 are mainly impacted by displacement and reduction of available habitat (Darrigran et al., 2020; Labaut
293 et al., 2021). Thus, like the golden mussel, *C. fluminea* often plays a role of ecosystem engineer, causing
294 physical disruptions wherever it establishes and changing the structure of macroinvertebrate benthic
295 communities (Reshaid et al., 2017). Labaut et al. (2021) observed that on the Limay River, in the
296 Argentinean Patagonia, *C. fluminea* impacts the abundance of some taxa, due to the competition for
297 resources in a low productivity ecosystem. The faeces and pseudo-faeces of *C. fluminea* deposited on
298 the sediment enrich their organic content. However, they compete for food with benthic
299 macroinvertebrates. Sites invaded by *C. fluminea* showed a tendency towards homogenization of
300 species and functional composition (Labaut et al., 2021). However, in other cases, the evidence for
301 competitive displacement of native species is not always strong. Clavijo and Carranza (2014), analysing
302 the correlation between the critical reduction of the distribution of the native *Cyanocyclas* spp. and the
303 spread of *Corbicula* in Uruguay, proposed the interplay between a) the direct adverse effect of
304 interspecific competition with the Asiatic clam, and/or b) the degradation of environmental conditions
305 leading to the disappearance of the native species and their replacement by opportunistic species. Both
306 hypotheses should be regarded as extremes of a continuum, with several intermediate scenarios likely
307 to coexist.

309 Reproductive studies offer a solid basis for predictive trends of the invasion of populations of *C.*
310 *fluminea*. The reproductive features (Pigneur et al., 2014; Ludwig et al., 2014; Cao et al., 2017) facilitate
311 the survival of *C. fluminea* from Venezuela (10°10'S - 63°30'W) to Patagonia Argentina (39°28'S -
312 68°58'W) (Labaut et al., 2021), being present in about half of the South American freshwater ecoregions
313 (Darrigran et al., 2020). The rapid spread of *C. fluminea* in South America has involved humans as
314 vectors, either transporting individuals in the bilge water of crafts, with or as fish bait, in dredged river
315 sand, as juveniles attached to boat hulls, and by aquarium hobbyists (McMahon, 2000; Belz et al., 2012;
316 Labaut, 2021).

317 Other NNMS freshwater species with reported impacts in South America are *Melanoides*
318 *tuberculata* (Müller, 1774) and the New Zealand mud snail *Potamopyrgus antipodarum* (Gray, 1843). In
319 Brazil, *M. tuberculata* has negatively affected native populations of *Pomacea lineata* (Spix in J. A.

320 Wagner, 1827) in Rio de Janeiro state, *Biomphalaria glabrata* (Say, 1818) in Minas Gerais and Rio de
321 Janeiro states, *Biomphalaria straminea* (Dunker, 1848) in Minas Gerais, and *Aylacostoma tenuilabris*
322 (Reeve, 1860) in the Tocantins River, Goiás (Guimarães et al., 2001; Giovanelli et al., 2002; Fernandez et
323 al., 2003). Similarly, Collado et al. (2019) reported correlational evidence of competitive displacement of
324 native gastropods by *P. antipodarum* in Chile. Interactions of native species with NNMS or TMS are also
325 worth evaluating. Maldonado & Martin (2019) experimentally evaluated the effects of *Pomacea*
326 *canaliculata*, *Melanoides tuberculata* and *Physa acuta* Draparnaud, 1805 on native snails [*Heleobia*
327 *parchappii*, (d'Orbigny, 1835), *Biomphalaria peregrina* (d'Orbigny, 1835), and *Chilina parchappii*
328 (d'Orbigny, 1835)], showing negative interactions including reduced fecundity in *P. acuta* and *B.
329 peregrina*, although the NNMS *Melanoides tuberculata* was not affected by *P. canaliculata*. Thus, the
330 impact of *P. canaliculata* in recently colonised regions of South America deserves further attention.

331

332 **Documented Socio-Economic effects**

333 **Marine Ecosystems**

334 So far, there are few documented negative effects on economic activities by NNMS in South American
335 marine ecosystems. The mytilids *Mytella strigata* and the false mussels *Mytilopsis* spp. have been
336 reported to produce a trophic imbalance in culture pools, decreasing production in shrimp farming as
337 well as fouling in some structures (Aldridge et al., 2008; Lodeiros et al., 2019, 2021). Similarly, the boring
338 TMS *L. aristatus* caused damage to shells of the cultured scallop *Nodipecten nodosus*, producing serious
339 scars, deformations and even death, in a marine farm in São Paulo state (Brazil; Simone & Gonçalves
340 2006). Additionally, *Talonostrea talonata* Li & Qi, 1994 [=Crassostrea talonata (Li & Qi, 1994)] may
341 outcompete *Crassotrea tulipa* (Lamarck, 1819) [=Crassostrea gasar (Lamarck, 1819)], being a nuisance
342 species in oyster culture (Cavaleiro et al., 2019). Finally, the vermetid *Eualetes tulipa* fouls power plant
343 turbines in Venezuela (Miloslavich & Penchaszadeh, 1992).

344 On the other hand, positive economic return is associated with commercial cultures of *Haliotis*
345 *discus* and *Haliotis rufescens* (Flores Aguilar et al., 2007; Castilla & Neill, 2009; SUBPESCA, 2021) and the
346 Pacific oyster *Magallana gigas* (Furse et al., 2004; dos Santos & Costa, 2016; Martínez-García et al.,
347 2021). This kind of introductions for commercial aquaculture often presents positive social effects such
348 as direct income, increased employment and associated research. In this line, the development of
349 experimental aquaculture may also be considered as a positive effect associated with the green mussel
350 *Perna viridis* in Venezuela, since it provides new employment opportunities for local researchers and
351 workers (Acosta-Balbás et al., 2019).

352 Another interesting effect to be more carefully analysed is the claim that NNMS act as vectors of
353 boring polychaetes. Once marine species are introduced to new areas for aquaculture, their associated
354 epibionts can also be accidentally introduced. This may pose a risk both to the economic activity and the

native biodiversity, since non-native epibionts may be able to exploit new native hosts (e.g., Kuris & Culver 1999). This effect could change population and community composition and dynamics (Grosholz et al., 2000), but this phenomenon remains poorly understood in South America. However, Moreno et al. (2006) pointed out that aquaculture activities may be the primary introduction vector for boring polychaete species in Chile. Similarly, spionid polychaetes heavily parasitize and destroy the shell of the invading *Rapana venosa* in Uruguay (A. Carranza, unpublished), and in certain areas it may be exerting some control of the invader species. However, the identity and biogeographic origin of the polychaete species involved is hard to elucidate.

363

364 **Freshwater Ecosystems**

365 *Limnoperna fortunei* easily invades water transfer tunnels and attaches to tunnel walls and structures
366 with extremely high density, resulting in biofouling and being responsible for negative effects on
367 hydropower generation, water quality, and damages in man-made structures (Adelino et al., 2021). The
368 effect on turbine components occurs by hydro-abrasion; the abrasiveness of the golden mussel shell
369 was compared with that of silicon carbide (SiC) and the wear mechanisms acting on the SiC tests are the
370 same as for the mussels (de Castro et al., 2019). Additionally, the consequences of the establishment of
371 *L. fortunei* also include reduction in pipe diameter or outright blockage of pipes, water contamination by
372 massive mortality of individuals, and obstruction of cooling systems (Darrigan, 2010; Boltovskoy,
373 2015a). Rebelo et al. (2018) estimated that the cost of monitoring and maintenance due to golden
374 mussel fouling in the infrastructure of hydroelectric power plants in Brazil ranges between USD 6.9 and
375 8 million annually, and the economic losses in that country due to the stoppage of a turbine are in the
376 order of USD 120 million a year. For Argentina, Duboscq-Carra et al. (2021) indicated a cost of around
377 USD 2 million from three reports on management, while Haubrock et al. (2022) reported a total of USD
378 40.5 million between 2001 and 2020 for South America.

379 In contrast with the effects of *Corbicula fluminea* reported from North America (McMahon, 2000),
380 in South America the only known report come from a hydroelectric power station in the Rio Grande do
381 Sul state, Brazil, where it fouled heat exchangers in 1988 (dos Santos et al., 2012).

382 Another socio-economic issue is reported for *Anodontites trapesialis*, a TMS whose larvae
383 heavily parasitize some fish cultures in South America (Silva-Souza & Eiras, 2002; Felipi & Silva-Souza,
384 2008; Agudo-Padrón, 2019). Furthermore, the mollusc-borne fluke *Philophthalmus gralli* Mathis and
385 Leger, 1910 (Digenea, Philophthalmidae; hosted by *Melanoides tuberculata*) can infect poultry causing
386 profit loss (Pinto & de Melo, 2010). Well-documented direct economic effects of *Pomacea* spp. in rice
387 cultures has also been reported (Wiryareja & Tjoe-Awie, 2006; Agudo-Padrón et al., 2010; Horgan et al.,
388 2014a, 2014b; Correoso Rodriguez et al., 2017).

389 *Pseudosuccinea columella* (Say, 1817) and *Galba truncatula* (O. F. Müller, 1774) are vectors for
390 the trematodes *Fasciola hepatica* Linnaeus 1759 (Digenea, Fasciolidae) and *Cotylophoron cotylophorum*
391 (Fischoeder, 1901) (Digenea, Paramphistomidae), which can infect domestic cattle, resulting in
392 deteriorated condition of infected individuals and consequent economic losses (Ueta, 1980; Heinzen et
393 al., 1994; Mas-Coma et al., 2001; Salazar Jaramillo et al., 2006; Lopez et al., 2008; Prepelitchi &
394 Wisnivesky-Colli, 2013).

395

396 **Impacts on Public Health**

397 ***Marine ecosystems***

398 No public health issues or even risks are reported associated with most marine NNMS. The only
399 exception pertains to the sea slug *Pleurobranchaea maculata* (Quoy & Gaimard, 1832), which can carry
400 neurotoxins that affect human and domestic animals (Bökenhans et al., 2019). The presence of the
401 bacteria *Xenohaliotis californiensis* and the probable presence of *Bonamia* sp. in abalone cultures is also
402 worth noting (Campalans & Lohrmann, 2009).

403

404 ***Freshwater ecosystems***

405 At least four NNMS can be hosts of pathogen parasites that cause human diseases. The liver fluke
406 *Fasciola hepatica*, that causes human fasciolosis, has been reported in the lymnaeid snails
407 *Pseudosuccinea columella* (Ueta, 1980; Heinzen et al., 1994; Salazar Jaramillo et al., 2006; Prepelitchi &
408 Wisnivesky-Colli, 2013) and *Galba truncatula* (Mas-Coma et al., 2001; Esteban et al., 2002). In the
409 Bolivian Altiplano, where endemic fasciolosis has been reported since 1984, the transmission to humans
410 appears to be linked with the ingestion of aquatic plants infected with metacercariae, and the
411 prevalence of the disease is correlated with the presence of snails (Marcos et al., 2006; Parkinson et al.,
412 2007). Genetic evidence from individuals of *Fasciola hepatica* and *Galba truncatula* suggest a recent
413 introduction from Europe (Mas-Coma et al., 2001), and concomitantly, prevalence and intensity of
414 human fasciolosis in the northern Bolivian Altiplano are the highest reported to date.

415 The freshwater gastropod *Melanoides tuberculata* can also act as an intermediate host of the
416 trematode *Centrocestus formosanus* Nishigori, 1924 (Digenea, Heterophyidae) (Hernández et al., 2003;
417 Velásquez et al., 2006; Pinto et al., 2018), which can infect humans through ingestion of raw or
418 undercooked parasitized fish, causing gastric pain and indigestion accompanied by diarrhea (Chai et al.,
419 2013). However, there are no reported cases in South America.

420 In 2008, the presence of *Angiostrongylus cantonensis* (Chen, 1935) (Nematoda,
421 Angiostrongylidae) was reported for the first time in Ecuador, as well as the first cases of an emerging
422 disease caused by the larval stage, eosinophilic meningitis. Several authors have highlighted the apple
423 snail *Pomacea canaliculata* as an intermediate host of *A. cantonensis* in Ecuador (Solórzano Álava et al.,

424 2014; Correoso Rodriguez et al., 2017; Thiengo et al., 2017). In 2015 an experimental infection of
425 *Pomacea canaliculata* with *Angiostrongylus vasorum* (Baillet, 1866), which infects the heart and
426 pulmonary artery of domestic and wild canids was reported (Mozzer et al., 2015).

427 On the other hand, *Schistosoma mansoni* Sambon, 1907 (Digenea, Schistosomatidae) is a blood
428 fluke causing schistosomiasis in humans, depending on Planorbidae snails as intermediate hosts. This
429 tropical disease is largely neglected but ranks amongst the most prevalent in humans: in 2021, the
430 World Health Organisation reported 236.6 millions of people diagnosed with schistosomiasis in Africa,
431 the Middle East, the Caribbean, Brazil, Venezuela and Suriname. In this case, *Marisa cornuarietis*
432 (Linnaeus, 1758) has been regarded as a biological control of schistosomiasis vectors, thus providing an
433 example of a positive impacts of a NNMS in the Public Health dimension.

434 Finally, the New Zealand mud snail *Potamopyrgus antipodarum* is another NNMS known to host
435 parasites of veterinary and human health relevance, such as *Sanguinicola* sp. (Bacteria),
436 *Paracardicolooides yamagutii* Martin, 1974 (Digenea, Aporocotylidae) and *Notocotylus gippyensis*
437 (Beverley-Burton, 1958) (Digenea, Notocotylidae) (Hine, 1978; Morley, 2008), but no study has yet
438 analysed their prevalence in South America.

439

440 CONCLUDING REMARKS

441 Twenty-eight NNMS and TMS are known to have documented impacts and effects on at least one of the
442 three dimensions here considered. Given that South America is a large and heterogeneous continent, it
443 is unclear how impacts or effects (positive or negative) of a NNNMS or TMS can be distributed along a
444 species distribution range. However, this contribution provides a synoptic view of the literature at a
445 continental scale, and thus can be useful to direct future research priorities. The first interesting fact
446 emerging from our study, is that 70% of all NNMS from marine and freshwater habitats in South
447 America (30 species according to Darrigran et al., 2020) had documented impacts and effects compared
448 with only 41% of all TMS (14 species according to Darrigran et al., 2022). Thus, the overall impact of
449 NNMS exceeds that of TMS, and/or alternatively, there may be a bias towards documenting impacts of
450 exotic, well known invasive species. This putative bias should be further investigated, since there are
451 known biases towards reporting negative over positive effects (e.g., Boltovskoy et al., 2021, 2022). This
452 provides interesting avenues for new research, and to disentangle if this perceived pattern is correlated
453 with biological reality or a publication bias. Notice, however, that we were not able to compare the
454 relative magnitude of these impacts and effects. Besides, impacts have different levels of certainty.
455 Studies reporting correlational evidence were often included as an impact (e.g., Clavijo & Carranza,
456 2018), in particular when direct quantitative estimates were lacking. Further work should focus on a
457 deeper analysis of these claimed or suggested impacts. Finally, there is not a clear relationship between
458 the direct impact of NNMS and TMS in aquatic environments of South America and losses in native

459 biodiversity, in line with previous work suggesting that the main threat drivers are habitat loss,
460 overharvesting and habitat disturbances (e.g., Dueñas Gurevitch et al., 2018; Gurevitch & Padilla, 2004).

461 Except for costs associated with the control of *Limnoperna fortunei*, quantified direct economic
462 effects are scarce in the available data and literature. Our results provide an underestimation of the
463 environmental impacts of NNMS and TMS in South America, due to both underreporting and the often-
464 considerable lag between first record, identification and communication of new NNMS and TMS (Pires
465 Teixeira & Creed, 2020). Among the ecosystem services recognised (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment,
466 2005), the results of this work show the alterations caused by NNMS and TMS in South America directly
467 on provisioning, regulation, and supporting services (Tables 1 and 2), but do not often consider the
468 cultural services of ecosystems. However, there is evidence that indicates that both directly (e.g.,
469 injuries caused in bathers by mussel colonies in recreational waterbodies) and indirectly (e.g., enhancing
470 cyanobacterial blooms), NNMS and TMS can affect recreational, aesthetic, and spiritual services.

471 The effective control of established invasive species remains a pressing challenge for most South
472 American ecosystems. If this control is not achieved, it is very likely that the dispersal of species
473 mediated by humans will cause the breakdown of biogeographic barriers and that, not only climate, but
474 also to some extent, socio-economic relations will define biogeography in an era of global change
475 (Campinha et al., 2015). A lot of work remains to be done concerning the impact of NNMS and TMS in
476 South America. In this vein, it is worth noting that the listed impacts and positive or negative effects for
477 all established categories may be based on a single study for a given region. We encourage targeting
478 less explored areas of research, such as economic valuation of human health (and veterinary) effects
479 attributable to NNMS/TMS, and expanding the knowledge of environmental impacts for all the species
480 listed here. We hope that this review will help direct efforts of the research community in South
481 America and beyond to achieve a multidisciplinary approach in investigating the socio-ecological effects
482 of biological invasions in aquatic habitats.

483

484 **Competing Interests:** All authors certify that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any
485 organization or entity with any financial interest or non-financial interest in the subject discussed in this
486 manuscript.

487 **Data availability:** The information necessary to replicate this study is present in the manuscript.

488

489 REFERENCES

490 Acosta, V., A. Prieto & C. Lodeiros, 2006. Índice de condición de los mejillones *Perna perna* y *Perna*
491 *viridis* (Bivalvia: Mytilidae) bajo un sistema suspendido de cultivo en la Ensenada de Turpialito, Golfo de
492 Cariaco, Venezuela. Zootecnia Tropical 24: 177-192.

- 493 Acosta-Balbás, V., C. Lodeiros, J. Mendoza-Hill & J. M. Mazón-Suástequi, 2019. Tropical mussels *Perna*
494 *perna* and *P. viridis* (Bivalvia: Mytilidae): Bottom or suspended culture? Aquaculture 512: 734298.
495 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2019.734298>.
- 496 Adelino, J. R. P., G. Heringer, C. Diagne, F. Courchamp, L. D. B. Faria & R. D. Zenni, 2021. The economic
497 costs of biological invasions in Brazil: a first assessment. Neobiota 67: 349-374.
498 <https://doi.org/10.3897/neobiota.67.59185>.
- 499 Agostini, V. O. & C. P. Ozorio, 2016. Colonization record of *Isognomon bicolor* (Mollusca: Bivalvia) on
500 pipeline monobuoys in the Brazilian south coast. Marine Biodiversity Records 9: 84.
501 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41200-016-0061-2>.
- 502 Agudo-Padrón, A. I., 2019. The giant native freshwater mussel/naiad Myctopodidae *Anodontites*
503 *trapesialis* (Lamarck, 1819), an emerging invasive plague in fish culture farms of Santa Catarina State/ SC
504 and other localities in Southern Brazil: new geographical records and brief revision. FMCS Newsletter
505 Ellipsaria 21: 36-38.
- 506 Agudo-Padrón, A. I., J. V. d. Oliveira & T. F. S. d. Freitas, 2010. Ocorrência de moluscos em culturas de
507 arroz irrigado (*Oryza sativa* L.) no Rio Grande do Sul, RS, Brasil. Informativo Sociedade Brasileira de
508 Malacologia 41: 9-13.
- 509 Aldridge, D. C., M. Salazar, A. Serna & J. Cock, 2008. Density-dependent effects of a new invasive false
510 mussel, *Mytilopsis trautwineana* (Tryon 1866), on shrimp, *Litopenaeus vannamei* (Boone 1931),
511 aquaculture in Colombia. Aquaculture 281: 34-42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2008.05.022>.
- 512 Bazterrica, M. C., F. J. Hidalgo, C. Rumbold, A. M. Casariego, M. L. Jaubet, M. Merlo, I. César, M.
513 Provenzal, M. Addino, P. J. Barón & S. Obenat, 2022. Macrofaunal assemblages structure three decades
514 after the first report of the invasive *Crassostrea gigas* reefs in a soft-intertidal of Argentina. Estuarine,
515 Coastal and Shelf Science 5: 107832. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2022.107832>.
- 516 Belz, C. E., G. Darrigran, O. S. Mäder Netto, W. A. Boeger & P. J. Ribeiro, 2012. Analysis of four dispersion
517 vectors in inland waters: The case of the invading bivalves in South America. Journal of Shellfish
518 Research 31: 777-784. <https://doi.org/10.2983/035.031.0322>.
- 519 Belz, C. E., L. R. L. Simone, N. Silveira Júnior, R. A. Baggio, M. D. V. Gernet & C. J. Birckolz, 2020. First
520 record of the Mediterranean mussel *Mytilus galloprovincialis* (Bivalvia, Mytilidae) in Brazil. Papéis
521 Avulsos de Zoologia, 60. <https://doi.org/10.11606/1807-0205/2020.60.07>.

- 522 Besen M. A. & N. Garcia Marengoni, 2021. Bioaccumulation of metals and evaluation of golden mussels
523 encrusted on different screens of net cages. Boletim do Instituto de Pesca 47: e624.
524 <https://doi.org/10.20950/1678-2305/bip.2021.47.e624>.
- 525 Bökenhans, V., J. E. Fernández Alfaya, G. Bigatti & A. Averbuj, 2019. Diet of the invasive sea slug
526 *Pleurobranchaea maculata* in Patagonian coastal waters. New Zealand Journal of Zoology 46: 87-94.
527 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03014223.2018.1464035>.
- 528 Boltovskoy, D., 2015a. *Limnoperna fortunei*. The Ecology, Distribution and Control of a Swiftly Spreading
529 Invasive Fouling Mussel. Invading Nature - Springer Series in Invasion Ecology 10.
- 530 Boltovskoy, D., 2015b. Distribution and Colonization of *Limnoperna fortunei*: Special Traits of an Odd
531 Mussel, pp. 301–311. In: Boltovskoy D. (ed.) *Limnoperna fortunei*. The Ecology, Distribution and Control
532 of a Swiftly Spreading Invasive Fouling Mussel. Invading Nature - Springer Series in Invasion Ecology 10.
533 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13494-9_16.
- 534 Boltovskoy, D. & N. Correa, 2015. Ecosystem impacts of the invasive bivalve *Limnoperna fortunei* (golden
535 mussel) in South America. Hydrobiologia 746: 81-95. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-014-1882-9>.
- 536 Boltovskoy D, N. Correa, D. Cataldo & F. Sylvester, 2006. Dispersion and impact of invasive freshwater
537 bivalves: *Limnoperna fortunei* in the Río de la Plata watershed and beyond. Biological Invasions 8: 947-
538 963. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-005-5107-z>.
- 539 Boltovskoy, D., A. Karatayev, L. Burlakova, D. Cataldo, V. Karatayev, F. Sylvester & A. Mariñelarena,
540 2009. Significant ecosystem-wide effects of the swiftly spreading invasive freshwater bivalve
541 *Limnoperna fortunei*. Hydrobiologia 636: 271–284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-009-9956-9>.
- 542 Boltovskoy D., N. Correa, F. Bordet, V. Leites & D. Cataldo, 2013. Toxic *Microcystis* (Cyanobacteria)
543 inhibit recruitment of the bloom-enhancing invasive bivalve *Limnoperna fortunei*. Freshwater Biology
544 58: 1968–1981. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12184>.
- 545 Boltovskoy, D., N. Correa, F. Sylvester & D. Cataldo, 2015. Nutrient recycling, phytoplankton grazing, and
546 associated impacts of *Limnoperna fortunei*, pp. 153–176. In: Boltovskoy D. (ed.) *Limnoperna fortunei*.
547 The Ecology, Distribution and Control of a Swiftly Spreading Invasive Fouling Mussel. Invading Nature -
548 Springer Series in Invasion Ecology 10. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13494-9_9.

- 549 Boltovskoy, D., N. M. Correa, L. E. Burlakova, A. Y. Karataev, E. V Thuesen, F. Sylvester & E. M. Paolucci,
550 2021. Traits and impacts of introduced species: a quantitative review of meta-analyses. *Hydrobiologia*
551 848: 2225-2258. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-020-04378-9>.
- 552 Boltovskoy, D., R. Guiaşu, L. Burlakova, A. Karataev, M. A. Schlaepfer & N. Correa, 2022. Misleading
553 estimates of economic impacts of biological invasions: Including the costs but not the benefits. *Ambio*
554 51: 1786–1799. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-022-01707-1>.
- 555 Bonelli, A. G., C. B. Giachetti, A. J. Jaureguizar & A. C. Milessi, 2016. First report of predation by a small
556 shark on the invasive rapa whelk *Rapana venosa* (Valenciennes, 1846) in Argentinean waters.
557 BioInvasions Records 5: 169-172. <http://doi.org/10.3391/bir.2016.5.3.08>.
- 558 Borges, P. D., S. Ludwig & W. A. Boeger, 2017. Testing hypotheses on the origin and dispersion of
559 *Limnoperna fortunei* (Bivalvia, Mytilidae) in the Iguassu River (Paraná, Brazil): molecular markers in
560 larvae and adults. *Limnology* 18: 31-39. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10201-016-0485-8>.
- 561 Breves-Ramos, A., A. O. R. Junqueira, H. P. Lavrado, S. H. G. Silva & M. A. G. Ferreira-Silva, 2009.
562 Population structure of the invasive bivalve *Isognomon bicolor* on rocky shores of Rio de Janeiro State
563 (Brazil). *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom* 90: 453-459.
564 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315409990919>.
- 565 Brugnoli, E., J. Clemente, L. Boccardi, A. Borthagaray & F. Scarabino, 2005. Golden mussel *Limnoperna*
566 *fortunei* (Bivalvia: Mytilidae) distribution in the main hydrographical basins of Uruguay: update and
567 predictions. *Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciencias* 77: 235-244.
- 568 Brugnoli, E., J. Clemente, G. Riestra, L. Boccardi & A. I. Borthagaray, 2006. Especies acuáticas exóticas en
569 Uruguay: situación, problemática y manejo, pp. 351-362. In: Menafra R., Rodríguez-Gallego L., Scarabino
570 F. & Conde D. (eds.) *Bases para la conservación y el manejo de la costa uruguaya. Vida Silvestre*
571 (Sociedad Uruguaya para la Conservación de la Naturaleza), Montevideo, Uruguay.
- 572 Burlakova, L. E., A. Y. Karataev, D. Boltovskoy & N. M. Correa, 2022. Ecosystem services provided
573 by the exotic bivalves *Dreissena polymorpha*, *D. rostriformis bugensis*, and *Limnoperna fortunei*.
574 *Hydrobiologia*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-022-04935-4>.
- 575 Campalans, M. & K. Lohrmann, 2009. Histological survey of four species of cultivated molluscs in Chile
576 susceptible to OIE notifiable diseases. *Revista de Biología Marina y Oceanografía* 44: 561-569.

- 577 Campinha, C., F. Essl, H. Seebens, D. Moser & H. M. Pereira, 2015. The dispersal of alien species
578 redefines biogeography in the Anthropocene. *Science* 348: 1248-1251.
- 579 <https://10.1126/science.aaa8913>.
- 580 Cao, L., C. Damborenea, P. E. Penchaszadeh & G. Darrigran, 2017. Gonadal cycle of *Corbicula fluminea*
581 (Bivalvia: Corbiculidae) in Pampean streams (Southern Neotropical Region). *PLoS ONE* 12: e0186850.
582 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186850>.
- 583 Carlton, J. T., 1996. Biological invasions and cryptogenic species. *Ecology* 77: 1653-1655.
584 <http://doi.org/10.2307/2265767>.
- 585 Carranza, A., A. Estrades, F. Scarabino & A. Segura, 2010a. Loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta* (Linnaeus,
586 1758) preying on the invading gastropod *Rapana venosa* (Valenciennes, 1846) in the Río de la Plata
587 Estuary. *Marine Ecology* 32: 142-147. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0485.2010.00424.x>.
- 588 Carranza, A., C. de Mello, A. Ligrone, S. González, P. Píriz & F. Scarabino, 2010b. Observations on the
589 invading gastropod *Rapana venosa* in Punta del Este, Maldonado Bay, Uruguay. *Biological Invasions* 12:
590 995-998. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-009-9534-0>.
- 591 Castilla, J. C. & P.E. Neill, 2009. Marine bioinvasions in the Southeastern Pacific: status, ecology,
592 economic Impacts, conservation and management, pp. 439-457. In: Rilov G. & Crooks J. A. (eds.)
593 *Biological Invasions in marine ecosystems*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg.
- 594 Cataldo, D. 2015. Trophic relationships of *Limnoperna fortunei* with adult fishes, pp. 231-248. In:
595 Boltovskoy D. (ed.) *Limnoperna fortunei. The Ecology, Distribution and Control of a Swiftly Spreading*
596 *Invasive Fouling Mussel. Invading Nature - Springer Series in Invasion Ecology* 10.
597 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13494-9_13.
- 598 Cataldo D. H., D. Boltovskoy, J. Stripeikis & M. Pose, 2001. Condition index and growth rates of field
599 caged *Corbicula fluminea* (Bivalvia) as biomarkers of pollution gradients in the Paraná river delta
600 (Argentina). *Aquatic Ecosystem Health and Management* 4: 187-201.
601 <http://doi.or/10.1080/14634980127712>.
- 602 Cataldo, D., A. Vinocur, I. O'Farrell, E. Paolucci, V. Leites & D. Boltovskoy, 2012a. The introduced bivalve
603 *Limnoperna fortunei* boosts *Microcystis* growth in Salto Grande reservoir (Argentina): Evidence from
604 mesocosm experiments. *Hydrobiologia* 680: 25-38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-011-0897-8>.

- 605 Cataldo, D., I. O'Farrell, E. Paolucci, F. Sylvester & D. Boltovskoy, 2012b. Impact of the invasive golden
606 mussel (*Limnoperna fortunei*) on phytoplankton and nutrient cycling. *Aquatic Invasions* 7: 91-100.
607 <http://doi.org/10.3391/ai.2012.7.1.010>.
- 608 Cavaleiro, N. P., C. Lazoski, C. R. Tureck, C. M. R. Melo, V. S. do Amaral, B. J. Lomovasky, T. M. Absher &
609 A. M. Solé-Cava, 2019. *Crassostrea talonata*, a new threat to native oyster (Bivalvia: Ostreidae) culture in
610 the Southwest Atlantic. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 511: 91-99.
611 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2018.11.011>.
- 612 Chai, J. Y., W. M. Sohn, T. S. Yong, K. S. Eom, D.Y. Min, M. Y. Lee, H. Lim, B. Insisiengmay, B. Phommasack
613 & H. J. Rim, 2013. *Centrocestus formosanus* (Heterophyidae): Human Infections and the Infection Source
614 in Lao. *Journal of Parasitology Research* 99: 531-536. <http://doi.org/10.1645/12-37.1>.
- 615 Clavijo, C., 2014. Diversidad de Corbiculidae (Mollusca: Bivalvia) en Uruguay. Tesis de Maestría.
616 Universidad de la República Facultad de Ciencias Maestría en Ciencias Biológicas PEDECIBA Subárea
617 Zoología. 122 pp.
- 618 Clavijo, C. & A. Carranza, 2018. Critical reduction of the geographic distribution of *Cyanocyclas*
619 (Cyrenidae: Bivalvia) in Uruguay. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 28: 1249-
620 1252. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2941>.
- 621 Collado, G. A., M. A. Vidal, K. P. Aguayo, M. A. Méndez, M. A. Valladares, F. J. Cabrera, L. Pastenes, D. E.
622 Gutiérrez Gregoric & N. Puillandre, 2019. Morphological and molecular analysis of cryptic native and
623 invasive freshwater snails in Chile. *Scientific Reports* 9: 7846. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-41279-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-
624 41279-x).
- 625 Correoso Rodriguez, M., E. Espinoza & M. C. Rodríguez, 2017. *Pomacea canaliculata* in Ecuador: a recent
626 pest with multiple implications, pp. 257-291. In: Joshi R. C., Cowie R. H. & Sebastian L. S. (eds.) *Biology*
627 and Management of Invasive Apple Snails. Philippine Rice Research Institute (PhilRice), Nueva Ecija.
- 628 Costa, J. I., M. I. E. Martins & D. M. M. R. Ayoza, 2018. Impact of control of the golden mussel on the
629 production costs of tilapia bred in net cages. *Boletim do Instituto de Pesca* 44: 110-115.
630 <https://doi.org/10.20950/1678-2305.2018.284>.
- 631 Crespo, D., M. Dolbeth, S. Leston, R. Sousa & M.A. Pardal, 2015. Distribution of *Corbicula fluminea*
632 (Muller, 1774) in the invaded range: a geographic approach with notes on species traits variability.
633 *Biological Invasions* 17: 2087–2101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-015-0862-y>.

- 634 Darrigran, G., 2002. Potential impact of filter-feeding invaders on temperate inland freshwater
635 environments. *Biological Invasions* 4: 145-156. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020521811416>.
- 636 Darrigran, G., 2010. Summary of the distribution and impact of the golden mussel in Argentina and
637 neighbouring countries, pp 389-396. In: Claudi R. & Mackie G. (eds.) *Monitoring and Control of Aquatic*
638 *Invasive Molluscs in Freshwater Systems*. Taylor and Francis Group, LLC. NW, USA.
- 639 Darrigran, G. & C. Damborenea, 2005. A bioinvasion history in South America. *Limnoperna fortunei*
640 (Dunker, 1857), the golden mussel. *American Malacological Bulletin* 20: 105-112.
- 641 Darrigran, G. & C. Damborenea, 2006. Bio-invasión del mejillón dorado en el continente americano.
642 Editorial de la Universidad Nacional de La Plata (EDULP).
- 643 Darrigran G. & C. Damborenea, 2009. Introdução a biologia das Invasões o Mexilhão Dourado na
644 América do Sul: biologia, dispersão, impacto, prevenção e controlo. CUBO editora AES Tiete. São Carlos
645 SP. 248 pp.
- 646 Darrigran, G. & C. Damborenea, 2011. Ecosystem engineering impact of *Limnoperna fortunei* in South
647 America. *Zoological Science* 28: 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.2108/zsj.28.1>.
- 648 Darrigran, G. & G. Pastorino, 1995. The recent introduction of a freshwater Asiatic bivalve, *Limnoperna*
649 *fortunei* (Mytilidae) into South America. *The Veliger* 38: 171-175.
- 650 Darrigran, G., S.M. Martin, B. Gullo & L. Armendariz, 1998. Macroinvertebrados associated with
651 *Limnoperna fortunei* (Dunker, 1857) (Pelecypoda, Mytilidae) in Río de la Plata, Argentina. *Hydrobiologia*
652 367: 223-230. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1003244603854>.
- 653 Darrigran, G., C. Damborenea & N. Greco, 2007. An evaluation pattern for antimacrofouling procedures:
654 *Limnoperna fortunei* larvae study in a hydroelectric power plant in South America. *Ambio: A Journal of*
655 *the Human Environment* 36: 575-579. [https://doi.org/10.1579/0044-7447\(2007\)36\[575:AEPFAP\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1579/0044-7447(2007)36[575:AEPFAP]2.0.CO;2).
- 657 Darrigran, G., I. Agudo-Padrón, P. Baez, C. Belz, F. Cardoso, A. Carranza, G. Collado, M. Correoso, M. G.
658 Cuezzo, A. Fabres, D. E. Gutiérrez Gregoric, S. Letelier, S. Ludwig, M. C. Mansur, G. Pastorino, P. E.
659 Penchaszadeh, C. Peralta, A. Rebollo, A. Rumi, S. Santos, S. Thiengo, T. Vidigal & C. Damborenea,
660 2020. Non-native mollusks throughout South America: emergent patterns in an understudied continent.
661 *Biological Invasions* 22: 853-871. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-019-02178-4>.

662 Darrigran, G., I. Agudo-Padrón, P. Baez, C. Belz, F. Cardoso, G. A. Collado, M. Correoso, M. G. Cuezzo, C.
663 Damborenea, A. Fabres, M. A. Fernandez, S. R Gomes, D. E. Gutiérrez Gregoric, S. Letelier, C. Lodeiros,
664 S. Ludwig, M. C. Mansur, S. Narciso, G. Pastorino, P. Penchaszadeh, A. C. Peralta, A. Rebolledo, A. Rumi,
665 R. B. Salvador, S. Santos, P. Spotorno, S. Thiengo, T. Vidigal & A. Carranza, 2022. Species movements
666 within biogeographic regions: Exploring the distribution of transplanted molluscs species in South
667 America. Biological Invasions. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-022-02942-z>.

668 de Castro, A. L. P., R. O. P. Serrano, M. A. Pinto, G. H. T. Á da Silva, L. de Andrade Ribeiro, E. M. de Faria
669 Viana & C. B. Martinez, 2019. Case study: Abrasive capacity of *Limnoperna fortunei* (golden mussel)
670 shells on the wear of 3 different steel types. Wear 438-439: 202999.
671 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wear.2019.202999>.

672 de Lucía, M., G. Darrigran & D. Gutiérrez Gregoric, 2023. The most problematic freshwater invasive
673 species in South America, *Limnoperna fortunei* (Dunker, 1857), and its status after 30 years of invasion.
674 Aquatic Sciences 85: 5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00027-022-00907-x>.

675 Dextrase, A. J. & N. E. Mandrak, 2006. Impacts of alien invasive species on freshwater fauna at risk in
676 Canada. Biological Invasions 8: 13-24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-005-0232-2>.

677 Diagne, C., B. Leroy, A. C. Vaissière, R. E. Gozlan, D. Roiz, I. Jarić, J.M. Salles, C. J. Bradshaw & F.
678 Courchamp, 2021. High and rising economic costs of biological invasions worldwide. Nature 592: 571-
679 576. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03405-6>.

680 Dias, T. L. P., E. L. S. Mota, A. I. Gondim, J. M. Oliveira, E. F. Rabelo, S. M. de Almeida & M.L.
681 Christoffersen, 2013. *Isognomon bicolor* (C. B. Adams, 1845) (Mollusca: 527 Bivalvia): first record of this
682 invasive species for the States of Paraíba and Alagoas and new records for other localities of
683 Northeastern Brazil. Check List 9: 159-611. <https://doi.org/10.15560/9.1.157>.

684 Diez, M. E., V. I. Radashevsky, J. M. Orensan & F. Cremonte, 2011. Spionid polychaetes (Annelida:
685 Spionidae) boring into shells of molluscs of commercial interest in northern Patagonia, Argentina. Italian
686 Journal of Zoology 78: 497-504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11250003.2011.572565>.

687 do Amaral, V. S., L. R. Simone, F. T. de S. Tâmega, E. Barbieri, S. H. Calazans, R. Coutinho & P. Spotorno-
688 Oliveira, 2020. New records of the non-indigenous oyster *Saccostrea cucullata* (Bivalvia: Ostreidae) from
689 the southeast and south Brazilian coast. Regional Studies in Marine Science 33: 100924.
690 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rsma.2019.100924>.

- 691 Doherty-Bone, T. M., A. M. Dunn, F. L. Jackson & L. E. Brown, 2019. Multi-faceted impacts of native and
692 invasive alien decapod species on freshwater biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. Freshwater
693 Biology 64: 461-473. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13234>.
- 694 dos Santos, A. A. & S. W. d. Costa, 2016. Síntese Informativa da Maricultura 2015. Empresa de Pesquisa
695 Agropecuária e Extensão Rural de Santa Catarina (EPAGRI) and Centro de Desenvolvimento em
696 Agricultura e Pesca (Cedap) 8.
- 697 dos Santos S. B., S. C. Thiengo, M. A. Fernandez, I. C. Miyahira, I. C. B. Gonçalves, R. de F. Ximenes, M. C.
698 D. Mansur & D. Pereira, 2012. Espécies de moluscos límnicos invasores no Brasil, pp 25–49. In: Mansur
699 M. C. D. et al (org.). Moluscos límnicos invasores no Brasil: biologia, prevenção e controle. Redes
700 Editora, Porto Alegre.
- 701 Dreher Mansur, M.C., C. Pinheiro dos Santos, D. Pereira, I.C. Padula Paz, M.L. Leite Zurita, M.T. Raya
702 Rodriguez, M. Vilar Nehrke, P.E. Aydos Bergonci (org), 2012. Moluscos Límnicos Invasores no Brasil.
703 Biologia, prevenção, controle. Redes Editora. Porto Alegre. 412pp.
- 704 Duchini, D., D. Boltovskoy & F. Sylvester, 2018. The invasive freshwater bivalve *Limnoperna fortunei* in
705 South America: multiannual changes in its predation and effects on associated benthic invertebrates.
706 Hydrobiologia 817: 431-446. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-018-3561-8>
- 707 Duboscq-Carra, V. G., R. D. Fernandez, P. J. Haubrock, R. D. Dimarco, E. Angulo, L. Ballesteros-Mejia, C.
708 Diagne, F. Courchamp & M. A. Nuñez, 2021. Economic impact of invasive alien species in Argentina: a
709 first national synthesis. NeoBiota 67: 329-348. <http://doi.org/10.3897/neobiota.67.63208>.
- 710 Dueñas Gurevitch, M.A., H.J. Ruffhead, N.H. Wakefield, P.D. Roberts, D.J. Hemming, H. Diaz-Soltero,
711 2018. The role played by invasive species in interactions with endangered and threatened species in the
712 United States: a systematic review. Biodiversity and Conservation 27: 3171-3183.
713 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-018-1595-x>.
- 714 Ebi, K. L., R. S. Kovats & B. Menne, 2006. An approach for assessing human health vulnerability and
715 public health interventions to adapt to climate change. Environmental Health Perspectives 114: 1930-
716 1934. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.8430>.
- 717 Esteban, J. G., C. González, M. D. Bargues, R. Angles, C. Sanchez, C. Náquira & S. Mas-Coma, 2002. High
718 fascioliasis infection in children linked to a man-made irrigation zone in Peru. Tropical Medicine
719 International Health 7: 339-348. <http://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3156.2002.00870.x>.

- 720 Everard, M., J. Gray, V. Wilkins-Kindemba & I. G. Cowx, 2009. Impacts of invasive species on ecosystem
721 services: The case of the signal crayfish (*Pacifastacus leniusculus*). Environmental Law and Management
722 21: 250-259.
- 723 Felipi, P. G. & A. T. Silva-Souza, 2008. *Anodontites trapesialis* (Lamarck, 1819): um bivalve parasito de
724 peixes de água doce. Semina: Ciências Agrárias 29: 895-904.
- 725 Fernandez, M.A., S.C. Thiengo & M.F. Boaventura, 2001. Gastrópodes límnicos do Campus de
726 Manguinhos, Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro, RJ. Revista da Sociedade Brasileira de Medicina
727 Tropical 34: 279-282. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0037-86822001000300009>.
- 728 Fernandez, M. A., S. C. Thiengo & L. R. L. Simone, 2003. Distribution of the introduced freshwater snail
729 *Melanoides tuberculatus* (Gastropoda: Thiaridae) in Brazil. The Nautilus 117: 78-82.
- 730 Flores-Aguilar, R.A., A. Gutiérrez, A. Ellwanger & R. Searcy-Bernal, 2007. Development and current status
731 of abalone aquaculture in Chile. Journal of Shellfish Research 26: 705-711.
732 [https://doi.org/10.2983/0730-8000\(2007\)26\[705:DACSOA\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.2983/0730-8000(2007)26[705:DACSOA]2.0.CO;2).
- 733 Furse, K., J. Gallo, M. Noriega & C. Ramos, 2004. Cultivo y comercialización de ostras del tipo *Crassostrea*
734 *gigas*. Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola, Peú.
735 <https://repositorio.usil.edu.pe/server/api/core/bitstreams/b3b9a929-3bec-43bc-8306-3d5c64cc1c3d/content>
- 737 García, M. & L. Montalvo, 2006. Los peces depredadores de *Limnoperna fortunei* en los ambientes
738 colonizados. In: Darrigran G. & Damborenea C. (eds.) Bioinvasion del mejillón dorado en el continente
739 americano. Edulp La Plata: 113–129.
- 740 Giberto, D. A., A. Schiariti & C. S. Bremec, 2011. Diet and daily consumption rates of *Rapana venosa*
741 (Valenciennes, 1846) (Gastropoda: Muricidae) from the Ro de la Plata (Argentina-Uruguay). Journal of
742 Shellfish Research 30: 349-358. <https://doi.org/10.2983/035.030.0222>
- 743 Giovanelli, A., C. L. P. A. C. D. Silva, L. Medeiros & M. C. D. Vasconcellos, 2002. The molluscicidal activity
744 of Niclosamide (Bayluscide WP70®) on *Melanoides tuberculata* (Thiaridae), a snail associated with
745 habitats of *Biomphalaria glabrata* (Planorbidae). Memórias do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz 97: 743-745.
746 <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0074-02762002000500027>.

- 747 González-Bergonzoni, I., F. Teixeira-de Mello, N. Vidal, A. D'Anatro & M. Masdeu, 2010. Reappearance
748 and diet of juvenile armado catfish (*Pterodoras granulosus*) in Lower Uruguay River (Rio Negro,
749 Uruguay). Boletín de la Sociedad Zoológica del Uruguay 19:42-46.
- 750 Grosholz, E. D., G. M. Ruiz, C. A. Dean, K. A. Shirley, J. L. Maron & P. G Connors, 2000. The impacts of a
751 nonindigenous marine predator in a California bay. Ecology 81: 1206-1224.
752 [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658\(2000\)081\[1206:TIOANM\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2000)081[1206:TIOANM]2.0.CO;2).
- 753 Guimarães, V. & J. Barbujani Sígolo, 2008. Detecção de contaminantes em espécie bioindicadora
754 (*Corbicula fluminea*) - Rio Ribeira de Iguape – SP. Química Nova 31: 1696-1698
755 <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0100-40422008000700018>.
- 756 Guimarães, C. T., C. P. de Souza & D. de M. Soares, 2001. Possible competitive displacement of
757 planorbids by *Melanoides tuberculata* in Minas Gerais, Brazil. Memórias do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz 96
758 (supl.): 173-176. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0074-02762001000900027>.
- 759 Gurevitch, J. & D.K. Padilla, 2004. Are invasive species a major cause of extinctions? Trends in Ecology
760 and Evolution 19: 470-474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2004.07.005>.
- 761 Haubrock, P. J., R. N. Cuthbert, A. Ricciardi, C. Diagne & F. Courchamp, 2022. Economic costs of invasive
762 bivalves in freshwater ecosystems. Diversity and Distributions 28: 1010-1021.
763 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.13501>.
- 764 Heinzen, T., O. Castro, C. Pepe & A. Ibarburu, 1994. *Lymnaea columella* como hospedero intermediario
765 de *Fasciola hepatica* en Uruguay. XXII Jornadas Uruguayas de Buiatría, Centro Médico Veterinario de
766 Paysandú, Uruguay.
- 767 Hermes-Silva, S., J. Ribolli, S. D. Ávila-Simas, E. Zaniboni-Filho, G. F. M. Cardoso & A. P. D. O. Nuñer,
768 2021. *Limnoperna fortunei*-Updating the geographic distribution in the Brazilian watersheds and
769 mapping the regional occurrence in the Upper Uruguay River basin. Biota Neotropica 21: e20201175.
770 <https://doi.org/10.1590/1676-0611-BN-2020-1175>.
- 771 Hernández, L. E., M. T. Díaz & A. K. Bashirullah, 2003. Description of different developmental stages of
772 *Centrocestus formosanus* (Nishigori, 1924) (Digenea: Heterophyidae). Revista Científica FCV-LUZ 13: 285-
773 292.

- 774 Hine, P. M., 1978. Distribution of some parasites of freshwater eels in New Zealand. New Zealand
775 Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 12: 179-187.
776 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00288330.1978.9515739>.
- 777 Horgan, F., M. Felix, D. Portalanza, L. Sanchez, W. Rios, E. F. Simón, J. Wither, C. Andrade & E. Espin,
778 2014a. Responses by farmers to the apple snail invasion of Ecuador's rice fields and attitudes toward
779 predatory snail kites. Crop Protection 62: 135-143.
- 780 Horgan, F. G., A. M. Stuart & E. P. Kudavidanage, 2014b. Impact of invasive apple snails on the
781 functioning and services of natural and managed wetlands. Acta Oecologica 54: 90-100.
782 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2012.10.002>.
- 783 Ignacio, B. L., L. M. Julio, A. O. R. Junqueira & M. A. G. Ferreira-Silva, 2010. Bioinvasion in a Brazilian Bay:
784 Filling Gaps in the Knowledge of Southwestern Atlantic Biota. PLoS One 5: e13065.
785 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0013065>.
- 786 IPBES, 2019. Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental
787 Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. In: Brondizio E. S., Settele J., Díaz S. &
788 Ngo H. T. (eds.) IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany. 1148 pages.
789 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3831673>.
- 790 Jeschke J.M., S. Bacher, T. M. Blackburn, J. T. A. Dick, F. Essl, T. Evans, M. Gaertner, P. E. Hulme, I. Kühn,
791 A. Mrugała, J. Pergl, P. Pyšek, W. Rabitsch, A. Ricciardi, D. M. Richardson, A. Sendek, M. Vilà, M. Winter
792 & S. Kumschick, 2014. Defining the impact of non-native species. Conservation Biology 28:1188-94.
793 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12299>.
- 794 Kuris, A. M. & C. S. Culver, 1999. An introduced sabellid polychaete pest of cultured abalone and its
795 potential spread to other California gastropods. Invertebrate Biology 118: 391–403.
796 <https://doi.org/10.2307/3227008>.
- 797 Labaut, Y., 2021. Proceso de Invasión de *Corbicula fluminea* (Müller, 1774) en la Patagonia Argentina.
798 Tesis Doctoral, Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Museo de la Universidad Nacional de La Plata.
799 <https://doi.org/10.35537/10915/123116>.
- 800 Labaut, Y., P. A. Macchi, F. M. Archuby & G. Darrigran, 2021. Homogenization of macroinvertebrate
801 assemblages and asiatic clam *Corbicula fluminea* invasion in a river of the arid Patagonian Plateau,
802 Argentina. Frontiers in Environmental Science 9: 728620. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2021.728620>.

- 803 Lanfranconi, A., E. Brugnoli & P. Muniz, 2013. Preliminary estimates of consumption rates of *Rapana*
804 *venosa* (Gastropoda, Muricidae); a new threat to mollusk biodiversity in the Río de la Plata. *Aquatic*
805 *Invasions* 8: 437-442. <http://doi.org/10.3391/ai.2013.8.4.07>.
- 806 Lezama, C., A. Carranza, A. Fallabrino, A. Estrades, F. Scarabino & M. López-Mendilaharsu, 2013.
807 Unintended backpackers: Biofouling of the invasive gastropod *Rapana venosa* on the green turtle
808 *Chelonia mydas* in the Río de la Plata Estuary, Uruguay. *Biological Invasions* 15: 483-487.
809 <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-012-0307-9>.
- 810 Lodeiros, C., N. González-Henríquez, J. Cuéllar-Anjel, D. Hernández-Reyes, C. Medina-Alcaraz, J.
811 Quinteiro & M. Rey-Méndez, 2019. Invasion of the dark false mussel in shrimp farms in Venezuela:
812 species identification and genetic analysis. *BioInvasions Records* 8: 838-847.
813 <https://doi.org/10.3391/bir.2019.8.4.12>.
- 814 Lodeiros, C., D. Hernández-Reyes, J. M. Salazar, M. Rey-Méndez & N. González-Henríquez, 2021. First
815 report of the mussel *Mytella strigata* (Hanley, 1843) in the Venezuelan Caribbean from an invasion in a
816 shrimp farm. *Latin American Journal of Aquatic Research* 49: 531-537. <http://doi.org/10.3856/vol49-issue3-fulltext-2626>.
- 818 Lopez, L., J. Romero & L. Velásquez, 2008. Aislamiento de Paramphistomidae en vacas de leche y en el
819 hospedador intermedio (*Lymnea truncatula* y *Lymnea columella*) en una granja del trópico alto en el
820 occidente de Colombia. *Revista Colombiana de ciencias pecuarias* 21: 9-18.
- 821 López M. S., R. Coutinho R, C. E. L. Ferreira & G. Rilov, 2010. Predator–prey interactions in a bioinvasion
822 scenario: differential predation by native predators on two exotic rocky intertidal bivalves. *Marine*
823 *Ecology Progress Series* 403: 101-112. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08409>.
- 824 Ludwig, S., R. Patella, S. Stoiev, G. Castilho-Westphal, M. V. Girotto & A. Ostrensky, 2011. A molecular
825 method to detect and identify the native species of southwestern Atlantic *Crassostrea* (Mollusca:
826 Ostreidae). *Zoologia (Curitiba)* 28: 420-426. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1984-46702011000400002>.
- 827 Ludwig, S., M. K. Tschá, R. Patella, A. J. Oliveira & W. A. Boeger, 2014. Looking for a needle in a haystack:
828 molecular detection of larvae of invasive *Corbicula* clams. *Management of biological Invasions* 5: 143-
829 149. <http://doi.org/10.3391/mbi.2014.5.2.07>.
- 830 Ludwig, S., E. H. R. Sari, H. Paixão, L. C. Montresor, J. Araújo, C. F. A. Brito, G. Darrigran, A. R. Pepato, T.
831 H. D. A. Vidigal & C. B. Martinez, 2021. High connectivity and migration potentiate the invasion

- 832 of *Limnoperna fortunei* (Mollusca: Mytilidae) in South America. *Hydrobiologia* 848: 499–513.
833 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-020-04458-w>.
- 834 Maldonado, M. A. & P. R. Martín, 2019. Dealing with a hyper-successful neighbor: effects of the invasive
835 apple snail *Pomacea canaliculata* on exotic and native snails in South America. *Current Zoology* 65: 225-
836 235. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cz/zoy060>.
- 837 Mansur M. C. D., C. P. Santos & M. V. Nehrke, 2011. Corbiculidae na América do Sul, espécies nativas e
838 invasoras, dispersão e a situação das pesquisas no Brasil (Mollusca: Bivalvia), pp. 324-335. In: Fernandez
839 M. A., Santos S. B., Pimenta A. D. & Thiengo S. C (eds.) 2011. Tópicos em malacologia, ecos do XIX
840 EBRAM. Sociedade Brasileira de Malacologia, Rio de Janeiro.
- 841 Marcos, L., V. Maco, F. Samalvides, A. Terashima, J. E. Espinoza & E. Gotuzzo, 2006. Risk factors for
842 *Fasciola hepatica* infection in children: a case-control study. *Transactions of The Royal Society of
843 Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 100: 158-166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trstmh.2005.05.016>.
- 844 Marengoni, N.G., E.S. Klosowski, K. P. Oliveira, A. P. S. Chambo & A. C. Gonçalves, 2013. Bioaccumulation
845 of heavy metals and nutrients in the golden mussel of the reservoir of the Itaipu Binational Hydroelectric
846 power plant. *Química Nova* 36: 359-363. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0100-40422013000300002>.
- 847 Martínez-García M. F., J. L. Ruesink, J. M. Grijalva-Chon, C. Lodeiros, J. A. Arreola-Lizárraga, E. de la Re-
848 Vega, A. Varela-Romero & J. Chávez-Villalba, 2021. Socioecological factors related to aquaculture
849 introductions and production of Pacific oysters (*Crassostrea gigas*) worldwide. *Reviews in Aquaculture*.
850 <https://doi.org/10.1111/raq.12615>.
- 851 Martinez-Juarez, P., A. Chiabai, T. Taylor & S. Q. Gómez, 2015. The impact of ecosystems on human
852 health and well-being: A critical review. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism* 10: 63-69.
853 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2015.06.008>.
- 854 Martuzzi, M., 2005. Science, policy, and the protection of human health: A European perspective.
855 *Bioelectromagnetics* 26: S151-S156. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bem.20143>.
- 856 Mas-Coma, S., I. R. Funatsu & M. D. Bargues, 2001. *Fasciola hepatica* and lymnaeid snails occurring at
857 very high altitude in South America. *Parasitology* 123: 115-127.
858 <http://doi.org/doi:10.1017/S0031182001008034>.

- 859 Mazza, G., E. Tricario, P. Genovesi & F. Gherardi, 2013. Biological invaders are threats to human health:
860 an overview. *Ethology, Ecology & Evolution* 26: 112-129.
861 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03949370.2013.863225>.
- 862 McMahon R. F., 2000. Invasive characteristics of the freshwater bivalve, *Corbicula fluminea*, pp. 315-
863 343. In: Claudi R. & Leach J. H. (eds.) *Nonindigenous freshwater organisms: vectors, biology, and*
864 *impacts*. Lewis, Washington DC.
- 865 Melo, C. M. R., F. C. Silva, C. H. A. M. Gomes, A. M. Solé-Cava & C. Lazoski, 2010. *Crassostrea gigas* in
866 natural oyster banks in southern Brazil. *Biological Invasions* 12: 441-449. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-009-9475-7>.
- 868 Mendez, M. M., E. Schwindt, A. Bortolus, A. Roche, M. Maggioni & M. Narvarte, 2015. Ecological impacts
869 of the austral-most population of *Crassostrea gigas* in South America: a matter of time? *Ecological*
870 *Research* 30: 979-987. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11284-015-1298-7>.
- 871 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005. *Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis*. Island Press,
872 Washington, DC.
- 873 Miloslavich, P. & P. E. Penchaszadeh, 1992. Reproductive biology of *Vermetus* sp. and *Dendropoma*
874 *corrodens* (Orbigny, 1842): Two vermetid gastropods from the Southern Caribbean. *The Veliger* 35: 78-
875 88.
- 876 Moreno, R. A., P. E. Neill & N. Rozbaczylo, 2006. Native and non-indigenous boring polychaetes in Chile:
877 a threat to native and commercial mollusc species. *Revista Chilena de Historia Natural* 79: 263-278.
878 <http://doi.org/10.4067/S0716-078X2006000200012>.
- 879 Morley, N. J., 2008. The role of the invasive snail *Potamopyrgus antipodarum* in the transmission of
880 trematode parasites in Europe and its implications for ecotoxicological studies. *Aquatic Sciences* 70: 107-
881 114. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00027-007-7052-7>.
- 882 Mozzer, L. R., A. L. Coaglio, R. M. Dracz, V. M. A. Ribeiro & W. S. Lima, 2015. The development of
883 *Angiostrongylus vasorum* (Baillet, 1866) in the freshwater snail *Pomacea canaliculata* (Lamarck, 1822)
884 *Journal of Helminthology* 89: 755-759. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022149X14000856>.
- 885 Oliva, D., L.R. Durán, 2012. Cultivo de almejas, una alternativa para la diversificación de la acuicultura de
886 pequeña escala en Chile. *AQUA* 159: 88-89.

- 887 Oricchio, F. T., A. C. Marques, E. Hajdu, F. B. Pitombo, F. Azevedo, F. D. Passos, L. M. Vieira, S. N.
888 Stampar, R. M. Rocha & G. M. Dias, 2019. Exotic species dominate marinas between the two most
889 populated regions in the southwestern Atlantic Ocean. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 146: 884-892.
890 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2019.07.013>.
- 891 Paolucci, E. M. & E. V. Thuesen, 2015. Trophic relationships of *Limnoperna fortunei* with larval fishes, pp
892 211-229. In: Boltovskoy D. (ed.) *Limnoperna fortunei*. The Ecology, Distribution and Control of a Swiftly
893 Spreading Invasive Fouling Mussel. Invading Nature - Springer Series in Invasion Ecology 10.
894 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13494-9_12.
- 895 Paolucci, E. M., D. H. Cataldo, C. M. Fuentes & D. Boltovskoy, 2007. Larvae of the invasive species,
896 *Limnoperna fortunei* (Bivalvia), in the diet of fish larvae in the Parana River. *Hydrobiologia* 589: 219–233.
897 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-007-0734-2>.
- 898 Parkinson, M., S. M. O'Neill & J. P. Dalton, 2007. Endemic human fasciolosis in the Bolivian Altiplano.
899 Epidemiology & Infection 135: 669-674. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S095026880600728X>.
- 900 Pecl, G.T., M. B., Araújo, J. D. Bell, J. Blanchard, T. C. Bonebrake, I. C. Chen & S. E. Williams, 2017.
901 Biodiversity redistribution under climate change: Impacts on ecosystems and human well-being. *Science*
902 355(6332): eaai9214. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aai9214>.
- 903 Pedersen, U. B., N. Midzi, T. Mduluza, W. Soko, A. S. Stensgaard, B. J. Vennervald, S. Mukaratirwa & T. K.
904 Kristensen, 2014. Modelling spatial distribution of snails transmitting parasitic worms with importance
905 to human and animal health and analysis of distributional changes in relation to climate. *Geospatial
906 Health* 8: 335-343. <https://doi.org/10.4081/gh.2014.23>.
- 907 Penchaszadeh, P. E.(coord.), 2005. Invasores: Invertebrados exóticos en el Río de la Plata y región
908 marina aledaña. Eudeba, Buenos Aires.
- 909 Penchaszadeh, P.E., G. Darrigran, C. Angulo, A. Averbuj, M. Brögger, A. Dogliotti & N. Pérez, 2000.
910 Predation of the invasive freshwater mussel *Limnoperna fortunei* (Dunker, 1857) by the fish *Leporinus
911 obtusidens* Valenciennes, 1846 (Anostomidae) in the Río de la Plata, Argentina. *Journal Shellfish
912 Research* 19: 229–231.
- 913 Pereira, D., M. C. Dreher Mansur, L. D. S. Duarte, A. Schramm de Oliveira, D. Mansur Pimpão, C. Tasso
914 Callil, C. Ituarte, E. Parada, S. Peredo, G. Darrigran, F. Scarabino, C. Clavijo, G. Lara, I. C. Miyahira, M. T.
915 Raya Rodriguez & C. Lasso, 2013. Bivalve distribution in hydrographic regions in South America:

- 916 Historical overview and conservation. *Hydrobiologia* 735: 15-44. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-013-1639-x>.
- 917
- 918 Pigneur, L. M., E. Etoundi, D. C. Aldridge, J. Marescaux, N. Yasuda & K. Van Doninck, 2014. Genetic
919 uniformity and long-distance clonal dispersal in the invasive androgenetic *Corbicula* clams. *Molecular
920 ecology* 23: 5102-5116. <http://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12912>.
- 921 Pinto, H. A. & A. L. de Melo, 2010. *Melanoides tuberculata* as intermediate host of *Philophthalmus gralli*
922 in Brazil. *Revista do Instituto de Medicina Tropical de São Paulo* 52: 323-327.
923 <http://doi.org/10.1590/S0036-46652010000600007>.
- 924 Pinto, H. A., N. Q. Gonçalves, D. López-Hernandez, E. A. Pulido-Murillo & A. L. Melo, 2018. The life cycle
925 of a zoonotic parasite reassessed: Experimental infection of *Melanoides tuberculata* (Mollusca:
926 Thiaridae) with *Centrocestus formosanus* (Trematoda: Heterophyidae). *PLoS ONE* 13: e0194161.
927 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0194161>.
- 928 Pires Teixeira, L. M. & J. C. Creed, 2020. A decade on an updated assessment of the status of marine
929 non-indigenous species in Brazil. *Aquatic Invasions* 15: 30–43. <https://doi.org/10.3391/ai.2020.15.1.03>.
- 930 Prepelitchi, L. & C. Wisnivesky-Colli, 2013. *Fasciola hepatica*: epidemiología y control en la región
931 noreste de Argentina. In: Salomon O. & Rumi A. (eds.) *Moluscos de Interés Sanitario en la Argentina*.
932 Ministerio de Salud de la Nación – INMET: 54-83.
- 933 Pyšek, P., D. M. Richardson, J. Pergl, V. Jarošík, Z. Sixtová & E. Weber, 2008. Geographical and taxonomic
934 biases in invasion ecology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 23: 237-244.
935 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2008.02.002>.
- 936 Pyšek, P., J. Pergl, F. Essl, B. Lenzner, W. Dawson, H. Kreft, P. Weigelt, M. Winter, J. Kartesz, M. Nishin,
937 L.A. Antonova, J.F. Barcelona, F.J. Cabezas, D. Cárdenas, J. Cárdenas -Toro, N. Castaño, E. Chacón, C.
938 Chatelain, S. Dullinger, A.L. Ebel, E. Figueiredo, N. Fuentes, P. Genovesi, Q.J. Groom, L. Henderson, S.
939 Inderjit, A. Kupriyanov, S. Masciadri, N. Maurel, J. Meerman, O. Morozova, D. Moser, D. Nickrent, P.M.
940 Nowak, S. Pagad, A. Patzelt, P.B. Pelser, H. Seebens, W. Shu, J. Thomas, M. Velayos, E. Weber, J.J.
941 Wieringa, M.P. Baptiste & M. van Kleunen, 2017. Naturalized alien flora of the world: species diversity,
942 taxonomic and phylogenetic patterns, geographic distribution and global hotspots of plant invasion.
943 *Preslia* 89: 203–274. <https://doi.org/10.23855/preslia.2017.203>.
- 944 Pyšek P., P.E. Hulme, D. Simberloff, S. Bacher, T.M. Blackburn, J.T. Carlton, W. Dawson, F. Essl, L.C.
945 Foxcroft, P. Genovesi, J. M. Jeschke, I. Kühn, A. M. Liebhold, N. E. Mandra, L. A. Meyerson, A. Pauchard,

- 946 J. Pergl, H. E. Roy, H. Seebens, M. van Kleunen, M. Vilà, M. J. Wingfield & D. M. Richardson, 2020.
947 Scientists' warning on invasive alien species. Biological reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society.
948 95:1511-1534. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12627>.
- 949 Rebelo, M. F., L. F. Afonso, J. A. Americo, L. da Silva, J. L. Neto, F. Dondero & Q. Zhang, 2018. A
950 sustainable synthetic biology approach for the control of the invasive golden mussel (*Limnoperna*
951 *fortunei*). PeerJ Preprints: e27164v3. <https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27164v3>.
- 952 Resende, M. F. d., C. B. Martinez & T. Vidigal, 2014. Interferências provocadas pela infestação de
953 mexilhões-dourados (*Limnoperna fortunei*) sobre bombas centrífugas. Congreso Latinoamericano XII de
954 Hidrogeología y XXVI de hidráulica - 25 a 30 de Agosto de 2014, Santiago de Chile.
- 955 Reshaid, Y., L. Cao, F. Brea, M. O. Blanche, S. Torres & G. Darrigran, 2017. Variation in the distribution of
956 *Corbicula* species (Mollusca: Bivalvia: Corbiculidae) after 25 years of its introduction in the Río de la
957 Plata, Argentina. Zoologia 34: 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.3897/zootaxa.34.22181>.
- 958 Reyna P. B., M. L. Ballesteros, M. L. Albá, L. Bertrand, M. González, K. S. B. Miglioranza, M. Tatián & A. C.
959 Hued, 2019. A multilevel response approach reveals the Asian clam *Corbicula largillierti* as a mirror of
960 aquatic pollution. Science of The Total Environment 692: 175-187.
961 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.07.194>.
- 962 Reyna, P. B., M. L. Alba, F. A. Rodríguez, M. Gonzalez, C. Pegoraro, A. C. Hued, M. Tatian & M. L.
963 Ballesteros, 2021. What does the freshwater clam, *Corbicula largillierti*, have to tell us about
964 chlorothalonil effects? Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety 208: 111603.
965 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2020.111603>.
- 966 Ricciardi, A., 2003. Predicting the impacts of an introduced species from its invasion history: an empirical
967 approach applied to zebra mussel invasions. Freshwater Biology 48: 972-981.
968 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2427.2003.01071.x>.
- 969 Rojas Molina, F. & S. J. de Paggi, S. J., 2008. Zooplankton in the Paraná River floodplain (South America)
970 before and after the invasion of *Limnoperna fortunei* (Bivalvia). Wetlands 28: 695-702.
971 <https://doi.org/10.1672/07-179.1>.
- 972 Rojas Molina F. & V. Williner, 2013. First record of the non-indigenous mussel *Limnoperna fortunei*
973 (Bivalvia, Mytilidae) as an epibiont of the crab *Trichodactylus borellianus* (Decapoda, Trichodactylidae).
974 Crustaceana 86: 682-692. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685403-00003183>.

- 975 Rojas Molina, F., J. C. Paggi, & M. Devercelli, 2010. Zooplanktophagy in the natural diet and selectivity of
976 the invasive mollusk *Limnoperna fortunei*. Biological Invasions 12: 1647-1659.
- 977 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-009-9578-1>.
- 978 Rojas Molina, F, S. B. José de paggi & D. F. Frau, 2012. Impacts of the Invading Golden Mussel
979 *Limnoperna fortunei* on Zooplankton: A Mesocosm Experiment. Zoological Studies 51: 733-744.
980 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13494-9_10.
- 981 Rojas Molina, F. R., S. B. José de Paggi & J. C. Paggi, 2015. Impacts of *Limnoperna fortunei* on
982 Zooplankton, pp. 177-190. In: Boltovskoy D. (ed.) *Limnoperna fortunei*. The Ecology, Distribution and
983 Control of a Swiftly Spreading Invasive Fouling Mussel. Invading Nature - Springer Series in Invasion
984 Ecology 10.
- 985 Salazar Jaramillo, L., V. Estrada & L. E. Velásquez, 2006. Effect of the exposure to *Fasciola hepatica*
986 (Trematoda: Digenea) on life history traits of *Lymnaea cousini* and *Lymnaea columella* (Gastropoda:
987 Lymnaeidae). Experimental Parasitology 114: 77-83. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.exppara.2006.02.013>.
- 988 Sardiña P., D. Cataldo & D. Boltovskoy, 2008. The effects of the invasive mussel, *Limnoperna fortunei*, on
989 associated fauna in South American freshwaters: importance of physical structure and food supply.
990 Fundamental and Applied Limnology 173:135–144. <http://doi.org/10.1127/1863-9135/2008/0173-0135>.
- 991 Sardiña P., E. Chaves & M. Marchese, 2011. Benthic community responses to invasion by the golden
992 mussel, *Limnoperna fortunei* Dunker: biotic homogenization vs environmental driving forces. Journal of
993 the North American Benthological Society 30:1009–1023.
- 994 Silva, I., E. Brugnoli, C. Clavijo, A. D'Anatro, D. E. Naya, F. T. de Mello, G. Tesitore, I. González-Bergonzoni,
995 2021a. Interacciones entre el mejillón dorado y macroinvertebrados bentónicos nativos del Río
996 Uruguay. Innotec: e573-e573. <https://doi.org/10.26461/22.04>.
- 997 Silva, I., D. Naya, F. T. de Mello, A. D'Anatro, G. Tesitore, C. Clavijo & I. González-Bergonzoni, 2021b. Fish
998 vs. Aliens: Predatory fish regulate populations of *Limnoperna fortunei* mitigating impacts on native
999 macroinvertebrate communities. Hydrobiologia 848: 2281-2301. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-020-04421-9>.
- 1001 Silva Bertão, A. P., R. V. V. Leite, A. Horodesky, M. R. Pie, T. L. Zanin, O. S. M. Netto & A. Ostrensky,
1002 2021. Ecological interactions between invasive and native fouling species in the reservoir of a
1003 hydroelectric plant. Hydrobiologia 848: 5169-5185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-021-04706-7>.

- 1004 Silva-Souza, A. T. & J. C. Eiras, 2002. The histopathology of the infection of *Tilapia rendalli* and
1005 *Hypostomus regani* (Osteichthyes) by Lasidium larvae of *Anodontites trapesialis* (Mollusca, Bivalvia).
1006 Memórias do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz 97: 431-433. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0074-02762002000300029>.
- 1007 Simone, L.R.L. & E.P. Gonçalvez, 2006. Anatomical study on *Myoforceps aristatus*, an invasive boring
1008 bivalve in S.E. Brazilian coast (Mytilidae). Papeis Avulsos de Zoologia 46:57–65.
- 1009 Solórzano Álava, L. F., L. Martini Robles, H. Hernández Álvarez, J. Sarracent Pérez, J. Muzzio Aroca & L. R.
1010 Rivero, 2014. *Angiostrongylus cantonensis*: un parásito emergente en Ecuador. Revista Cubana de
1011 Medicina Tropical 66: 20-33.
- 1012 Speziale, K. L., S. A. Lambertucci, M. Carrete & J. L. Tella, 2012. Dealing with non-native species: What
1013 makes the difference in South America? Biological Invasions 14: 1609-1621.
1014 <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-011-0162-0>.
- 1015 Spotorno-Oliveira, P., R. Pereira Lopes, A. Larroque, D. Monteiro, P. Dentzien-Dias & F. de Souza
1016 Tâmega, 2020. First detection of the non-indigenous gastropod *Rapana venosa* in the southernmost
1017 coast of Brazil. Continental Shelf Research 194: 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2020.104047>.
- 1018 SUBPESCA, 2021. Informe sectorial de Pesca y Acuicultura. [https://www.subpesca.cl/portal/618/w3-
1019 article-112811.html](https://www.subpesca.cl/portal/618/w3-article-112811.html).
- 1020 Sylvester, F. & P. Sardiña, 2015. Relationships of *Limnoperna fortunei* with Benthic Animals, pp 191-210.
1021 In: Boltovskoy D. (ed.) *Limnoperna fortunei*. The Ecology, Distribution and Control of a Swiftly Spreading
1022 Invasive Fouling Mussel. Invading Nature - Springer Series in Invasion Ecology 10.
1023 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13494-9_11.
- 1024 Sylvester F, D. Boltovskoy & D. Cataldo, 2007a. The invasive bivalve *Limnoperna fortunei* enhances
1025 benthic invertebrate densities in South American floodplain rivers. Hydrobiologia 589:15–27.
1026 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-007-0708-4>.
- 1027 Sylvester, F., D. Boltovskoy & D. Cataldo, 2007b. Fast response of freshwater consumers to a new
1028 trophic resource: predation on the recently introduced Asian bivalve *Limnoperna fortunei* in the lower
1029 Paraná River, South America. Austral Ecology 32: 403–415. [9993.2007.01707.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-
1030 9993.2007.01707.x).

- 1031 Thiengo, S., H. Pinto, A. Mattos & M. Fernandez, 2017. Helminths parasitizing species of *Pomacea* in
1032 South America (Caenogastropoda; Ampullariidae). In: Santanna B. S. & Hattori G. Y. (eds.) Amazonian
1033 Apple Snails, Nova Science Publishers, New York.
- 1034 Thomsen, M. S., T. Wernberg, J.D. Olden, J. E. Byers, J. F. Bruno, B.R. Silliman & D R. Schiel, 2014. Forty
1035 years of experiments on aquatic invasive species: Are study biases limiting our understanding of
1036 impacts? *NeoBiota* 22: 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.3897/neobiota.22.6224>.
- 1037 Ueta, M., 1980. Ocorrência de infecção natural de *Fasciola hepatica* Linnaeus, 1758 em *Lymnaea*
1038 *columella* Say, 1817, no Vale do Paraíba, SP, Brasil. *Revista Saude Publica* 14: 230-233.
- 1039 Velásquez, L. E., J. C. Bedoya, A. Areiza & I. Vélez, 2006. Primer registro de *Centrocestus formosanus*
1040 (Digenea: Heterophyidae) en Colombia. *Revista Mexicana de Biodiversidad* 77: 119-121.
1041 <http://doi.org/10.22201/ib.20078706e.2006.001.326>.
- 1042 Villafranca, S. & M. Jiménez, 2006. Comunidad de moluscos asociados al mejillón verde *Perna viridis*
1043 (Mollusca: Bivalvia) y sus relaciones tróficas en la costa norte de la península de Araya, Estado Sucre,
1044 Venezuela. *Revista de Biología Tropical* 54 (Suppl. 3): 135-144.
- 1045 von Brand, E., A. Abarca, G.E. Merino, W. Stotz, 2016) Scallop fishery and aquaculture in Chile: A history
1046 of developments and declines, pp 1047–1072. In: Shumway S. E. & Parsons G. J. (eds.) Scallop, biology,
1047 ecology, aquaculture and fisheries. Elsevier, Oxford.
- 1048 Westfall, K. M. & J. P. A. Gardner, 2013. Interlineage *Mytilus galloprovincialis* Lmk. 1819 hybridization
1049 yields inconsistent genetic outcomes in the Southern hemisphere. *Biological Invasions* 15: 1493-1506.
1050 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-012-0385-8>.
- 1051 Wiryareja, S. & J. R. Tjoe-Awie, 2006. Golden apple snail: its occurrence and importance in Suriname's
1052 rice ecosystem, pp. 337- 342. In: Joshi R. C. & Sebastian L. S. (eds.) Global Advances in Ecology and
1053 Management of Golden Apple Snails, Philippines Rice Research Institute, Nueva Ecija, Philippines.
- 1054 Zbawicka, M., M. I. Trucco, & R. Wenne, 2018. Single nucleotide polymorphisms in native South
1055 American Atlantic coast populations of smooth shelled mussels: hybridization with invasive European
1056 *Mytilus galloprovincialis*. *Genetics Selection Evolution* 50: 1-14. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s12711-018-0376-z>.

1058 Zeimes, C. B., G. E. Olsson, C. Ahlm & S. O. Vanwambeke, 2012. Modelling zoonotic diseases in humans:
1059 comparison of methods for hantavirus in Sweden. International Journal of Health Geographics 11: 39.
1060 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-072X-11-39>.

TABLE 1. List and summary of documented impacts and effects of freshwater species in South America, according to the Environmental / Biodiversity, Socio-Economic and Public Health categories. *NNMS: non-native mollusc species; **TMS: transplanted mollusc species. (-) negative effect, (+) positive effect.

TAXA	ENVIRONMENTAL/ BIODIVERSITY IMPACTS	SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS	PUBLIC HEALTH EFFECTS
BIVALVIA			
<i>Anodontites trapesialis</i> ** (Mycetopodidae)	(-) Effects in fish cultures via glochidiosis [1-3]		
<i>Corbicula fluminea</i> * (Cyrenidae)	Competitive displacement of native bivalves [4-6] and other invertebrates [7]. Empty shells provide shelter and substrate for other species [7].	(-) Macrofouling in heat exchangers, hydroelectric power station [8]. (+) Bioindicator [9]; (+/-) Bioaccumulate lead, cadmium and copper [10].	
<i>Corbicula largillierti</i> * (Cyrenidae)	Competitive displacement of native bivalves [11].	(+) Bioindicator [12] and biomarker of Chlorothalonil (CLT) [13]. (-) Obstruction of the refrigeration system of power generation facilities [8].	
<i>Limnoperna fortunei</i> * (Mytilidae)	Overgrowth of other organisms [14-17]. Impacts on benthic communities [18-25]. Predation by larval and adult fishes [24, 26-33]. Impacts on the water column – nutrient recycling [34-37]. Water clarification and plankton grazing [27, 34-44], enhancement of Cyanobacteria [41, 43].	(-) Fouling on a wide array of human infrastructure: affects water supply sources for drinking water treatment plants, industrial refrigeration systems, fire protection systems and power plants [14, 15, 44-52]. (-) Fish-farming [53, 54]. (+) Bioindicator [54]. (+/-) Bioaccumulation of heavy metals [55].	
GASTROPODA			
<i>Galba truncatula</i> * (Lymnaeidae)	(-) Vector of <i>Fasciola hepatica</i> [56, 57] and <i>Cotylophoron corylophorum</i> [58].		
<i>Marisa cornuarietis</i> * (Ampullariidae)	Competition with and predation of native vector snails [61].	(+) Pet trade [61].	(+) Control of <i>Schistosoma mansoni</i> vectors [61].

<i>Melanoides tuberculata</i> *	Competitive displacement of local gastropods [62-65]. (Thiaridae)	(-) Vector of <i>Philophthalmus gralli</i> (Digenea, Philophthalmidae) [66].
<i>Physa acuta</i> *	Incorporation in local food webs [67]. (Physidae)	
<i>Pomacea canaliculata</i> **	Potential control of <i>Physa acuta</i> [67]. (Ampullariidae)	(-) Effects on rice culture [61, 68-71]. (-) Vector of <i>Fasciola hepatica</i> and <i>Cotylophoron cotylophorum</i> [58, 74].
<i>Pseudosuccinea columella</i> *		(-) Vector of <i>Philophthalmus gralli</i> [66].
<i>Potamopyrgus antipodarum</i> *	Competitive displacement of local gastropods [79]. (Tateidae)	(-) Vector of <i>Angiostrongylus cantonensis</i> [71-73]. (-) Vector of <i>Fasciola hepatica</i> [67, 74, 75]. (-) Vector of <i>Centrocestus formosanus</i> [76-78].

[1] Silva-Souza & Eiras, 2002; [2] Felipi & Silva-Souza, 2008; [3] Agudo-Padrón, 2019; [4] Pereira et al., 2013; [5] Reshaid et al., 2017; [6] Clavijo & Carranza, 2018; [7] Labaut et al., 2021; [8] dos Santos et al., 2012; [9] Guimarães & Barbujani Sígolo, 2008); [10] Cataldo et al., 2001; [11] Clavijo, 2014; [12] Reyna et al., 2019; [13] Reyna et al., 2021; [14] Darrigran, 2002; [15] Darrigran & Damborenea, 2005; [16] Silva et al., 2021a]; [17] Rojas Molina & Williner, 2013; [18] Darrigran et al., 1998; [19] Sylvester et al., 2007a; [20] Sardiña et al., 2008; [21] Sardiña et al., 2011; [22] Sylvester & Sardiña, 2015 and references therein; [23] Duchini et al., 2018; [24] Silva et al., 2021b; [25] Silva Bertão et al., 2021; [26] Penchaszadeh et al., 2000; [27] Boltovskoy et al., 2006; [28] García & Montaldo, 2006; [29] Paolucci et al., 2007; [30] Sylvester et al., 2007b; [31] González-Bergonzoni et al., 2010; [32] Cataldo, 2015; [33] Paolucci & Thuesen, 2015; [34] Cataldo et al., 2012b; [35] Boltovskoy et al., 2009; [36] Boltovskoy et al., 2015 and references therein; [37] Burlakova et al., 2022; [38] Rojas Molina & José de Paggi, 2008; [39] Rojas Molina et al., 2010, [40] Rojas Molina et al., 2015 y referencias en el mismo; [41] Cataldo et al., 2012a; [42] Rojas Molina et al., 2012; [43] Boltovskoy et al., 2013; [44] Darrigran & Pastorino, 1995; [45] Darrigran & Damborenea, 2011; [46] Brugnoli et al., 2005, [47] Brugnoli et al., 2006; [48] Darrigran et al., 2007; [49] Boltovskoy & Correa, 2015; [50] Resende et al., 2014; [51] de Castro et al., 2019; [52] Hermes-Silva et al., 2021; [53] Costa et al., 2018; [54] Besen & Garcia Marengoni, 2021; [55] Marengoni et al., 2013; [56] Salazar Jaramillo et al., 2006; [57] Prepelitchi & Wisnivesky-Colli, 2013; [58] Lopez et al., 2008; [59] Ueta, 1980; [60] Heinzen et al., 1994; [61] Horgan et al., 2014b; [62] Fernandez et al., 2001; [63] Fernandez et al., 2003; [64] Guimarães et al., 2001; [65] Giovanelli et al., 2002; [66] Pinto & de Melo, 2010; [67] Maldonado & Martín, 2019; [68] Wiryareja & Tjoe-Awie, 2006; [69] Agudo Padrón et al., 2010; [70] Horgan et al., 2014a; [71] Correoso Rodriguez et al., 2017; [72] Solózano Álava et al., 2014; [73] Thiengo et al., 2017; [74] Mas-Coma et al., 2001; [75] Esteban et al., 2002; [76] Hernández et al., 2003; [77] Velásquez et al., 2006; [78] Pinto et al., 2018; [79] Collado et al., 2019.

TABLE 2. List and summary of documented impacts and effects of marine species in South America, according to the Environmental / Biodiversity, Socio-Economic and Public Health categories. *NNMS: non-native mollusc species; **TMS: transplanted mollusc species. (-) negative effect; (+) positive effect.

TAXA	ENVIRONMENTAL/ BIODIVERSITY IMPACTS	SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS	PUBLIC HEALTH EFFECTS
BIVALVIA			
<i>Argopecten purpuratus</i> ** (Pectinidae)	(+) Commercial aquaculture [1].		
<i>Isognomon bicolor</i> * (Isognomonidae)	Habitat modification [2]. Incorporation in local food webs [3].	(-) Fouling on pipeline monobuoys [4].	
<i>Leiosolenus aristatus</i> ** (Mytilidae)	(-) Boring in shells of cultured scallops [5]		
<i>Magallana gigas</i> * [= <i>Crassostrea gigas</i>] (Ostreidae)	Habitat modification [6, 7]. Increased diversity of macrofaunal benthic assemblages [8]. Probable vector for boring polychaetes infecting native mollusc species [9].	(+) Commercial aquaculture [10, 11]. (-) Probable vector for introduced boring polychaetes infecting cultured species [9, 12].	
<i>Mytella strigata</i> ** (Mytilidae)	(-) Fouling in culture structures and trophic imbalance in the culture pools [13].		
<i>Mytilopsis leucophaeata</i> * (Dreissenidae)	(-) Fouling in culture structures and trophic imbalance in the culture pools, [14]		
<i>Mytilopsis trautwineana</i> ** (Dreissenidae)	(-) Fouling in culture structures and trophic imbalance in the culture pools		

		[15]. Calculated incurred cost in South America of USD 0.007 billion [16].
<i>Mytilus galloprovincialis</i> * (Mytilidae)	Hybridization with local Mytilidae [17, 18].	(-) Fouling in culture structures [19].
<i>Perna viridis</i> * (Mytilidae)	Habitat modification [20].	(+) Experimental aquaculture [21].
<i>Saccostrea cucullata</i> * (Ostreidae)	Probably reducing available habitat in mangrove ecosystems [22].	
<i>Talonostrea talonata</i> * [=Crassostrea talonata] (Ostreidae)		(-) Nuisance species for oyster <i>Crassostrea tulipa</i> culture (space competition) [23].
<i>Tawera elliptica</i> ** (Veneridae)		(+) Commercial aquaculture [24]
GASTROPODA		
<i>Eualetes tulipa</i> * (Vermidae)		(-) Fouling on power plant turbines [25].
<i>Haliotis discus</i> * (Haliotidae)	Substrate for native boring polychaetes [10].	(+) Commercial aquaculture [26-28].
<i>Haliotis rufescens</i> * (Haliotidae)	Substrate for native boring polychaetes [10].	(+) Commercial aquaculture [26-28]. (-) Probable vector for introduced boring polychaetes infecting cultured species [10]. (-) Probable presence of <i>Bonamia</i> sp. [29].
		(-) Presence of the bacteria <i>Xenohaliotis californiensis</i> [29].

<i>Pleurobranchaea maculata</i> * (Pleurobranchaeidae)	Predation on native benthic species [30].	(-) Presence of neurotoxins that affect human and domestic animals [30].
<i>Rapana venosa</i> * (Muricidae)	Predation on native bivalves; [31-34]. Fouling on green turtles [31] Incorporation in local food webs [35-37].	

[1] Von Brand et al., 2016; [2] Breves-Ramos et al., 2009; [3] López et al., 2010; [4] Agostini & Ozorio, 2016; [5] Simone & Gonçalves 2006; [6] Melo et al., 2010; [7] Mendez et al., 2015; [8] Bazterrica et al., 2022; [9] Moreno et al., 2006; [10] Furse et al., 2004; [11] dos Santos & Costa, 2016; [12] Diez et al., 2011; [13] Lodeiros et al., 2021; [14] Lodeiros et al., 2019; [15] Aldridge et al., 2008; [16] Haubrock et al., 2022; [17] Westfall & Gardner, 2013; [18] Zbawicka et al., 2018; [19] Belz et al., 2020]; [20] Villafranca & Jiménez, 2006; [21] Acosta et al., 2006; [22] do Amaral et al., 2020; [23] Cavaleiro et al., 2019; [24] Oliva & Durán 2012; [25] Miloslavich & Penchaszadeh, 1992; [26] Flores-Aguilar et al., 2007; [27] Castilla & Neil, 2009; [28] SUBPESCA, 2021; [29] Campalans & Lohrmann, 2009; [30] Bökenhans et al., 2019; [31] Carranza et al. 2010a; [32] Carranza et al. 2010b; [33] Giberto et al., 2011; [34] Lanfranconi et al., 2013; [35] Lezama et al., 2013; [36] Bonelli et al., 2016; [37] Spotorno-Oliveira et al., 2020.