

1 Running head

2 **Round goby gut contents**

3

4 Title

5 **Egg predation on native fish by invasive round goby revealed by species-specific gut content DNA analyses**

6

7 **Authors**

8 Elisabeth Lutz^{1*}, Philipp Emanuel Hirsch^{1*}, Karen Bussmann¹, Joschka Wiegler¹, Hans-Peter Jermann², Roxane

9 Muller³, Patricia Burkhardt-Holm¹, Irene Adrian-Kalchhauser¹

10 *shared first authorship

11

12 **Author affiliations**

13 ¹Program Man-Society-Environment, Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Basel, Vesalgasse 1,

14 4051 Switzerland

15 ²Head of fisheries, Office for Environment and Energy, Canton Basel-Stadt, Hochbergerstrasse 158, 4019 Basel

16 ³Agroscope, Forage Production and Grassland, Reckenholzstrasse 191, 8046 Zürich

17 Switzerland,

18

19 **Author contributions**

20 For DNA analyses, EL and IAK designed experiments, EL organised and performed fieldwork, laboratory

21 experiments and analysed the data. For mark-recapture studies, RM, and PEH organised and performed fieldwork

22 and analysed the data. HPJ performed field work and provided native fish samples and data on native fish. IAK,

23 PEH, EL, KB, JW, and PBH wrote the manuscript.

24 **Funding**

25 This work was funded by the Federal Office for the Environment, Switzerland; the Canton Basel-Stadt; the lottery
26 funds of the Cantons Solothurn, Aargau and Basel-Landschaft.

27

28 **Permissions**

29 Fish used in this work were caught in accordance with permission 2-3-6-4-1 from the Cantonal Office for
30 Environment and Energy, Basel Stadt, marked and maintained in accordance with permissions 2645, 2846 and
31 1022H from the Cantonal Veterinary Office Basel Stadt and following institutional guidelines. Research involving
32 protected species was conducted in accordance with applicable laws and in collaboration with the local office for
33 environment.

34 **Abstract**

35

36 1. Conservation of riverine fish typically aims at improving access to spawning grounds and the restoration of
37 longitudinal connectivity requires substantial investments. However, the removal of migration barriers also
38 enables the upstream invasion of non-native species into spawning areas, with potential negative effects on
39 recruitment of threatened freshwater fish through egg or fry predation.

40

41 2. Detecting egg predation is often challenging. Visual gut inspections are thought to underestimate predation
42 on soft material such as eggs and fry, which hampers the discovery of predators preying upon these life-
43 stages. For soft materials, molecular approaches may therefore offer a more sensitive tool for detection.

44

45 3. Here, we uncover such a macroscopically invisible conservation issue caused by predation of invasive
46 round goby (*Neogobius melanostomus*) predation on eggs or fry of threatened common nase
47 (*Chondrostoma nasus*) in Switzerland.

48

49 4. In addition, this manuscript presents species-specific molecular assays for five more valuable native fish,
50 including endangered salmonid and cyprinid river spawners, and confirms the applicability of the assays in
51 a series of laboratory and field feeding experiments involving eggs and fish tissue. The manuscript also
52 provides a guiding tool for conservation managers regarding the use and applicability of different molecular
53 approaches in gut-content analysis.

54

55 5. Our results inspire recommendations for local conservation measures such as a temporary reduction of
56 round goby densities at the spawning site prior to the spawning period, and demonstrate how the targeted
57 application of species-specific molecular markers can inform freshwater fish management.

58

59 **Keywords**

60 *Neogobius melanostomus*, population recruitment, reproduction, common nase, *Chondrostoma nasus*, invasion
61 management

62 **Introduction**

63

64 **Conservation target: freshwater fish recruitment**

65 Migratory species often have high socio-cultural importance and an exceptional value attached to
66 conserving their migrations (Meretsky, Atwell, & Hyman, 2011). At the same time, they are particularly vulnerable,
67 since they depend on connected habitats and open migration corridors. Many riverine freshwater fish species are
68 gravel spawners and therefore migrate from major rivers or the sea into tributaries to reproduce. Migration barriers
69 are one of the greatest threats to reproduction by impairing spawning migrations and thus population recruitment
70 (Ignatius & Haapasaari, 2018). Hydropower dams constitute such migration barriers and are of particular importance
71 in Switzerland where electricity supply relies heavily on run-of-the-river hydropower plants. In appreciation of the
72 associated conservation issues, spawning sites of so-called ‘national importance’ have been mapped by federal
73 authorities for migratory species of the River Rhine’s tributaries (Kirchhofer, Breitenstein, & Guthruf, 2002;
74 Zbinden & Hefti, 2000) (**Table 1**). The importance of these species is reflected by effected and planned investments
75 of 627 million € between 2009 and 2027 in the River Rhine and its tributaries alone. These investments mainly go
76 into measures of stocking and securing access to spawning sites, such as building fish ladders and removing dams
77 (Bölscher, van Slobbe, van Vliet, & Werners, 2013), **Figure 1**).

78


English name	Common barbel	Common nase	Grayling	Brown trout	Atlantic salmon	European chub
Latin name	<i>Barbus barbus</i>	<i>Chondrostoma nasus</i>	<i>Thymallus thymallus</i>	<i>Salmo trutta fario</i>	<i>Salmo salar</i>	<i>Squalius cephalus</i>
German name	Barbe	Nase	Äsche	Forelle	Lachs	Döbel/Alet
IUCN Read List of Threatened Species 2001	Near Threatened	Critically Endangered	Vulnerable	Near Threatened	Regionally Extinct	Least concern
Protected according to Berne Convention	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Local spawning season / fry emergence	May-July	March-May	March-May / June	October-January / March - June	October-January / March-June	April-June

79

80 **Table 1.**

81 *Iconic / protected / locally relevant freshwater fish for which assays were developed in this study. Source for*
82 *spawning and fry emergence: Office for the Environment Basel Stadt.*

83



84

85

86 **Figure 1**

87 *Map of the study area at the River Rhine in Switzerland. River sections and tributaries colonized by invasive round*
 88 *goby are marked with orange and red, respectively. The orange color intensity in the river Rhine reflects time since*
 89 *first record, with more recent colonization displayed in paler shades (Basel: 2012; close to the river Sissle: 2018).*
 90 *Spawning areas for fish of national importance (common nase (*Chondrostoma nasus*) grayling (*Thymallus**
 91 *thymallus, brown trout (*Salmo trutta*), as well as areas in which the locally extinct Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) is*
 92 *stocked for reintroduction are indicated by fish symbols next to the tributaries. In recent years, major investments*
 93 *have been made to improve the accessibility and structure of tributaries, as well as the ecological permeability of*
 94 *hydropower plants in the River Rhine. Sum figures of recent and planned monetary investments are indicated by*
 95 *green circles, with the amount reflected by the circle area.*

96 **Conservation threat from a non-native egg predator – the round goby**

97 The efforts to improve spawning site access for migratory species have unwanted side-effects. Migration
98 barriers not only impede spawning migrations but also protect spawning sites from invasive species dispersing from
99 the main river. Once migration barriers for gravel spawners have fallen, the upstream invasion of potential predators
100 and competitors poses a threat to their spawning and recruitment success.

101 This problem is epitomized by one of Europe’s 100 worst invasive species, the round goby (*Neogobius*
102 *melanostomus*). This small benthic fish is currently spreading in the River Rhine in Switzerland. Its range is now
103 expanding into the tributaries which contain the spawning sites of several native gravel spawners (Hirsch,
104 Thorlacius, Brodin, & Burkhardt-Holm, 2017). Round gobies consume a broad diet, but are also known as egg and
105 fry predators. Experiments and field observations show that they prey on eggs and fry of larger fish in rivers and
106 lakes (Chotkowski & Ellen Marsden, 1999; Fitzsimons et al., 2006; Kornis, Mercado-Silva, & Vander Zanden,
107 2012). In the Great Lakes, round goby predation on spawning reefs has led to severe recruitment losses of socio-
108 economically important salmonid species (Roseman, Taylor, Hayes, Jones, & Francis, 2006). Consequently,
109 removal efforts have been developed with the intention to decrease round goby density over spawning reefs prior to
110 the spawning season (Wagner, Cooper, Gross, & Coffin, 2015).

111

112 **The necessary evidence for conservation efforts can be gathered by molecular tools**

113 A round goby invasion into tributaries has the potential to undermine costly conservation efforts. To decide
114 on potential countermeasures, robust scientific evidence is required (Salafsky et al., 2019). This scientific evidence
115 base for egg predation by round goby in the wild is difficult to establish with current methods. Diet quantifications
116 usually rely on visual identification, but eggs and fry represent soft materials and gobies grind prey with their
117 pharyngeal teeth thus further disintegrating these prey (Ghedotti, Smihula, & Smith, 1995). This renders such prey
118 types visually hard to identify, which impedes the macroscopic identification in round goby stomachs.(Baker,
119 Buckland, & Sheaves, 2014). Although eggs and fish remains are occasionally observed in round goby guts
120 (Nichols et al., 2003; Roseman et al., 2006), visual methods may fail to report the true extent, and usually fail to
121 provide species-level information on the prey. This situation thus requires novel tools that provide a scientific and
122 conclusive confirmation and documentation of round goby predation on native fish species. Prey species
123 components that are shredded beyond recognition can be identified with a variety of methods. In the context of

124 conservation, species-specific approaches are most useful because they require least efforts once they have been
125 tailored to the situation (see Methods section for details).

126

127 **Aims**

128 In this paper, species-specific assays are used to detect egg predation of round goby on native nase
129 (*Chondrostoma nasus*) and five other native species based on molecular gut content analyses. First, species-specific
130 assays for five native species are designed (**Table 1**) and their specificity is confirmed. The method is then validated
131 in aquarium and field feeding experiments involving fish tissues and eggs. Finally, predation of round goby on one
132 particular species, the common nase, is tested at a spawning site in the field, with the aim to inform future
133 conservation efforts.

134

135 **Study species and study site**

136 The nase is an endangered and protected freshwater fish that undergoes a spawning migration into
137 tributaries. Several major spawning sites of national importance have been mapped in the River Wiese in Basel,
138 Switzerland. At the most important site located furthest downstream, ~1000 individuals of male and female nase
139 aggregate every year to spawn over gravel beds in 0.5 to 1m depth along a short section of river which is only 20-
140 40m long and 20m wide (**Figure 2**; (Maier, 1997), own observations, see also the Supporting-Information-video of a
141 nase spawning aggregation, filmed where pictures for **Figure 2** were taken). Since two years round goby are
142 dispersing into this river, have reached the nase spawning sites (own fishing records, unpublished data, **Figure 2**),
143 and are expected to disperse further upstream towards upstream spawning sites of nase. Based on previous research,
144 we expect that nase reproduction is especially vulnerable to round goby predation. In contrast to salmonid winter
145 spawners, nase spawn in spring when temperatures are higher (Maier, 1997; Zbinden & Hefti, 2000) and round goby
146 are more actively feeding. Nase eggs are not buried, but are spawned on top of the gravel bed, where they adhere
147 and are thus directly accessible for predators (Hofer & Kirchhofer, 1996; Patzner, Weidinger, & Rühl, 2006). Nase
148 eggs and fry are sensitive to several external factors and losses can amount to almost 100% (Penazk & Luck, 1965 -
149 cited in Patzner et al, 2006). For example, egg predation frequently leads to 20-30% losses (Maier, 1997), and
150 embryonic survival is reduced by up to 20% by temperature increases of more than 5 degrees over the optimum
151 temperature (Targońska & Kucharczyk, 2008). Finally, studies suggest that the mortality of larvae can amount to

152 99% in the first two months following hatch (Bartl & Keckeis, 2004). Even minor impacts on recruitment therefore
153 pose a conservation threat to this species. Thus the possible predation of eggs and fry of the endangered nase at its
154 yearly spawning site by the round goby is a relevant and suitable testbed for putting a molecular method into
155 conservation practice.
156



157
158 **Figure 2**
159 *Photographic depiction of the nase (*Chondrostoma nasus*) spawning run in the River Wiese in Basel, Switzerland.*
160 *Top left picture; A co-author standing above the bridge with the white dashed line indicating the spawning area.*
161 *This gives an idea of the scale of the actual spawning site is in terms of depth and widths of the River Wiese. A video*
162 *filmed from the co-author's position was uploaded as a Supporting information for review, filename: 'Nase*
163 *spawning aggregation April 2018 in Basel - CH.mov'. Right: A typical group of spawners located approx.*
164 *equidistant to another, each individual framed by a white circle. Bottom left picture: an underwater picture of a*
165 *nase with approx. 50cm total body length. Note that the underwater picture was taken outside of the spawning*
166 *season and not at this site, to prevent any disturbance.*
167

168 **Methods**

169

170 **Evaluation of different molecular approaches**

171 Three approaches (see below) with unique advantages and disadvantages are currently available for
172 molecular gut content identification. The approaches differ with regard to the most challenging step (assay
173 development versus data analysis) and in their specificity (detection of a species of interest versus detection of an
174 entire community; **Figure 3**).

175

176 (1) **Species-specific approaches** detect unique and species-specific DNA sequences. They are difficult to design,
177 but any molecular diagnostic laboratory can generate and interpret results without the need for sequencing or
178 bioinformatic analyses. Species-specific approaches have been used to investigate prey diversity (Corse et al., 2010),
179 but they are most useful when the aim is to investigate specific prey species.

180

181 (2) **Barcoding approaches** can be used to identify individual large prey items or to determine the diversity of gut
182 contents, for example in lion fish *Pterois volitans* (Valdez-Moreno, Quintal-Lizama, Gómez-Lozano, & García-
183 Rivas, 2012). They rely on the amplification of barcoding genes such as mitochondrial Cytochrome B or
184 Cytochrome Oxidase 1, and reagents to amplify barcoding genes have been designed for many clades including
185 invertebrates (Valentini et al., 2009). Barcoding requires reasonably intact DNA and fails on strongly digested
186 samples. Also, predator DNA can swamp the signal and outcompete scarce prey items. For example, just 61'000
187 prey sequence reads were retrieved from 2'000'000 total reads for spiders (Piñol, San Andrés, Clare, Mir, &
188 Symondson, 2014). Finally, data analysis requires sequencing to identify individual larger items or Next Generation
189 Sequencing (NGS) and bioinformatics for analyses of diversity.

190

191 (3) **Shotgun approaches** determine prey diversity. All DNA fragments in a sample are sequenced by NGS, and the
192 species affiliation of individual DNA fragments is then inferred bioinformatically by matching sequencing results
193 against existing databases. In contrast to species-specific approaches, shotgun approaches require no a priori
194 knowledge about DNA sequences of predator or prey and have been successfully applied to insects (Paula et al.,

195 2016). However, signals from the predator or its microbiome can outcompete scarce prey items, and data analysis
196 requires advanced bioinformatic skills.

197 In the context of conservation, where bioinformatic skills and costs are limiting and the prey species of
198 interest is usually known, as was the case for this study, species-specific approaches (1) are most recommendable.

199

200 **Gut content isolation and DNA isolation**

201 Gut contents of all gobies used in the following experiments were isolated after terminal anesthesia with
202 Koi Med Sleep by opening the body cavity from the anus towards the pelvic fin with scissors, removing the gut, and
203 squeezing its contents into an Eppendorf tube with 100% EtOH. Samples were stored at 4°C, with EtOH being
204 exchanged once after several hours or on the following day. DNA extractions were performed with the DNeasy
205 Blood & Tissue Kit from Qiagen, which yielded DNA of higher integrity than a standard Phenol Chloroform
206 extraction as was discovered via the comparison of three extracted samples with each method.

207

208 **PCR conditions**


209 PCRs were done with FastStart™ Taq DNA Polymerase from Roche in a 20 µL volume (2 µL 10x buffer,
210 1.6 µL dNTPs (2.5 mM), 0.4 µL forward primer (10 nM), 0.4 µL reverse primer (10 nM), 1.25 µL BSA (20 mg mL⁻¹),
211 0.2 µL Polymerase (5 U µL⁻¹), 60 ng of template-DNA and ultra-pure H₂O to a total volume of 20 µL). BSA was
212 included to alleviate potential PCR inhibition which is common in environmental samples (Adrian-Kalchhauser &
213 Burkhardt-Holm, 2016).

214

215 **Assay design**

216 Cytochrome Oxidase I (COI) was chosen as target gene because, as of 2017, the NCBI database contained
217 more bony fish COI sequences than other widely sequenced genes (12srDNA, 16srDNA, or Cytochrome B).

218



219

220 **Figure 3**

221 *Overview of molecular approaches to gut content identification. In any given gut, some prey items can be identified*
 222 *to species level visually (such as gammarids or mussels), some prey items can be identified to higher taxonomic*
 223 *level (such as fish remains), and some prey items are digested beyond recognition (such as unidentifiable egg or fish*

224 *remains). Samples always also contain DNA from the predator and DNA from the gut microbiome. The amount and*
225 *the fragment length of DNA isolated from gut contents depends on the degree of digestion. Species-specific*
226 *approaches (1) are designed to detect the DNA of a selected prey species of interest. Barcoding approaches (2) are*
227 *designed to either identify individual prey items, or to reveal prey diversity within a clade of interest. If predator and*
228 *prey are phylogenetically related, predator DNA may be amplified with primers designed for the prey. Shotgun*
229 *approaches (3) are designed to reveal the entire prey diversity and do not focus on a particular genomic region. The*
230 *figure lists major challenges and advantages of each approach.*

231 Hard-material invertebrate prey item as a method test

232 As a method test, an assay targeting a common invertebrate prey item was developed. For that we used the
233 zebra mussel (*Dreissena polymorpha*) because it is a common prey item in round goby and because its hard shell is
234 easy to identify visually (Özdal, 2016). COI sequences for all bivalves and gastropods present in the High Rhine
235 (Rey et al., 2015) (Appendix S2) were retrieved from the NCBI database and aligned with the Clustal Omega online
236 tool (Chojnacki, Cowley, Lee, Foix, & Lopez, 2017). Primers were chosen with 1) zebra-mussel specific and GC
237 rich 3'ends, 2) primer lengths between 22 and 24 and 3) amplicon size below 300 base pairs. EL_17F
238 ATTGGTACCAATAATACTGAGTC (5'-3') and EL_18R GCACGTATATTACCTCATGTCC, **Appendix S3**)
239 were tested on samples from a previous fishing campaign, and results were predominantly in agreement with visual
240 gut content inspections.


241

242 Fish assays

243 In a similar manner, assays for six fish species were designed: Common barbel (*Barbus barbus*), common
244 nase (*Chondrostoma nasus*), grayling (*Thymallus thymallus*), brown trout (*Salmo trutta fario*), Atlantic salmon
245 (*Salmo salar*), and European chub (*Squalius cephalus*). All species spawn in the investigated area, are relevant to
246 local fisheries and/or are endangered and part of species protection programs and/or are species of local and national
247 importance (**Table 1**). Primers were designed as above on an alignment of native locally occurring fish (**Appendix**
248 **S4**). Specificity was tested on samples obtained from 'Projet Lac' (EAWAG/Ole Seehausen), local food stores,
249 stocking companies, and routine monitoring campaigns. For Souffia (*Telestes souffia*), brook lamprey (*Lampetra*
250 *planeri*), and the European bitterling (*Rhodeus amarus*) no samples were available (**Appendix S5**).

251 The applicability and feasibility of the assays in wild individuals were tested by field feeding. Filets of the
252 target species was fastened inside minnow traps (one target species per trap). Traps were exposed for 5h in the local
253 harbor Kleinhüningen (N 47.587453°, E 7.593608°) and/or in the River Rhine (N 47.570444°, E 7.583609° and N
254 47.560365°, E 7.620167°). The assays reliably detected ingested prey of the respective target species and, in many
255 cases, were more sensitive than visual inspections (**Figure 4**), with the exception of European chub. While the
256 European chub assay detected pure chub DNA reliably, amplification from six round goby gut contents failed, even
257 though putative fish tissue was visible in one sample.

258



* ingested tissue was visible
 < 500 bp ◀ 100 bp

259

260

261 **Figure 4**

262 *PCR-based detection of brown trout, Atlantic salmon, common barbel, common nase, and grayling material from*
 263 *the guts of wild round goby that were caught in traps baited with the respective species. A white band in the agarose*
 264 *gel indicates successful detection of the target species. Leftmost and rightmost lanes: size standards, arrows indicate*
 265 *100bp and 500bp band. First lane: assay on pure DNA of the target species (positive control). Second lane: assay*
 266 *on pure DNA from round goby (negative control). Last lane: assay on water (negative control). Other lanes: assay*
 267 *on DNA extracted from round goby gut contents. An asterisk marks the samples in which ingested bait tissue chunks*
 268 *were macroscopically visible during gut content isolation.*

269

270 **Trout egg predation**

271 Current efforts in trout fisheries management move away from stocking and towards enhancing natural
 272 reproduction (Spalinger, Dönni, Hefti, & Vonlanthen, 2018). To understand the potential of round goby to
 273 negatively affect those efforts, the ability of round goby to consume trout eggs as well as the ability of the trout
 274 assay to detect ingested eggs was determined in aquaria experiments. Due to the protected status of nase, nase eggs
 275 were not available for experiments. Sixty round goby were maintained in groups of 5 individuals, fed with
 276 bloodworms (chironomid larvae), and starved for two days before the feeding experiments. Brown trout eggs at the
 277 eyed egg stage (diameter ~ 4 mm) from the local cantonal fisheries association (www.basler-fischerei.ch, Hermann

278 Koffel) were placed in front of individual round gobies hiding in PVC tubes. Eggs were offered to large individuals
279 first and then progressively to smaller individuals. Feeding was stopped when it became clear that individuals below
280 9 cm would not accept eggs. Nine individuals were found to consume eggs. After feeding they were translocated to
281 an empty tank and sampled after time spans of 15 min (n = 2), 2 h (n = 1), ~5 h (n = 3), or ~20 h (n = 3). Two
282 individuals received bloodworms as negative controls.

283

284 **Common nase egg predation at natural spawning sites**

285 Next, the consumption of common nase egg or fry was tested at a natural spawning site in the field. Round
286 goby were sampled with minnow traps and by electrofishing at a local spawning site in the River Wiese (N
287 47.581812°, E 7.591157°; **Figure 2**). For conservation reasons, electrofishing and intense trapping efforts were
288 restricted until after hatch. Common nase eggs require around 180 day degrees to develop, which corresponds to 10-
289 16 days in local conditions. Larvae then remain on site for another 10 days. Spawning took place from the 14th to the
290 20th of April 2018. Traps were set at the river banks from 16th of April to 16th of May and emptied every 2-4 days,
291 while electrofishing was carried out on the 25th of April upstream from the spawning site, and on the 16th of May
292 (when larvae were expected to have emerged), upstream and downstream from the spawning site. 50 round goby
293 were caught with both approaches combined. In addition, 10 round goby were caught with traps at a nearby
294 commercial harbor as negative control. In the harbor, nase are occasionally caught but no nase spawning occurs.

295


296 **Management options and required resources**

297 Round goby densities at the common nase spawning site are available from 2016 and 2017, the two years
298 preceding this work. In 2016, a mark-recapture study was performed between the 14th September and 10th October
299 2016. Round gobies were marked with pit tags and population density was determined with the Lincoln-Peterson
300 estimator for a 2-sample closed-population model (Bagenal & Tesch, 1978). In summer 2017, the Office for
301 Environment and Energy, canton Basel-Stadt, conducted an electrofishing campaign at the site, targeting large
302 species for relocation in the course of a renaturation project, and as a by-product caught hundreds of round goby.

303

304

327 the common nase. Despite the sampling limitations, which were instigated to avoid disturbing spawning and
 328 negative impacts on recruitment, four out of fifty gut samples tested positive for common nase, two of them strongly
 329 (4115 and 4152) and two of them weakly (4120 and 4150; **Figure 6**). All four positive round goby individuals were
 330 caught close to the spawning site. Samples from further downstream as well as all control samples from the nearby
 331 harbor were tested negative. Samples were also tested for presence of grayling and European chub, two species that
 332 spawn at the same time but further upstream, but all samples were tested negative for these two species (data not
 333 shown).
 334



335
 336 **Figure 6**
 337 *Round goby consume eggs of the endangered and protected common nase near a spawning site. Top panel: Map of*
 338 *the River Wiese, with areas of round goby fishing marked in yellow and common nase spawning sites indicated in*
 339 *red. Bottom panel: PCR results. A white band indicates presence of target species DNA. Leftmost and rightmost*
 340 *lanes: size standards, arrows indicate 100bp and 500bp band. First lane: assay on pure DNA of common nase*
 341 *(positive control). Second lane: assay on pure DNA from round goby (negative control). Last lane: assay on water*
 342 *(negative control). Gut samples (harbour): assay on DNA extracted from round goby gut contents from a nearby*

343 *industrial harbor where no common nase spawning took place. Gut samples (Wiese): assay on DNA extracted from*
344 *round goby gut contents from the River Wiese. In two samples (4115 and 4152) a strong signal is visible, in two*
345 *samples (4120 and 4150) a weak but repeatable (n=3) signal is visible. Note that all round goby individuals were*
346 *caught after the spawning season proper and downstream of the actual spawning site in order to not disturb*
347 *spawning (see methods for details).*

348

349 **Round goby density quantification and management options**

350 The mark-recapture campaign revealed a maximum population density near the spawning site of ~11 round
351 gobies per sqm. On the 20x20 m of the investigated spawning site, this corresponds to a maximum of ~4400
352 individuals in total. A non-quantitative sampling campaign directed at large individuals of other species in the same
353 area in 2017 yielded hundreds of round goby.

354 **Discussion**

355 Our molecular approach confirms that round goby consume eggs or fry of the common nase at their natural
356 spawning sites, and thus pose a potential conservation issue for this migratory gravel spawner. Visual gut content
357 analysis would not have been able to discover this issue. Our tests have the potential to reveal similar “invisible”
358 conservation threats for trout, grayling, barbel, salmon, and chub, since the assays are able to detect ingested tissue
359 when it is no longer macroscopically visible.

360

361 **Conservation implications of round goby egg predation on the nase**

362 The data collected in this study does not allow to quantitatively predict population-scale effects of round
363 goby on the nase. Such quantitative predictions require sound data on round goby densities, round goby
364 consumption rates, egg availability, and the relative contributions of other factors to nase reproductive output. Such
365 data cannot be provided due to sampling limitations. The local nase population is extremely well-protected and the
366 knowledge gain from sampling and quantification of spawners, eggs, or fry needs to be balanced against the
367 potential losses. Because larvae can be extremely sensitive to electrofishing, this method could also not be used in
368 closer temporal or spatial proximity to the actual spawning. The actual number of positively tested round goby
369 might be even higher if they could have been caught directly above the spawning site and directly during or shortly
370 after spawning. At any case, in the absence of such further data, any attempts to make speculative quantifications of
371 losses on the population level should be discouraged. However, it is quite likely that the observation of 4 positive
372 gut samples out of 50 guts analyzed substantially underestimates predation pressure due to the time and distance
373 between the catch of the potential predators and spawning of the potential prey.

374 Considering the high mortality of nase eggs and larvae described in the literature (see introduction), the
375 sensitivity of the species to adverse factors such as higher spring temperatures which are likely to increase in the
376 near future, and the vulnerability of common nase to chemical pollution from the petro- and agrochemistry industry
377 (Devaux et al., 2015), even a few percent loss of reproduction to round goby predation could be the proverbial nail
378 in the coffin for nase recruitment at a given year. Accordingly, following the precautionary principle (Leung et al.,
379 2002) and considering investments already undertaken to support the population, our data is certainly sufficient to
380 instigate a discussion on the conservation implications of evidence for egg predation.

381 Our data makes a local removal of round goby populations a conceivable solution to minimize negative
382 effects on recruitment of iconic or protected species. Round gobies directly below the spawning site, but not further
383 downstream, had ingested common nase larvae or eggs. Round gobies generally show high site fidelity with
384 estimated home-ranges of $5 \pm 1.2 \text{ m}^2$ (Ray & Corkum, 2001). A study in Lake Michigan showed individuals to
385 move within a maximum of 67 m shoreline range of a release point (Wolfe & Marsden, 1998). This indicates that
386 physically removing round goby from spawning sites of national importance prior to the spawning season should be
387 further investigated as an efficacious option to minimize egg predation.

388 Based on existing population control models (N'Guyen et al., 2018), eradication of round goby in secluded
389 areas might be achieved by a long-term yearly removal of 85% of all the population's adult individuals. Our own
390 experience with sampling in 2018 and participation in the 2017 electrofishing campaign indicates that round goby
391 populations at the nase spawning site can be substantially reduced by electrofishing. It is unclear how many round
392 goby need to be removed to reduce predation pressure. However, it can be estimated that a series of consecutive
393 electrofishing campaigns can substantially reduce population density in the given setting. Three campaigns would
394 correspond to 9 whole workdays or 72 work hours. At a rate of 50 EUR per hour (average Swiss labor cost), this
395 corresponds to personnel costs of EUR 3600 per year. Although this estimate of the expected costs is coarse, it
396 allows for a simple conclusion: the costs for temporarily reducing round goby densities at the spawning site are
397 vanishingly small compared with the planned investment of more than 35 million EUR into river restoration of the
398 River Wiese over the course of 15-20 years (office for environment and energy, canton Basel-Stadt, 2015). Ten
399 million Euros have already been spent between 2016 and 2018 to restore only the downstream section, where the
400 spawning sites of the nase are located (office for environment and energy, canton Basel-Stadt, 2018).

401

402 **Methodological advancements for evidencing egg predation by invasive species**

403 Our work underscores the potential of species-specific molecular prey detection to uncover previously
404 unknown and "invisible" conservation threats. Molecular prey identification methods are increasingly used to
405 elucidate prey diversity, because they outperform visual approaches in three ways.

406 Firstly, they extend the detection window (Carreon-Martinez, Johnson, Ludsin, & Heath, 2011). For
407 example, visual identification of herring eggs in round goby stomachs is possible only during 9 h post feeding

408 (Wiegleb, Kotterba, Hammer, & Oesterwind, 2018). Similarly, our assays extended the detection window for eggs
409 as well as for soft muscle tissue compared to visual inspection.

410 Secondly, molecular approaches reduce detection bias against soft prey items. The round goby is known to
411 prey on a variety of taxa, including zooplankton, benthic invertebrates, small fishes, fish eggs and the larvae of small
412 fishes, with exact diet composition depending on habitat, season, and body size (Karlson, Almqvist, Skora, &
413 Appelberg, 2007; Kornis et al., 2012; Wiegleb et al., 2018). Commonly, diet components are determined to the
414 “lowest possible taxon” based on structures such as shells and exoskeleton elements. This approach performs poorly
415 on soft structures (such as larvae or eggs) or taxonomically ambiguous prey items (such as juvenile fish) and
416 disregards amorphous masses. In our experience, up to 30 % of round goby gut contents can be categorized as
417 amorphous mass (Özdal, 2016). Accordingly, large biases introduced by differential prey digestion are expected in
418 visual approaches (Walsh, Dittman, & O’Gorman, 2007). Molecular approaches promise to reduce this bias, as
419 exemplified in this study.

420 Thirdly, molecular approaches yield species-specific information on ambiguous prey items. Eggs found in
421 fish stomachs usually cannot be assigned to a species with certainty, and have to be reared until hatch for visual
422 species identification. Molecular approaches circumvent such issues.

423

424 **Molecular tools for conservation**

425 A major obstacle in nature conservation is the lack of data supporting or discouraging management. With
426 this article, it is aimed to fill such a knowledge gap for a specific species, and provide tools for conservation
427 managers to gather additional data, in line with a state-of-the-art conservation management framework of (Salafsky
428 et al., 2019). Our data encourages locally and temporally restricted management of round goby at spawning sites.
429 Conducting and reporting on such a campaign is beyond the scope of our article. However, our study’s results can
430 provide a sound basis for political decision makers, conservation managers and scientists to engage in a co-design of
431 a research project to tackle these challenges.

432

433 **Caveats and future research directions**

434 A disadvantage of molecular methods is that they do not discriminate the ingested tissue type. Eggs, fry, or
435 muscle tissue would all yield the same signal. Accordingly, the positive samples from the Wiese could also stem

436 from nase carcass consumption. Carcass-feeding in round goby has been described in experimental settings (Polacik,
437 Jurajda, Blazek, & Janac, 2015) and the extent of carcass feeding by round goby in the wild is at present unknown.
438 However, common nase do not die after spawning as, for example, Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) do, and no
439 dead animals were observed at the site.

440 For this and other reasons, molecular approaches are unlikely to completely substitute visual stomach
441 content analyses in the future. It is rather likely that crossover approaches combining visual and molecular analyses
442 are most promising. Samples could be fixed in ethanol, large prey items could be identified visually, and amorphous
443 masses could be further processed for barcoding, shotgun, and/or species-specific approaches, depending on the
444 research question.

445

446 **Conclusions**

447 In conclusion, our results demonstrate the value of species-specific molecular markers to generate
448 conservation-relevant data. This data can be used to inform freshwater fish management. This manuscript
449 demonstrates that these assays are useful to find a tailored solution for a real-world problem, namely whether a
450 particular species or area may require protective measures in the face of predator invasions and the removal of
451 migration barriers. These assays allow to indicate predation risk with greater sensitivity and robustness than visual
452 and taxonomic approaches. Evidence gathered by the assays can then become the basis of management e.g. a
453 removal strategy, which was deemed a valuable and worthy investment considering the substantial investments into
454 restoration efforts. Our results can now enable political decision makers, practitioners, and researchers to co-design
455 and implement such effective conservation measures together.

456 **Acknowledgements**

457 We are grateful to Attila Rüegg for animal care and assistance in field work, to Guillaume Arnet for
458 assistance with electrofishing and field work, to Hermann Koffel for providing trout eggs, to Ole Seehausen and
459 Project Lac for providing fish samples, and to Mark Charran for critically reading the manuscript. The authors have
460 no conflict of interest to declare.

461 **References**

- 462 Adrian-Kalchhauser, I., & Burkhardt-Holm, P. (2016). An eDNA assay to monitor a globally invasive fish species
463 from flowing freshwater. *Plos One*, *11*(1), e0147558. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0147558
- 464 Bagenal, T. B., & Tesch, F. W. (1978). Age and growth. In T. Bagenal (Ed.), *Methods for assessment of fish*
465 *production in fresh waters. IBP Handbook No 3* (pp. 101–136). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Scientific
466 Publications.
- 467 Baker, R., Buckland, A., & Sheaves, M. (2014). Fish gut content analysis: robust measures of diet composition. *Fish*
468 *and Fisheries*, *15*(1), 170-177. doi:10.1111/faf.12026
- 469 Bartl, E., & Keckeis, H. (2004). Growth and mortality of introduced fish larvae in a newly restored urban river.
470 *Journal of Fish Biology* *64*, 1577-1592.
- 471 Bölscher, T., van Slobbe, E., van Vliet, M., & Werners, S. (2013). Adaptation turning points in river restoration?
472 The Rhine Salmon case. *Sustainability*, *5*(6), 2288.
- 473 Carreon-Martinez, L., Johnson, T. B., Ludsin, S. A., & Heath, D. D. (2011). Utilization of stomach content DNA to
474 determine diet diversity in piscivorous fishes. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *78*(4), 1170-1182.
475 doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2011.02925.x
- 476 Chojnacki, S., Cowley, A., Lee, J., Foix, A., & Lopez, R. (2017). Programmatic access to bioinformatics tools from
477 EMBL-EBI update: 2017. *Nucleic acids research*, *45*(W1), W550-W553. doi:10.1093/nar/gkx273
- 478 Chotkowski, M. A., & Ellen Marsden, J. (1999). Round goby and mottled sculpin predation on Lake Trout eggs and
479 fry: Field predictions from laboratory experiments. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, *25*(1), 26-35.
480 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0380-1330\(99\)70714-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0380-1330(99)70714-8)
- 481 Corse, E., Costedoat, C., Chappaz, R., Pech, N., Martin, J.-F., & Gilles, A. (2010). A PCR-based method for diet
482 analysis in freshwater organisms using 18S rDNA barcoding on faeces. *Molecular Ecology Resources*,
483 *10*(1), 96-108. doi:10.1111/j.1755-0998.2009.02795.x
- 484 Devaux, A., Bony, S., Plenet, S., Sagnes, P., Segura, S., Suaire, R., . . . Olivier, J.-M. (2015). Field evidence of
485 reproduction impairment through sperm DNA damage in the fish nase (*Chondrostoma nasus*) in
486 anthropized hydrosystems. *Aquatic Toxicology*, *169*, 113-122.
487 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquatox.2015.10.013>

- 488 Fitzsimons, J., Williston, B., Williston, G., Bravener, G., Jonas, J. L., Claramunt, R. M., . . . Ellrott, B. J. (2006).
489 Laboratory estimates of salmonine egg predation by round gobies (*Neogobius melanostomus*), sculpins
490 (*Cottus cognatus* and *C. bairdi*), and crayfish (*Orconectes propinquus*). *Journal of Great Lakes Research*,
491 32(2), 227-241. doi:10.3394/0380-1330(2006)32[227:leosep]2.0.co;2
- 492 Ghedotti, M. J., Smihula, J. C., & Smith, G. R. (1995). Zebra mussel predation by round gobies in the laboratory.
493 *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 21(4), 665-669. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0380-1330\(95\)71076-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0380-1330(95)71076-0)
- 494 Hirsch, Thorlacius, M., Brodin, T., & Burkhardt-Holm, P. (2017). An approach to incorporate individual personality
495 in modeling fish dispersal across in-stream barriers. *Ecology and Evolution*, 7(2), 720-732.
496 doi:10.1002/ece3.2629
- 497 Hofer, K., & Kirchhofer, A. (1996). Drift, habitat choice and growth of the nase (*Chondrostoma nasus*, Cyprinidae)
498 during early life stages. In A. Kirchhofer & D. Hefti (Eds.), *Conservation of Endangered Freshwater Fish*
499 *in Europe* (pp. 269-278). Basel: Birkhäuser Basel.
- 500 Ignatius, S., & Haapasaari, P. (2018). Justification theory for the analysis of the socio-cultural value of fish and
501 fisheries: The case of Baltic salmon. *Marine Policy*, 88, 167-173.
502 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.11.007>
- 503 Karlson, A. M. L., Almqvist, G., Skora, K. E., & Appelberg, M. (2007). Indications of competition between non-
504 indigenous round goby and native flounder in the Baltic Sea. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 64(3), 479-
505 486. doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsl049
- 506 Kirchhofer, A., Breitenstein, M., & Guthruf, J. (2002). Äschenpopulationen von nationaler Bedeutung. *Bundesamt*
507 *für Umwelt, Wald und Landschaft, MFI-70-D*, 1-20.
- 508 Kornis, M. S., Mercado-Silva, N., & Vander Zanden, M. J. (2012). Twenty years of invasion: a review of round
509 goby *Neogobius melanostomus* biology, spread and ecological implications. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 80(2),
510 235-285. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2011.03157.x
- 511 Leung, B., Lodge, D. M., Finnoff, D., Shogren, J. F., Lewis, M. A., & Lamberti, G. (2002). An ounce of prevention
512 or a pound of cure: bioeconomic risk analysis of invasive species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-*
513 *Biological Sciences*, 269(1508), 2407-2413. doi:10.1098/rspb.2002.2179
- 514 Maier, K.-J. (1997). On the nase, *Chondrostoma nasus* spawning area situation in Switzerland *Folia Zoologica*, 46,
515 79-87.

- 516 Meretsky, V. J., Atwell, J. W., & Hyman, J. B. (2011). Migration and conservation: frameworks, gaps, and synergies
517 in science, law, and management. *Environmental law (Northwestern School of Law)*, 41(2), 447-534.
- 518 N'Guyen, A., Hirsch, P. E., Bozzuto, C., Adrian-Kalchhauser, I., Hůrková, K., & Burkhardt-Holm, P. (2018). A
519 dynamical model for invasive round goby populations reveals efficient and effective management options.
520 *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 55(1), 342-352. doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12934
- 521 Nichols, J. S., Kennedy, G., Crawford, E., Allen, J., French, J., Black, G., . . . Thomas, M. (2003). Assessment of
522 Lake Sturgeon (*Acipenser fulvescens*) spawning efforts in the Lower St. Clair River, Michigan. *Journal of*
523 *Great Lakes Research*, 29(3), 383-391. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0380-1330\(03\)70445-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0380-1330(03)70445-6)
- 524 Özdal, N. (2016). *Feeding habits of round goby (Neogobius melanostomus) in the Kleinhüningen Harbour Basel.*
525 (M.Sc.), University of Basel, Basel.
- 526 Patzner, R. A., Weidinger, K., & Rühl, R. (2006). Die Eier heimischer Fische - 18. Nase – *Chondrostoma nasus*
527 (Linnaeus, 1758) (Cyprinidae). *Österreichs Fischerei*, 59, 163 –168.
- 528 Paula, D. P., Linard, B., Crampton-Platt, A., Srivathsan, A., Timmermans, M. J. T. N., Sujii, E. R., . . . Vogler, A. P.
529 (2016). Uncovering trophic interactions in arthropod predators through DNA shotgun-sequencing of gut
530 contents. *Plos One*, 11(9), e0161841. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161841
- 531 Piñol, J., San Andrés, V., Clare, E. L., Mir, G., & Symondson, W. O. C. (2014). A pragmatic approach to the
532 analysis of diets of generalist predators: the use of next-generation sequencing with no blocking probes.
533 *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 14(1), 18-26. doi:10.1111/1755-0998.12156
- 534 Polacik, M., Jurajda, P., Blazek, R., & Janac, M. (2015). Carcass feeding as a cryptic foraging mode in round goby
535 *Neogobius melanostomus*. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 87(1), 194-199. doi:10.1111/jfb.12708
- 536 Ray, W. J., & Corkum, L. D. (2001). Habitat and site affinity of the round goby. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*,
537 27, 329-334.
- 538 Rey, P., Mürle, U., Werner, S., Ortlepp, J., Hesselschwerdt, J., & Unger, B. (2015). Koordinierte biologische
539 Untersuchungen im Hochrhein 2011/2012. *Bundesamt für Umwelt, UZ-1522-D*, 1-130.
- 540 Roseman, E. F., Taylor, W. W., Hayes, D. B., Jones, A. L., & Francis, J. T. (2006). Predation on Walleye eggs by
541 fish on reefs in Western Lake Erie. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 32(3), 415-423.
542 doi:[https://doi.org/10.3394/0380-1330\(2006\)32\[415:POWEBF\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.3394/0380-1330(2006)32[415:POWEBF]2.0.CO;2)

- 543 Salafsky, N., Boshoven, J., Burivalova, Z., Dubois, N. S., Gomez, A., Johnson, A., . . . Wordley, C. F. R. (2019).
544 Defining and using evidence in conservation practice. *Conservation Science and Practice*, 1(5), e27.
545 doi:10.1111/csp2.27
- 546 Spalinger, L., Dönni, W., Hefti, D., & Vonlanthen, P. (2018). Fischbesatz in Fliessgewässern. Bundesamt für
547 Umwelt BAFU. *Umwelt-Wissen*, 1823, 1-42.
- 548 Targońska, K., & Kucharczyk, D. (2008). A review of the artificial reproduction of Asp, *Aspius aspius* (L.), and
549 Nase, *Chondrostoma nasus* (L.). *Archives of Polish Fisheries*, 16, 342-354. doi:10.2478/s10086-008-0022-
550 4
- 551 Valdez-Moreno, M., Quintal-Lizama, C., Gómez-Lozano, R., & García-Rivas, M. d. C. (2012). Monitoring an alien
552 invasion: DNA barcoding and the identification of lionfish and their prey on coral reefs of the Mexican
553 Caribbean. *Plos One*, 7(6), e36636. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0036636
- 554 Valentini, A., Miquel C, Nawaz MA, Bellemain E, Coissac E, Pompanon F, . . . P., T. (2009). New perspectives in
555 diet analysis based on DNA barcoding and parallel pyrosequencing: the trnL approach. *Molecular Ecology*
556 *Resources*, 9(1), 51-60. doi:10.1111/j.1755-0998.2008.02352.x
- 557 Wagner, T. L., Cooper, C. D., Gross, J. A., & Coffin, A. B. (2015). The effect of seismic waterguns on the inner ears
558 of round goby. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 41(4), 1191-1196.
559 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jglr.2015.08.012>
- 560 Walsh, M. G., Dittman, D. E., & O’Gorman, R. (2007). Occurrence and food habits of the round goby in the
561 profundal zone of Southwestern Lake Ontario. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 33(1), 83-92.
562 doi:[https://doi.org/10.3394/0380-1330\(2007\)33\[83:OAFHOT\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.3394/0380-1330(2007)33[83:OAFHOT]2.0.CO;2)
- 563 Wiegleb, J., Kotterba, P., Hammer, C., & Oesterwind, D. (2018). Predation of the round goby (*Neogobius*
564 *melanostomus* Pallas, 1814) on Atlantic herring eggs in the Western Baltic Sea. *Marine Biology Research*,
565 14(9-10), 989-1003. doi:10.1080/17451000.2019.1577977
- 566 Wolfe, R. K., & Marsden, J. E. (1998). Tagging methods for the round goby (*Neogobius melanostomus*). *Journal of*
567 *Great Lakes Research*, 24, 731-735.
- 568 Zbinden, S., & Hefti, D. (2000). Monitoring der Nase (*Chondrostoma nasus*) in der Schweiz. *Bundesamt für*
569 *Umwelt, Wald und Landschaft*, 1-17, MFI-67-D, 1-17.
- 570