

This is the author's final, peer-reviewed manuscript as accepted for publication. The publisher-formatted version may be available through the publisher's web site or your institution's library.

Earthworm invasion in North America: food resource competition affects native millipede survival and invasive earthworm reproduction

Bruce A. Snyder, Mac A. Callaham Jr., Christopher N. Lowe, and Paul F. Hendrix

How to cite this manuscript

If you make reference to this version of the manuscript, use the following information:

Snyder, B. A., Callaham, M. A., Jr., Lowe, C. N., & Hendrix, P. F. (2013). Earthworm invasion in North America: Food resource competition affects native millipede survival and invasive earthworm reproduction. Retrieved from <http://krex.ksu.edu>

Published Version Information

Citation: Snyder, B. A., Callaham, M. A., Jr., Lowe, C. N., & Hendrix, P. F. (2013). Earthworm invasion in North America: Food resource competition affects native millipede survival and invasive earthworm reproduction. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*, 57, 212-216.

Copyright: © 2012 Elsevier Ltd.

Digital Object Identifier (DOI): doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2012.08.022

Publisher's Link: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0038071712003355>

This item was retrieved from the K-State Research Exchange (K-REx), the institutional repository of Kansas State University. K-REx is available at <http://krex.ksu.edu>

1 Type of contribution: Regular paper

2 Preparation date: May 2012 (revised August 2012)

3 Text pages: 11, Tables: 2, Figures: 4

4 Title:

5 Earthworm invasion in North America: food resource competition affects native
6 millipede survival and invasive earthworm reproduction.

7

8

9 Authors:

10 Bruce A. Snyder ^{a,b*}, Mac A. Callaham Jr. ^c, Christopher N. Lowe ^d, and Paul F. Hendrix
11 ^{b,e}.

12 Affiliations:

13 ^a Division of Biology, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, USA

14 ^b Odum School of Ecology, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, USA

15 ^c Center for Forest Disturbance Science, Southern Research Station, USDA Forest
16 Service, Athens, Georgia, USA

17 ^d School of Built and Natural Environment, University of Central Lancashire, PR1 2HE
18 Preston, United Kingdom

19 ^e Department of Crop and Soil Science, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, USA

20

21

* Corresponding author. Mail: Kansas State University, Division of Biology, 116 Ackert Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506-4901. Tel.: +1 785 532 2430; fax: +1 785 532 6653. E-mail address: bruceasnyder@gmail.com (B.A. Snyder).

22 **Abstract**

23 The invasive non-native earthworm *Amyntas agrestis* (Goto and Hatai 1899) has
24 recently been documented invading forests of the Appalachian Mountains in the
25 southeastern United States. This epigeic earthworm decreases the depth of organic soil
26 horizons, and this may play a role in the decrease of millipede richness and abundance
27 associated with *A. agrestis* invasion. To investigate the mechanisms behind these
28 effects, *A. agrestis* and the millipede *Sigmoria ainsliei* (Xystodesmidae) were placed into
29 microcosms with soil and either L horizon, F and H horizon, or a combination L/FH
30 treatment. Microcosms were destructively sampled and reconstructed with the same
31 treatments every four weeks to assess faunal fresh weight change and survival. Soils
32 from earthworm treatments were wet-sieved for cocoons to assess treatment effects on
33 reproduction. On average, millipede mortality occurred 88 days sooner in treatments that
34 did not have FH horizon material, and within all litter treatments millipedes tended to
35 survive longer when *A. agrestis* was absent. Earthworms maintained higher fresh weight
36 in L/FH than FH or L treatments. With a single exception, no *A. agrestis* cocoons were
37 recovered from microcosms that also contained *S. ainsliei*. The results suggest that *A.*
38 *agrestis* and *S. ainsliei* may compete for food resources, particularly the smaller particle
39 material in the FH horizons of the forest floor. Millipedes may exert some biotic
40 resistance to *A. agrestis* invasion, as diminished earthworm fecundity was observed in
41 experimental units containing both species.

42

43 Keywords: Millipede; earthworm; *Sigmoria*; *Amyntas*; competition; food preference;
44 invasive species

45

46 **1 Introduction**

47 Non-native earthworm invasion is a truly global phenomenon in which invasive
48 earthworm species are invading every continent, except Antarctica (Hendrix et al., 2008).
49 These earthworm species also have origins on every continent, except Antarctica. In
50 North America, earthworms of Asian origin (the genera *Amyntas*, *Metaphire*,
51 *Pheretima*, and *Pithemera*) have recently been documented in the northeastern (Steinberg
52 et al., 1997; Burtelow et al., 1998; Bohlen et al., 2004a,b), central (Snyder, unpublished
53 results), and southeastern (Callaham et al., 2003; Snyder et al., 2011) regions of the
54 United States, although these earthworms have been known in North America since the
55 early 20th century (Garman, 1888; Gates, 1937).

56 Earthworm invasion can significantly alter forest ecosystems. Physical changes
57 to the forest floor through consumption of organic horizons, mixing of organic and
58 mineral horizons, and burrowing and casting activities can impact biogeochemical
59 cycling (Bohlen et al., 2004a,b,c). Earthworm invasion can also impact soil fauna
60 communities through competition and through the significant alteration of soil profile and
61 structure (Bohlen et al., 2004b,c; Frelich et al., 2006). Although much is known about
62 the interactions of invasive earthworms with soil micro- and mesofauna, less is known
63 about interactions with detritivorous macrofauna, such as millipedes (Migge-Kleian et al.,
64 2006). Bonkowski et al. (1998) found that earthworms benefited from consuming
65 millipede (*Glomeris marginata*) fecal pellets in a European Beech forest. However, in a
66 microcosm experiment, millipedes were negatively affected by earthworms (*A. corticis*),
67 but earthworms may have similarly consumed millipede fecal material (Snyder et al.,

68 2009). Snyder et al. (2009) found that although the millipede *Pseudopolydesmus erasus*
69 was epigeic and *A. corticis* was endogeic, *P. erasus* acquired less C during the four-week
70 course of the experiment in the presence of *A. corticis*, and it is likely that over longer
71 time scales, this C deficit could affect growth, weight maintenance, survival, and/or
72 reproductive output.

73 *Amyntas gracilis* invasion in forests of New York, USA was found to reduce O
74 horizon organic matter (Steinberg et al., 1997; Burtelow et al., 1998). Similarly, invasion
75 of *A. agrestis* in the Great Smoky Mountains, USA, reduced the depth of the FH horizon
76 (a combination of the F and H horizons) (Snyder et al., 2011). Millipedes reside in and
77 consume FH horizon, and Snyder et al. (2011) found that millipedes were negatively
78 affected by this *A. agrestis* invasion, both in terms of abundance and species richness.
79 The field observations of Snyder et al. (2011) motivated us to explore the mechanisms
80 behind this interaction, and a microcosm experiment was performed to test whether these
81 two taxa competed for food resources in the L or FH horizons, and whether earthworms
82 and millipedes benefited from the presence of these resources. This microcosm
83 experiment was novel in its approach towards creating a longer-term study (i.e., Months
84 instead of weeks). Earthworms, and to a lesser extent millipedes, burrow in the soil and
85 this prevents regular monitoring of faunal survival and fresh weight without causing
86 disturbance. In order to facilitate data collection, all microcosms were destructively
87 sampled every four weeks and fauna were put into newly constructed microcosms of the
88 same treatment.

89

90 **2 Methods**

91 Millipedes and earthworms were collected by manually searching through leaf
92 litter at the Great Smoky Mountains Institute at Tremont (Blount Co., Tennessee, USA;
93 35°38'22" N, 83°41'17" W), within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park (GSMNP)
94 in early June 2007. Earthworms and millipedes were kept separate during transport to the
95 laboratory. The two taxa were also stored separately until the beginning of the
96 experiment in containers with soil and litter from the collection site.

97 Microcosms consisted of 1 l transparent plastic containers with perforated snap-on
98 lids. Each microcosm received 500 ± 5 g of air dried soil that was then mixed with $70 \pm$
99 5 mL tap water. Soil was a commercially acquired ultisol (USDA soil taxonomy) from
100 the top 25 cm of a recently cleared forested site in Clarke Co., GA, USA. Soil was
101 screened through a 4.75 mm sieve to remove large aggregates and rocks. Litter was
102 previously collected from GSMNP and defaunated via Berlese extraction for 72 hours,
103 followed by air-drying. Dominant tree species at the litter collection site were *Acer* spp.,
104 *Quercus* spp., *Liquidambar styraciflua*, *Liriodendron tulipifera*, and *Pinus strobus*
105 (Snyder et al., 2011).

106 Litter treatments were defined by particle size: litter was 4.75 mm sieved to
107 separate unfragmented leaves (L horizon) from fragmented and partially decomposed
108 organic matter (FH, combined F and H horizons). Large rocks, twigs, seeds and nuts
109 were discarded. Organic layer treatments were L (15 ± 0.1 g of L horizon), L/FH ($7.5 \pm$
110 0.1 g each of L and FH horizon), or FH (15 ± 0.1 g of FH horizon). Litter was misted
111 with a standard quantity (~ 7 mL) of tap water when microcosms were constructed. Three
112 fauna treatments were established: two *Amyntas agrestis* individuals (mean fresh weight
113 0.86 ± 0.036 g each); one adult male *Sigmoria ainsliei* (mean fresh weight 2.26 ± 0.038

114 g); and two *A. agrestis* and one *S. ainsliei* together. *Amyntas agrestis* were all clitellate
115 or pre-clitellate. All individuals were approximately the same size and due to the annual
116 nature of their life cycle (Reynolds, 1978; Callaham et al., 2003; Snyder et al., 2011) all
117 individuals were similar in age. Individuals were randomly assigned to treatments with 6-
118 7 replicates for a total of 76 microcosms. However, at the end of the experiment four
119 experimental units were found to contain *Amyntas corticis* rather than *A. agrestis*; these
120 were excluded from subsequent analyses.

121 All microcosms were kept in the dark at 20°C (\pm 2°C). Each microcosm was
122 misted with tap water weekly, except early in the incubation when microcosms were
123 misted every 3 d. Incubation began in June 2007 and continued until all fauna died
124 (except *A. corticis* mentioned above).

125 Microcosms were destructively sampled every four weeks. After destructive
126 sampling, new microcosms were constructed and the surviving fauna were weighed and
127 placed into the new microcosms. Earthworms were rinsed in tap water to remove soil
128 and gently dried on a paper towel prior to weighing. If any fauna (earthworm or
129 millipede) from the original treatment were alive, then a new microcosm was constructed,
130 if all fauna in a particular microcosm had died, then that microcosm was terminated. In
131 this way, longevity of every individual could be assessed. Soils from treatments that
132 included earthworms were wet-sieved through a 2 mm sieve to assess cocoon production.
133 After the first cocoons collected were found to be only slightly larger than 2 mm in
134 diameter, a 1.4 mm sieve was employed to ensure cocoon capture.

135 Millipede and earthworm survival and fresh weight data were analyzed using a
136 general linear model (GLM), with the LSMEANS option for post-hoc tests. Data used in

137 the GLM analysis for earthworm survival were the calculated average days of survival
138 for the two worms in each microcosm. Fresh weight changes through 12 weeks
139 (millipedes) and 16 weeks (earthworms) were analyzed using a repeated measures
140 analysis; beyond this point there were insufficient replicates for robust analyses. Cocoon
141 production was assessed with a t-test comparing between Months 1-3 and 4-7, and GLM
142 comparing between Months 4, 5, 6, and 7. All statistical analyses were completed in SAS
143 (Version 9.2).

144

145 **3 Results**

146 *3.1 Survival and Growth*

147 Millipedes lived a mean time of 136.8 ± 10.6 d ($n = 36$) from the beginning of the
148 experiment (Fig. 1). The overall model testing fauna and litter effects was significant (P
149 = 0.0002). Millipede survival was significantly affected by litter ($P < 0.0001$), with
150 survival time significantly decreased in L relative to FH ($P < 0.0001$) and L/FH ($P =$
151 0.0012). However, differences in millipede survival times between L/FH and FH
152 treatments were not statistically significant ($P = 0.0567$). There was a trend for
153 earthworm presence to decrease millipede survival time, but this was not statistically
154 significant ($P = 0.0750$). Specifically, when *A. agrestis* was absent, millipedes survived
155 an average of 26 days longer in L/FH and 54 days longer in FH (Fig. 1). Overall,
156 millipedes survived 47.4% (69 days) longer in the L/FH treatment and 58.1% (106 days)
157 longer in the FH treatment relative to the L treatment. There was no interaction between
158 litter and fauna ($P = 0.4655$).

159 Mean time to *A. agrestis* mortality was 117.9 ± 4.1 d ($n = 36$ experimental units)
160 from the initiation of the experiment. The first and second *A. agrestis* mortality within
161 each experimental unit were 31.8 ± 5.6 d apart ($n = 36$). There was no evidence for
162 earthworm survival being affected by millipede presence or litter type ($P = 0.2771$, Fig.
163 2). In microcosms with both earthworms and millipedes, at least one earthworm survived
164 longer than the millipede in every replicate.

165 Millipede fresh weight (Fig. 3A) did not differ between treatments at the
166 beginning of the experiment ($P = 0.5294$) or at the last measurement before mortality (P
167 $= 0.9010$). There were significant differences between litter treatments but earthworms
168 did not impact millipede fresh weight (Fig. 3A, Table 1, analyzed through week 12).
169 Millipede fresh weight increased significantly more in FH relative to L treatments ($P =$
170 0.0100), but neither were significantly different from L/FH treatments (FH vs. L/FH $P =$
171 0.1351 ; L vs. L/FH $P = 0.1412$). Within-subjects tests for effects over time and
172 interactions with time were all non-significant (data not shown).

173 Earthworm fresh weight (Fig. 3B) did not differ between treatments at the
174 beginning of the experiment ($P = 0.6190$). A significant impact of litter ($P = 0.0180$), but
175 not of millipede treatments ($P = 0.9531$, Table 1), was observed in fresh weight changes
176 through week 16: *A. agrestis* maintained a higher fresh weight in L/FH than in FH and L
177 treatments. Earthworm fresh weight decreased over time (Table 2, Fig. 3B, $P < 0.0001$),
178 and a time by litter interaction was also significant ($P = 0.0211$).

179 3.2 Earthworm cocoon production

180 Cocoons were detected beginning in the fourth month and in every subsequent
181 month of incubation (Fig. 4). In Months 4-7, microcosms in which cocoons were

182 recovered contained 2.06 ± 0.44 cocoons; this was a significant increase over the zero
183 cocoons recovered during Months 1-3 (t-test, $n = 17$, $P = 0.0003$). Numbers of cocoons
184 recovered in Months 4-7 were not significantly different from one another (GLM, $P =$
185 0.8952). Cocoons were recovered from microcosms that began a month with either one or
186 two earthworms, but the number of cocoons per microcosm was not significantly
187 different due to this factor ($P = 0.5381$). There were a total of 28 cocoons recovered
188 during the experiment, and only one of these was recovered from a microcosm that also
189 contained a live millipede. Three cocoons were recovered in millipede treatments after
190 millipede mortality. Litter treatment did not influence the number of cocoons recovered
191 per microcosm ($P = 0.7868$).

192 **4 Discussion**

193 Based on inferences from field (Snyder et al., 2011) and microcosm (Snyder et
194 al., 2009) studies that Asian invasive earthworms may compete with native North
195 American millipedes, we designed a microcosm experiment to evaluate longer-term
196 interactions between two species focusing on the potential for food competition. ‘Longer-
197 term’ in this case is relative to most microcosm experiments and also to the putative life-
198 span of these taxa, i.e., the experiment continued for months rather than weeks. This
199 methodology had the advantage of allowing measurement of fresh weight and survival
200 while limiting the frequency of disturbance. Although the disturbance to the microcosms
201 may seem substantial - the entire microcosm was destroyed and replaced – in reality the
202 stress to the organisms was quite brief and limited as much as possible. In practice, each
203 organism was quickly located, weighed, and placed into a new microcosm in a matter of
204 seconds. The alternative of searching for surviving individuals, weighing, and returning

205 to the same container would have the potential of differentially disturbing experimental
206 units depending on how quickly and easily individual organisms were discovered,
207 collected, and measured.

208 Presence of FH material was important for *Sigmoria ainsliei*: millipede survival
209 time decreased greatly without FH material and biomass increased the most in the FH
210 treatment. However, earthworm fresh weight, but not survival, was highest in the
211 treatment with both particle sizes (L/FH). In FH and L/FH, we observed that *A. agrestis*
212 consumed nearly all FH material within each four-week time period. This finding is
213 consistent with field observations and data showing that a decrease in FH horizon
214 correlates with *A. agrestis* invasion (Snyder et al., 2011), and supports the hypothesis that
215 *A. agrestis* directly causes this decrease through consumption.

216 In L/FH and FH treatments, there was also a trend that *S. ainsliei* survived a
217 shorter amount of time when *A. agrestis* was present, but this was not statistically
218 significant. However, we propose that from biological standpoint, this may indeed be a
219 relationship worthy of further exploration. Interestingly, when both species were present,
220 millipedes almost always died first, and this suggests that when the two are in close
221 proximity, the invasive earthworms may outcompete millipedes and eventually exclude
222 them. In these same litter treatments (FH and L/FH) there was also a very weak trend that
223 *A. agrestis* survived longer in treatments without millipedes. However, in L treatments,
224 *A. agrestis* tended to survive longer in the presence of millipedes, suggesting that
225 earthworms may benefit from millipede presence in L treatments, probably through
226 consumption of litter that had been processed by millipedes, as has been observed in
227 other studies (Bonkowski et al., 1998; Snyder et al., 2009). Earthworms were also

228 observed to burrow into mineral soil during the incubations, and may have been able to
229 exploit organic matter in the mineral soil in addition to resources supplied on the soil
230 surface (Zhang et al., 2008; Callaham et al., unpublished results). This behavior is
231 consistent with the findings of Zhang et al. (2008) who showed that *Amyntas* had
232 substantial dietary flexibility, and this possible additional source of organic matter may
233 help explain why earthworm survival was not affected by litter treatment, as well as why
234 the effect of millipede presence was not statistically significant. When availability of
235 aboveground resources was limited, *A. agrestis* may have burrowed and consumed soil
236 organic matter, while adult *S. ainsliei* were restricted to feeding on surface organic
237 horizons. Millipedes appear to have inhibited reproductive potential, possibly through
238 this same mechanism. In the presence of millipedes, earthworms may have spent more
239 energy burrowing to access lower quality food resources. This combination may have led
240 to less energy being available to devote to cocoon production.

241 *4.1 Conclusions and future perspectives*

242 Overall, the data from the present study are consistent with, and help to elucidate,
243 observations from field studies (Snyder et al., 2011), and other lab experiments with
244 invasive earthworms and millipedes (Snyder et al., 2009). *Amyntas agrestis* invasions
245 being associated with decreased F/H horizon depth and decreased millipede abundance
246 (Snyder et al., 2011) served as a starting point to ask questions about what the potential
247 mechanisms behind these relationships might be. From our microcosms, we now have
248 evidence that two of the organisms involved in the field study will consume the same
249 food sources, and that when they are kept in proximity to one another, these organisms
250 affect one another's longevity and reproductive output. Although microcosms are, of

251 necessity, quite simple relative to the natural systems they are meant to simulate, they can
252 nevertheless offer important insights particularly into mechanistic relationships (Drake
253 and Kramer, 2012; Cadotte et al., 2005). We suggest that our study has uncovered just
254 such a mechanistic relationship between *A. agrestis* and *S. ainsliei*, but we also
255 recommend that much more detailed work should be undertaken to examine the trophic
256 ecology and resource use of these organisms in their native habitats. Such work will be
257 crucial if we are to have fuller understanding of effects of earthworm invasion, and
258 imperative to the future development of successful management approaches to control
259 earthworm invasions in the Southern Appalachian Mountains.

260 Our data lends support to the hypothesis that earthworms and millipedes compete
261 for partially decomposed leaf material, but many questions remain. Greater cocoon
262 production in the absence of millipedes supports the competition hypothesis and suggests
263 that millipedes may provide some biotic resistance to invasion. Future studies could
264 offset the natural variability in earthworm and millipede mortality, and improve their
265 statistical power, by including more replicates. Additionally, initiating treatment
266 conditions on younger individuals may produce stronger responses. Maintenance of
267 laboratory cultures (Lowe and Butt, 2005) will be a critical step in our ability to perform
268 more of these experiments.

269

270 **Acknowledgements**

271 The authors would like to acknowledge the assistance of L. Dame, B. Sheko, A. Silletti,
272 S. C. Rostkowski, K. Seader, the University of Central Lancashire (Preston, UK), the
273 USDA Forest Service, and the staff of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park (study

274 number GRSM-00337) and Great Smoky Mountains Institute at Tremont. This study was
275 supported in part by National Science Foundation grant number 0236276 to the
276 University of Georgia Research Foundation, Inc.

277

278 **References**

279 Alban, D.H., Berry, E.C., 1994. Effects of earthworm invasion on morphology, carbon,
280 and nitrogen of a forest soil. *Applied Soil Ecology* 1, 243-249.

281 Bohlen, P.J., Scheu, S., Hale, C.M., McLean, M.A., Migge, S., Groffman, P.M.,
282 Parkinson, D., 2004a. Non-native invasive earthworms as agents of change in
283 northern temperate forests. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 2, 427-435.

284 Bohlen, P.J., Groffman, P.M., Fahey, T.J., Fisk, M.C., Suárez, E., Pelletier, D., Fahey, R.,
285 2004b. Ecosystem consequences of exotic earthworm invasion of north temperate
286 forests. *Ecosystems* 7, 1-12.

287 Bohlen, P.J., Pelletier, D., Groffman, P.M., Fahey, T.J., 2004c. Influences of earthworm
288 invasion on redistribution and retention of soil carbon and nitrogen in northern
289 temperate forests. *Ecosystems* 7, 13-27.

290 Bonkowski, M., Scheu, S., Schaefer, M., 1998. Interactions of earthworms (*Octolasion*
291 *lacteum*), millipedes (*Glomeris marginata*) and plants (*Hordelymus europaeus*) in
292 a beechwood on a basalt hill: implications for litter decomposition and soil
293 formation. *Applied Soil Ecology* 9, 161-166.

294 Burtelow, A.E., Bohlen, P.J., Groffman, P.M., 1998. Influence of exotic earthworm
295 invasion on soil organic matter, microbial biomass and denitrification potential in
296 forest soils of the northeastern United States. *Applied Soil Ecology* 9, 197-201.

297 Cadotte, M.W, Drake, J.A., Fukami, T., 2005. Constructing nature: Laboratory models
298 as necessary tools for investigating complex ecological communities. *Advances*
299 *in Ecological Research* 37, 333-353.

300 Callaham, Jr., M.A., Hendrix, P.F., Phillips, R.J., 2003. Occurrence of an exotic
301 earthworm (*Amyntas agrestis*) in undisturbed soils of the southern Appalachian
302 Mountains USA. *Pedobiologia* 47, 466-470.

303 Drake, J.M, Kramer A.M., 2012. Mechanistic analogy: how microcosms explain nature.
304 *Theoretical Ecology* 5, 433-444.

305 Eisenhauer, N., Patsch, S., Parkinson, D., Scheu, S., 2007. Invasion of a deciduous forest
306 by earthworms: Changes in soil chemistry, microflora, microarthropods and
307 vegetation. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 39, 1099-1110.

308 Fisk, M.C., Fahey, T.J., Groffman, P.M., Bohlen, P.J., 2004. Earthworm invasion, fine-
309 root distributions, and soil respiration in north temperate forests. *Ecosystems* 7,
310 55-62.

311 Frelich, L.E., Hale, C.M., Scheu, S., Holdsworth, A.R., Heneghan, L., Bohlen, P.J.,
312 Reich, P.B., 2006. Earthworm invasion into previously earthworms-free
313 temperate and boreal forests. *Biological Invasions* 8, 1235-1245.

314 Garman, H., 1888. On the anatomy and histology of a new earthworm (*Diplocardia*
315 *communis*, gen. et sp. nov.). *Bulletin of the Illinois State Laboratory of Natural*
316 *History* 3, 47-77.

317 Gates, G.E., 1937. The genus *Pheretima* in North America. *Bulletin of the Museum of*
318 *Comparative Zoology, Harvard* 80, 339-373.

319 Hendrix, P.F., Callaham Jr., M.A., Drake, J., Huang, C.-Y., James, S.W., Snyder, B.A.,
320 Zhang, W. 2008. Pandora's box contained bait: the global problem of introduced
321 earthworms. *Annual Reviews of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 39, 593-
322 613.

323 Lowe, C.N., Butt, K.R., 2005. Culture techniques for soil dwelling earthworms: a review.
324 *Pedobiologia* 49, 401-413.

325 Maraun, M., Scheu, S., 1996. Changes in microbial biomass, respiration and nutrient
326 status of beech (*Fagus sylvatica*) leaf litter processed by millipedes (*Glomeris*
327 *marginata*). *Oecologia* 107, 131-140.

328 Migge-Kleian, S., McLean, M.A., Maerz, J.C., Heneghan, L., 2006. The influence of
329 invasive earthworms on indigenous fauna in ecosystems previously uninhabited
330 by earthworms. *Biological Invasions* 8, 1275-1285.

331 Reynolds, J.W. 1978. The earthworms of Tennessee (Oligochaeta). IV. Megascolecidae,
332 with notes on distribution, biology and a key to the species in the state.
333 *Megadrilogica* 3, 117-129.

334 Snyder, B.A., Boots, B., Hendrix, P.F. 2009. Competition between invasive earthworms
335 (*Amyntas corticis*, Megascolecidae) and native North American millipedes
336 (*Pseudopolydesmus erasus*, Polydesmidae): Effects on carbon cycling and soil
337 structure. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 41, 1442-1449.

338 Snyder, B.A., Callaham Jr., M.A., Hendrix, P.F. 2011. Spatial variability of an invasive
339 earthworm (*Amyntas agrestis*) population and potential impacts on soil
340 characteristics and millipedes in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, USA.
341 *Biological Invasions* 13, 349-358.

342 Steinberg, D.A., Pouyat, R.V., Parmelee, R.W., Groffman, P.M., 1997. Earthworm
343 abundance and nitrogen mineralization rates along an urban-rural land use
344 gradient. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 29, 427-430.

345 Zhang, W., Hendrix, P.F., Snyder, B.A., Molina, M., Li, J., Rao, X., Siemann, E., Fu, S.,
346 2010. Dietary flexibility aids Asian earthworm invasion in North American
347 forests. *Ecology* 91, 2070-2079.

348

349 Figure Captions

350 Fig. 1. Mean survival (\pm SE) of *Sigmoria ainsliei* from initiation of the incubation with
351 (M+W) and without (M) earthworms. Litter treatments were litter (L), litter and FH
352 material (L/FH), and FH only (FH).

353

354 Fig. 2. Mean survival (\pm SE) of *Amyntas agrestis* from initiation of the incubation with
355 (W+M) and without (W) millipedes. Litter treatments were litter (L), litter and FH
356 material (L/FH), and FH only (FH).

357

358 Fig. 3. Mean fresh weight change of surviving fauna (\pm SE) since the beginning of the
359 experiment, expressed as percent of initial mass: millipedes (A) and earthworms (B) in
360 different litter treatments through 12 weeks (millipedes) or 16 weeks (earthworms) of the
361 incubation. Different letters indicates significant P -values at $\alpha=0.05$ within one sampling
362 time.

363

364 Fig. 4. Cocoon production by *Amyntas agrestis* over the duration of the incubation.

365 Mean (\pm SE) number of cocoons recovered per microcosm (A) and number of
366 earthworm-containing microcosms from which cocoons were (shaded) and were not
367 (open) recovered (B). Cocoon recovery in Months 4-7 was greater than 0 (Months 1-3, P
368 = 0.0003; $n = 17$).

369

370

371

372 Table 1. Results of repeated measures GLM analyses tests of hypotheses for between
 373 subjects effects on fresh weight change from initiation of the incubation. Fresh weight
 374 was measured every four weeks. Millipede data were analyzed until week 12 and
 375 earthworm data until week 16. Significant *P*-values at $\alpha=0.05$ indicated by an asterisk.
 376

Source	df	SS	MS	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
Millipede Fresh Weight					
Fauna treatment	1	3.72x10 ⁻⁶	3.72x10 ⁻⁶	0.00	0.9912
Litter treatment	2	0.21553	0.10777	3.59	0.0438*
Fauna * Litter	2	0.03781	0.01891	0.63	0.5411
Error	23	0.68954	0.02997		
Earthworm Fresh Weight					
Fauna treatment	1	0.00274	0.00274	0.00	0.9531
Litter treatment	2	7.73328	3.8666	5.00	0.0180*
Fauna * Litter	2	1.19285	0.59642	0.77	0.4761
Error	23	14.6819	0.77273		

377

378

379

380 Table 2. Results of repeated measures GLM analyses tests of hypotheses for within

381 subjects effects on earthworm fresh weight change from initiation of the incubation.

382 Fresh weight was measured every four weeks and analyzed until week 16. Significant *P*-

383 values at $\alpha=0.05$ indicated by an asterisk.

384

Source	df	SS	MS	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
Time	3	19.2486	6.41619	86.54	< 0.0001*
Time * Fauna	3	0.18038	0.06013	0.81	0.4930
Time * Litter	6	1.21529	0.20255	2.73	0.0211*
Time * Fauna * Litter	6	0.07883	0.01314	0.18	0.9820
Error (Time)	57	4.22590	0.07414		

385

386