

*The effect of the alternative prey,
Paramecium caudatum (Peniculida:
Parameciidae), on the predation of Culex
pipiens (Diptera: Culicidae) by the
copepods Macrocyclus albidus and
Megacyclus viridis (Cyclopoida:
Cyclopidae)*

Article

Accepted Version

Cuthbert, R. N., Callaghan, A. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2731-3352> and Dick, J. T. A. (2019) The effect of the alternative prey, *Paramecium caudatum* (Peniculida: Parameciidae), on the predation of *Culex pipiens* (Diptera: Culicidae) by the copepods *Macrocyclus albidus* and *Megacyclus viridis* (Cyclopoida: Cyclopidae). *Journal of Medical Entomology*, 56 (1). pp. 276-279. ISSN 1938-2928 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jme/tjy155> Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/79221/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jme/tjy155>

Publisher: Oxford Academic

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1 Short Communication

2 **The effect of the alternative prey, *Paramecium caudatum***
3 **(Peniculida: Parameciidae), on the predation of *Culex pipiens***
4 **(Diptera: Culicidae) by the copepods *Macrocyclus albidus* and**
5 ***Megacyclus viridis* (Cyclopoida: Cyclopidae)**

6 Ross N. Cuthbert^{1,2,3}, Amanda Callaghan², Jaimie T.A. Dick¹

7 ¹Institute for Global Food Security, School of Biological Sciences, Medical Biology Centre,
8 Queen's University Belfast, Belfast BT9 7BL, Northern Ireland, ²Ecology and Evolutionary

9 Biology, School of Biological Sciences, University of Reading, Harborne Building,

10 Whiteknights, Reading RG6 6AS, England, ³Corresponding author, email:

11 rcuthbert03@qub.ac.uk

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 **Abstract**

22 Biological control can be an effective tool to combat public health risks associated with
23 mosquito-borne disease. However, target impacts of biological control agents may be reduced
24 by biotic contexts such as the presence of alternative prey. In turn, this can impede our ability
25 to realistically assess biocontrol agent efficacy. Here, we examine the effects of alternative
26 ciliate prey on the predation potential of two cyclopoid copepods, *Macrocyclops albidus*
27 Jurine (Cyclopoida: Cyclopidae) and *Megacyclops viridis* Jurine (Cyclopoida: Cyclopidae),
28 towards larvae of the West Nile virus vector mosquito *Culex pipiens* Linnaeus (Diptera:
29 Culicidae). Using functional responses (FRs; resource use under different resource densities),
30 we demonstrate that both copepods exhibit potentially destabilising Type II FRs towards
31 mosquito prey. However, where the alternative prey was present, we observed species-
32 specific modulations to FR form and magnitude. For *M. albidus*, FRs remained Type II where
33 ciliate prey were present, however, maximum feeding rates on mosquito larvae were reduced.
34 Conversely, for *M. viridis*, FRs moved towards more stabilising Type III, whilst maximum
35 feeding rates on mosquito larvae were not significantly reduced. Whilst both species of
36 cyclopoid copepod were able to effectively target and consume larval mosquitoes in the
37 presence of alternative prey, we demonstrate that overall efficacies may be reduced in aquatic
38 habitats which contain multiple prey types. We thus advocate that biotic contexts such as
39 prey selectivity should be integrated into predatory biocontrol agent examinations for
40 mosquitoes which vector pathogens and parasites, to more holistically assess their efficacy.

41 **Key words:**

42 mosquito-borne disease, functional response, *Culex pipiens*, prey choice, cyclopoid

43

44

45 **Introduction**

46 Public health endangerment from mosquito-borne diseases has never been more apparent
47 (Fernandes et al. 2018). To this end, a variety of vector control approaches have been
48 developed and implemented, with varying levels of success (Becker et al. 2010). Biological
49 control could present new tools to combat mosquito-borne disease in future (Thomas, 2018),
50 with potential to reduce mosquito-borne disease circulation at large scales (Kay and Nam,
51 2005). Predatory cyclopoid copepods have proven especially efficacious in the biocontrol of
52 mosquitoes which vector pathogens and parasites (Marten and Reid, 2007; Cuthbert et al.
53 2018a). Indeed, copepod efficacy has proven particularly high in artificial, human-mediated
54 aquatic environments (Townroe and Callaghan, 2014; Veronesi et al. 2015). Although
55 predation efficiencies of copepods have proven robust to abiotic environmental contexts such
56 as habitat complexity (Cuthbert et al. 2018b) and turbidity (Cuthbert et al. 2018c),
57 quantifications of biotic effects associated with alternative prey on their predatory impacts are
58 lacking.

59 Within ecosystems, the presence of alternative prey can drive patterns of coexistence and thus
60 impart stability to populations through frequency-dependent prey selection processes which
61 alleviate predation pressures towards specific prey through switching (Murdoch, 1969;
62 Cuthbert et al. 2018d). Accordingly, alternative prey may reduce biocontrol agent efficacies
63 towards target organisms. Functional responses (FRs) have been used widely to quantify
64 consumer-resource interactions under differing resource densities (Holling 1959), with FR
65 form and magnitude offering insights into consumer impacts (e.g. biocontrol agents) towards
66 target organisms (Dick et al. 2014). Type II FRs are characterized by a decelerating intake
67 rate, where consumption rates are high at low prey densities. On the other hand, Type III FRs
68 are sigmoidal, with low proportional intake at low prey densities. A Type II FR can therefore
69 be population destabilising due to high proportional consumption at low prey densities, whilst

70 Type III FRs may impart stability to prey populations through the provision of low density
71 prey refugia (Holling 1959; Alexander et al. 2012). Thus, in a biocontrol context, agents
72 which demonstrate a Type II FR irrespective of environmental contexts are desirable.
73 Cyclopoid copepods have been shown to exhibit potentially population destabilising Type II
74 FRs towards larval mosquito prey (Cuthbert et al. 2018a, b). However, effects of alternative
75 prey, which often coexist with larval mosquitoes, on copepod-mosquito interaction strengths
76 have not been comprehensively assessed. In aquatic habitats, ciliate protists are ubiquitous in
77 stagnant waters where mosquitoes breed (Duguma et al. 2017). Thus, since alternative prey
78 may reduce predatory impact and hence natural enemy efficacy towards mosquitoes, here we
79 examine the effects of a common alternative ciliate prey on the biocontrol efficiency of
80 cyclopoid copepods towards larvae of the vectorially-important mosquito *Culex pipiens*
81 Linnaeus (Diptera: Culicidae).

82 **Materials and Methods**

83 The focal predators, *Macrocyclops albidus* Jurine (Cyclopoida: Cyclopidae) and *Megacyclops*
84 *viridis* Jurine (Cyclopoida: Cyclopidae) were collected from Glasstry Clay Pit ponds, Northern
85 Ireland (54°29'18.5"N; 5°28'19.9"W) and transported in water from the collection site to
86 Queen's Marine Laboratory, Portaferry. We initiated separate copepod cultures for each
87 species from single gravid origerous females. Cultures were maintained at 25±2 °C, 50-60%
88 RH and under a 16:8 light:dark regime. *Paramecium caudatum* and *Chilomonas paramecium*
89 were supplied *ad libitum* to the copepods for culture proliferation, with adult copepod
90 samples from each culture dissected and identified to species. Whilst *P. caudatum* is a food
91 source for adults and copepodids, *C. paramecium* provides nurishment for nauplii stages. The
92 prey, *Cx. pipiens* were obtained from a colony maintained in the same laboratory. This
93 colony originated from eggs supplied in 2017 by The Pirbright Institute (Woking, England).
94 Adult females were kept in 32.5 cm³ cages (Bugdorm, Watkins and Doncaster, Leominster,

95 England) and fed regularly using defibrinated horse blood *via* a membrane feeding system
96 (Hemotek Ltd, Accrington, England). Sucrose-soaked cotton pads were additionally supplied
97 for sustenance in each cage. Eggs rafts were removed regularly and larvae reared in 3 L larval
98 bowls with crushed guinea pig food pellets provided *ad libitum* (Pets at Home,
99 Newtownabbey, Northern Ireland) until pupation.

100 To quantify the effects of alternative prey on the FR of both copepod species, we employed a
101 factorial $2 \times 2 \times 6$ experimental design with respect to ‘predator species’ (*M. albidus*/*M.*
102 *viridis*), ‘alternative prey’ (present/absent) and ‘prey supply’ (prey densities of either 2, 4, 6,
103 8, 15 or 30). *Culex pipiens* first instar larvae (1.1 – 1.3 mm) were supplied to adult female *M.*
104 *albidus* (1.6 – 1.8 mm) or *M. viridis* (2 – 2.3 mm) over a 6 hour experimental period ($n = 5$
105 per experimental treatment). Experiments were undertaken in polypropylene arenas of 42 mm
106 diameter containing 20 ml of dechlorinated tap water from an aerated source. For the
107 alternative prey treatment, we added 3 ml of *P. caudatum* culture (approx. 150 ciliates ml⁻¹
108 before addition to 17 ml dechlorinated tap water) to experimental arenas. This concentration
109 aligns with densities used in other studies (e.g. Reiss and Schmid-Araya 2011). We starved
110 non-ovigerous adult female copepods individually for 24 hours before the experiment to
111 standardise hunger levels. To eliminate dissolved oxygen variability among treatments, we
112 bubbled oxygen into the *P. caudatum* culture for 2 minutes prior to its dissemination. Prey
113 were allowed to settle for 2 hours before the experiment was initiated through the addition of
114 predators. After 6 hours during the photoperiod, the predators were removed and remaining
115 live prey counted. Controls were five replicates at each prey density and alternative prey
116 treatment in the absence of a predator.

117 All statistical analyses were undertaken in R (R Core Team, 2018). We compared overall
118 prey consumption (numbers eaten) with respect to the ‘predator species, ‘alternative prey’
119 and ‘prey supply’ factors using a generalized linear model (GLM) assuming a Poisson

120 distribution and log link as counts were not overdispersed. Non-significant factors and
121 interactions were removed to generate the most parsimonious model through a step-deletion
122 process using χ^2 for model selection *via* analysis of deviance (Crawley, 2007).

123 We determined FR types using logistic regression of the proportion of prey killed as a
124 function of prey density. A significantly negative first order term is indicative of a Type II
125 FR, whilst a significantly positive first order term followed by a significantly negative second
126 order term indicates a Type III FR (Juliano, 2001). We additionally used locally weighted
127 scatterplot smoothing (LOWESS; 9/10 smoothing factor) to further examine proportional
128 consumption across varying prey densities. We then fit flexible functional response models
129 using the *frair* package in R (Pritchard et al. 2017), which can integrate a scaling exponent
130 (q) if the results of logistic regression are equivocal (Real, 1977; Wasserman et al. 2016):

$$131 \quad N_e = N_0 (1 - \exp(bN_0^q(hN_e - T)))$$

132 Eqn. 1

133 where N_e is the number of prey eaten, N_0 is the initial prey density, b is the search coefficient,
134 h is the handling time, q is the scaling exponent and T is the total time available. Where a
135 categorical Type II functional response is evidenced, the scaling exponent q may be fixed at
136 0, whilst responses are increasingly sigmoidal where $q > 0$. We then non-parametrically
137 bootstrapped ($n = 2000$) initial b and h parameter estimates to construct 95% confidence
138 intervals (CIs) around FR curves. This enabled results to be considered at the population-
139 level, with differences subsequently inferred on the basis of FR overlaps across prey
140 densities.

141 **Results and Discussion**

142 Prey survival in controls was 99.9% overall, and thus we assumed that prey deaths in
143 treatments resulted from predation, which was also evidenced through partially consumed
144 remains of larval mosquitoes. Overall, significantly more prey items were consumed by *M.*
145 *viridis* than *M. albidus* ($\chi^2 = 3.95$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.047$), whilst predation was significantly
146 reduced in the presence of alternative prey for both species ($\chi^2 = 8.40$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.004$). The
147 alternative prey effect was consistent between predators as there were no interactions
148 between the ‘predator species’ and ‘alternative prey’ factors ($\chi^2 = 0.73$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.39$).
149 Further, overall consumption was significantly greater as more prey were supplied ($\chi^2 =$
150 114.86 , $df = 5$, $P < 0.001$). No further significant interactions were found for the ‘predator \times
151 prey supply’ ($\chi^2 = 1.47$, $df = 5$, $P = 0.92$), ‘alternative prey \times prey supply’ ($\chi^2 = 2.75$, $df = 5$, P
152 $= 0.74$), or ‘alternative prey \times predator \times prey supply’ terms in the model ($\chi^2 = 2.59$, $df = 5$, P
153 $= 0.76$).

154 Both *M. albidus* and *M. viridis* exhibited Type II FRs when no alternative prey were available
155 (Table 1; Figure 1a,b). *Macrocyclus albidus* also displayed a categorical Type II FR in the
156 presence of alternative prey (Figure 1a). However, in the presence of alternative prey, the FR
157 form of *M. viridis* was equivocal between Type II and Type III (Figure 1b). Thus, for this
158 treatment, a scaling exponent was integrated, where the FR was deemed to be moving
159 towards being a sigmoidal Type III ($q = 0.83$; Table 1).

160 The search coefficient b trended towards being lower under the presence of alternative prey,
161 whilst handling time h tended to be higher, and thus maximum feeding rate $1/h$ lower (Table
162 1; Figure 2a, b). Shaded FR CIs overlapped only at low prey densities in the case of *M.*
163 *albidus* (Figure 2a), and thus maximum feeding rates were significantly greater in the absence
164 of alternative prey for this species. On the other hand, in the case of *M. viridis*, FR CIs
165 overlapped at all except the lowest prey densities (Figure 2b). This reflects the sigmoidal FR
166 form and low search coefficient b in the presence of alternative prey for *M. viridis*. Where

167 there were no alternative prey, FR CIs of the two copepod species converged across all prey
168 supplies, and thus FRs were not significantly different within this treatment. However, where
169 there were alternative prey present, at intermediate densities the FR CIs of *M. albidus* were
170 significantly lower in comparison to *M. viridis* (Figure 2).

171 Biotic contexts such as the presence of alternative prey can affect derivations of ecological
172 impact between consumers and resources (Médoc et al. 2018), and is relevant in the
173 biocontrol context as multiple prey items often occur simultaneously within ecosystems.
174 Indeed, for generalist consumers, prey switching and prey preferences can have a marked
175 influence on ecological impacts (Murdoch 1969; Bolnick et al. 2002; Cuthbert et al. 2018d).
176 Such biotic contexts are neglected where experimental designs focus upon singular prey
177 species, and thus impact quantifications and transfer of results to empirical applications are
178 inherently restricted. Several species of cyclopoid copepods have proven effective in field
179 applications targetting mosquitoes which vector pathogens and parasites (Marten and Reid
180 2007). As cyclopoid copepods are known to feed on a range of organisms (Kumar et al.
181 2008), understanding the effects of such alternative prey on their biocontrol efficacy is vital
182 for mosquito control efficacy assessments.

183 The present study demonstrates that the presence of alternative prey can significantly
184 influence the predation efficiency of cyclopoid copepods towards vectorially-important
185 mosquitoes. Our results corroborate with Rey et al. (2004) and Kumar et al. (2008), where
186 alternative prey significantly reduced mosquito consumption by cyclopoid copepods. For
187 both species here, the presence of alternative prey reduced the overall strength of interactions
188 with larval mosquito prey. Whilst the Type II FRs exhibited by both copepods here in the
189 absence of alternative prey corroborate with other studies (Cuthbert et al. 2018a, b, c), we
190 found that the presence of alternative prey can drive species-specific shifts in FR form and
191 magnitude. For *M. albidus*, whilst the Type II FR was sustained in the presence of alternative

192 prey, maximum feeding rates were significantly reduced. On the other hand, for *M. viridis*,
193 FR form shifted towards a sigmoidal Type III in the presence of alternative prey whilst
194 maximum feeding rates were similar to where alternative prey were absent. Thus, whilst the
195 Type II FR demonstrates that *M. albidus* may offer high and sustained predation levels at low
196 prey densities, *M. viridis* may give refuge to mosquito prey at low prey densities due to an
197 increasingly sigmoidal FR. Indeed, *M. albidus* has been regularly operationalized in
198 biocontrol and has proven particularly efficacious in field applications, and thus our results
199 corroborate with these field-based trends in light of sustained population destabilising Type II
200 FRs (Marten and Reid, 2007). Our results suggest that cyclopoid copepods are able to still
201 effectively reduce mosquito numbers in the presence of alternative prey. However, future
202 examinations of biocontrol agents should seek to incorporate assessments as to the effects of
203 multiple alternative prey on ecological impact prior to agent release.

204 **Acknowledgements**

205 We acknowledge funding from the Department for the Economy, Northern Ireland. We thank
206 Maria Hołyńska, Polish Academy of Sciences for assistance with copepod identification.
207 *Culex pipiens* eggs were initially supplied under BBSRC project code BBS/E/I/00007039 by
208 The Pirbright Institute.

209 **References**

- 210 **Alexander, M. E., J. T. A. Dick, N. E. O'Connor, N. R. Haddaway, and K. D.**
211 **Farnsworth.** 2012. Functional responses of the intertidal amphipod *Echinogammarus*
212 *marinus*: effects of prey supply, model selection and habitat complexity. Mar. Ecol. Prog.
213 Ser. 468: 191–202.
- 214 **Becker, N., D. Petric, M. Zgomba, C. Boase, M. B. Madon, C. Dahl, and A. Kaiser.** 2010.
215 Mosquitoes and their control. Springer, Berlin, Germany.

216 **Bolnick, D. I., L. H. Yang, J. A. Fordyce, and J. M. Davis.** 2002. Measuring individual-
217 level resource specialization. *Ecology* 83: 2936–2941.

218 **Crawley, M. J.** 2007. *The R book*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, United Kingdom.

219 **Cuthbert, R. N., J. T. A. Dick, A. Callaghan, and J. W. E. Dickey.** 2018a. Biological
220 control agent selection under environmental change using functional responses, abundances
221 and fecundities; the Relative Control Potential (RCP) metric. *Biol. Control* 121: 50–57.

222 **Cuthbert, R. N., J. T. A. Dick, and A. Callaghan.** 2018b. Interspecific variation, habitat
223 complexity and ovipositional responses modulate the efficacy of cyclopoid copepods in
224 disease vector control. *Biol. Control* 121: 80–87.

225 **Cuthbert, R. N., J. T. A. Dick, and A. Callaghan.** 2018c. Dye another day: the predatory
226 impact of cyclopoid copepods on larval mosquito *Culex pipiens* is unaffected by dyed
227 environments. *J. Vector Ecol.* In press.

228 **Cuthbert, R. N., J. W. E. Dickey, C. Lavery, C. McMorrow, and J. T. A. Dick.** 2018d.
229 Resistance is futile: lack of predator switching and a preference for native prey predict the
230 success of an invasive prey species. *Royal Soc. Open Sci.* In press.

231 **Dick, J. T. A., M. E. Alexander, J. M. Jeschke, A. Ricciardi, H. J. MacIsaac, T. B.**
232 **Robinson, S. Kumschick, O. L. F. Weyl, A. M. Dunn, M. J. Hatcher, R. A. Paterson, K.**
233 **D. Farnsworth, and D. M. Richardson.** 2014. Advancing impact prediction and hypothesis
234 testing in invasion ecology using a comparative functional response approach. *Biol. Invasions*
235 16: 735–753.

236 **Duguma, D., M. G. Kaufman, and A. B. Simas Domingos.** 2017. Aquatic microfauna alter
237 larval food resources and affect development and biomass of West Nile and Saint Louis
238 encephalitis vector *Culex nigripalpus* (Diptera: Culicidae). *Ecol. Evol.* 7: 3507–3519.

239 **Fernandes, J. N., I. K. Moise, G. L. Moranto, and B. C. Beier.** 2018. Revamping
240 mosquito-borne disease control to tackle future threats. *Trends Parasitol.* 34: 359–368.

241 **Holling, C. S.** 1959. Some characteristics of simple types of predation and parasitism. *The*
242 *Can. Entomol.* 91: 385–398.

243 **Juliano, S. A.** 2001. Non-linear curve fitting: predation and functional response curves, pp.
244 178–196. *In* Scheiner, S. M., and J. Gurevitch, (eds.), *Design and Analysis of Ecological*
245 *Experiments*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom.

246 **Kay, B. H., and V. S. Nam.** 2005. New strategy against *Aedes aegypti* in Vietnam. *Lancet*
247 365: 613-617.

248 **Kumar, R., P. Muhid, H. -U Dahms, L. -C. Tseng, and J. -S. Hwang.** 2008. Potential of
249 three aquatic predators to control mosquitoes in the presence of alternative prey: a
250 comparative experimental assessment. *Mar. Freshw. Res.* 59: 817–835.

251 **Marten, G., and J. Reid.** 2007. Cyclopoid copepods. *J. Am. Mosq. Control Assoc.* 23: 65–
252 92.

253 **Médoc, V., L. Thuillier, and T. Spataro.** 2018. Opportunistic omnivory impairs our ability
254 to predict invasive species impacts from functional response comparisons. *Biol. Invasions* 20:
255 1307–1319.

256 **Murdoch, W. W. 1969.** Switching in general predators: experiments on predator specificity
257 and stability of prey populations. *Ecol. Monogr.* 39: 335–354.

258 **Pritchard, D. W., R. Paterson, H. C. Bovy, and D. Barrios-O'Neill.** 2017. Frair: an R
259 package for fitting and comparing consumer functional responses. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 8:
260 1528–1534.

261 **R Core Team.** 2018. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, R
262 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

263 **Real, L. A.** 1977. The kinetics of functional response. *Am. Nat.* 111: 289–300.

264 **Reiss, J., and J. M. Schmid-Araya.** 2011. Feeding response of a benthic copepod to ciliate
265 preytype, prey concentration and habitat complexity. *Freshwater Biol.* 56: 1519–1530.

266 **Rey, J. R., S. O’Connell, S. Suárez, Z. Menéndez, L. P. Lounibos, and G. Byer.** 2004.
267 Laboratory and field studies of *Macrocyclus albidus* (Crustacea: Copepoda) for biological
268 control of mosquitoes in artificial containers in a subtropical environment. *J. Vector Ecol.* 29:
269 124–134.

270 **Thomas, M. B.** 2018. Biological control of human disease vectors: a perspective on
271 challenges and opportunities. *BioControl* 63: 61–19.

272 **Townroe, S., and A. Callaghan.** 2014. British container breeding mosquitoes: the impact of
273 urbanisation and climate change on community composition and phenology. *PLoS ONE* 9:
274 e95325.

275 **Veronesi, R., M. Carrieri, B. Maccagnani, S. Maini, and R. Bellini.** 2015. *Macrocyclus*
276 *albidus* (Copepoda: Cyclopidae) for the biocontrol of *Aedes albopictus* and *Culex pipiens* in
277 Italy. *J. Am. Mosq. Control Assoc.* 31: 32–43.

278 **Wasserman, R. J., M. E. Alexander, D. Barrios-O’Neill, O. L. F. Weyl, and T. Dalu.**
279 2016. Using functional responses to assess predator hatching phenology implications for
280 pioneering prey in arid temporary pools. *J. Plankt. Res.* 38: 154–158.

281

282

283 Table 1. Results of logistic regression for both Type II and Type III models, considering prey
 284 killed as a function of prey density, and parameter estimates resulting from the flexible
 285 functional response models.

	<i>Macrocyclus albidus</i>		<i>Megacyclus viridis</i>	
(a) Alternative prey	No	Yes	No	Yes
(b) Logistic regression				
Type II response				
First term	-0.04	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02
<i>P</i> value	0.001	0.03	0.006	0.11
Type III response				
First term	-0.07	-0.10	-0.04	0.02
<i>P</i> value	0.35	0.25	0.54	0.78
Second term	0.0007	0.002	0.0003	-0.001
<i>P</i> value	0.71	0.43	0.88	0.58
(c) Parameter estimates				
<i>b</i>	0.63	0.35	0.62	0.11
<i>h</i>	0.13	0.18	0.08	0.16
<i>q</i>	Fixed at 0	Fixed at 0	Fixed at 0	0.83

286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297

298 Figure 1. Functional response forms determined from proportion of prey consumed under
299 differing initial prey densities for *Macrocyclus albidus* (a) and *Megacyclus viridis* (b)
300 preying on larvae of *Culex pipiens* without (solid lines; circles) and with (dashed lines;
301 triangles) alternative prey (*Paramecium caudatum*). Relationships are presented using
302 LOWESS lines with means \pm SE ($n = 5$ per experimental group).

303 Figure 2. Functional responses ($n = 5$ per experimental group) of predatory copepods
304 *Macrocyclus albidus* (a) and *Megacyclus viridis* (b) towards first instar *Culex pipiens*,
305 without (solid lines) and with (dashed lines) alternative prey (*Paramecium caudatum*) over 6
306 hour experimental period. Shaded areas indicate bootstrapped ($n = 2000$) 95% confidence
307 intervals (CIs).