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Abstract: The aims of the present paper were to review the knowledge about the Mediterranean non-indigenous species of the taxa Cnidaria and Ctenophora (CC NIS), to screen the risk of 98 species for their potential invasiveness in the Mediterranean Sea and their approach to the Italian waters. Of these, 38% are well established in the basin, 4% are known for their invasiveness, 44% are casual, 11% have a taxonomic status unresolved, and 3% are included in the category “cryptogenic”. The biodiversity CC NIS of the Mediterranean Sea has changed considerably in the last two decades and 27 out of 98 Mediterranean CC NIS are present in the Italian waters. Fifteen CC NIS, some equipped with high invasive potential, should be regarded as good candidates to become future immigrants of the Italian waters. Anticipatory NIS forecast based on biogeographical and ecological analyses may provide a useful tool for targeted management of the CC NIS issue and for the assessment of the second descriptor of Good Environmental Status. On the other hand, conservation and management of marine ecosystem should be based on the conservation of the essential environmental conditions for the functioning of these ecosystems instead of the contamination or eradication of alien species.
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1. Introduction

Marine non-indigenous species (NIS) represent a potential risk to the host environments [1,2] inducing ecosystem alterations often with socioeconomic effects in coastal areas [3–5].

Dispersal and invasion of species in new habitats have occurred throughout the history of marine life, but an important point is the fast rate at which invasions are recently taking place facilitated by anthropic activities [6]. The rate of introduction and the spread of invasive alien species increased rapidly in recent decades, so that these species are now considered one of the first anthropogenic threats for the marine communities [7–9]. Worldwide revisions and inventories highlight that biological diversity consists of both long-term native species and NIS that in some regions can contribute to local biodiversity with up to more than half of all the species [10]. Today, more than 980 alien species have been counted in the most invaded marine region of the world situated between Spanish and Middle East Mediterranean waters [1]. The best-known Mediterranean invasions are linked to macroalgae with negative impacts on native communities, biodiversity reduction, and ecological relationships alteration [11–14].

Mediterranean NIS have been examined by the scientific community through spatial and temporal patterns flanked by revision or species inventories [1,5,6,15–27]. Moreover, breaking of ecological barriers and excavating of canals promoted invasions of marine NIS leading to inclusion of the Mediterranean Sea into the Indo-Pacific region [28]. In the last decades, climate change affects the vulnerability of the region to biological invasions [29–31], influencing native species’ geographical and depth ranges [32,33] or the
possibility that these species may be replaced by NIS [34,35]. Changing climate is leading indeed the Mediterranean Sea into a new stage characterized by an increase in the number of NIS with warm water affinities [16,36]. Several studies have covered the native distribution range of the Mediterranean marine NIS, but most of them have examined it only at country or regional level [2,37–39]. Only a few studies have provided a large-scale estimate of the native distribution of NIS across the Mediterranean and the other European Seas [1,27,40]. Furthermore, the revolution of Good Environmental Status (GES), 11 descriptors of the European Marine Strategy Framework Directive, introduced a new approach to define the status of the environment considering the effects of the putative causes of impact on the living component [33]. In this study, the Mediterranean non-indigenous species of the taxa Cnidaria and Ctenophora (CC NIS) have been considered as a good proxy for changes in biodiversity in the plankton and in the benthos, because of their structuring and functional roles. They inhabit all aquatic ecosystems displaying a wide array of life-cycle strategies with potential negative impacts on biodiversity, ecosystem, tourism, fisheries, fish farms, and power plants. Their native distribution and the main introduction pathways have been examined jointly to time trends of species introductions in relation to the prevailing native distribution areas. Moreover, evaluation of their invasiveness, also through the analysis of some case studies, could allow anticipatory NIS forecast based on biogeographical and ecological analyses of the CC NIS identified as good candidates to become future immigrants of the Italian waters that, to date, host more than 160 marine and brackish NIS along its coastline [39].

2. Materials and Methods

An inclusive bibliographic survey was performed to gather data for this review (indexed and non-indexed journals, checklists, on-line databases, and grey literature). Taxonomically, our survey is based on the extensive revision of the information found in the World Register of Marine Species [41]. Only CC NIS detected in marine and brackish waters were considered.

We identified Mediterranean CC NIS by examining records from the 19th century to 2020 to trace their origin, date, method of introduction, current distribution and establishment status, and global distribution. A database with more than 18,200 records was organized to provide the following information: species, family, collector, life-cycle phase, reproductive state, location, date of collection, publication year of the article, substrate type, water depth, synonymy, and cited references.

The following data (Supplementary Materials) are provided for each CC NIS:

- establishment success in the Mediterranean Sea according to Zenetos et al. [15]: established (widely recorded at some sites), invasive (able to disseminate from their area of initial introduction), casual (few records), cryptogenic (species with no definite evidence of their native or introduced status), questionable (species with taxonomic status unresolved), unknown;
- first record in the Mediterranean Sea (date, locality, reference: the date and location of the first observation) of each species in the Mediterranean Sea were extracted from the literature; if possible, the actual date of first record was reported, along with its publication date;
- native distribution range: following the global marine biogeographic realms proposed by Spalding et al. [42];
- distribution per Mediterranean subregion (following MSFD, Marine Strategy Framework Directive, 2017) [43]: Aegean-Levantine Sea, Ionian Sea and the Central Mediterranean Sea, Adriatic Sea, Western Mediterranean Sea;
- extra-Mediterranean distribution;
- the taxonomic position of each species (Class, Order, Family);
- the primary pathway(s) of introduction in Europe based on CBD [44]: indicating the frequency if low (L), medium (M) or high (H);
- possible notes;
Temporal trends of CC NIS introductions in the Mediterranean Sea per 5-year intervals have been performed for the time period 1950–2014, whose native distribution corresponds to at least one of the five most important realms of the Mediterranean CC NIS’ native distribution ranges (Temperate Northern Atlantic, Central Indo-Pacific, Western Indo-Pacific, Tropical Atlantic, Temperate Australasia). Due to the time lag between observation date of a new CC NIS and its subsequent reporting, temporal trends only reports up to 2014 were taken into consideration.

Finally, CC NIS have been investigated through the evaluation of their invasiveness (depending on the species ability to rapidly conquer new spaces, spread and generate various impacts) by identifying the possible future immigrants of the Italian waters, and considering also the distribution of CC NIS already established in the Italian seas through the following steps: (1) summarize the data about CC NIS in the Italian waters; (2) determine the origin regions for the CC invaders; (3) analyze CC biodiversity data in each region; (4) determine of new potential Italian invaders according to the data about CC invasive species in neighboring regions (information extracted from Supplementary Materials).

3. Results

Most CC NIS are concentrated in the Aegean-Levantine region (61 species, 38%) followed by the Western Mediterranean Sea (59 species, 36%), Adriatic Sea (22 species, 14%), and Ionian Sea and Central Mediterranean Sea (20 species, 12%). Most CC NIS, established in one or more Mediterranean subregion [43], have their native distribution range in the following Indo-Pacific realms: Central Indo-Pacific (20 species, 21%), Western Indo-Pacific (19 species, 19%), Temperate Australasia (6 species, 6%), and Tropical Eastern-Pacific (2 species, 2%). On the other hand, the Temperate Northern Atlantic (27 species, 28%) and the Tropical Atlantic (10 species, 10%) constitute also important realms of Mediterranean NIS native distributions (Figure 1, Supplementary Materials). Very few CC NIS have their native distribution in the Temperate Northern Pacific (3 species, 3%), Temperate South Africa (2 species, 2%), Temperate South America (2 species, 2%), and Southern Ocean (4 species, 4%); 3 species have an unknown origin (3%). More biogeographical details of the CC NIS with native distribution in each MSFD Mediterranean subregion are provided in Supplementary Materials.

![Figure 1. Proportion of the major native distribution ranges of CC NIS (following Spalding et al. [42] for biogeographic realms classifications) in the Mediterranean subregions. The size of each pie chart represents the total number of NIS primarily introduced in a subregion.](image-url)
Of the 98 CC NIS, 38% are well established in the basin, 4% are known for their invasiveness, 44% are casual, 11% have a taxonomic status unresolved, and 3% are included in the category “cryptogenic”.

The analysis has shown different patterns of the most important pathways among the native distribution realms (Figure 2).

Figure 2. Number of CC NIS introduced in the Mediterranean Sea through primary introduction pathways, based on CBD [44] scheme associated with each of five major realms of Mediterranean CC NIS’s native distribution: (a) Western Indo-Pacific, (b) Central Indo-Pacific, (c) Temperate Australasia, (d) Tropical Atlantic, (e) Temperate Northern Atlantic. Several species are linked to more than one pathway.

CC NIS with native distribution in the Western and Central Indo-Pacific have been introduced into the Mediterranean Sea mostly through “Corridor: interconnected waterways/basins/Seas”, corresponding to the Suez Canal. On the other hand, CC NIS with native distribution in the Temperate Australasia have been introduced mainly through shipping, including both “Transport-stowaway: ship/boat ballast water” (hereafter referred to as shipping-ballast) and “Transport-stowaway: ship/boat hull fouling” (hereafter referred to as shipping-fouling). “Transport-contaminant: contaminant on animals (except parasites, species transported by host/vector)” (hereafter referred to as aquaculture-contamination) concerns a few CC NIS with Temperate Australasia native realm. Finally, most CC NIS with native distribution in the Tropical Atlantic are associated with shipping (both ballast and fouling) and with “Corridor: interconnected waterways/basins/Seas”. Similarly, CC
NIS related to the Temperate Northern Atlantic realm are mainly linked to interconnection across the Strait of Gibraltar and shipping-ballast/fouling.

Up to 1980–1984, temporal analysis revealed an overall increasing trend of new CC NIS introductions with native distribution in the realms: Western and Central Indo-Pacific, Temperate Australasia, Tropical Atlantic, and Temperate Northern Atlantic. After this period, most of them present a constant or decreasing trend, less for CC NIS introduced from the Indo-Pacific and Temperate Northern Atlantic (Figure 3).

![Figure 3. Temporal trends of new marine CC NIS introductions in Europe per 5-year intervals, whose native distribution corresponds to at least one of the five most important realms of Mediterranean CC NIS’ native distribution ranges for the time period 1950–2014 (dashed lines: mobile averages over 3-year period).](image)

### 3.1. Cnidaria and Ctenophora Potential Invaders of the Italian Waters

Among the most invasive species, *Mnemiopsis leidyi* A. Agassiz, 1865 and *Rhopilema nomadica* Galil, Spanier & Ferguson, 1990 have been recently reported in the Italian waters [45–49]. Other CC NIS (15 species), well established in some areas of the Mediterranean basin (some of these equipped with invasive potential), could soon reach the Italian waters (Table 1).

#### Table 1. Cnidaria potential invaders of the Italian waters.

| Taxa                  | Origin          | Main Way of Introduction          | Distribution in Mediterranean Sea and Records | Last Record (Locality and Year)                           | Probable Invasiveness |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| *Hydrozoa*            |                 |                                   |                                             |                                                         |                       |
| *Dynamena quadridentata* (Ellis & Solander, 1786) | Tropical Atlantic | Suez Canal (Lessepsian species) | Levant Sea [50] | Lebanon coast (2004) | ++                    |
| *Eucheleita paradoxica* Mayer, 1900 | Tropical Atlantic | Unknown                          | Croatian coast [51], Alborán Sea [52], Levant Sea [53–55], French coast [56,57], Tunisian coast [58,59], Algerian coast [60] | Tunisian coast (2015) | ++ |
Table 1. Cont.

| Taxa                              | Origin       | Main Way of Introduction | Distribution in Mediterranean Sea and Records                                                                 | Last Record (Locality and Year) | Probable Invasiveness |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| *Eucheilota ventricularis* McCrady, 1859 | North temperate Atlantic | Suez Canal (Lessepsian species) | Levant Sea [53–55,61]                                                                                      | Lebanon coast (1989)            | +                     |
| *Haliscera bigelowi* Kramp, 1947 | Tropical eastern Pacific | Unknown                   | Croatian coast [51,62], Alborán Sea [63], Spanish coast [64–68], Tunisian coast [59,69]                  | Tunisian coast (2015)           | ++                    |
| *Macrophylalia philippina* Kirchenpauer, 1872 | Central Indo-Pacific | Suez Canal (Lessepsian species) | Lebanon coast [50,70,71], Levantine coast of Turkey [72], Suez Canal [22], Aegean Sea [73] | Suez Canal (2014)               | +++                   |
| *Moerisia carinata* Bouillon, 1978 | Central Indo-Pacific | Suez Canal (Lessepsian species) | Levant Sea [53–55]                                                                                      | Lebanon coast (1989)            | +                     |
| *Olindias singularis* Browne, 1905 | Central Indo-Pacific | Suez Canal (Lessepsian species) | Egyptian Mediterranean coast [74]                                                                         | Egyptian Mediterranean coast (extending from Alexandria in the east to Sidi Barani in the west) (2001) | ++                    |
| *Plumularia pulchella* Bale, 1882  | Temperate Australasia | Unknown                   | Alborán Sea [65], Spanish coast [75–77], Egyptian Mediterranean waters [78]                             | Egyptian Mediterranean waters (1977) | +                     |
| *Sertularia marginata* (Kirchenpauer, 1864) | Western Indo-Pacific | Suez Canal (Lessepsian species) | Levant Sea [50,79–82], Alborán Sea [83]                                                               | Alborán Sea (2012)             | +++                   |
| *Sertularia tongensis* (Stechow, 1919) as *S. theocarpa* | Western Indo-Pacific | Suez Canal (Lessepsian species) | Levant Sea [50]                                                                                                | Lebanon coast (2004)           | ++                    |
| *Tetrorchis erythrogaster* Bigelow, 1909 | Tropical eastern Pacific | Unknown                   | Beyrouth [53–55,61,84]                                                                                    | Lebanon coast (1982)           | +                     |
| *Gymnangium montagui* (Billard, 1912) | Temperate North Atlantic | Expansion natural range | French coast [85], Alborán Sea [86]                                                                     | Strait of Gibraltar and nearby areas (1993) | ++                    |
| Scyphozoa                         |              |                          |                                                                                                             |                                 |                       |
| *Cotylorhiza erythraea* Stiasny, 1920 | Western Indo-Pacific | Suez Canal (Lessepsian species) | Levant Sea [87]                                                                                           | Israel coast (2015)            | +++                   |
| *Marinaella stellata* Gall & Gershwin, 2010 | Western Indo-Pacific | Shipping (ballast waters) (Lessepsian species)                                                             | Levant Sea [88–91]                                                          | Syrian coast (2015), Lebanese waters (2015) | +++                   |
| Anthozoa                         |              |                          |                                                                                                             |                                 |                       |
| *Oulastrea crispata* (Lamarck, 1816) | Central Indo-Pacific | Unknown                   | Corsica [92]                                                                                                | Corsica (2014)                 | ++                    |

+: low; ++: medium; +++: high.

Figure 4 shows the distribution of CC NIS in the Italian seas. The majority of CC NIS are concentrated in the South (16 species) and Central Tyrrenhian Sea (9 species), in the Ligurian Sea (14 species) and in the North Adriatic Sea (9 species).
3.2. *Oculina patagonica*, a Positive Alien Species?

In 1966, *Oculina patagonica* de Angelis, 1908 has been registered for the first time in the Mediterranean waters (Savona, Italy) [94,95]. This species expanded its presence, being found in Alicante (Spain, 1973), Egypt (1981) and in the Eastern Mediterranean (1992), as well as in the Croatian waters in 2011 [95]. Recently, it has been detected also in the Sicilian coasts (Giovanni Giallongo personal observation), suggesting an invasive trend in the Italian waters. Its widespread presence is due to its capacity to adapt to harsh conditions and almost to every kind of substrate [96], in vertical or horizontal surfaces and in a wide depth range [97]. Artificial substrata are especially suitable for this invasive species [95,98], which seems to have little problems even in polluted conditions [99,100].

Probably one of the keys to understand the successful invasion of this anthozoan is related to its early sexual reproduction (1–2 years, [95]) and the bailout propagation of the
species [99]. Gametogenesis is fast, taking five months in the case of female colonies and three months in the case of male colonies [101], similar to the parasitic aclyonarian Alcyonium coralloides [102]. This kind of reproduction may be an advantage in a fast-changing sea in which cnidarians may have problems in the stabilization of their populations due to climate change [103]. However, another potential advantage in the species expansion is the relationship with sea urchins and the erosion of the hard bottom substrate [100]. It has been shown that, in seven years (2003–2010), the population density increased between 172–276% [100], concurrently with an increase in abundance of the Arbaxia lixula and Paracentrotus lividus sea urchins. The surface eroded by the sea urchins is not suitable for most of the sessile species, but it seems to be an ideal substrate for Oculina patagonica expansion.

The presence of the sea urchins seems to be an essential point for the invasive species, which takes advantage of the absence of the macroalgae in shallow waters. However, one interesting point is that, once settled, O. patagonica may share the space with new incoming algae that are not grazed by the sea urchins [100]. So, in a certain sense, we are in front of a facilitator species, which in some way partially “protects” some of the autochthonous benthic algae from the excessive sea urchin grazing. The system recovers and may also enhance biodiversity on some occasions due to the presence of this eco-engineering species [104]. O. patagonica is thus a good monitored example of how a NIS may partially transform the habitat.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

The Mediterranean Sea is widely colonized by marine NIS hosting the highest number of them in the world [5]. Mediterranean cnidarian biodiversity is changing, and seawater warming is impacting marine ecosystems, but as highlighted by Bianchi et al. [105], an accurate evaluation of changes requires the availability of long-term biological data series.

The Mediterranean high number of CC NIS is mainly linked to the presence of the Lessepsian immigrants, heavy shipping traffic (fouling and ballast waters), but also to the long history of marine monitoring [1,2,15–18,40,106].

According to Galil et al. [28] and Tsiamis et al. [1], the patterns concerning the Mediterranean CC NIS native distribution differ among the Mediterranean marine subregions, following the history and traits of the dominating primary pathways of introduction in each subregion. In fact, the vast majority of the marine Mediterranean CC NIS have their native distribution in the Central and Western Indo-Pacific mostly associated with their introductions into the Mediterranean Sea through the Suez Canal [16,25,40]. As a result, 38% of all the Mediterranean CC NIS primary introductions were reported first in the Aegean-Levantine Sea. On the other hand, CC NIS reported first from the Western Mediterranean Sea have their native distribution mainly in the Temperate Northern Atlantic (28%) as pathway of introduction the entrance through the Strait of Gibraltar and shipping (ballast/fouling) traffic [86,107,108]. Other species of Mediterranean CC NIS have their native distribution in the Tropical Atlantic (10%) and Temperate Australasia (6%) with shipping (both ballast and fouling) as most responsible pathway for their introductions into the Mediterranean basin. On the other hand, very few Mediterranean CC NIS are associated to the Southern Ocean (4%), possibly due to climate differences and the limited pathways presence in this marine realm.

A surge in the records in the 1980s reflects probably the publication of the results of specific programs in the Levant Sea (see Galil [109] for more details). Moreover, the increase in shipping transported CC NIS may be attributed to the increase in shipping volume throughout the Mediterranean basin resulting in new shipping routes, a result of a significant shift in global economy trends. In the same way, the increase in commercial introductions follows the increase of shellfish production in aquaculture facilities [110].

According to several researchers [1,23–25], during the last years an overall negative trend in species introductions is noted in the Mediterranean Sea. However, the observed general decrease in NIS introductions should be considered with caution because could be attributed to the time lag between the observation date of a NIS and its subsequent
reporting [1,111,112]. Moreover, this decrease should be attributed to the fewer introductions of CC NIS associated with aquaculture-contamination [17] and shipping, presumably due to compulsory measures implemented at a national or European level [113,114], and the recent adoption by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) of the “International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships’ Ballast Water and Sediments” (BWM Convention). The approval of the guidance of the Marine Environment Protection Committee [115] should be encouraged since it concerns the shipping that has an important role in the CC NIS introductions [1,116–119]. We must consider also the permanence and spread of existing CC NIS, and their role in the ecosystem functioning. Is not only a matter of ‘new introduced species’, but also which role they may have in the habitat composition, energy fluxes and biogeochemical cycles in the near future [103].

According to the CC NIS invasiveness, and the distance from a region where their introductions were registered, three of the fifteen CC NIS potential invaders of the Italian waters (Table 1) deserve special attention.

The first species, *Macrorhynchia philippina* Kirchenpauer, 1872, native of the southern Pacific Ocean region, is one of the alien hydroid species most widely spread and well established in the Levant Sea [70,120]. This Lessepsian invader, found in shallow waters, can create dense populations and has been recorded also in the Aegean Sea introduced by shipping [70,121] being characterized by a high invasive potential. It is now a worldwide species in all tropical and sub-tropical oceans [108] and there are also records from temperate regions [122]. *M. philippina* is a stinging species and the increase of its density and abundance in the Mediterranean basin could have a negative impact on local economies [70,121].

The second species, *Oulastrea crispata* (Lamarck, 1816), a non-indigenous zooxanthellate scleractinian coral, has been found in shallow water on the west coast of Corsica [92]. It is a species native on near-shore coral reefs in the central Indo-Pacific and a successful colonizer being able to settle on a wide variety of substrata and utilizes various reproductive strategies. Being widespread in temperate and subtropical waters, it is likely that it will be able to find a suitable temperature regime in the Mediterranean basin for further range expansion due to the “tropicalization” of this area [105].

Finally, the third species, *Eucheilota paradoxica* Mayer, 1900 is native of the tropical Atlantic region and its medusa stage has been recorded near the Italian coasts (along the Croatian coast [51] and the French coast [56,57] in the ’70s and ’90s, respectively), while the most recent records occurred along the African coasts [60].

Another aspect to consider is the spatial scale. According to several authors [123,124], the biodiversity of native and exotic species is often negatively correlated at small scale, but positively related at large scale. At broader spatial scale the complexity of natural community environments reduces the resistance to the spread of NIS provided by high species richness [125,126]. Recently, research on positive or neutral effects of NIS has received particular attention even if, generally, their positive impacts may be underestimated [5,127–130]. In fact, there are many examples in the literature regarding the NIS introduction accounting its effects on diversity, structure and functioning of marine ecosystems [124,131–134] where the problem is magnified because complex life cycles facilitate connectivity among distant environments. An assessment of ecological and economic impacts is still lacking in the marine environment [135–138]. In European seas an attempt to treat the impact of NIS on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning was addressed by Katsanevakis et al. [5]. The authors found most of the ecological services (food provision, water purification, recreation and tourism) were negatively impacted by the presence of NIS. The results of a few macro-ecological studies [124,139] have revealed the presence of positive relationships between alien and native species richness in marine environments focusing attention on some large-scale features. These factors, not detectable by studies carried out on a single species or habitat, can contribute toward the development to a more complete understanding of the impacts of alien species from an ecosystem perspective [124,140,141]. Moreover, the general perception that NIS are a threat to biodiversity is true [142,143] but it...
should be considered that in most cases the time of investigation has not been long enough to clarify their real effects on the habitat composition and functioning [139,144]. On the one hand, the impact of NIS on biodiversity cannot be generalized because they cause different effects at several spatial and temporal scales [13,124,145–151] being difficult to predict the fate of NIS in new habitat [152]. On the other hand, there is the possibility that some endangered species could also benefit from their transport towards different environments. In fact, considering that some invaders could survive better than endemic species in changing habitats that may compensate the decrease in the number of species caused by climate change and may act as ‘reservoirs of diversity’ [139,153]. According to Davis et al. [154], the ‘practical value of the native-versus-alien species dichotomy’ in conservation is setting. As suggested by Giangrande et al. [139], therefore, it is essential to distinguish early NIS from naturalized species defining a temporal baseline that can be used for this purpose.

The monitoring bias is another issue that should not be neglected: inevitably more NIS primary introductions in the Mediterranean Sea have been reported for well-known taxonomic groups (e.g., mollusks, fish, macroalgae) [133,155–157]. In addition, more focused studies are needed to examine pathway-introduction of most Mediterranean CC NIS because for the majority of introductions the pathway certainty is not sufficient, with the exception of the Lessepsian immigrants.

The information concerning the pathways could indeed be useful for CC NIS management per marine subregion according to the MSFD, directing where priority should be given to avoid new introductions. Furthermore, risk screening of the potential invasiveness of non-native species in the Mediterranean Sea can aid managers in making informed decisions on targeting species for management [158].

The study of new arrivals at an ecosystem level should involve interdisciplinary synergism and accurate analysis of species distribution. This requires international cooperation to define issues of provenance and to assess possible risks related to commercial exchanges [139].

In conclusion, as suggested by Corriero et al. [124] and Buonocore et al. [120], from a conservation point of view, diverse marine communities have unquestioned conservation and ecological value, and provide economic benefits such as diving experiences, nursering effect, shelter of fisheries biomass, carbon sequesters. Therefore, two different models should be distinguished during marine monitoring, the first aimed at promptly reporting the arrival of NIS in hot spots of introduction and the second at evaluating the success of these species in marine communities. Finally, according to Ekebom [159] and considering the unpredictability of the invasions processes, methods to detect impacts should be improved by implementing mensurative and experimental studies at different spatial and temporal scales.

Supplementary Materials: The following are available online at https://www.mdpi.com/article/10.3390/w13081062/s1.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, C.G. and S.R.; methodology, C.G.; validation, C.G. and S.R.; formal analysis, C.G.; investigation, C.G. and S.R.; resources, C.G. and S.R.; data curation, C.G. and S.R.; writing—original draft preparation, C.G. and S.R.; writing—review and editing, C.G. and S.R.; visualization, C.G. and S.R.; supervision, C.G. and S.R. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments: We thank Stefano Piraino (University of Salento) for his contribution (advice and discussions) to the paper. Thanks to Francesco Cozzoli for consultancy on the processing of data relating to temporal trends.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
References

1. Tsiamis, K.; Zenetos, A.; Deriu, I.; Gervasini, E.; Cardoso, A.C. The native distribution of the European marine non-indigenous species. *Aquat. Invasions* 2018, 13, 187–198. [CrossRef]

2. Servello, G.; Andaloro, F.; Azzurro, E.; Castrìa, L.; Catra, M.; Chiarore, A.; Crocetta, F.; D’alessandro, M.; Denitto, F.; Froglia, C.; et al. Marine Alien Species in Italy: A Contribution to the Implementation of Descriptor D2 of The Marine Strategy Framework Directive. *Medit. Mar. Sci.* 2019, 20, 1–48. [CrossRef]

3. Wallentinus, I.; Nyberg, C.D. Introduced marine organisms as habitat modifiers. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 2007, 55, 323–332. [CrossRef]

4. Molnar, J.L.; Gamboa, R.L.; Revenga, C.; Spalding, M.D. Assessing the global threat of invasive species to marine biodiversity. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 2008, 6, 485–492. [CrossRef]

5. Katsanevakis, S.; Wallentinus, I.; Zenetos, A.; Leppäkoski, E.; Çinar, M.E.; Oztürk, B.; Cardoso, A.C. Impacts of marine invasive alien species on ecosystem services and biodiversity: A pan-European review. *Aquat. Invasions* 2014, 9, 391–423. [CrossRef]

6. Ójaveer, H.; Galil, B.G.; Carlton, J.T.; Alleeley, H.; Goulletquer, P.; Lehtiniemi, M.; Marchini, A.; Miller, W.; Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A.; Peharda, M.; et al. Historical baselines in marine bioinvasions: Implications for policy and management. *PLoS ONE* 2018, 13, e0202383. [CrossRef]

7. Nellemann, C.; Hain, S.; Alder, J. *Rapid Response Assessment in Dead Water—Merging of Climate Change with Pollution, Over-Harvest, and Infestations in the World’s Fishing Grounds*; United Nations Environment Programme, GRID-Arendal: Arendal, Norway, 2008.

8. Costello, M.J.; Coll, M.; Danovaro, R.; Halpin, P.; Ójaveer, H.; Miloslavich, P. A census of marine biodiversity knowledge, resources, and future challenges. *PLoS ONE* 2010, 5, e12110. [CrossRef]

9. Galil, B.S.; Marchini, A.; Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A.; Ójaveer, H.; Narščius, A.; Ojaveer, H.; Olenin, S.; Normant-Saremba, M.; et al. Alien species in the Mediterranean Sea by 2012. A contribution to the application of European Union’s Marine Strategy Framework Directive. Part 2. Introduction trends and pathways. *Mediterr. Mar. Sci.* 2012, 13, 328–352. [CrossRef]

10. Tsiamis, K.; Zenetos, A.; Deriu, I.; Gervasini, E.; Cardoso, A.C. The native distribution of the European marine non-indigenous species. *Aquat. Invasions* 2014, 9, 13–35. [CrossRef]

11. Thomsen, M.S.; Wernberg, T.; Tuya, F.; Silliman, B.R. Evidence for impact of nonindigenous macroalgae: A meta-analysis of experimental and field studies. *J. Phycol.* 2009, 45, 812–819. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

12. Galil, B.S.; Marchini, A.; Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A.; Minchin, D.; Narščius, A.; Ójaveer, H.; Olenin, S. International arrivals: Widespread bioinvasions in European Seas. *Ethol. Ecol. Ecol.* 2014, 26, 152–171. [CrossRef]

13. Ojaveer, H.; Galil, B.G.; Carlton, J.T.; Alleeley, H.; Goulletquer, P.; Lehtiniemi, M.; Marchini, A.; Miller, W.; Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A.; Peharda, M.; et al. Historical baselines in marine bioinvasions: Implications for policy and management. *PLoS ONE* 2018, 13, e0202383. [CrossRef]

14. Schlaepfer, M.A. Do non-native species contribute to biodiversity? *PLoS Biol.* 2016, 15, e2005568. [CrossRef]

15. Boudouresque, C.F.; Verlaque, M. Biological pollution in the Mediterranean Sea: Invasive versus introduced macrophytes. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 2002, 44, 32–38. [CrossRef]

16. Piazzi, L.; Meinesz, A.; Verlaque, M.; Akçali, B.; Antolić, B.; Argyrou, M.; Balata, D.; Ballesteros, E.; Calvo, S.; Cinelli, F.; et al. Invasion of *Caulerpa racemosa* var. * cylindracea* (Caulerpales, Chlorophyta) in the Mediterranean Sea: An assessment of the spread. *Crytopgam. Algol.* 2005, 26, 189–202.

17. Galil, B.S.; Marchini, A.; Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A.; Minchin, D.; Narščius, A.; Ójaveer, H.; Olenin, S. International arrivals: Widespread bioinvasions in European Seas. *Ethol. Ecol. Ecol.* 2014, 26, 152–171. [CrossRef]

18. Cardeccia, A.; Marchini, A.; Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A.; Galil, B.; Gollasch, S.; Minchin, D.; Narščius, A.; Ójaveer, H. Assessing biological invasions in European Seas: Biological traits of the most widespread non-indigenous species. *Aquat. Invasions* 2014, 9, 133–144. [CrossRef]

19. Cardecia, A.; Marchini, A.; Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A.; Galil, B.; Gollasch, S.; Minchin, D.; Narščius, A.; Ójaveer, H. Assessing biological invasions in European Seas: Biological traits of the most widespread non-indigenous species. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* 2016, 201, 17–28. [CrossRef]

20. Ójaveer, H.; Olenin, S.; Narščius, A.; Florin, A.B.; Ezhova, E.; Gollasch, S.; Jensen, K.R.; Lehtiniemi, M.; Minchin, D.; Normant-Saremba, M.; et al. Dynamics of biological invasions and pathways over time: A case study of a temperate coastal sea. *Biol. Invasions* 2016, 19, 799–813. [CrossRef]

21. Galil, B.S.; Marchini, A.; Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A.; Ójaveer, H. The enlargement of the Suez Canal—Erythraean introductions and management challenges. *Manag. Biol. Invasions* 2017, 8, 141–152. [CrossRef]

22. Zibrowius, H. Annotated list of marine alien species in the Mediterranean with records of the worst invasive species. *Mediterr. Mar. Sci.* 2005, 6, 63–118. [CrossRef]

23. Zibrowius, H. Annotated list of marine alien species in the Mediterranean with records of the worst invasive species. *Mediterr. Mar. Sci.* 2005, 6, 63–118. [CrossRef]

24. Zibrowius, H. Annotated list of marine alien species in the Mediterranean with records of the worst invasive species. *Mediterr. Mar. Sci.* 2005, 6, 63–118. [CrossRef]

25. Zibrowius, H. Annotated list of marine alien species in the Mediterranean with records of the worst invasive species. *Mediterr. Mar. Sci.* 2005, 6, 63–118. [CrossRef]

26. Zibrowius, H. Annotated list of marine alien species in the Mediterranean with records of the worst invasive species. *Mediterr. Mar. Sci.* 2005, 6, 63–118. [CrossRef]
27. Katsanevakis, S.; Poursanidis, D.; Hoffman, R.; Rizgalla, J.; Rothman, S.B.-S.; Levitt-Barmat, Y.; Hadjioannou, L.; Trkov, D.; Garmandia, M.K.; Rizzo, M.; et al. Unpublished Mediterranean records of marine alien and cryptogenic species. *BioInvasions Rec.* 2020, 9, 165–182. [CrossRef]

28. Galil, B.S.; Boero, F.; Campbell, M.L.; Carlton, J.T.; Cook, E.; Fraschetti, S.; Gollasch, S.; Hewitt, C.L.; Jelmert, A.; Macpherson, E.; et al. ‘Double trouble’: The expansion of the Suez Canal and marine bioinvasions in the Mediterranean Sea. *Biol. Invasions 2015*, 17, 973–976. [CrossRef]

29. Masters, G.; Norgrove, L. Climate change and invasive alien species. *CABI Work. Pap.* 2010, 1, 30.

30. Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A.; Galil, B.S. Marine alien species as an aspect of global change. *Adv. Oceanogr. Limnol. Adv. Oceanogr. Limnol. 2010*, 1, 199–218. [CrossRef]

31. Gravili, C. Alien jellyfish in expansion: The contribution of taxonomy to ecology. In *Jellyfish: Ecology, Distribution Patterns and Human Interactions*; Mariotti, G.L., Ed.; Nova Publishers: New York, NY, USA, 2017; pp. 27–49.

32. Ponti, M.; Perlini, R.A.; Ventra, V.; Grech, D.; Abbati, M.; Cerrano, C. Ecological shifts in Mediterranean coralligenous assemblages related to gorgonian forest loss. *PLoS ONE 2014*, 9, e102782. [CrossRef]

33. Boero, F. The future of the Mediterranean Sea ecosystem: Towards a different tomorrow. *Rend. Fis. Acc. Lincei 2015*, 26, 3–12. [CrossRef]

34. Dukes, J.S.; Mooney, H.A. Does global change increase the success of biological invaders? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 1999, 14, 135–139. [CrossRef]

35. Cox, G.W. *Alien Species and Evolution: The Evolutionary Ecology of Exotic Plants, Animals, Microbes, and Interacting Native Species*; Island Press: Washington, DC, USA, 2004.

36. Mannino, A.; Balistrieri, P.; Deidun, A. The marine biodiversity of the Mediterranean Sea in a changing climate: The impact of biological invasions. In *Mediterranean Identities—Environment, Society, Culture*; Fuerst-Bjelis, B., Ed.; IntechOpen: Zagabria, Croatia, 2017; pp. 101–127.

37. Galil, B.S. Seeing Red: Alien species along the Mediterranean coast of Israel. *Aquat. Invasions 2007*, 2, 281–312. [CrossRef]

38. Zenetos, A.; Pancucci-Papadopoulou, M.A.; Zagoris, S.; Papastergiadou, E.; Vardakas, L.; Aligizaki, K.; Economou, A. Aquatic alien species in Greece: Tracking sources, patterns and effects on the ecosystem. *J. Biol. Res. Thessalon.* 2009, 12, 135–172.

39. Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A.; Marchini, A.; Castelli, A.; Chimenz, C.; Cormaci, M.; Froglia, C.; Furnari, G.; Gambi, M.C.; Giaccone, G.; et al. Alien species along the Italian coasts: An overview. *Biol. Invasions 2011*, 13, 215–237. [CrossRef]

40. Zenetos, A.; Gofas, S.; Verlaque, M.; Cinar, M.E.; Garcia Raso, J.E.; Bianchi, C.N.; Morri, C.; Azzurro, E.; Bilecenoglu, M.; Froglia, C.; et al. Alien species in the Mediterranean Sea by 2010. A contribution to the application of European Union’s Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD). Part I. Spatial distribution. *Mediterr. Mar. Sci.* 2010, 112, 381–493. [CrossRef]

41. Appeltans, W.; Bouchet, P.; Boxshall, G.A.; De Broyer, C.; de Voogd, N.J.; Gordon, D.P.; Høeckema, B.W.; Horton, T.; Kennedy, M.; Mees, J.; et al. (Eds.) World Register of Marine Species. 2012. Available online: http://www.marinespecies.org (accessed on 17 October 2020).

42. Spalding, M.D.; Fox, H.E.; Allen, G.R.; Davidson, N.; Ferdaña, Z.A.; Finlayson, C.; Halpern, B.S.; Jorge, M.A.; Lombana, A.; Lourie, S.A.; et al. Marine ecoregions of the world: A bioregionalization of coastal and shelf areas. *BioScience 2007*, 57, 573–583. [CrossRef]

43. MSFD. *Technical Document on the Delineation of MSFD Article 4 Marine Regions and Subregions*; Jensen, H.M., Panagiotidis, P., Eds.; 16/05/2017. Version 1.0; European Environment Agency: København, Denmark, 2017; 21p.

44. CBD. *Pathways of Introduction of Invasive Species, Their Prioritization and Management*; UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/9/Add.1; CBD: Montreal, QC, Canada, June 2014; 18p.

45. Boero, F.; Brotz, L.; Gibbons, M.J.; Piraino, S.; Zampardi, S. Impacts and effects of ocean warming on jellyfish. In *Explaining Ocean Warming: Causes, Scale, Effects and Consequences*; Lagiffole, D., Baxter, J.M., Eds.; IUCN: Gland, Switzerland, 2016; pp. 213–237.

46. Balistrieri, P.; Spiga, A.; Deidun, A.; Gueroun, S.K.; Yahia, M.N.D. Further spread of the venomous jellyfish *Rhopilema nomadica* Galil, Spanner & Ferguson, 1990 (Rhizostomae, Rhizostomatidae) in the western Mediterranean. *BioInvasions Rec.* 2017, 6, 19–24. [CrossRef]

47. Malej, A.; Tirelli, V.; Lučić, D.; Paliaga, P.; Vodopivec, M.; Goruppi, A.; Sara, A.; Benzi, M.; Bettosso, N.; Camatti, E.; et al. *Mnemiopsis leidyi* in the northern Adriatic: Here to stay? *J. Sea Res.* 2017, 124, 10–16. [CrossRef]

48. Morri, C.; Puce, S.; Bianchi, C.N.; Bitar, G.; Zibrowius, H.; Bavestrello, G. Hydroids (Cnidaria: Hydrozoa) from the Levant Sea (mainly Lebanon), with emphasis on alien species. *J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. U.K.* 2009, 89, 49–62. [CrossRef]

49. Schmidt, H.E.; Benović, A. Notes on the Hydromedusae (Cnidaria) from the Adriatic Sea. *J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. U.K.* 1977, 57, 635–640. [CrossRef]

50. Dallot, S.; Goy, J.; Carré, C. Peuplements de carnivores planctoniques gléateux et structures productives en Méditerranée occidentale. *Oceanol. Acta 1988*, 88, 31, 299.
83. González-Duarte, M.M.; Megina, C.; Bethencourt, M. Sertularia marginata (Cnidaria: Hydrozoa) in the Mediterranea: An alien species in expansion? *Medit. Mar. Sci.* 2013, 14, 384–389. [CrossRef]

84. Lakkis, S. Contribution à l’étude du zooplancton des eaux libanaises. *Mar. Biol. Berl.* 1971, 11, 138–148.

85. Rediet, L. Hydraelles et bryozoaides de Méditerranée. II—Banyuls-sur-Mer. *Cah. Nat.* 1962, 18, 33–38.

86. Medel, M.D.; Vervoort, W. Plumarian hydroids (Cnidaria: Hydrozoa) from the Strait of Gibraltar and nearby areas. *Zool. Verh. Leiden* 1995, 300, 1–72.

87. Galil, B.S.; Gershwin, L.-A.; Zorea, M.; Rahav, A.; Rothman, S.B.-S.; Fine, M.; Lubinevsky, H.; Douek, J.; Paz, G.; Rinkevich, B. *Cotylorhiza erythrea* Stiasny, 1920 (Scyphozoa: Rhizostomeae: Cepheidae), yet another erythraean jellyfish from the Mediterranean coast of Israel. *Mar. Biodiv.* 2017, 47, 229–235. [CrossRef]

88. Galil, B.S.; Gershwin, L.-A.; Douek, J.; Rinkevich, B. *Marivagia stellata* gen. et sp. nov. (Scyphozoa: Rhizostomeae: Cepheidae), another alien jellyfish from the Mediterranean coast of Israel. *Aquat. Invasions* 2010, 5, 331–340. [CrossRef]

89. Zaatari, M. Odd Marine Changes Strike Coast of Sidon. *The Daily Star Lebanon*. 17 October 2010. Available online: https://www.dailystar.com.lb/News/Lebanon-News/2010/Oct-07/59848-odd-marine-changes-strike-coast-of-sidon.ashx (accessed on 17 October 2020).

90. Bitar, G.; Badreddine, A. First record of *Marivagia stellata* Galil and Gershwin, 2010 (Scyphozoa: Rhizostomeae: Cepheidae) from the Lebanese waters in the eastern Mediterranean Sea. *J. Black Sea/Mediterr. Environ.* 2019, 25, 172–177.

91. Mamish, S.; Durgham, H.; Al-Masri, M.S. First record of the new alien sea jelly species *Marivagia stellata* Galil and Gershwin, 2010 off the Syrian coast. *Mar. Biodivers. Rec.* 2016, 9, 23. [CrossRef]

92. Hoeksema, B.W.; Ocaña Vicente, O. First record of the Central Indo-Pacific reef coral *Oulastrea crispata* in the Mediterranean Sea. *Mediterr. Mar. Sci.* 2014, 15, 429–436. [CrossRef]

93. Bianchi, C.N. Proposta di suddivisione dei mari italiani in settori biogeografici. *Notiziario SIBM* 1992, 153–173. [CrossRef]

94. Serrano, E.; Ribes, M.; Coma, R. Demographics of the zooxanthellate coral *Oculina patagonica* in the Mediterranean Sea. *Mar. Biol.* 2001, 138, 1195–1203. [CrossRef]

95. Fine, M.; Zibrowius, H.; Loya, Y. *Oculina patagonica*: A non-lessepsian scleractinian coral invading the Mediterranean Sea. *Mar. Biol.* 2011, 159, 257–267. [CrossRef]

96. Salomidi, M.; Katsanevakis, S.; Issaris, Y.; Tsiamis, K. Anthropogenic disturbance of coastal habitats promotes the spread of the introduced scleractinian coral *Oculina patagonica* in the Mediterranean Sea. *Biol. Invasions* 2013, 15, 1961–1971. [CrossRef]

97. Serrano, E.; Coma, R.; Ribes, M. Pattern of *Oculina patagonica* occurrence along the Iberian peninsula coastline: A first step to understand the factors affecting its invasion dynamics. *Rapp. Comm. Int. Mer Mediterr.* 2013, 40, 603.

98. Rubio-Portillo, E.; Vazquez, M.; Valle, C. Growth and bleaching of the coral *Oculina patagonica* under different environmental conditions in the western Mediterranean Sea. *Mar. Biol.* 2014, 161, 1333–2343. [CrossRef]

99. Armoza-Zvuloni, R.; Segal, R.; Kramarsky-Winter, E.; Loya, Y. Repeated bleaching events may result in high tolerance and notable gametogenesis in stony corals: *Oculina patagonica* as a model. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 2011, 426, 149–159. [CrossRef]

100. Coma, R.; Serrano, E.; Linares, C.; Ribes, M.; Díaz, D.; Ballesteros, E. Sea urchins predation facilitates coral invasion in a marine reserve. *PLoS ONE* 2011, 6, e22017. [CrossRef]

101. Airi, V.; Gizzi, F.; Marchini, C.; Goffredo, S. Sexual reproduction of Mediterranean scleractinian corals. In *The Cnidaria, Past, Present and Future*; Goffredo, S., Z. Dubinsky, Eds.; Springer International Publishing: Cham, Switzerland, 2016; pp. 269–278. [CrossRef]

102. Quintanilla, E.; Gili, J.M.; López-González, P.J.; Tsounis, G.; Madurell, T.; Fiorillo, I.; Rossi, S. Sexual reproductive cycle of the epibiotic soft coral, *Alcyonium coralloides* (Octocorallia, Alcyonacea), growing on the Mediterranean gorgonian *Paramuricea clavata*. *Aquat. Biol.* 2013, 18, 113–124. [CrossRef]

103. Rossi, S.; Isla, E.; Bosch-Belmar, M.; Galli, G.; Gori, A.; Cristina, M.; Ingrosso, G.; Milisenda, G.; Piraino, S.; Rizzo, L.; et al. Changes of energy fluxes in the marine animal forest of the Anthropocene: Factors shaping the future seascape. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 2019, 76, 2008–2019. [CrossRef]

104. Serrano, E.; Ribes, M.; Coma, R. Demographics of the zooxanthellate coral *Oculina patagonica* along the Mediterranean Iberian coast in relation to environmental parameters. *Sci. Total Environ.* 2018, 634, 1580–1592. [CrossRef]

105. Bianchi, C.N.; Azzola, A.; Parravicini, V.; Peirano, A.; Morri, C.; Montefalcone, M. Abrupt change in a subtidal rocky reef community coincided with a rapid acceleration of sea water warming. *Diversity* 2019, 11, 215. [CrossRef]

106. Dragičević, B.; Anadoli, O.; Angel, D.; Benabdı, M.; Bitar, G.; Castriota, L.; Crocetta, F.; Deidun, A.; Jakov, D.; Edelist, D.; et al. New Mediterranean Biodiversity Records (December 2019). *Mediterr. Mar. Sci.* 2019, 20, 645–656. [CrossRef]

107. Ramil, F.; Vervoort, W. Report on the Hydroidea collected by the “BALGIM” expedition in and around the Strait of Gibraltar. *Zool. Verh. Leiden* 1992, 277, 1–262.

108. Bouillon, J.; Medel, M.D.; Pages, F.; Gili, J.-M.; Boero, F.; Gravili, C. Fauna of the Mediterranean Hydrozoa. *Sci. Mar.* 2004, 68 (Suppl. 2), 5–438.

109. Galil, B.S. Alien species in the Mediterranean Sea—Which, when, where, why? *Hydrobiologia* 2008, 606, 105–116. [CrossRef]

110. UNEP/MAP/MED POL. Mariculture in the Mediterranean. *MAP Tech. Rep. Ser.* 2004, 140, 80.

111. Azzurro, E.; Maynou, F.; Belmaker, J.; Golani, D.; Crooks, J.A. Lag times in Lessepsian fish invasion. *Biol. Invasions* 2016, 18, 2761–2772. [CrossRef]
Water 2021, 13, 1062

112. Zenetos, A.; Gratsia, E.; Cardoso, A.; Tsiamis, K. Time lags in reporting of biological invasions: The case of Mediterranean Sea. *Mediterr. Mar. Sci.* 2019, 20, 469–475. [CrossRef]

113. EU. Council Regulation (EC) No 708/2007 of 11 June 2007 concerning use of alien and locally absent species in aquaculture. *OJEU Off. J. Eur. Union* 2007, 168, 1–17.

114. Savini, D.; Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A.; Marchini, A.; Tricarico, E.; Gherardi, F.; Olenin, S.; Gollasch, S. The top 27 animal alien species introduced into Europe for aquaculture and related activities. *J. Appl. Ichthyol.* 2010, 26, 1–7. [CrossRef]

115. MEPC. *Guidelines for the Control and Management of Ships’ Biofouling to Minimize the Transfer of Invasive Aquatic Species*; Annex 26. Resolution MEPC.207(62); Marine Environment Protection Committee: London, UK, 15 July 2011; 25p.

116. Mineur, F.; Johnson, M.P.; Maggs, C.A. Macroalgal introductions by hull fouling on recreational vessels: Seaweeds and sailors. *Environ. Manag.* 2008, 42, 667–676. [CrossRef]

117. Murray, C.C.; Pakhomov, E.A.; Therriault, T.W. Recreational boating: A large unregulated vector transporting marine invasive species. *Divers. Distrib.* 2011, 17, 1161–1176. [CrossRef]

118. Gravili, C.; Di Camillo, C.G.; Piraino, S.; Boero, F. Hydrozoan species richness in the Mediterranean Sea: Past and present. *Mar. Ecol.* 2013, 34 (Suppl. 1), 41–62. [CrossRef]

119. Foster, V.; Giesler, R.J.; Wilson, A.M.W.; Nall, C.R.; Cook, E.J. Identifying the physical features of marina infrastructure associated with the presence of non-native species in the UK. *Mar. Biol.* 2016, 163, 173. [CrossRef]

120. Buonocore, E.; Franzese, P.P.; Russo, G.F. Marine ecosystem services: Understanding the value of nature. *Water* 2021. In press.

121. Gonzalez-Duarte, M.M.; Megina, C.; López-González, P.J.; Galil, B. Cnidarian alien species in expansion. In *The Cnidaria, Past, Present and Future.* The world of Medusa and her sisters; Goffredo, S., Dubinsky, Z., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2016; pp. 139–160.

122. Moura, C.J.; Cuhna, M.R.; Porteiro, F.M.; Rogers, A.D. A molecular phylogenetic appraisal of the systematics of the *Aglaopheniidae* (Cnidaria: Hydrozoa, Leptothecata) from the north-east Atlantic and west Mediterranean. *Zool. J. Linnean Soc.* 2012, 164, 717–727. [CrossRef]

123. Byers, J.E.; Noonburg, E.G. Scale dependent effects of biotic resistance to biological invasion. *Ecology* 2003, 84, 1428–1433. [CrossRef]

124. Corriero, G.; Pierri, C.; Accoroni, S.; Alabiso, G.; Bavestrello, G.; Barbone, E.; Bastianini, M.; Bazzoni, A.M.; Bernardi Aubry, F.; Boero, F.; et al. Ecosystem vulnerability to alien and invasive species: A case study on marine habitats along the Italian coast. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* 2015, 26, 392–409. [CrossRef]

125. Levine, J.M. Species diversity and biological invasions: Relating local process to community pattern. *Science* 2000, 288, 852–854. [CrossRef]

126. Shea, K.; Chesson, P. Community ecology theory as a framework for biological invasions. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 2002, 17, 170–176. [CrossRef]

127. Thieltges, D.W.; Strasser, M.; Reise, K. How bad are invaders in coastal waters? The case of the American slipper limpet *Crepidula fornicator* in western Europe. *Biol. Invasions* 2006, 8, 1673–1680. [CrossRef]

128. Schlaepfer, M.A.; Sax, D.F.; Olden, J.D. The potential conservation value of non-native species. *Conserv. Biol.* 2011, 25, 428–437. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

129. McLaughlan, C.; Gallardo, B.; Aldridge, D.C. How complete is our knowledge of the ecosystem services impacts of Europe’s top 10 invasive species? *Acta Oecol.* 2013, 54, 119–130. [CrossRef]

130. Thomsen, M.S.; Byers, J.E.; Schiel, D.R.; Bruno, J.F.; Olden, J.D.; Wernberg, T.; Silliman, B.R. Impacts of marine invaders on biodiversity depend on trophic position and functional similarity. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 2014, 495, 39–47. [CrossRef]

131. Pimentel, D.; Lach, L.; Zuniga, R.; Morrison, D. Environmental and economic costs of nonindigenous species in the United States. *BioScience* 2000, 50, 53–65. [CrossRef]

132. Stachowicz, J.J.; Byrnes, J.E. Species diversity, invasion success, and ecosystem functioning: Disentangling the influence of resource competition, facilitation, and extrinsic factors. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 2006, 311, 251–262. [CrossRef]

133. Galil, B.S. Loss or gain? Invasive aliens and biodiversity in the Mediterranean Sea. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 2007, 55, 314–322. [CrossRef]

134. Thomsen, M.S.; Olden, J.D.; Wernberg, T.; Griffin, J.N.; Silliman, B.R. A broad framework to organize and compare ecological invasion impacts. *Environ. Res.* 2011, 111, 899–908. [CrossRef]

135. Perrings, C.; Williamson, M.; Barbier, E.B.; Delfino, D.; Dalmazzzone, S.; Shogren, J.; Simmons, P.; Watkinson, A. Biological invasion risks and the public good: An economic perspective. *Conserv. Ecol.* 2002, 6, 1. [CrossRef]

136. Dick, J.T.A.; Alexander, M.E.; Jeschke, J.M.; Ricciardi, A.; Maclsaac, H.J.; Robinson, T.B.; Kumschick, S.; Weyl, O.L.F.; Dunn, A.M.; Hatcher, M.J.; et al. Advancing impact prediction and hypothesis testing in invasion ecology using a comparative functional response approach. *Bio. Invasions 2014, 16, 735–753. [CrossRef]*

137. Ojaveer, H.; Galil, B.S.; Campbell, M.L.; Carlton, J.T.; Canning-Clode, J.; Cook, E.J.; Davidson, A.D.; Hewitt, C.L.; Jelmert, A.; Marchini, A.; et al. Classification of non-indigenous species based on their impacts: Considerations for application in marine management. *PloS Biol.* 2015, 13, e1002130. [CrossRef]

138. Giakoumi, S.; Katsanevakis, S.; Albano, P.G.; Azzurro, E.; Cardoso, A.C.; Cebrian, E.; Deidun, A.; Edelst, D.; Francour, P.; Jimenez, C.; et al. Management priorities for marine invasive species. *Sci. Total Environ.* 2019, 688, 976–982. [CrossRef]

139. Giangrande, A.; Pierri, C.; Del Pasqua, M.; Gravili, C.; Gambi, M.C.; Gravina, M.F. The Mediterranean in check: Biological invasions in a changing sea. *Mar. Ecol.* 2020, 41, e12583. [CrossRef]
140. Davis, M.A.; Grime, J.P.; Thompson, K. Fluctuating resources in plant communities: A general theory of invisibility. *J. Ecol.* 2000, 88, 528–534. [CrossRef]
141. Zaiko, A.; Olenin, S.; Daunys, D.; Nalepa, T. Vulnerability of benthic habitats to the aquatic invasive species. *Biol. Invasions* 2007, 9, 703–714. [CrossRef]
142. Paolucci, E.M.; MacIsaac, K.J.; Ricciardi, A. Origin matters: Alien consumers inflict greater damage on prey populations than do native consumers. *Divers. Distrib.* 2013, 19, 988–995. [CrossRef]
143. Simberloff, D. Biological invasions: What’s worth fighting and what can be won? *Ecol. Eng.* 2014, 65, 112–121. [CrossRef]
144. Carosi, A.; Ghetti, L.; Lorenzoni, M. The role of climate changes in the spread of freshwater fishes: Implications for alien cool and warm-water species in a Mediterranean basin. *Water* 2021, 13, 347. [CrossRef]
145. Ceccherelli, G.; Campo, D. Different effects of *Caulerpa racemosa* on two co-occurring seagrasses in the Mediterranean. *Bot. Mar.* 2002, 45, 71–76. [CrossRef]
146. Grosholz, E. Ecological and evolutionary consequences of coastal invasions. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 2002, 17, 22–27. [CrossRef]
147. Arenas, F.; Sanchez, I.; Hawkins, S.; Jenkins, S.R. The invasibility of marine algal assemblages: Role of functional diversity and identity. *Ecology* 2006, 87, 2851–2861. [CrossRef]
148. Ricciardi, A.; Cohen, J. The invasiveness of an introduced species does not predict its impact. *Biol. Invasions* 2007, 9, 309–315. [CrossRef]
149. Kumschick, S.; Gaertner, M.; Vilà, M.; Essl, F.; Jeschke, J.M.; Pyšek, P.; Ricciardi, A.; Bacher, S.; Blackburn, T.M.; Dick, J.T.A.; et al. Ecological impacts of alien species: Quantification, scope, caveats, and recommendations. *Bioscience* 2015, 65, 55–63. [CrossRef]
150. Zwierschke, N.; Hollyman, P.R.; Wild, R.; Stringer, R.; Turner, J.R.; King, J.W. Limited impact of an invasive oyster on intertidal assemblage structure and biodiversity: The importance of environmental context and functional equivalency with native species. *Mar. Biol.* 2018, 165, 89. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
151. Bonanno, G.; Orlando-Bonaca, M. Non-indigenous marine species in the Mediterranean Sea—Myth and reality. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 2019, 96, 123–131. [CrossRef]
152. Sagoff, M. Do non-native species threaten the natural environment? *J. Agric. Environ. Ethics* 2005, 18, 215–236. [CrossRef]
153. Walther, G.R.; Roques, A.; Hulme, P.E.; Sykes, M.T.; Pyšek, P.; Kühn, I.; Zobel, M.; Bacher, S.; Botta-Dukát, Z.; Bugmann, H.; et al. Alien species in a warmer world: Risks and opportunities. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 2009, 24, 684–693. [CrossRef]
154. Davis, M.A.; Chew, M.K.; Hobbs, R.J.; Lugo, A.E.; Ewel, J.J.; Vermeij, G.J.; Brown, J.H.; Rosenzweig, M.L.; Gardener, M.R.; Carroll, S.P.; et al. Don’t judge species on their origins. *Nature* 2011, 474, 153–154. [CrossRef]
155. Galil, B.S. Taking stock: Inventory of alien species in the Mediterranean Sea. *Biol. Invasions* 2009, 11, 359–372. [CrossRef]
156. Galil, B.S. The alien crustaceans in the Mediterranean Sea: An historical review. In *In the Wrong Place—Alien Marine Crustaceans: Distribution, Biology and Impacts*; Galil, B.S., Clark, P.F., Carlton, J.T., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Netherlands, 2011; pp. 377–401.
157. Sala, E.; Kizilkaya, Z.; Yildirim, D.; Ballesteros, E. Alien marine fishes deplete algal biomass in the eastern Mediterranean. *PLoS ONE* 2011, 6, e17356. [CrossRef]
158. Killi, N.; Tarkan, A.S.; Kozic, S.; Copp, G.H.; Davison, P.I.; Vilizzi, L. Risk screening of the potential invasiveness of non-native jellyfishes in the Mediterranean Sea. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 2020, 150, 110728. [CrossRef]
159. Ekebom, J. The long and winding road of the ecosystem approach into marine environmental policies. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst* 2013, 23, 1–6. [CrossRef]