

Peer Review

Review of: "Prey Selection of the Invasive Gastropod *Rapana venosa* (Valenciennes 1846) from the Río de la Plata Estuary Under Laboratory Conditions"

Rafael Arocena¹

1. Limnology, Universidad de la República, Uruguay

The manuscript reports a preference of *Rapana* for the clam *Erodona mactroides* over the mussel *Mytilus edulis*. However, a greater biomass of *M. edulis* was consumed. It is unclear how this is possible. Perhaps *Mytilus* individuals are larger than *Erodona*, but this information is not provided. Including the individual wet weights of each species would be helpful.

The experiment was conducted using only three individuals of *Rapana*. Justification is needed to support whether this sample size is sufficient. The container volume is reported as "3l," which is somewhat unclear. If this refers to 3 liters, it would be clearer to write "3 L." Furthermore, it is stated that "the consumed organisms were replaced by new live bivalve organisms," but the timing of this replacement is not specified—whether it occurred immediately or after consumption was noted. Similarly, it is mentioned that prey consumption was recorded through direct observation, but it is not indicated whether this observation was continuous or periodic.

Results & Discussion

Authors say "... the three snails examined consumed a notably higher quantity of *E. mactroides* (57%) in comparison to the intake of *M. edulis* (43%)." It is unclear whether this difference is truly notable or statistically significant. With only three replicates, the results could be due to random variation.

In the reported wet weight consumption (0.19 and 0.3 g wwt/day), it would be clearer to write "0.30" to maintain consistent numerical resolution. Additionally, the method and equipment used to weigh the animals are not specified and should be included.

It is unnecessary to state that “the total daily food ingestion was 0.49 g ww/d,” as this value is easily derived from the previous data: $0.19 + 0.30 = 0.49$.

Instead of saying “the observed **consumption** of clams and mussels was indeed due to **predation**,” it may be more accurate to refer to any observed **decrease** in clams and mussels, since consumption necessarily implies predation, while other causes (e.g., escape, death) could also explain a decrease in individuals.

Other comments and suggestions are included in the file attached.

Attachments: available at <https://doi.org/10.32388/EL1QBT>

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.