Predicting how climate change and globally invasive piscivorous fishes will interact to threaten populations of endemic fishes in a freshwater biodiversity hotspot

Özgür Emiroğlu¹, Sadi Aksu^{2*}, Sercan Başkurt¹, J. Robert Britton³, Ali Serhan Tarkan^{4,5*}

¹Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Faculty of Science, Department of Biology, Eskişehir, Turkey

² Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Vocational School of Health Services, Eskişehir, Turkey
 ³ Department of Life and Environmental Sciences, Bournemouth University, Poole, Dorset, UK

⁴ Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Faculty of Fisheries, Muğla, Turkey

⁵ Department of Ecology and Vertebrate Zoology, Faculty of Biology and Environmental Protection, University of Łódź, Łódź, Poland

* Corresponding author: serhantarkan@gmail.com (ORCID: 0000-0001-8628-0514)

1 Abstract

2

3 Freshwater ecosystems are highly vulnerable to the detrimental impacts of both biological 4 invasions and climate change. Piscivorous alien fishes drive populations of small-bodied native 5 fishes to extinction and warming is already driving extreme temperature events in lakes and 6 rivers globally. Here, we use Ecological Niche Modelling (ENM) to predict how climate change 7 will alter the geographical space of six alien fishes and five native fish genera (which include multiple endemic species) in Turkey, a hotspot of freshwater fish diversity. The models 8 9 predicted that the geographical space of the alien fishes already present in Turkey would 10 generally increase (including pikeperch Sander lucioperca and perch Perca fluviatilis), but with 11 the most substantial increases in largemouth bass Micropterus salmoides, a species not yet 12 present in Turkey but that is invasive in countries nearby and is highly popular for sport angling. 13 For the native fish genera, general predictions were for reduced geographical space, especially 14 in the south and east of the country, suggesting the endemic species will become increasingly 15 imperilled in future. Their populations will also be at increasing risk of deleterious impacts 16 from the alien piscivores, as the predictions were also for increasing overlaps in the 17 geographical space of both the alien fishes and native fish genera. These predictions suggest 18 that the conservation of these endemic species need to consider measures on preventing both 19 the introduction of alien species (e.g. largemouth bass) and the further dispersal of extant alien 20 species (e.g. pikeperch), as well as habitat interventions that will limit the effects of climate 21 change on their populations. These results also indicate that the combination of climate change 22 and alien invasions could have substantial impacts on this – and similar – hotspots of freshwater 23 diversity.

24

Keywords: Ecological Niche Modelling, Biological Invasions, Freshwater conservation,
Impact risk

27 Introduction

28 Freshwater ecosystems are highly vulnerable to the detrimental impacts of climate change 29 (Woodward et al. 2010), with warming already driving extreme temperature events in lakes and 30 rivers around the world (Gudmundsson et al. 2021; Piccolroaz et al. 2020). These are coupled 31 with extreme low flow events in rivers, which have globally been experiencing substantial 32 declines in their fish diversity and population abundances (Su et al. 2021). Contemporary 33 climate change is resulting in many species in the northern hemisphere shifting their 34 distributions to areas of higher latitude (Jaric et al. 2019). However, the climate-driven dispersal 35 of riverine fishes is inherently limited by natural and anthropogenic physical boundaries, 36 resulting in species not shifting their distributions at a pace sufficient to track the rate of 37 warming (Comte et al. 2013). Consequently, climatically vulnerable riverine fishes must also 38 adapt in situ within communities where all species are responding to the altered conditions 39 (Piccolroaz et al. 2020).

40

41 Where climate is a primary driver of species distributions (Hampe et al. 2004), predicting 42 changes in their distributions requires consideration of both current and future climate scenarios 43 (Heikkinen et al. 2006). This is more complex in regions where alien species are frequently 44 introduced and translocated. This is because when these introductions are successful due to the 45 effects of climate change (e.g., due to warming), it is highly likely that the integration of the alien species into the community will result in ecological impacts on native fishes that 46 47 exacerbate the impacts already being caused by warming (Radinger et al. 2019; Radinger & 48 Garcia-Berthou 2020). Moreover, warming temperatures might also release the thermal 49 constraints on some warm-water alien fishes that are already present in temperate freshwaters, 50 facilitating their establishment in areas where the current thermal regime inhibits this (Rahel 51 and Olden 2008). This is already evident in England and Wales for some alien freshwater fish species, including common carp *Cyprinus carpio*, which are now increasingly developing invasive populations through warmer summer temperatures (Skeate et al. 2022). Predicting which of these persistent alien species will go on to develop invasive populations is important for implementing preventative measures to minimise impacts on native species (Spear et al. 2021; Iacarella et al. 2015). These measures are especially important to implement in regions where the assemblages include endemic species that are already threatened by other environmental changes, such as habitat fragmentation (Beatty and Morgan 2013).

59

60 Predatory invasive species have been identified as a major driver of species extinctions, 61 with invasive predatory mammals implicated in the extinction or endangerment of 738 vertebrate species (Doherty et al. 2016). In freshwaters, invasive piscivorous fishes are a key 62 63 driver of fish diversity loss (Britton 2022). For example, invasive peacock basses (*Cichla* spp.) 64 are implicated in the substantial declines (> 90 %) in the diversity and abundance of native and 65 endemic fishes in some hydro-electric reservoirs in southern Brazil (Pelicice and Agostinho 66 2009; Leal et al. 2021). Largemouth bass Micropterus salmoides, a widely introduced invasive 67 sport fish, has similarly been associated with large declines in populations of small-bodied, 68 native prey fishes (Gratwicke and Marshall 2001), including causing extinctions (Hickley et al. 69 2015). Moreover, depending on the species and ecosystem, impacts of alien piscivorous fishes 70 are often predicted to negatively affect prey populations more severely than native fishes due 71 to substantially higher attack and consumption rates (Alexander et al. 2014). Correspondingly, 72 in regions where these alien fishes have been introduced and are persisting but are not yet 73 invasive due to thermal constraints, there is high concern that these species will subsequently 74 develop invasive populations that then have deleterious impacts on native and endemic fish 75 populations (Britton et al. 2010).

77 Climatically constrained but persistent alien species could thus potentially develop 78 invasive populations in future. This can be predicted by climate change models to project shifts 79 in the suitable thermal habitat of these species and hence predict their future distributions (Ruiz-80 Navarro et al. 2016a). When these predictions in shifting geographical space are completed for 81 multiple species across large spatial areas, including endemic and native species, the extent of 82 the spatial overlap in their geographical spaces can predict the extent to which these species are 83 likely to coexist in future (Ruiz-Navarro et al. 2016b). Where an invading species is predicted 84 to expand its geographical space and the extent of its co-existence with endemic species of 85 diminishing geographical space, deleterious impacts on those endemics would then be predicted 86 through both sub-optimal thermal regimes and increased predation pressure (Pysek et al. 2017). 87 The identification of areas of high endemism that coincide with areas of highest invasion risk 88 from persistent alien species can then be prioritised for immediate management actions to 89 reduce these risks. Consequently, the aim of this study was to predict, in a freshwater 90 biodiversity hotspot of high endemism, how climate change will alter the climate space for a 91 range of high impacting alien piscivorous fishes, and overlay these predictions on those of 92 threatened native fish genera. We posit that the geographical space for the alien piscivores will 93 expand through warming to overlap the future distribution areas of the native fish genera, 94 increasing their future interactions that will potentially result in substantially decreased fish 95 diversity and endemism.

96

97 Material and Methods

98 The full roadmap on which analyses were based is summarized in Fig. 1

99

100 Study area and fish species

101 The focal area of study was the country of Turkey, a hotspot of freshwater fish diversity and

102 endemism (Fricke et al. 2007), which has a distinct ichthyofauna that comprises of species 103 present from both Europe and Asia (Smith and Darwall 2006; Cuttelod et al. 2009). To date, 104 384 freshwater fish species have been recorded from Turkey, of which 208 (54%) are endemic 105 and 15 (4%) are alien (Cicek et al. 2020). The country's latitudinal and longitudinal dimensions 106 result in substantial differences in regional climates and so its climate change projections, with 107 these coupled with the presence of large trans-boundary river systems that elevate the risk of 108 introductions of alien fishes from both Asia and Europe. The risk of alien fish introductions is 109 further elevated by government authorized aquaculture and stocking programmes based on both 110 cage aquaculture and capture fisheries, with these acting as major introduction vectors (Tarkan 111 et al. 2015).

112

113 There were six alien fish species selected for use here based on their current and likely 114 coexistence with assemblages of native fish genera (Table S1); these were all of the order 115 Perciformes: ruffe Gymnocephalus cernua, pumpkinseed Lepomis gibbosus, largemouth bass 116 Micropterus salmoides, European perch Perca fluviatilis, Chinese sleeper Perccottus glenii and 117 pikeperch Sander lucioperca. All of these fishes are piscivorous and the majority have 118 deleterious and top-down impacts on small-bodied prey fish populations. Largemouth bass and 119 Chinese sleeper have yet to be introduced, ruffe is present in the European regions only, with 120 the remaining species all present across the country with populations either stable (pikeperch) 121 or increasing (perch and pumpkinseed). All of these are temperate species, except for L. 122 gibbosus and G. cernua that have wide temperature tolerances (4-30°C). Occurrence data were 123 collected and modelled at genus-level for the native and endemic species that were all genera 124 within the Cyprinidae family: Alburnoides, Alburnus, Barbus, Gobio and Squalius, within 125 which there are numerous endemic species (Table S2). All modelled species were endemics of 126 restricted distribution belonging to native fish genera and were all temperate.

128 Fish distribution data

129 Data on the occurrences of the selected alien fishes were obtained from a combination of 130 sampling (for the species already present within Turkey) and global databases (e.g. the Global 131 Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF, https://www.gbif.org/) (Table S3), where all records 132 were non-duplicates. The corresponding occurrence unpublished data for native fish genera 133 were obtained from only sampling programmes completed between 2002 and 2021 (Fig. S1) 134 and from literature review. The reviewed literature covered peer-reviewed scientific papers and 135 grey literature (e.g. checklists, institutional reports, conference proceedings), and covered the 136 same time period as the sampling period. These data were then supplemented by data-mining 137 online (e.g. geo-referenced images of alien fishes on social media sites). To sufficiently remove 138 duplicates and avoid sampling bias, the records were rarefied spatially at 5 km intervals by 139 using SDMtoolbox (Brown et al., 2017) in ArcGIS version 10.8.1 (ESRI, 2020). For alien 140 species, the total number of occurrence records were: perch: 1679; ruffe: 1859; Chinese sleeper: 141 812; largemouth bass: 1788; pikeperch: 3230; and pumpkinseed: 1162. For the native fish 142 genera, the total number of occurrence records were Squalius: 739; Alburnoides: 139; Gobio: 143 100; and Alburnus: 513. Note that for all of the native species of Table S1, their data were used 144 at the genera level for the predictive modelling. This was because there were too few occurrence 145 points for many of the endemic species to be useful at that taxonomic level and, given the high 146 ecological and morphological characteristics of these species at the genus level, their 147 occurrence data were able to be combined without compromising the relevance of the outputs.

148

149 Climate data

150 The climate data used were 19 bioclimate variables (Table S4), downloaded from WorldClim 151 database version 2.1 (Fick and Hijmans 2017), and that had a spatial resolution of 2.5' (~4.63 152 km at the equator). These data were then clipped to the study area and their correlations tested 153 in order to reduce the multicollinearity; where variables were highly correlated (r > 0.7), one of 154 these variables was removed based on the relevancy of the variable to distribution of modelled 155 species from the SDM toolbox (Brown et al. 2017). This resulted in 8 climate variables being 156 used for both sets of species (Table S5). It acknowledged, however, that the retained climate 157 variables are unlikely to be the only determinants of the distribution of these species (Pont et 158 al. 2006), with other abiotic and biotic variables likely to also be influential, although they could 159 not be incorporated into the models used (Wu et al. 2019).

160

161 The climate change projections used were for the years 2050 (2041-2060) and 2100 162 (2081-2100), using the lower and the upper limits of the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways 163 (SSPs; SSP126 and SSP585) that were obtained from eight different global climate models 164 (GCMs): BCC-CSM2-MR (Wu et al. 2019), CNRM-CM6-1 (Voldoire et al. 2019) CNRM-165 ESM2-1 (Seferian et al. 2019), CanESM5 (Swart et al. 2019), IPSL-CM6A-LR (Boucher et al. 166 2020), MIROC-ES2L (Tachiiri et al. 2019), MIROC6 (Shiogama et al. 2019), MRI-ESM2-0 167 (Yukimoto et al. 2019). These models represent a gradual decrease in CO₂ emissions and 168 largely higher CO₂ respectively, and were used at a resolution of 2.5 (CarbonBrief 2016; 169 https://www.worldclim.org/data/worldclim21.html). SSPs were used in the 6th Assessment 170 Report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 2017), with these data from 171 Phase 6 of the Combined Model Comparison Project (CMIP6) (Eyring et al. 2016; CarbonBrief 172 2016). The selection of CMIP6 models over CMIP5 models was primarily through their higher 173 equilibrium climate sensitivity (ECS) (Carbonbrief, 2016), where model averages with low, 174 medium and high ESC values were used.

175

176 Geographical space modelling

177 Predicted changes in the geographical space of the alien fishes and native fish genera 178 were determined in bioclimate ensemble (i.e. consensus) (Marmion et al. 2009), as ensemble 179 models overcome the variability of predictions that might occur between single models (Ruiz-180 Navarro et al. 2016b). Predictions of current and future fish species distributions were from 10 181 algorithms in the biomod2 package (Thuiller et al. 2014) in R 2020: (1) generalized linear 182 models (GLM), (2) Generalized Boosting Model (GBM), (3) random forests (RF), (4) 183 generalized additive models (GAM), (5) classification tree analysis (CTA), (6) multivariate 184 adaptive regression splines (MARS), (7) artificial neural networks (ANN), (8) Maximum 185 entropy (MAXENT.Phillips.2), (9) BIOCLIM (SRE) and (10) Flexible Discriminant Analysis 186 (FDA). Evaluation of the models used the area under the ROC curve ('AUC)' and the true skill 187 statistic (TSS). AUC values range between 0 and 1, where 1 indicates 100 % accuracy and 188 values ≤ 0.5 indicate predictive discrimination that is no better than a random guess (Ruiz-189 Navarro et al. 2016a). TSS values also vary between 0 and 1, with higher values indicating 190 higher predictive ability, with values <0.2 having no predictive ability (TSS < 0.2) (Ben Rais 191 Lasram et al. 2010; Lin et al. 2019). The variable importance of the included predictors in the 192 ensemble model of each species were defined using the variables importance function. Model 193 evaluation also used Cohen's Kappa (Heidke skill score) (KAPPA), using an 80:20 split of 194 training to test data (Allouche et al. 2006). We created a community of different algorithms by 195 calculating the weighting of the single models that had a ROC (or AUC) value higher than 0.7. 196 The model outputs of the distribution-climate modelling for each alien species and native genus 197 for each climate change projection was the simulated extent of the spatial area of Turkey and 198 Europe (as calibration areas) that populations of these fishes occupy in current climate 199 conditions, and their predicted spatial distribution under each climate change projection. These 200 outputs, therefore, indicate the extent of simulated current versus predicted projection for each 201 species. If a single model had a ROC assessment point below 0.7 then it was removed from the ensemble model. However, it was not case for the present study (*cf.* Table 1). In the study,
pseudo-absence points were used as much as the occurrence point. Each pseudo absence point
was randomly generated with 3 replicates.

205

206 The habitat suitability area of each species was determined by using the minimum threshold value of 0.1 (as the minimum for each species in the ArcMap version 10.8.1), obtained 207 208 after the modeling of all species. The compatibility area was calculated by the controlled 209 classification (maximum likelihood classification) method in ArcMap after .shp values were 210 converted to a polygon file. Polygon data of alien species and native fish genera were combined 211 separately using the 'merge function' in ArcMap. Comparisons in overlapping habitats were 212 completed between alien and endemic fish species across Turkey based on all examined 213 scenarios. It was calculated as the number of overlapping squares in the new predicted range of 214 species and this was represented as percent of overlapping range suggesting interaction 215 probability (0-25.0% = 1, 25.1-50.0% = 2, 50.1-75.0 = 3, 75.1-100% = 4).

217 Results

218 Ensemble model predictions

219 Amongst the native genera, the Alburnoides genus and Squalius genus were predicted to have 220 substantial reductions in their geographical space under future conditions (Fig. S2-7; Table 2). 221 In the alien fishes, there were species-specificity in their predicted geographical spaces with, 222 for example, the widest geographical space for ruffe being in current conditions (Table 2, Fig. 223 S2), whereas for largemouth bass and pumpkinseed it was in future conditions (SSPs 585 2100 224 and SSPs 126 2100 respectively; Table 2, Fig. S3, S4). In general, the alien fishes with patterns 225 of increased geographical space under the projected scenarios had increases that were in more 226 southerly and easterly directions, whereas the native genera had predictions in these directions 227 of decreasing geographical space (Table 2). The climate variables that contributed most to the 228 predictions of shifts in geographical space are provided in Fig. 2.

229

230 Overlapping geographical space for alien and native fish genera

231 The geographical space overlaps of alien largemouth bass and the native Alburnoides genus 232 was at the highest probability in the 585 2100 scenario and it was generally above 2 (i.e. more 233 than 50% probability). The other native genera were generally less affected by the geographical 234 space increases of the alien species (interaction probability ≤ 2), other than for the *Gobio* genus 235 that had more than 50% encountering probability with alien perch and pikeperch in the 236 126 2050 scenario (Table 3). The highest extent of geographical space overlaps between all of 237 the alien species and the native genera, and thus where there is the highest risk of deleterious 238 impacts on the endemic species, was in the 126 2100 scenario, followed by the 126 2050, 239 585 2050 and 585 2100 scenarios. These predictions suggest that the risk of ecological 240 impacts will be higher in future, with this risk elevated above current conditions in all of Turkey 241 except for eastern areas (Fig. 3). However, all scenarios predicted that the native genera would have a high risk of impacts from alien percids (Fig. 3, S2-7).

243

244 **Discussion**

245

246 The Ecological Niche Modelling (ENM) that were applied to different climate change 247 projections for both modelled native genera and invasive freshwater fishes in Turkey predicted 248 that their shifts on geographical space were species-specific, with a general pattern of increases 249 for the alien species and decreases for the native genera. For the alien species, predictions 250 ranged from relatively small increases in geographical space (Chinese sleeper) to relatively 251 large (largemouth bass), and where changes in the annual range of temperature was the most 252 important variable in the ensemble model predictions. This was in contrast to the native genera, 253 where the combination of precipitation in the driest month and annual mean temperature was 254 most influential. Notwithstanding, it is considered likely that the distributions of these alien species are likely to shift through a combination of anthropogenic-mediated dispersal (usually 255 256 between catchments) and natural dispersal (within catchments) (Tarkan et al. 2015), although 257 the models were limited to only two dispersal scenarios (no dispersal/ full dispersal). Thus, 258 future predictive models should be developed to also include the influence of hydrological 259 connectivity (Dominguez Almela et al. 2020; 2022).

260

There are a number of factors that are already altering the composition of riverine fish communities in Turkey, including river impoundments (such as the presence of weirs that impede migratory species), introductions of alien species (Tarkan et al. 2015), pollution, and habitat modification (Aksu 2020; 2021). However, these generally influence fish population abundances, community structure and trait expression, rather than presence (Tarkan et. al. 2012). In general, ENM is considered as suitable for predicting how climate change will 267 influence the distributions of fish species in marine and freshwater ecosystems (Rahel and 268 Olden 2008; Jones et al. 2013; Elliott et al. 2015), especially where the distributions of these 269 species are strongly temperature driven and so influenced by latitudinal and altitudinal gradients 270 (Chen et al. 2011; Forister et al. 2010). However, species-specific characters (physiological 271 tolerance, resilience) and sensitivity to environmental changes can also have a crucial role for 272 the direction and magnitude of range shifts (Comte and Grenouillet 2015). Here, more complex, 273 interactive relationships between explanatory environmental factors (e.g. temperature versus 274 precipitation) for the species concerned and their temporal pattern (i.e. size of distributional 275 ranges) would need consideration (Conti et al. 2015). For all native genera, predictions 276 suggested some temperature thresholds might exist, given their predicted expansions of 277 geographical space under low emission projections, but constrictions under high emissions. A 278 recent meta-analysis suggested that the ability of species distribution models, such as ENM, to 279 predict occurrence can be low, with predictions being best used as hypotheses to test with 280 independent data, especially when being used to inform conservation decisions (Lee-Yaw et al. 281 2021). In the context of the present study, the spatial extent of Turkey and the complexity of 282 the fish communities present mean that the application of the ENM to inform conservation 283 decisions could be considered as appropriate, given the difficulties of obtaining independent 284 data over and above that already applied here.

285

The most substantial predicted shifts in geographical space were for the alien species in the eastern and southern parts of Turkey, especially for largemouth bass and Chinese sleeper (as they are currently not present there), but also for pumpkinseed, perch and pikeperch that are already present. For largemouth bass, these predictions are consistent with those in the Korean peninsula and South Africa, where mean annual temperature and the maximum temperature of the warmest month were the most influential climate variables (Mamun et al. 2018; Khosa et

al. 2019). The range sizes of all of the alien species and native genera modelled either remain
unchanged or reduced under scenarios of no dispersal, but reductions were only evident in the
native genera under the full dispersal scenario. These reduced geographical spaces in the native
genera are consistent with some recent studies in Iran suggesting that some important habitats
of endemic *Alburnus* and *Albornoides* species will become unsuitable in next decades (Esmaeili
et al. 2018; Yousefi et al. 2020) due to changes in annual precipitation temperatures.

298

299 All of the modelled alien species are piscivorous and so have high potential for causing 300 deleterious, top-down effects on the native fish genera. Given that Turkey is a hotspot of 301 freshwater fish diversity, with almost one-third of species present being local endemics (Cicek 302 et al. 2020), then these climate-based predictions are highly concerning in a conservation 303 context. Although largemouth bass is currently not present in Turkey, it was the alien fish that 304 presented the highest risk under the climate change scenarios as it had the highest predicted 305 overlap in geographical space with the Alburnoides genus that comprises of many local 306 endemics. Listed as one of the 100 worst alien species in the world (Lowe et al. 2000), the 307 primary impact mechanism of largemouth bass is predation pressure exerted by established 308 populations, which is usually sufficient to incur significant ecological impacts in invaded 309 ecosystems. Reported impacts include significant declines in the native cyprinid fish species 310 Alburnus alborella in Italy (Bianco and Ketmaier 2001), which belongs to a close genus with 311 similar body sizes of fish species in *Alburnoides* genus, and also large declines in populations 312 of similar small-bodied, native prey fishes in Southern Africa (Gratwicke and Marshall 2001). 313 Indeed, largemouth bass is commonly considered as causing the displacement, declines and 314 even extirpation of indigenous fish species, including cyprinids, soon after their establishment 315 and invasion (de Leoan et al. 2000; Wittenberg 2005). Should they be introduced into Turkey 316 then it is considered highly likely that this species could drive the extirpation of several threatened native endemics of the *Alburnoides* genus that already have a highly restricted distribution range. Our models also indicated some similar - but of lower magnitude - overlaps in geographical space of existing invaders in Turkey (pikeperch, perch and pumpkinseed) and native genera. Given that both pikeperch and perch predate on similar-sized cyprinid species to largemouth bass (Mustamaki et al. 2014; Nolan and Britton 2018) then they pose a more active threat to the endemic *Alburnoides* species, especially as they increasingly share geographical space in future.

324

325 Our results clearly suggest that conservation measures are necessary to prevent future impacts 326 on the endemic fishes of Turkey from these alien piscivorous fishes. For species such as perch, 327 pikeperch and pumpkinseed, policies and regulations require implementing for preventing their 328 further dispersal through translocations. For largemouth bass and Chinese sleeper that are not 329 present, but are present in countries nearby and, in the case of largemouth bass, is a popular sport fish, then there is a need for introduction prevention, including active surveillance of 330 331 potential points of entry. Local populations of endemic and climate-vulnerable species could 332 be managed actively, such as using managed relocations (MR) to safeguard the species in 333 future, although care would be needed to prevent potential genetic issues through introducing 334 fish between different watersheds (Griffiths et al. 2009). Given there is no such stocking 335 practice on native endemic species in Turkey other than some native trout species (Akkan et al. 336 2016), in situ conservation management could also focus on habitat quality and quantity 337 restoration, particularly in the areas where warming water temperatures (from air temperature 338 increases) degrade the suitable habitats (e.g. Top et al. 2016).

339

340 In conclusion, predictions were for some marked changes in the geographical spaces of the 341 modelled alien species and native genera of freshwater fishes in Turkey, with further 342 predictions that these fishes will increasingly overlap in their geographical space in future, 343 potentially leading to extirpations of endemic species. While some caution is suggested in these 344 results, as they are based on ENM that does not consider other abiotic and biotic variables in 345 their predictions, they nevertheless suggest that conservation measures require implementation 346 to safeguard these endemic fishes. These measures should integrate strategies to prevent new 347 introductions and translocations of alien species, and improve the status of endemic species 348 through assisted translocation and habitat improvement to increase population resilience. While 349 these results are important for conserving aquatic biodiversity in Turkey, they also highlight 350 that similar issues are likely to be present in other biodiversity hotspots in the world affected 351 by alien species and climate change. 352 353 Acknowledgement 354 We thank Dr Baran Yoğurtçuoğlu for his constructive criticism on the early draft of the 355 manuscript.

356

357 Author contributions

Özgür Emiroğlu: Conceptualization, Investigation, Data curation. Sadi Aksu: Methodology,
Visualization, Writing – original draft. Sercan Başkurt: Writing – review & editing,
Visualization. Robert Britton: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing, Supervision.
Ali Serhan Tarkan: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – original draft, review&
editing.

363

364 Data availability

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article and areavailable from the corresponding author.

367

368 **Declarations**

369 Conflict of interest The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the370 content of this article.

- 372 **Consent to publication** All authors have consented to publish this version of the manuscript.
- 373

374 References

- Akkan Ö, Başçınar N, Bulut M, Ümüzer A (2016) Brown trout production, and fish releasing
 in inland waters at forest areas under the project monitoring and control: Artvin-Yusufeli
 study. Journal of Anatolian Environmental and Animal Sciences 1: 83-86
- 378 Aksu S (2020) Fish Fauna of the Upper Porsuk River Basin, *2nd International Symposium on*379 *Biodiversity Research* 18-20 November 2020.
- Aksu S (2021) Current and future potential habitat suitability prediction of an endemic
 freshwater fish species *Seminemacheilus lendlii* (Hankó, 1925) using Maximum Entropy
 Modelling (MaxEnt) under climate change scenarios: implications for conservation.
 Journal of Limnology and Freshwater Fisheries Research 7: 83-91.
- Aksu S, Başkurt S, Emiroğlu Ö, Tarkan AS (2021) Establishment and range expansion of nonnative fish species facilitated by hot springs: the case study from the Upper Sakarya Basin
 (NW, Turkey). Oceanological and Hydrobiological Studies 50: 247-258.
- Alexander ME, Dick JT, Weyl OL, Robinson TB, Richardson DM (2014) Existing and
 emerging high impact invasive species are characterized by higher functional responses
 than natives. Biology Letters 10: 20130946.
- Allouche O, Tsoar A, Kadmon R (2006) Assessing the accuracy of species distribution models:
 prevalence, kappa and the true skill statistic (TSS). Journal of Applied Ecology 43: 12231232.
- Beatty SJ, Morgan DL (2013) Introduced freshwater fishes in a global endemic hotspot and
 implications of habitat and climatic change. BioInvasions Records 2: 1-9.
- Ben Rais Lasram F, Guilhaumon F, Albouy C, Somot S, Thuiller W, Mouillot D (2010) The
 Mediterranean Sea as a 'cul-de-sac'for endemic fishes facing climate change. Global
 Change Biology 16: 3233-3245.
- Bianco PG, Ketmaier V (2001) Anthropogenic changes in the freshwater fish fauna of Italy,
 with reference to the central region and *Barbus graellsii*, a newly established alien species
 of Iberian origin. Journal of Fish Biology 59: 190-208.
- Boucher O, et al. (2020) Presentation and evaluation of the IPSL-CM6A-LR climate model.
 Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems 12: e2019MS002010.
- Britton JR, Cucherousset J, Davies GD, Godard MJ, Copp GH (2010) Non-native fishes and
 climate change: predicting species responses to warming temperatures in a temperate
 region. Freshwater Biology 55: 1130-1141.

- Britton JR (2022). Contemporary perspectives on the ecological impacts of invasive freshwater
 fishes. Journal of Fish Biology https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.15240
- 408 Brown JL, Bennett JR, French CM (2017) SDMtoolbox 2.0: the next generation Python-based
- 409 GIS toolkit for landscape genetic, biogeographic and species distribution model analyses.
 410 PeerJ 5: e4095.
- 411 CarbonBrief (2016). Website https://www.carbonbrief.org/ Eyring, V. et al. Overview of the
 412 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and
 413 organization. Geosci Model De 9: 1937–1958.
- Chen IC, Hill JK, Ohlemüller R, Roy DB, Thomas CD (2011) Rapid range shifts of species
 associated with high levels of climate warming. Science 333: 1024-1026.
- 416 Comte L, Grenouillet G (2013) Do stream fish track climate change? Assessing distribution
 417 shifts in recent decades. Ecography 36: 1236-1246.
- 418 Comte L, Grenouillet G (2015) Distribution shifts of freshwater fish under a variable climate:
 419 Comparing climatic, bioclimatic and biotic velocities. Diversity and Distributions 21:
 420 1014-1026.
- 421 Conti L, Comte L, Hugueny B, Grenouillet G (2015) Drivers of freshwater fish colonisations
 422 and extirpations under climate change. Ecography 38: 510-519.
- 423 Cuttelod A, García N, Malak DA, Temple HJ, Katariya V (2009) The Mediterranean: a
 424 biodiversity hotspot under threat. Wildlife in a Changing World–an analysis of the 2008
 425 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 89: 9.
- de Leoan GPP, Garcíaa-Prieto L, Leóan-Réggagnon V, Choudhury A (2000) Helminth
 communities of native and introduced fishes in Lake Pátzcuaro, Michoacán,
 México. Journal of Fish Biology 57: 303-325.
- Doherty TS, Glen AS, Nimmo DG, Ritchie EG, Dickman CR (2016) Invasive predators and
 global biodiversity loss. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 113: 11261-
- 431 11265.
- 432 Dominguez Almela V, Palmer SC, Gillingham PK, Travis JM, Britton JR (2020) Integrating
 433 an individual-based model with approximate Bayesian computation to predict the invasion
- 434 of a freshwater fish provides insights into dispersal and range expansion dynamics.
- 435 Biological Invasions 22: 1461-1480.
- 436 Dominguez Almela V, Palmer SC, Andreou D, Gillingham PK, Travis JM, Britton JR (2022)
- 437 Predicting the influence of river network configuration, biological traits and habitat quality
 438 interactions on riverine fish invasions. Diversity and Distributions 28: 257-270.
- 439 Çiçek E, Sungur S, Fricke R (2020) Freshwater lampreys and fishes of Turkey; a revised and

- 440 updated annotated checklist 2020. Zootaxa 4809: 241-270.
- 441 Elliott JA, Henrys P, Tanguy M, Cooper J, Maberly SC (2015) Predicting the habitat expansion
- 442 of the invasive roach *Rutilus rutilus* (Actinopterygii, Cyprinidae), in Great Britain.
 443 Hydrobiologia 751: 127-134.
- Esmaeili HR, Gholamhosseini A, Mohammadian-Kalat T, Aliabadian M. (2018) Predicted
 changes in climatic niche of *Alburnus* species (Teleostei: Cyprinidae) in Iran until
 2050. Turkish Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 18: 995-1003.
- Eyring V, Bony S, Meehl GA, Senior CA, Stevens B, Stouffer RJ, Taylor KE (2016) Overview
 of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and
 organization. Geoscientific Model Development 9: 1937-1958.
- 450 Fick SE, Hijmans RJ (2017) WorldClim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for
 451 global land areas. International Journal of Climatology 37: 4302-4315.
- 452 Forister et al. (2010) Compounded effects of climate change and habitat alteration shift patterns
 453 of butterfly diversity. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 107: 2088-2092.
- 454 Fricke R, Bilecenoğlu M, Sarı HM (2007) Annotated checklist of fish and lamprey species
 455 (Gnathostomata and Petromyzontomorphi) of Turkey, including a Red List of threatened
 456 and declining species. Stuttgarter Beitr Naturk Ser A, Nr 706: 1-172.
- Gratwicke B, Marshall BE (2001) The relationship between the exotic predators *Micropterus salmoides* and *Serranochromis robustus* and native stream fishes in Zimbabwe. Journal of
 Fish Biology 58: 68-75.
- Griffiths AM, Koizumi I, Bright D, Stevens JR (2009) A case of isolation by distance and shortterm temporal stability of population structure in brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) within the
 River Dart, southwest England. Evolutionary Applications 2: 537-554.
- Gudmundsson L, et. al. (2021) Globally observed trends in mean and extreme river flow
 attributed to climate change. Science 371: 1159-1162.
- Hampe A (2004) Bioclimate envelope models: what they detect and what they hide. Global
 Ecology and Biogeography 13: 469-471.
- Heikkinen RK, Luoto M, Araújo MB, Virkkala R, Thuiller W, Sykes MT (2006) Methods and
 uncertainties in bioclimatic envelope modelling under climate change. Progress in Physical
 Geography 30: 751-777.
- 470 Hickley P, Britton JR, Macharia S, Muchiri SM, Boar RR (2015) The introduced species fishery
- 471 of Lake Naivasha, Kenya: ecological impact vs socio-economic benefits. Fisheries
 472 Management and Ecology 22: 326-336.
- 473 Iacarella JC, Dick JT, Alexander ME, Ricciardi A (2015) Ecological impacts of invasive alien

- 474 species along temperature gradients: testing the role of environmental matching.
 475 Ecological Applications 25: 706-716.
- 476 IPCC (2017) Scoping of the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) Background, Cross Cutting
- 477 Issues and the AR6 Synthesis Report. Retrieved from
- 478 <u>https://apps.ipcc.ch/eventmanager/documents/47/040820171122-Doc.%206%20-</u>
- 479 <u>%20SYR_Scoping.pdf</u>.
- Jarić I, Lennox RJ, Kalinkat G, Cvijanović G, Radinger J (2019) Susceptibility of European
 freshwater fish to climate change: Species profiling based on life-history and
 environmental characteristics. Global Change Biology 25: 448-458.
- Jones MC, Dye SR, Fernandes JA, Frölicher TL, Pinnegar JK, Warren R, Cheung WW (2013)
 Predicting the impact of climate change on threatened species in UK waters. Plos One 8:
 e54216 (2013).
- Khosa D, Marr SM, Wasserman RJ, Zengeya TA, Weyl OL (2019) An evaluation of the current
 extent and potential spread of Black Bass invasions in South Africa. Biological Invasions
 21: 1721-1736.
- Leal LB, Hoeinghaus DJ, Compson ZG, Agostinho AA, Fernandes R, Pelicice FM (2021)
 Changes in ecosystem functions generated by fish populations after the introduction of a
 non-native predator (*Cichla kelberi*) (Perciformes: Cichlidae). Neotropical Ichthyology 19:
 2021.
- 493 Lee-Yaw JA, McCune JL, Pironon S, Sheth NS (2021) Species distribution models rarely
 494 predict the biology of real populations. Ecography 44: 1-16.
- 495 Lin CT, Chiu CA (2019) The Relic *Trochodendron aralioides* Siebold & Zucc.
 496 (Trochodendraceae) in Taiwan: Ensemble distribution modeling and climate change
 497 impacts. Forests 10: 7.
- Lowe S, Browne M, Boudjelas S, De Poorter M (2000) 100 of the world's worst invasive alien
 species: a selection from the global invasive species database (Vol. 12). Auckland:
 Invasive Species Specialist Group.
- Mamun M, Kim S, An KG (2018) Distribution pattern prediction of an invasive alien species
 largemouth bass using a maximum entropy model (MaxEnt) in the Korean
 peninsula. Journal of Asia-Pacific Biodiversity 11: 516-524.
- Marmion M, Parviainen M, Luoto M, Heikkinen RK, Thuiller W (2009) Evaluation of
 consensus methods in predictive species distribution modelling. Diversity and
 Distributions 15: 59-69.
- 507 Mustamaki N, Cederberg T, Mattila J (2014) Diet, stable isotopes and morphology of Eurasian

- perch (*Perca fluviatilis*) in littoral and pelagic habitats in the northern Baltic
 Proper. Environmental Biology of Fishes 97: 675-689.
- Nolan ET, Britton JR (2018) Diet of invasive pikeperch *Sander lucioperca*: developing nondestructive tissue sampling for stable isotope analysis with comparisons to stomach
 contents analysis. Knowledge & Management of Aquatic Ecosystems 419: 49.
- Pelicice FM, Agostinho AA (2009) Fish fauna destruction after the introduction of a non-native
 predator (*Cichla kelberi*) in a Neotropical reservoir. Biological Invasions 11: 1789-1801.
- 515 Piccolroaz S, Woolway RI, Merchant CJ (2020). Global reconstruction of twentieth century
 516 lake surface water temperature reveals different warming trends depending on the climatic
 517 zone. Climatic Change 160: 427-442.
- Pont D, Hugueny B, Beier U, Goffaux D, Melcher A, Noble R, Rogers C, Roset N, Schmutz S
 (2006) Assessing River biotic condition at a continental scale: a European approach using
 functional metrics and fish assemblages. Journal of Applied Ecology 43: 70-80.
- 521 Pysek P. et al. (2017) Naturalized alien flora of the world: Species diversity, taxonomic and
 522 phylogenetic patterns, geographic distribution and global hotspots of plant invasion. Preslia
 523 89: 203-274.
- R Core Team R (2020) A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
 for Statistical Computing. Version 4.0.3 [software]. 2020 Oct 10 [cited 2020 Oct 14].
 Available from: https://www.R-project.org/.
- Radinger J, Alcaraz-Hernández JD, García-Berthou E (2019) Environmental filtering governs
 the spatial distribution of alien fishes in a large, human-impacted Mediterranean river.
 Diversity and Distributions 25: 701-714.
- Radinger J, García-Berthou E (2020) The role of connectivity in the interplay between climate
 change and the spread of alien fish in a large Mediterranean river. Global Change Biology
 26: 6383-6398.
- Rahel FJ, Olden JD (2008) Assessing the effects of climate change on aquatic invasive species.
 Conservation Biology 22: 521-533.
- Ruiz-Navarro A, Gillingham PK, Britton JR (2016a) Predicting shifts in the climate space of
 freshwater fishes in Great Britain due to climate change. Biological Conservation 203: 3342.
- 538 Ruiz-Navarro A, Gillingham PK, Britton JR (2016b) Shifts in the climate space of temperate
- 539 cyprinid fishes due to climate change are coupled with altered body sizes and growth rates.
 540 Global Change Biology 22: 3221–3232.
- 541 Seferian R et al (2019) Evaluation of CNRM earth system model, CNRM-ESM2-1: Role of

- 542 earth system processes in present-day and future climate. Journal of Advances in Modeling543 Earth Systems 11: 4182-4227.
- Shiogama H, Abe M, Tatebe H (2019) MIROC MIROC6 model output prepared for CMIP6
 ScenarioMIP. Version 20220612. Earth System Grid Federation.
- 546 Skeate ER, Perrow MR, Tomlinson ML, Madgwick G, Harwood AJ, Ottewell D, Berridge R,
 547 Winfield IJ (2022) Fish stocking for recreational angling is culpable for the poor condition
- of many English lakes designated for conservation purposes. Inland Waters 12: 19-32.
- 549 Smith KG, Darwall WR (2006) (eds.). The status and distribution of freshwater fish endemic
 550 to the Mediterranean Basin (Vol. 1). IUCN (2006).
- 551 Spear MJ, Walsh JR, Ricciardi A, Zanden M (2021) The invasion ecology of sleeper 552 populations: prevalence, persistence, and abrupt shifts. BioScience 71: 357-369.
- Su G, Logez M, Xu J, Tao S, Villéger S, Brosse S (2021) Human impacts on global freshwater
 fish biodiversity. Science 371: 835-838.
- Swart NC. et al (2019) CCCma CanESM5 model output prepared for CMIP6 ScenarioMIP,
 Earth System Grid Federation, ssp. 126.
- 557 Tachiiri K. et al (2019) MIROC MIROC-ES2L model output prepared for CMIP6
 558 ScenarioMIP. Earth System Grid Federation. Retrieved from http://cera-www. dkrz.
 559 de/WDCC/meta/CMIP6/CMIP6. ScenarioMIP. MIROC. MIROC-ES2L.
- 560 Tarkan AS, Copp GH, Top N, Özdemir N, Önsoy B, Bilge G, Filiz H, Yapıcı S, Ekmekçi G,
- 561 Kırankaya Ş, Emiroğlu Ö, Gaygusuz Ö, Gürsoy Gaygusuz Ç, Oymak A, Özcan G, Saç G
 562 (2021) Are introduced gibel carp *Carassius gibelio* in Turkey more invasive in artificial
- 562 (2021) Are introduced gibel carp *Carassius gibelio* in Turkey more invasive in artificial
 563 than in natural waters? Fisheries Management and Ecology 19: 178-187.
- Tarkan AS, Marr SM, Ekmekçi FG (2015) Non-native and translocated freshwater fish.
 FiSHMED Fishes in Mediterranean Environments 3: 28.
- 566 Thuiller W, Georges D, Engler R, Breiner F (2014) biomod2: Ensemble platform for species
 567 distribution modeling. R package version 3.1-64. Available at: http://CRANR568 projectorg/package= biomod2.
- Top N, Tarkan AS, Vilizzi L, Karakuş U (2016) Microhabitat interactions of non-native
 pumpkinseed *Lepomis gibbosus* in a Mediterranean-type stream suggest no evidence for
 impact on endemic fishes. Knowledge & Management of Aquatic Ecosystems 417: 36.
- 572 Voldoire A. et al (2019) Evaluation of CMIP6 deck experiments with CNRM-CM6-1. Journal
 573 of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems 11: 2177-2213.
- Wittenberg R (2005) An inventory of alien species and their threat to biodiversity and economy
 in Switzerland. CABI Bioscience Switzerland Centre report to the Swiss Agency for

- 576 Environment, Forests and Landscape. The environment in practice 0629. Bern.
- 577 Woodward G, Perkins DM, Brown LE (2010) Climate change and freshwater ecosystems:
 578 impacts across multiple levels of organization. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal
- 579 Society B: Biological Sciences 365: 2093-2106.
- 580 Wu T. et al. (2019) The Beijing Climate Center climate system model (BCC-CSM): the main
 581 progress from CMIP5 to CMIP6. Geoscientific Model Development 12: 1573-1600.
- 582 Yousefi M, Jouladeh-Roudbar A, Kafash A (2020) Using endemic freshwater fishes as proxies
- 583 of their ecosystems to identify high priority rivers for conservation under climate 584 change. Ecological Indicators 112: 106137.
- 585 Yukimoto S. et al (2019) The Meteorological Research Institute Earth System Model version
- 586 2.0, MRI-ESM2. 0: Description and basic evaluation of the physical component. Journal
- 587 of the Meteorological Society of Japan. Ser. 2
- 588 <u>https://www.worldclim.org/data/worldclim21.html</u>
- 589
- 590

Table 1. The performance metrics of the ensemble distribution models per species. Area under

Species	TSS	ROC	KAPPA
Lepomis gibbosus	0.926	0.994	0.922
Gymnocephalus cernua	0.909	0.990	0.906
Micropterus salmoides	0.848	0.983	0.846
Perccottus glenii	0.910	0.991	0.905
Perca fluviatilis	0.950	0.996	0.942
Sander lucioperca	0.942	0.996	0.929
Alburnoides sp.	0.857	0.989	0.857
Alburnus sp.	0.986	0.996	0.986
Gobio sp.	0.949	0.993	0.950
Squalius sp.	0.885	0.987	0.885

592 curve (ROC), true skill statistic (TSS) and Cohen's Kappa (Heidke skill score) (KAPPA).

Alburnoides sp. SSPs_126_2100 -8.078 13457 9400 1 Alburnoides sp. SSPs_585_2050 -12.365 13457 8706 1 Alburnoides sp. SSPs_585_2100 -34.213 13457 6225 3 Alburnus sp. SSPs_126_2050 -22.932 10675 4675 3 Alburnus sp. SSPs_585_2050 -75.073 10675 309 3 Alburnus sp. SSPs_585_2050 -75.073 10675 249 3 Gobio sp. SSPs_585_2050 -65.901 13367 5145 3 Gobio sp. SSPs_585_2050 -65.901 13367 156 5 Gobio sp. SSPs_585_2050 -63.901 13367 156 5 Gobio sp. SSPs_585_2050 -33.175 10535 3484 3 Squalius sp. SSPs_585_2050 -44.357 10535 304 3 Squalius sp. SSPs_585_2050 -23.957 77715 35192 5 Squalius sp. SSPs_585_2050 -23.957 77715 35192 5	Species	Scenario & Year	Species Range Change (%)	Current Range Size	Future Range Size (No Dispersal)	Future Range Size (Full dispersal)
Alburnoides sp. SSPs_585_2050 -12.365 13457 8706 1 Alburnoides sp. SSPs_126_2050 -24.23 13457 6225 3 Alburnus sp. SSPs_126_2100 -24.000 10675 4499 3 Alburnus sp. SSPs_126_2050 -25.073 10675 3309 3 Alburnus sp. SSPs_585_2050 -75.073 10675 249 3 Gobio sp. SSPs_126_2050 -46.158 13367 5223 3 Gobio sp. SSPs_585_2050 -65.901 13367 5145 3 Gobio sp. SSPs_585_2050 -65.901 13367 156 3 Gobio sp. SSPs_585_2050 -63.901 13367 5145 3 Gobio sp. SSPs_585_2050 -43.157 10535 4402 3 3 Squalius sp. SSPs_585_2050 -44.357 10535 304 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 <	Alburnoides sp.	SSPs_126_2050	-9.564	13457	9420	12170
Alburnoides sp. SSPs_585_2100 -34.213 13457 6225 4 Alburnus sp. SSPs_126_2050 -22.932 10675 4499 4 Alburnus sp. SSPs_585_2050 -35.007 10675 3309 4 Alburnus sp. SSPs_185_2050 -75.073 10675 3309 4 Gobio sp. SSPs_126_2100 -75.073 10675 249 4 Gobio sp. SSPs_126_2050 -46.158 13367 5145 5 Gobio sp. SSPs_126_2100 -47.026 13367 5145 5 Gobio sp. SSPs_158_2050 -65.901 13367 156 5 Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2100 -33.156 10535 4402 5 Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2050 -44.357 10535 3262 5 Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2050 -44.357 10535 304 7 G. cernua SSPs_126_2050 -33.93 77715 35192 5 G. cernua SSPs_126_2050 -23.957 77715 35192 5	Alburnoides sp.	SSPs_126_2100	-8.078	13457	9400	12370
Alburnus sp. SSPs_126_2050 -22.932 10675 4675 4 Alburnus sp. SSPs_126_2100 -24.000 10675 4499 4 Alburnus sp. SSPs_585_2050 -35.007 10675 3309 4 Alburnus sp. SSPs_585_2126_2050 -46.158 13367 5223 5 Gobio sp. SSPs_126_2050 -46.158 13367 5145 5 Gobio sp. SSPs_585_2050 -65.901 13367 156 5 Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2050 -33.156 10535 4402 5 Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2050 -33.156 10535 304 3 G. cernua SSPs_126_2050 -3.993 77715 36192 5 Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2050 -3.993 77715 35192 5 G. cernua SSPs_126_2050 -2.3957 77715 35192 5 G. cernua SSPs_126_2050 2.3957 77715 35192 5 G. cernua SSPs_126_2100 0.382 77715 35192 5	Alburnoides sp.	SSPs_585_2050	-12.365	13457	8706	11793
Alburnus sp. SSPs_126_2100 -24.000 10675 4499 4 Alburnus sp. SSPs_585_2050 -35.007 10675 3309 4 Alburnus sp. SSPs_152_2050 -75.073 10675 249 4 Gobio sp. SSPs_126_2050 -46.158 13367 5223 4 Gobio sp. SSPs_158_2050 -65.901 13367 2553 4 Gobio sp. SSPs_152_2050 -65.901 13367 2553 4 Gobio sp. SSPs_152_2050 -33.156 10535 4384 5 Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2100 -33.175 10535 4402 4 Squalius sp. SSPs_152_2050 -44.357 10535 304 4 Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2100 -80.522 10535 304 4 7 G. cernua SSPs_126_2100 0.382 77715 84874 7 6 6 7 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 </td <td>Alburnoides sp.</td> <td>SSPs_585_2100</td> <td>-34.213</td> <td>13457</td> <td>6225</td> <td>8853</td>	Alburnoides sp.	SSPs_585_2100	-34.213	13457	6225	8853
Alburnus sp.SSPs_585_2050-35.007106753309Alburnus sp.SSPs_126_2050-75.07310675249Gobio sp.SSPs_126_2050-46.158133675223Gobio sp.SSPs_126_210047.026133675253Gobio sp.SSPs_585_2050-65.901133672553Gobio sp.SSPs_126_2100-93.30413367156Squalius sp.SSPs_126_2100-33.156105354402Squalius sp.SSPs_126_2100-33.175105353262Squalius sp.SSPs_585_2050-44.35710535304Squalius sp.SSPs_126_2100-80.52210535304G. cernuaSSPs_126_2050-3.9937771550143G. cernuaSSPs_126_21000.3827771535192G. cernuaSSPs_585_2050-23.9577771535192G. cernuaSSPs_585_205027.95211649292390J. gibbosusSSPs_126_205027.9521164929118J. gibbosusSSPs_126_2050-7.4224747922459M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2050-7.4224747923712M. salmoidesSSPs_585_200-9.1034747941984M. salmoidesSSPs_585_200-9.103474794986P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.9378671645869	Alburnus sp.	SSPs_126_2050	-22.932	10675	4675	8227
Alburnus sp. SSPs_585_2100 -75.073 10675 249 Gobio sp. SSPs_126_2050 -46.158 13367 5223 Gobio sp. SSPs_126_2100 -47.026 13367 5145 Gobio sp. SSPs_585_2050 -65.901 13367 2553 Gobio sp. SSPs_585_2100 -93.304 13367 156 Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2050 -33.156 10535 4402 Squalius sp. SSPs_585_2050 -44.357 10535 304 Squalius sp. SSPs_585_2050 -44.357 10535 304 77 G. cernua SSPs_585_2050 -3.993 77715 35192 59 G. cernua SSPs_585_2050 -23.957 77715 35192 59 G. cernua SSPs_585_2050 23.957 77715 35192 59 G. cernua SSPs_585_2050 27.952 116492 92390 14 L gibbosus SSPs_585_2050 27.952 116492 92390 14	Alburnus sp.	SSPs_126_2100	-24.000	10675	4499	8113
Gobio sp. SSPs_126_2050 -46.158 13367 5223 Gobio sp. SSPs_126_2100 -47.026 13367 5145 - Gobio sp. SSPs_585_2050 -65.901 13367 2553 - Gobio sp. SSPs_152_2050 -93.304 13367 156 - Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2050 -33.156 10535 4402 - Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2100 -33.175 10535 304 - Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2050 -44.357 10535 304 - G. cernua SSPs_126_2050 -3.993 77715 50143 7 G. cernua SSPs_126_2050 -23.957 77715 35192 55 G. cernua SSPs_126_2050 -23.957 77715 35192 55 G. cernua SSPs_126_2050 27.952 116492 92390 14 L gibbosus SSPs_126_2100 31.443 116492 92855 15 L gibbosus SSPs_12	Alburnus sp.	SSPs_585_2050	-35.007	10675	3309	6938
Gobiosp. SSPs_126_2100 -47.026 13367 5145 Gobiosp. SSPs_585_2050 -65.901 13367 2553 Gobiosp. SSPs_585_2100 -93.304 13367 156 Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2050 -33.156 10535 4384 Squalius sp. SSPs_126_2100 -33.175 10535 4402 Squalius sp. SSPs_585_2050 -44.357 10535 304 10535 Squalius sp. SSPs_585_2050 -34.9357 10535 304 10535 G. cernua SSPs_126_2050 -3.993 77715 48474 74 G. cernua SSPs_126_2050 -3.993 77715 35192 55 G. cernua SSPs_585_2050 -23.957 77715 35192 55 L. gibbosus SSPs_126_2050 28.643 116492 92890 14 L. gibbosus SSPs_126_2050 27.952 116492 92855 15 L. gibbosus SSPs_126_2050 -7.422 47479	Alburnus sp.	SSPs_585_2100	-75.073	10675	249	2661
Gobio sp.SSPs_585_2050-65.901133672553Gobio sp.SSPs_585_2100-93.30413367156Squalius sp.SSPs_126_2050-33.156105354384Squalius sp.SSPs_126_2100-33.175105354402Squalius sp.SSPs_585_2050-44.357105353262Squalius sp.SSPs_585_2050-44.35710535304G. cernuaSSPs_126_2050-3.993777154847477G. cernuaSSPs_126_2050-3.993777155014377G. cernuaSSPs_585_2050-23.957777153519255G. cernuaSSPs_585_2100-23.957777153519255L. gibbosusSSPs_126_205028.64311649292390144L. gibbosusSSPs_126_205027.9521164928118914L. gibbosusSSPs_136_2050-7.422474792245944M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2050-7.422474792371244M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2050-9.103474791498444M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.103474791498444M. salmoidesSSPs_126_205025.59378671645869	<i>Gobio</i> sp.	SSPs_126_2050	-46.158	13367	5223	7197
Gobio sp.SSPs_585_2100-93.30413367156Squalius sp.SSPs_126_2050-33.156105354384Squalius sp.SSPs_126_2100-33.175105354402Squalius sp.SSPs_585_2050-44.357105353262Squalius sp.SSPs_585_2050-44.35710535304G. cernuaSSPs_126_2050-3.99377715484747G. cernuaSSPs_126_2050-23.95777715501437G. cernuaSSPs_585_2050-23.957777153519255G. cernuaSSPs_585_2050-23.957777153519255L. gibbosusSSPs_126_205028.64311649292390144L. gibbosusSSPs_126_205027.9521164929285515L. gibbosusSSPs_585_2050-7.422474792245944M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2050-7.422474792245944M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.103474791498444M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.103474791498444M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.1034747981622P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.593786716458697	<i>Gobio</i> sp.	SSPs_126_2100	-47.026	13367	5145	7081
Squalius sp.SSPs_126_2050-33.156105354384Squalius sp.SSPs_126_2100-33.175105354402Squalius sp.SSPs_585_2050-44.357105353262Squalius sp.SSPs_585_2100-80.52210535304G. cernuaSSPs_126_2050-3.993777154847477G. cernuaSSPs_126_21000.382777153519255G. cernuaSSPs_585_2050-23.957777153519255G. cernuaSSPs_126_205028.6431164929239014L. gibbosusSSPs_126_210031.44311649292855155L. gibbosusSSPs_126_210027.9521164928118914L. gibbosusSSPs_585_2050-7.42247479224594M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2050-9.10347479149844M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2100-53.820474798162P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.593786716458697	Gobio sp.	SSPs_585_2050	-65.901	13367	2553	4558
Squalius sp.SSPs_126_2100-33.175105354402Squalius sp.SSPs_585_2050-44.357105353262Squalius sp.SSPs_585_2100-80.52210535304G. cernuaSSPs_126_2050-3.993777154847474G. cernuaSSPs_126_21000.382777155014377G. cernuaSSPs_585_2050-23.957777153519255G. cernuaSSPs_585_2100-23.957777153519255L. gibbosusSSPs_126_205028.6431164929239014L. gibbosusSSPs_126_210031.44311649292855155L. gibbosusSSPs_585_205027.9521164924941911M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2050-7.42247479224594M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2100-0.25947479237124M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2100-53.820474798162P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.59378671645869	<i>Gobio</i> sp.	SSPs_585_2100	-93.304	13367	156	895
Squalius sp.SSPs_585_2050-44.357105353262Squalius sp.SSPs_585_2100-80.52210535304G. cernuaSSPs_126_2050-3.993777154847477G. cernuaSSPs_126_21000.382777155014377G. cernuaSSPs_585_2050-23.957777153519255G. cernuaSSPs_585_2100-23.957777153519255G. cernuaSSPs_126_205028.6431164929239014L. gibbosusSSPs_126_210031.44311649292855155L. gibbosusSSPs_585_205027.9521164928118914L. gibbosusSSPs_585_2050-7.42247479224594M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2100-0.25947479237124M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.10347479149844M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2100-53.820474798162P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.59378671645869	<i>Squalius</i> sp.	SSPs_126_2050	-33.156	10535	4384	7042
Squalius sp.SSPs_585_2100-80.52210535304G. cernuaSSPs_126_2050-3.993777154847477G. cernuaSSPs_126_21000.382777155014377G. cernuaSSPs_585_2050-23.957777153519255G. cernuaSSPs_585_2100-23.957777153519255L. gibbosusSSPs_126_205028.6431164929239014L. gibbosusSSPs_126_210031.44311649292855155L. gibbosusSSPs_585_205027.9521164928118914L. gibbosusSSPs_585_2100-2.6041164924941911M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2050-7.422474792245944M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.103474791498444M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2100-53.8204747981622P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.593786716458697	<i>Squalius</i> sp.	SSPs_126_2100	-33.175	10535		7040
G. cernuaSSPs_126_2050-3.993777154847477G. cernuaSSPs_126_21000.382777155014377G. cernuaSSPs_585_2050-23.957777153519255G. cernuaSSPs_585_2100-23.957777153519255L. gibbosusSSPs_126_205028.6431164929239014L. gibbosusSSPs_126_210031.44311649292855155L. gibbosusSSPs_585_205027.9521164928118914L. gibbosusSSPs_585_2050-7.42247479224594M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2100-0.25947479237124M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.10347479149844M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2100-53.820474798162P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.59378671645869	<i>Squalius</i> sp.	SSPs_585_2050	-44.357	10535		5862
G. cernuaSSPs_126_21000.382777155014377G. cernuaSSPs_585_2050-23.957777153519255G. cernuaSSPs_585_2100-23.957777153519255L. gibbosusSSPs_126_205028.64311649292390144L. gibbosusSSPs_126_210031.44311649292855155L. gibbosusSSPs_585_205027.95211649281189144L. gibbosusSSPs_585_2050-2.60411649249419115M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2050-7.422474792245944M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.103474791498444M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2100-53.820474798162P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.593786716458694	<i>Squalius</i> sp.	SSPs_585_2100	-80.522	10535	304	2052
G. cernuaSSPs_585_2050-23.957777153519255G. cernuaSSPs_585_2100-23.957777153519255L. gibbosusSSPs_126_205028.6431164929239014L. gibbosusSSPs_126_210031.4431164929285515L. gibbosusSSPs_585_205027.9521164928118914L. gibbosusSSPs_585_2050-2.6041164924941911M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2100-2.6041164924941911M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2100-0.25947479224594M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.10347479149844M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2100-53.820474798162P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.59378671645869	G. cernua	SSPs_126_2050	-3.993	77715	48474	74612
G. cernuaSSPs_585_2100-23.957777153519255L. gibbosusSSPs_126_205028.6431164929239014L. gibbosusSSPs_126_210031.44311649292855155L. gibbosusSSPs_585_205027.9521164928118914L. gibbosusSSPs_585_2100-2.6041164924941911M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2050-7.422474792245944M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2100-0.259474792371244M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.103474791498444M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2100-53.820474798162P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.593786716458694	G. cernua	SSPs_126_2100	0.382	77715	50143	78012
L. gibbosusSSPs_126_205028.64311649292390144L. gibbosusSSPs_126_210031.44311649292855155L. gibbosusSSPs_585_205027.95211649281189144L. gibbosusSSPs_585_2100-2.60411649249419115M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2050-7.422474792245944M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2100-0.259474792371244M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.103474791498444M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2100-53.820474798162P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.593786716458694	G. cernua	SSPs_585_2050	-23.957	77715	35192	59097
L. gibbosusSSPs_126_210031.4431164929285515.L. gibbosusSSPs_585_205027.9521164928118914.L. gibbosusSSPs_585_2100-2.6041164924941911.M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2050-7.42247479224594.M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2100-0.25947479237124.M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.10347479149844.M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2100-53.820474798162.P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.59378671645869.						59097
L. gibbosusSSPs_585_205027.9521164928118914L. gibbosusSSPs_585_2100-2.6041164924941911M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2050-7.422474792245944M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2100-0.259474792371244M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.103474791498444M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2100-53.820474798162P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.593786716458694	-		28.643	116492		149859
L. gibbosusSSPs_585_2100-2.6041164924941911M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2050-7.422474792245944M. salmoidesSSPs_126_2100-0.259474792371244M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2050-9.103474791498444M. salmoidesSSPs_585_2100-53.820474798162P. fluviatilisSSPs_126_205025.593786716458694	L. gibbosus	SSPs_126_2100				153120
M. salmoides SSPs_126_2050 -7.422 47479 22459 47 M. salmoides SSPs_126_2100 -0.259 47479 23712 47 M. salmoides SSPs_585_2050 -9.103 47479 14984 47 M. salmoides SSPs_585_2100 -53.820 47479 816 27 P. fluviatilis SSPs_126_2050 25.593 78671 64586 94	-	SSPs_585_2050			81189	149054
M. salmoides SSPs_126_2100 -0.259 47479 23712 47 M. salmoides SSPs_585_2050 -9.103 47479 14984 47 M. salmoides SSPs_585_2100 -53.820 47479 816 27 P. fluviatilis SSPs_126_2050 25.593 78671 64586 97	L. gibbosus	SSPs_585_2100	-2.604	116492	49419	113458
M. salmoides SSPs_585_2050 -9.103 47479 14984 42 M. salmoides SSPs_585_2100 -53.820 47479 816 22 P. fluviatilis SSPs_126_2050 25.593 78671 64586 94	M. salmoides	SSPs_126_2050	-7.422	47479	22459	43955
M. salmoides SSPs_585_2100 -53.820 47479 816 2 P. fluviatilis SSPs_126_2050 25.593 78671 64586 94	M. salmoides	SSPs_126_2100		47479		47356
P. fluviatilis SSPs_126_2050 25.593 78671 64586 94	M. salmoides	SSPs_585_2050	-9.103	47479	14984	43157
	M. salmoides	SSPs_585_2100	-53.820	47479	816	21926
P. fluviatilis SSPs_126_2100 33.662 78671 66682 10	P. fluviatilis	SSPs_126_2050	25.593	78671	64586	98805
	P. fluviatilis	SSPs_126_2100	33.662	78671	66682	105153

Table 2. Distribution area % changes of species (from the number of pixels) according to future projections.

P. fluviatilis	SSPs_585_2050	43.859	78671	63050	113175
P. fluviatilis	SSPs_585_2100	47.066	78671	46955	115698
P. glenii	SSPs_126_2050	-42.301	33907	11255	19564
P. glenii	SSPs_126_2100	-39.281	33907	12760	20588
P. glenii	SSPs_585_2050	-51.635	33907	11081	16399
P. glenii	SSPs_585_2100	-99.997	33907	0	1
S. lucioperca	SSPs_126_2050	39.401	85214	63681	118789
S. lucioperca	SSPs_126_2100	46.012	85214	65069	124423
S. lucioperca	SSPs_585_2050	34.296	85214	56618	114439
S. lucioperca	SSPs_585_2100	20.184	85214	25408	68014

595 Table 3. The rate of niche overlap with native species of alien species in Turkey during the

596	periods when	alien specie	s are most	t widely	distributed.	Degree	of interaction	(overlapping)

Alburnoides sp. Alburnus sp. Gobio sp. Squalius sp. 0 А Е 0 А Е 0 А Е 0 Е Α 5.9 GC CURRENT 50.0 **(2)** 44.1 32.0 (**2**) 31.7 36.3 41.5 (2) 18.8 39.7 37.0 (**2**) 33.3 29.6 SL_126_2050 73.4 **(3**) 6.2 47.2 (**2**) 48.6 72.5 (3) 19.7 7.8 44.9 (**2**) 52.2 2.9 20.5 4.2 41.3 (**2**) MS 585 2100 76.4 (4) 10.3 (1) 5.9(1) 94.1 3.0 20.6 88.4 1.3 0.046.1 12.6 68.1 (**3**) LG_126_2100 43.0 (**2**) 29.1 2.8 55.1 2.0 33.5 (**2**) 66.4 0.1 39.7 (**2**) 59.4 0.9 PF_126_2050 69.7 (**3**) 44.3 (**2**) 68.7 (**3**) 22.3 9.0 43.9 (**2**) 23.0 7.3 50.3 5.4 53.6 2.5 PG 126 2100 18.7 (**1**) 7.2 74.1 16.5 (1) 19.4 64.1 17.5 (1) 27.1 55.4 22.6 (1) 18.1 59.2

597 probability are given in parenthesis and bold text.

598 O: Overlapping, A: Alien, E: Endemic, GC: Gymocephalus cernua, SL: Sander lucioperca, MS: Micropterus

599 salmoides, LG: Lepomis gibbosus, PF: Perca fluviatilis, PG: Perccottus glenii

601	Figure legends
602	
603	Fig. 1. Processing methods in the roadmap of this study.
604	
605	Fig. 2. The contribution rate of each environment variable to the modeling. Upper and lower
606	panels denote endemics and alien species (ALBN: Alnurnodies sp., ALBS: Alburnus sp., GB:
607	Gobio sp., SQ: Squalius sp., GC: Gymocephalus cernua, LG: Lepomis gibbosus, MS:
608	Micropterus salmoides, PF: Perca fluviatilis, PG: Perccottus glenii, SL: Sander lucioperca).
609	See Table S1 and S2 for explanations of environmental variables used.
610	
611	Fig. 3. Prediction of overall niche overlap between assessed alien and native species in the
612	borders of Turkey in different climate models when alien species would have the widest
613	distribution.
614	
615	
616	
617	
618	
619	
620	
621	
622	
623	
624	
625	
626	
627	
628	



- 630 Fig. 1.





Fig. 2.



Fig. 3.