

ABSTRACT

1. Many taxa around the globe are threatened by often unexplained mass mortality events (MMEs), which can decimate populations and compromise key ecosystem functions. One example of a highly threatened taxon facing frequent MMEs is freshwater mussels (Unionida).
2. There has been a recent increase in interest in understanding the causes of freshwater mussel MMEs, but standardised methodologies for how best to respond to them to facilitate diagnoses are unavailable. When an MME is observed, swift and appropriate sample collection is imperative owing to the transient nature of these phenomena.
3. Here we provide structured guidance that will facilitate rapid and appropriate sampling of MMEs, using freshwater mussels as an example. We set out standardised procedures for sample collection, preparation, and preservation.
4. The procedures we outline will improve our capacity for diagnostic investigations of MMEs and other mortality events, not only in

20 freshwater mussels but also across many other taxa. This, in turn, can
21 inform appropriate management responses.

22 Keywords

23 Die-off, diseases, freshwater mussel, histology, mortality event, protocol,
24 sampling methods, Unionida

25 1 INTRODUCTION

26 Mass mortality events (MMEs) are rapidly occurring demographic
27 catastrophes involving mortality rates higher than background levels (Fey et al.,
28 2015). MMEs can alter food web structures and change community composition
29 (Baruzzi et al., 2018; Fey et al., 2019), disrupt ecosystem function (Fey et al.,
30 2019), and influence the survival of species (García-March et al., 2020). Recently
31 reported MMEs include the death of hundreds of South American sea lions
32 (*Otaria byronia*) in Argentina due to an outbreak of highly pathogenic avian
33 influenza A (Rimondi et al., 2024), tsunami-induced burial and starvation of the
34 long-lived and sparsely populated clam *Mercenaria stimpsoni* (Kubota et al.,
35 2021), and the loss of over 200,000 Saiga antelope (*Saiga tatarica*) in three weeks
36 in central Kazakhstan due to bacterial-induced (*Pasteurella multocida*)
37 haemorrhagic septicaemia (Kock et al., 2018). Unlike these cases, there have
38 been many MMEs for which the cause remains undetermined (Fey et al., 2015;
39 Hamilton et al., 2021; Richard et al., 2021; Waller & Cope, 2019; Young, 1994).

This is partly due to the challenges in implementing a timely and comprehensive diagnostic investigation. Given that the frequency and magnitude of reported MMEs have increased in many phyla in recent decades (Fey et al., 2015), standardised mortality response and sampling methods could help overcome these challenges and lead to a better understanding of the causes of MMEs.

Freshwater mussels (Unionida) are among the most highly threatened faunal groups worldwide (Lopes-Lima et al., 2018). Since the 1940s and 1950s, MMEs have been reported in freshwater mussel populations (Downing et al., 2010; Neves, 1987; Waller & Cope, 2019), with recent examples including the MMEs of pheasantshell (*Ortmanniana pectorosa*) in the Clinch River, VA and TN, USA, during autumn each year between 2016 and 2019 (Leis et al., 2019; Richard, 2018; Richard et al., 2020, 2021), of mucket (*Ortmanniana ligamentina*) in the Huron River, MI, USA, in September 2018 (Richard et al., 2022), of multiple Unionida species in the Odra River, Poland, in the summer of 2022 (Marchowski et al., 2024; Sobieraj & Metelski, 2023; Szlauer-Łukaszewska et al., 2024), and of freshwater pearl mussels (*Margaritifera margaritifera*) in rivers across Sweden between 2005 and 2020 (Alfjorden et al., 2023; Wengström et al., 2019).

Considering that freshwater mussels maintain water quality, increase habitat complexity, and influence nutrient cycles, among other ecosystem functions (Zieritz et al., 2022), mussel MMEs could cause flow-on effects in the whole ecosystem (DuBose et al., 2019; Vaughn et al., 2015). Despite this, many

freshwater mussel MMEs are not systemically investigated, in part due to a lack of responders and clear sampling protocols for MMEs.

The overall objective of an MME investigation is to identify potential causative factors that may have led to the event (Work, 2015). To investigate MMEs, the steps used during a diagnostic investigation to identify the cause of death in a single animal are applied on a larger scale. This involves a combination of standardised field observations and diagnostic tests (Figure 1). A central component of the diagnostic investigation is the postmortem examination (that is, necropsy or autopsy on euthanised moribund (sick) or dead individuals), where tissues are examined at the gross (‘naked eye’) and microscopic level, along with the collection of samples for other diagnostic tests. The postmortem exam allows the identification of pathological processes and indicates potential causative agents for future research. Correlations between pathological findings and diagnostic test results subsequently help evaluate potential causes. Any diagnostic investigation depends on those working in a field setting collecting the right information and samples needed to execute these steps.

Although information is available for tips regarding the process of conducting an MME investigation (e.g., Abila et al., 2018; Meyer & Barclay, 1990; Southwick & Loftus, 2017; Work, 2015), preserving samples from marine mollusc MMEs (e.g., EURL for Molluscs Diseases, 2020), and quantifying MMEs

(Marchowski et al., 2024), a detailed and widely available protocol for how to collect and preserve the samples needed to undertake an MME diagnostic investigation is lacking, especially for freshwater mussels.

In this paper, we provide a protocol for sampling an MMEs in a manner that will facilitate an MME investigation through the application of a wide range of diagnostic methods. These methods can be used to investigate the role of many potential causes previously implicated in MMEs of both freshwater and marine bivalves, where the cause is not immediately obvious, including microbes (Alfjorden et al., 2023; Leis, Dziki, Richard et al., 2023; Neto et al., 2024; Richard et al., 2020, 2021; Zhong et al., 2016), macroparasites (Jonsson & And  , 1992; Thieltges, 2006), transmissible cancer (Carballal et al., 2015; Charles et al., 2020; McGladdery et al., 2001), harmful chemicals (e.g., heavy metals, organic pollutants, or algal or cyanobacterial bloom produced biotoxins) (Donaghy et al., 2016; Fleming et al., 1995; Neves, 1987; Sobieraj & Metelski, 2023), and various environmental factors such as low oxygen or high temperatures (Neves, 1987; Soon & Ransangan, 2019; Werner & Rothhaupt, 2008).

Methods involved in investigating potential causes of mussel losses that are obvious or associated with longer-term declines are not addressed in this paper. Examples of such causes include drought (Atkinson et al., 2014; DuBose et al., 2019; McDowell & Sousa, 2019), flooding (Downing et al., 2010; Haag, 2012; Sousa et al., 2012), impoundment (Tiemann et al., 2007; Vaughn & Taylor, 1999;

103 Watters, 1996; Watters & Flaute, 2010), predation (Downing et al., 2010; Strayer
104 et al., 2004), physical habitat destruction (Downing et al., 2010; Haag, 2012;
105 Strayer et al., 2004), and reductions in host fish abundance (Downing et al., 2010;
106 Haag, 2012; Strayer et al., 2004; Watters, 1996).

107 This paper aims to provide a protocol that equips non-specialist first
108 responders with a core procedure that will allow a rapid response to MMEs
109 (Figure 1), with a focus on sample collection and preservation. Using our
110 procedures will enable a subsequent diagnostic investigation with the support of
111 collaborations established before or after sampling. Although the protocol is
112 developed for MMEs in freshwater mussel populations, the approach can be
113 readily adapted for many taxa across a variety of scales and settings.

114 2 PRELIMINARY DATA COLLECTION

115 Although the focus of this paper is sampling for a diagnostic investigation,
116 a basic set of preliminary data (Table 1) derived from field investigations is
117 necessary to ensure the appropriate samples are collected, help prioritise
118 diagnostic tests, and enable the interpretation of laboratory findings. The
119 preliminary data could be collated from previous surveys or collected during or
120 before sampling. At a minimum, these preliminary data should include the
121 species and age class affected/unaffected, an approximate percentage of
122 mortality and number of mortalities observed, a timeframe of mortality, any
123 available information about the environmental circumstances (e.g., extreme

124 flow, temperature, and pH) that were observed in the water body before the
125 MME, wider environmental changes noticed at the site (e.g., construction
126 activities), and the presence or absence of mortalities in other taxa. However,
127 first responders should not be dissuaded from collecting all the relevant data
128 they can, even if it is not everything on the above list.

129 To quantify the extent of mortality, timed searches at each site can be
130 undertaken, recording the number of healthy mussels, moribund mussels, dead
131 mussels, and fresh shells found. Fresh shells typically have a clean and shiny
132 nacre (refer to Southwick and Loftus (2017) for further information on assessing
133 shell condition). For species that burrow, it may be necessary to use quadrats
134 and carefully excavate the sediment in the quadrats (e.g., as in Brian et al., (2022)
135 and Smith et al., (2001)) because moribund mussels may be less able to burrow
136 and may disproportionately occur on top of the sediment. The mortality may not
137 be evenly distributed, so searches should be conducted at multiple sites.
138 However, care must always be taken not to spread any biological or chemical
139 agents by proceeding from upstream to downstream (Section 3.4). For more
140 information on quantifying aquatic MMEs, refer to the work of Marchowski et al.
141 (2024) and Southwick and Loftus (2017).

142 Age can be estimated by measuring shell size, counting shell annuli
143 (where they occur), and then using relevant published von Bertalanffy growth
144 curves (e.g., as in Ollard & Aldridge (2023)).

In addition, it is beneficial to collect data regarding the mollusc community characteristics (e.g., age structure, population density, species diversity, and spatial extent of the mussel bed) (For detailed examples refer to Cummings et al., (2016)), hydrological conditions of the water body (flow rate or discharge, water level), land use practices (for example categorisations refer to page 14 of British Environmental Agency, (2003)), noticeable erosion (e.g., landslips) around the site, locations and sources of upstream discharges (e.g., wastewater treatment plants, industrial plants, feedlots), signs of pollution around the site, and any information about previous MMEs. Ideally, if invasive bivalves (e.g., *Corbicula* spp. or *Dreissena* spp.) have been recorded at the site, this should be noted and their abundance roughly quantified. It should be noted that in some cases it may be necessary to obtain a permit for the collection of these preliminary data.

3 PREPARING TO SAMPLE A MASS MORTALITY EVENT FOR A DIAGNOSTIC INVESTIGATION

Mass mortality events must be sampled rapidly after their detection to ensure that adequate samples of moribund individuals can be found. To facilitate rapid sampling, it is important to be prepared with appropriate permits, safety procedures, collaborations, and a sampling plan.

3.1 Permits and legal cases

165 The sampling team should contact the appropriate state, federal,
166 provincial, or equivalent natural resource agency to acquire any permits
167 necessary for the handling, sampling, and collection of mussels from the site.
168 Ideally, generalised sampling permits could be prepared in advance in case an
169 MME were to occur because rapid sampling is essential. Considering that in
170 many countries sampling water and sediment does not require a permit, in
171 cases where permits for mussel sampling are not immediately forthcoming,
172 water and sediment could be sampled immediately using the procedures we
173 outline. Local research teams should be aware of what sampling can be done
174 without a permit and this knowledge used to maximise the amount of sampling
175 that can take place immediately after detection of a possible MME. In the event
176 of a legal investigation, it is imperative to understand and follow procedures for
177 the proper documentation of the collection, transport, storage, and analysis of
178 legal case specimens (e.g., evidence tags or chain of custody forms) (Southwick &
179 Loftus, 2017). Where the MME has happened across many taxa (e.g., fish), it may
180 be necessary to coordinate with other research teams.

181 3.2 Safety and training

182 Safety concerns are similar to those of other field investigations and
183 include environment, equipment use, hazardous materials, health, work hours,
184 and dealing with the public. The sampling team should follow their agency's
185 standard operating procedures for safety and be trained in the proper methods

186 for the collection, handling, species identification, and transport of freshwater
187 mussels.

188 3.3 Collaborations

189 A comprehensive MME investigation typically involves collaborations with
190 other laboratories to aid in sample analysis, conducting postmortem
191 examinations and sample preservation steps, and/or field collection of more
192 specialised additional samples. Such collaborators can be sought by contacting
193 local government animal health laboratories, fish health laboratories, wildlife
194 disease surveillance programs, veterinary diagnostic laboratories, local
195 universities, or relevant region-specific professional organisations.

196 3.4 Sampling plan

197 A thorough sampling plan includes determining the sampling design,
198 sampling sites, sampling direction, samples to collect, order of sampling,
199 timeframe for sampling and sample processing, decontamination procedures,
200 and gear needed.

201 As part of the sampling plan, establish an appropriate sampling design. A
202 Before–After Control-Impact (BACI) design is optimal (Christie et al., 2019) but it
203 is likely not feasible because it would require prior in-depth monitoring and
204 sampling of populations before an MME occurs. Rather, to determine which
205 pathological findings or causal agents are unique to an MME, moribund
206 individuals along with apparently healthy control individuals at the impacted site,

as well as healthy control individuals from an unimpacted control site, should be sampled (Figure 2). Moribund individuals rather than dead individuals should be prioritised to limit confounding factors due to decomposition (Knowles et al., 2023; Waller & Cope, 2019). The healthy control population should be as similar to the impacted population as possible, for example, from an unimpacted, isolated, upstream location or tributary. Alternatively, mussels could be sampled from a similar nearby waterbody. If no suitable control sites are available within the watershed, a different watershed or a temporal control (e.g., sampling after mortality ends as well) could be considered. The sampling plan should also include a comparison of external environmental samples and parameters, including water samples, sediment samples, and temperature between the impacted site and unimpacted site (Figure 2). Sampling regimens similar to these recommendations have been applied to studying freshwater mussel MMEs previously and reflect a typical epidemiological case-control study design (Richard et al., 2020, 2021). If possible, repeat samplings over time of both the control and the impacted site should be undertaken, including sampling after an MME has ended (assuming mussels remain) (Leis, Dziki, Richard, et al., 2023; Richard et al., 2022).

Sampling should be undertaken in a downstream direction (if in a river) and at unimpacted sites without known MMEs before impacted sites to avoid the spread of biological or chemical agents. If an unimpacted site must be sampled

228 after an impacted site, a separate set of gear for impacted and unimpacted sites
229 should be used. If this is not possible, gear should be decontaminated before
230 entering the unimpacted site with a 1% Virkon solution or a 10% bleach solution,
231 according to the manufacturer's instructions. Similarly, gear should be
232 decontaminated between days and discrete sampling sites.

233 Rapid response to an MME can also be facilitated by the preparation of a
234 response kit that contains the necessary sampling supplies (Supplementary File
235 1) and can be stored on hand for sampling at short notice. Preparation of the
236 required equipment is especially important if sample processing (Section 4.4)
237 must be undertaken in the field because in this case it will be necessary to bring
238 the required preservatives sampling (Section 4.4, Supplementary File 1).

239 4 SAMPLING A MASS MORTALITY EVENT FOR A 240 DIAGNOSTIC INVESTIGATION

241 Considering the complex interactions between multiple stressors (any
242 biological or physical factor that negatively affects the physiology of an
243 organism; for example, etiological agents such as parasites or environmental
244 factors such as high temperature) involved with MMEs, a standardised protocol
245 that involves a cross-disciplinary approach integrating novel and traditional
246 techniques to investigate a range of potential causes is essential to provide a
247 deeper understanding of MMEs (Carella et al., 2023). To facilitate this, we outline
248 a procedure for the collection and preservation of samples from a freshwater

mussel MME. Following our procedure, the collected samples can be used for a variety of analysis methods (Table 2). If resources are limited, priority should be placed on collecting and processing mussel samples (Sections 4.2-4.4).

4.1 Collecting environmental parameters and samples

As time permits, environmental parameters and samples can be recorded and collected. There are many analytical options for environmental sampling that may require unique storage and handling, and a comprehensive review is beyond the scope of this paper. We provide some suggestions for parameters to measure but highlight that local context and contact with relevant specialists will determine the best environmental parameters or samples to take at a given MME.

Basic environmental factors (e.g., temperature, salinity or conductivity, dissolved oxygen (DO), ammonia, and pH) can be measured with appropriate probes and meters on-site, and upstream and downstream of all sampling areas. Many environmental factors are subject to significant diurnal fluctuations in the aquatic environment (Bridgewater et al., 2017) and should be measured multiple times throughout the day if possible. At a minimum, measurements should be collected contemporaneously with mussel samples.

Water samples (~1 L) can be collected, placed on ice, and transferred to a laboratory for the measurement of alkalinity, hardness, turbidity, nutrient concentrations, suspended solids, or other parameters if desired (Bridgewater et

al., 2017). These water samples should ideally be collected at representative points in the sampling reach (e.g., up and downstream, near any effluent sites or springs, etc.). If water quality issues are suspected as a likely cause, consult a specialist for additional sample collection considerations.

Potentially harmful chemicals (e.g., metals or biotoxins) from the environment can also be sampled by collecting three replicates of approximately 2 L of surficial sediments and water. Multiple representative locations should be sampled. Unless the event involves chronic toxic contamination or sample collection occurs contemporaneously with the onset of the event, harmful chemicals may be difficult to detect in water samples (Southwick & Loftus, 2017). In contrast, sediment samples can contain residual contaminants after the event has passed (Southwick & Loftus, 2017). For many chemicals, amber glass jars are ideal for collection followed by freezing at -20°C if storing long term (ensure to leave space for water expansion during freezing). However, if a chemical is a suspected cause of the MME, the relevant departments of health or environment should be informed, and a specialised laboratory should be consulted. The details of environmental chemical sample collection may depend on the target chemical and testing strategy used by the specialised laboratory (Campisano et al., 2017). For example, it is advisable to avoid storage containers that may leach contaminating compounds into the sample.

290 If available, a flow meter can be used to measure the flow rate. Otherwise,
291 flow rate and water-level data may be available from in-stream monitoring
292 gauges. During analysis, the environmental data gathered during the MME can
293 be compared with any historical data collated from records (Section 2) to detect
294 any anomalies that may have contributed to mortality.

295 Algae and cyanobacteria can produce harmful toxins or otherwise fatal
296 hypoxic conditions during periods of post-bloom decomposition. Changes in
297 water colour, unusual odours, and the presence of non-filamentous surface
298 scum should be noted because this will be useful for attributing an MME to algal
299 and cyanobacterial blooms (Hudnell, 2008).

300 Environmental samples for molecular analysis (e.g., PCR or
301 metagenomics) can be collected. Water (three replicates of approximately 1 L)
302 can be collected and filtered using 0.22 µm Sterivex (or similar) filters (Merck,
303 Germany). Ideally, both filters (containing cellular microbes) and filtered water
304 (containing viruses) should be frozen at -80°C within 24 hours of collection and
305 kept on ice until freezing. If 1 L cannot be filtered through a 0.22 µm filter due to
306 suspended particles, a prefilter through an approximately 20 µm filter can be
307 used. Water samples can be obtained directly from the waterbody with syringes
308 before filtering or first collected in a bottle before filtering. If the bottles for
309 collecting and storing water are not sterile, they can be sterilised with bleach for
310 5 minutes before use. The bleach can be rinsed out with sterile water or water

311 from the specific site of the sample collection. Three replicates of 1-5 mL of
312 sediment can also be collected in a 5 mL microcentrifuge or conical tube and
313 frozen the same way as the water samples. Gloves should be worn when
314 collecting the water and sediment samples and the samples should be collected
315 upstream of your body in flowing water.

316 4.2 Mussel collection

317 The following sections discuss sample collection and processing using
318 lethal methods. Lethal sampling of mussels allows for an analysis of the whole
319 animal, which is necessary for the detection of some stressors (e.g., pollutants)
320 and histological analysis, a fundamental aspect of all MME investigations. More
321 stressors can be analysed from one individual when taking lethal samples,
322 simplifying the sampling procedure, reducing the overall sample size, and
323 allowing the investigation of associations between different stressors. If lethal
324 sampling is completely restricted due to the protected nature of the species,
325 non-lethal sampling methods can be considered (refer to Section 4.4.2).

326 Mussels can be found using a bathyscope and collected from the water
327 body by hand. However, if the water body is too deep, rakes, dredges,
328 snorkelling, or diving may be required to find and collect mussels. Ideally,
329 individual notes about each mussel's condition and behaviour in the water body,
330 on removal from the water body, and while handling, would be recorded before
331 the mussel is placed in a uniquely labelled bag (refer to Supplementary File 2 for

an example datasheet). However, in many situations, such detailed notetaking may not be possible. Instead, mussels can simply be separated into healthy and moribund individuals with notes on the criteria used for the designations recorded (Section 4.3). For transport to a suitable place for processing, individual mussels can be placed in separate bags in a cooler or container of ice with a layer of cardboard or towels between the mussels and the ice to ensure the tissue does not freeze. Photographs should be taken to document the site, the mortality of mussels *in situ*, and the appearance of each sick and healthy mussel sampled.

During a day of sampling of an MME, the exact number of samples collected will vary depending on factors such as permit restrictions, the size of the team, the timing of sample collection relative to the MME (e.g., if mortality has mostly ceased, good moribund specimens may be hard to find amongst shells), other variables to collect (e.g., water samples or sediment samples), the method of sample processing (e.g., lethal removal of mussels to a lab for processing, lethal sampling of mussels in the field, or non-lethal processing in the field), the travel required to reach the site, water body conditions (depth, water clarity), mussel density, and the weather conditions on the day. A similar number of moribund individuals, apparently healthy individuals from the impacted site, and apparently healthy individuals from the control site should be

collected (Hewson et al., 2024). Depending on the above factors, approximately 10-20 individuals in each group can be an achievable goal.

Diagnostic value rapidly decreases as the time since death increases due to decomposition; therefore, sampling dead mussels is often avoided (Knowles et al., 2023; Waller & Cope, 2019). Despite this, dead mussels can be sampled in addition to moribund mussels, especially when moribund mussels are in short supply. However, dead individuals should not be sampled instead of available moribund mussels. Moribund and healthy controls should be collected from all impacted species.

4.3 In-field physical exam

Physical examination is a standard component of any diagnostic investigation and is undertaken to classify morbidity and better characterise the nature and duration of disease and involved organ systems. However, like many invertebrates, physical exam methods and metrics in mussels are presently limited. The classification of health is generally limited to moribund versus not moribund, and studies compare these groups to identify significant associations from coincidental (Alfjorden et al., 2023; Leis, Dziki, Standish, et al., 2023; Leis et al., 2019; Neto et al., 2024; Richard et al., 2020, 2021; Wengström et al., 2019). Therefore, a field biologist will need to use a physical examination of a mussel to classify it as either moribund or healthy. Distinguishing between healthy,

moribund, and even dead mussels can be challenging; thus, the following provides guidelines for categorising the health status of mussels.

The moribund state of mussels progresses incrementally, resulting in a gradient of lost organ functions as tissues die. The shell adductor muscle can act independently and may remain responsive after other vital processes have stopped. Therefore, we recommend using a suite of indicators to determine health status. Healthy control animals will often be buried firmly in the sediment, rapidly respond to tactile stimuli, close their valves firmly when disturbed, and resist opening when challenged (Richard et al., 2020). In some cases, a healthy mussel may be near the surface of the sediment and unburied if moving. Gravid females of some species will be above the surface of the sediment to display and/or release glochidia for fish infection. They can be distinguished from moribund mussels by their active valve closure response to probing. Moribund individuals will often be sitting on the surface of the sediment showing abnormal behaviour. For example, they may display gaping valves, tightly closed valves without filtering activity, secretion of excessive mucus, and slow or no response to tactile stimuli (Curley et al., 2021; Knowles et al., 2023; Richard et al., 2020; Southwick & Loftus, 2017). Moribund mussels may be only able to close their valves slowly and weakly, or the valves may be easily opened and held open by hand when challenged. Typically, fully open valves indicate a dead individual, which can be collected, but these samples are suboptimal compared to

moribund specimens (Section 4.2). It is not necessary to observe all symptoms in a mussel to classify it as moribund; rather, only a selection of symptoms will likely be observed in an individual moribund mussel. For reference images of mussels from MMEs, refer to Supplementary Figure 1.

4.4 Postmortem examination and sample preservation

In an ideal scenario, mussel samples collected in the field can be shipped to a diagnostic lab with expertise in mussel mortality investigation. In this case, a complete postmortem analysis can be accomplished, which may involve ancillary diagnostic methods that will not be discussed in detail in this paper. Such methods may include haemocytology, cytology of tissue preparations, and microbial culture. Although these methods have benefits (Table 2) and could be included in a comprehensive investigation, they will likely be impossible unless there is access to specialist knowledge (for more, refer to Supplementary File 3). Ideally, such collaborations are in place before sampling mussels (Section 3.3). However, mortality events can outpace abilities to identify laboratories that will perform the tests required for a comprehensive diagnostic investigation. Even so, the field biologist can still confidently undertake a core procedure to conduct a partial postmortem examination and preserve essential samples (Figure 1, steps in exclusively red box), facilitating diagnostic tests and pathological interpretations once collaborations have been found (Figure 1, steps outside the

red box). This core procedure is detailed below. During this procedure,
institutional guidelines for the euthanasia of bivalves should be followed.

4.4.1 Core procedure

Depending on logistics and resources, the core procedure may be
conducted in the field or in a laboratory. The laboratory is typically the preferred
setting because it allows for more time to collect mussels when sampling, is
generally safer, is conducive to more detailed tissue examination, and provides
better conditions for collecting molecular samples. The field setting may be
preferred in remote locations where samples cannot be quickly transferred to
the laboratory. If in the field, ensure to prepare all the necessary material to
preserve samples such as dry ice and formalin (refer to text below and
Supplementary File 1) before the sampling day.

Process mussels within approximately 24 hours of their collection to
ensure as little change in the microbial communities as possible. During
dissection, it is important to follow aseptic technique to avoid cross-
contamination. For each mussel dissection, wear fresh, clean, sterile gloves and
sterilise all tools with ethanol and flame or bleach followed by molecular-grade
water between specimens. Use fresh needles and syringes for each mussel
when drawing haemolymph. Sterilise the workspace and cutting board between
mussel dissections (e.g., with bleach) and/or use large, sterile single-use Petri
dishes for dissections. Use single-use sterile weighing trays for each mussel.

434 Supplementary File 2 contains a datasheet that can be used for recording all the
435 below-suggested notes.

436 First, take measurements of the shell length, width, and height and note
437 any external shell abnormalities. Next, extract haemolymph by opening the
438 mussel with sterile paediatric nasal speculums, mussel tongs, or other tools,
439 inserting a 25-26 gauge needle attached to a 1-3 mL medical syringe into the
440 anterior adductor muscle, and slowly drawing fluid (Fritts et al., 2015; Gustafson,
441 Stoskopf, Bogan, et al., 2005; McCartney et al., 2009; Raley et al., 2006) (Figure
442 3a). Haemolymph samples for molecular analysis should be immediately placed
443 on ice or at 4°C and stored at -80°C as soon as possible on the day of collection.

444 Subsequently, cut the adductor muscles with a sterile scalpel and open
445 the mussel (Figure 3b). Note any soft tissue abnormalities, record the condition
446 of the marsupial gills (i.e., gravidity) in females, and take a photograph of the
447 valves open with tissues *in situ* to show the condition of the mantle, gills, and
448 visceral mass. Then cut the soft body of the mussel out of the shell by cutting the
449 remaining muscles that attach the visceral mass to each side of the shell
450 (retractor and protractor muscles), running the scalpel under the mantle along
451 the pallial line to free the mantle from the shell without ripping it, and carefully
452 cutting the remaining muscles and ligaments attaching the mussel body to the
453 shell from around the hinge area (Figure 3c). Record the soft tissue wet mass
454 and shell mass and note any abnormalities on the inside of the shell. Store the

455 shells in a cool dry area because they can be used later for various applications
456 (e.g., ageing, contaminant analysis, and deformity examinations, among others).

457 To prepare the tissue for preservation, place the soft body on a sterile
458 surface and make a transverse section near the anterior end of the mussel at
459 approximately the widest portion of the visceral mass where the gonad-digestive
460 gland junction is located (Figure 3d shows the location of this cut). This cut
461 should be made such that the anterior and posterior sections contain a part of
462 most of the major organs (digestive gland, gonad, foot, gills, and mantle; Figure
463 3e). In healthy mussels, the digestive gland (at the anterior end of the visceral
464 mass) will often have a greenish colour and the gonads (posterior to the
465 digestive gland, in the mid-visceral mass) a pale brown colour, which can be used
466 to ensure that parts of both tissues are on either side of the cut. However, in sick
467 mussels distinguishing these tissues is more difficult because they will likely both
468 be shades of brown. If in doubt, have tissue of each organ on the anterior side of
469 the cut.

470 Place the posterior end of the mussel in a -80°C freezer. From these
471 tissues, molecular analysis including PCR or metagenomics and/or chemical (e.g.,
472 heavy metal, organic pollutant, pharmaceutical, or biotoxin) analysis methods
473 can be undertaken. This tissue can be stored in a sterile plastic container such as
474 a 50 mL conical tube. However, as with environmental samples, if intending to
475 undertake chemical analysis, a specialised laboratory should be consulted as

476 particular storage containers, sampling methodologies, and preservation
477 conditions may be required depending on the target chemical analyte.

478 Place the anterior end of the mussel into 10% neutral buffered formalin
479 for histology (or an alternative histological fixative, refer to Howard and Smith
480 (1983)) (Figure 3f). If gravid and the mussel anatomy is such that the marsupium
481 is not included in the anterior sample, ideally, collect a 3–4 mm strip of
482 marsupium and add it to the fixative as well. The fixative volume should be
483 approximately 15-20 times greater than the tissue volume (Carson & Cappellano,
484 2019). A sufficient volume of fixative to allow the tissue to float freely is essential.

485 Some may find it easier to make the transverse section while the mussel is
486 still in the shell before cutting all the attaching ligaments. This would allow the
487 anterior end of the mussel to be preserved in its shell, which will maintain the
488 tissue structure better. However, making a clean and precise transverse cut in
489 the shell can be difficult due to the curvature of the shell and the tough
490 ligaments.

491 The recommended fixation time varies depending on the fixative used
492 (Howard & Smith, 1983). For formalin, 24-48 hours is typically advised. If the
493 visceral mass of the specimen is thicker than 1 cm, serial transverse sections or
494 small incisions at 5-10 mm increments should be made to allow for sufficient
495 penetration of the fixative. To avoid tissue shrinkage artefacts and to allow for
496 subsequent molecular analysis on histological preparations (such as *in situ*

hybridisation or PCR), after fixing, place tissues in a graded series of ethanol solutions up to 70% ethanol for approximately 12–24 hours per change (e.g., 30%, 50%, 70% ethanol) (Carson & Cappellano, 2019). The tissues can remain in 70% ethanol indefinitely but should be regularly checked and topped up with ethanol in case evaporation has occurred.

Samples to be stored in the -80°C freezer (haemolymph and the posterior end of mussel body) should be placed in the freezer as soon as possible. After collection, samples can be initially stored on dry ice, in a -20°C freezer, or on ice (for a few hours at most), until they can be moved to the -80°C freezer for long-term storage. Liquid nitrogen is a suitable alternative for long-term storage. If the samples are processed in the field (not recommended unless it is impossible to get mussels to a lab within 24 hours) or the tissues to be stored at -80°C require further overnight transport to a different location, then these tissues should be transported on dry ice or in liquid nitrogen.

4.4.2 Non-lethal sampling

In some cases, extensive lethal sampling may not be possible. Thus, to sufficiently sample individuals from such MMEs, non-lethal methods can be used either solely or to complement lethal methods and increase the total number of samples. Do not use non-lethal methods as an alternative to following the core procedure if it is possible to take lethal samples because non-lethal samples have limited diagnostic value compared to full tissues preserved according to the

518 core procedure (Section 4.4.1). If undertaking non-lethal sampling, additional
519 time will be required on the day of sampling to process samples in the field.

520 When sampling larger mussels (>5.5 cm), small foot or mantle biopsies of
521 3 mm² to 1 cm² (depending on the mussel size), haemolymph (0.5-1 mL), or
522 gonadal fluid (<200 µL, reduce the volume in small individuals) can be taken non-
523 lethally (Berg et al., 1995; Fritts et al., 2015; Gustafson, Stoskopf, Bogan, et al.,
524 2005; Karlsson et al., 2013; McCartney et al., 2009; Naimo et al., 1998; Raley et al.,
525 2006; Saha & Layzer, 2008; Tsakiris et al., 2016). The only combination of non-
526 lethal biopsies shown to be non-lethal when used on the same individual is
527 haemolymph withdrawal with foot biopsies (Fritts et al., 2015).

528 When collecting haemolymph non-lethally, follow the procedure outlined
529 above (Section 4.4.1), taking additional care not to open the mussel too far and
530 insert the needle only once. To take tissue biopsies, specific biopsy tools (such as
531 3 mm oval-cupped jaw biopsy forceps (Fritts et al., 2015) or biopsy punches) or a
532 pair of small sharp scissors can be used. When collecting gonadal fluid, insert an
533 18-21-gauge needle preloaded with approximately 50 µL of sterile water into the
534 gonad through the foot. After injecting the water, gonadal fluid can be
535 withdrawn.

536 Preserve non-lethally collected samples in the field for molecular analysis
537 immediately by adding them to dry ice. Alternatively, non-lethally collected
538 samples can be taken on the day of collection on ice to a -80°C freezer. If more

539 days are required until the samples can be frozen at -80°C, record the time spent
540 on ice before freezing. If it is not possible to access dry ice or a -80°C freezer
541 within a day of sampling, then RNAlater® (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham,
542 U.S) (or similar preservative) can preserve solid biopsies (foot/mantle) samples
543 for a week at room temperature (but preferably at 4°C) before they are frozen on
544 return to the lab. If using RNAlater with tissue biopsies, samples can be stored
545 for 1 month at 4°C or indefinitely at -20°C. Gonadal fluid can be preserved for
546 cytological methods by adding it to 300 µL of 10% neutral buffered formalin
547 (Brian & Aldridge, 2020).

548 If the number of mussels or time is limited, the non-lethal sample type
549 and preservation method to prioritise will depend on the nature of the MME and
550 any pre-existing hypotheses about the cause (e.g., if a suspected parasite is
551 localised to a certain organ).

552 It is inadvisable to attempt non-lethal sampling on small mussels (<5.5 cm)
553 because increased mortality has been observed following haemolymph and/or
554 foot biopsy sampling in smaller mussels (Fritts et al., 2015).

555 4.4.3 If no moribund specimens can be found

556 It can often be difficult to sample mussels as an MME occurs. It may be
557 that upon arrival at the site only apparently healthy mussels, shells, and a few
558 fully dead specimens are found. In this case, dead specimens should be
559 collected. Apparently healthy individuals should also be sampled either lethally

or non-lethally (refer to Sections 4.4.1-4.4.2). Similarly, a control site with no MME should be sampled. Although samples from dead mussels are suboptimal and likely have lower diagnostic value, they can provide valuable information in cases where ideal samples are lacking.

4.4.4 Alternative sampling procedures

The core procedure above (Section 4.4.1) is designed to optimise sample collection for a diverse range of stressors when limited moribund samples are available, which can often be the case. However, alternative sampling procedures might be considered if focussing on fewer stressors or if more than 20 moribund samples can be found. For example, initial depuration of samples before fixing may improve the quality of histological preparations. If the necessary bio-secure facilities are available and chemical analysis is not a priority, it might be preferable to collect haemolymph samples and small tissue biopsies before depurating mussels, collecting additional tissues for other desired diagnostic tests, fixing mussels with shells on in 10% neutral buffered formalin, and transferring mussels into ethanol after 48 hours of fixation. In contrast, if focussing on chemical analysis, after consulting with specialists, it may be desirable to preserve some whole mussels immediately at -80°C because certain chemical analytes may not be adequately represented in only the posterior section of the mussel. If plenty of moribund specimens can be found, samples could be split between chemical analysis and pathogen analysis

methods to allow for the depuration and freezing of separate whole mussels. It is outside the scope of this paper to discuss all the intricacies of every available option. Such discussions can be undertaken with a specialist, and our methods can be adapted to their recommendations.

Ultimately, the division of samples from which individuals and for which tests will depend on any pre-existing hypotheses of potential causes, the permits obtained for sampling (lethal or non-lethal), the number of mussels found at the site, the resources available, and any pre-existing specialist collaborations. Even so, conducting the above-explained core procedure (Section 4.4.1; summarised in Figure 4 and Table 2) will adequately preserve samples for specialised labs to conduct a wide range of diagnostic analyses (a brief primer on analysis methods can be found in Supplementary File 3).

5 DISCUSSION

Many MMEs are the result of multiple interacting factors (Carella et al., 2023; Soon & Ransangan, 2019); thus, when investigating MMEs, cross-disciplinary methods that simultaneously target a range of potential causes are needed. This is especially the case when suspicions of potential causes are weak, necessitating a broad search of many potential stressors. This paper has set out a systematic method to collect samples for the investigation of multiple potential stressors that could be causing an MME. Various case studies of MME investigations demonstrate the application and importance of procedures such

602 as ours for sampling MMEs in freshwater mussels (Box 1) and other taxa (Box 2).
603 Our procedures will allow researchers and managers who are not specialists in
604 MME investigations to be prepared to sample an MME promptly and sufficiently
605 so that adequate material can be preserved to facilitate diagnoses.
606 Preparedness is essential when investigating MMEs because any delay in
607 collecting and preserving samples could introduce artefacts such as
608 opportunistic bacteria growing on dead tissue, which may confuse cause with
609 effect.

610 Understanding the causes of MMEs is difficult. It may be that initial
611 investigations using our methods fail to pinpoint a single cause. Often the
612 diagnostic investigation will require multiple iterations following adjustments or
613 additional tests based on previous results identifying additional stressors to
614 investigate before a refined diagnosis is achieved. Sampling may occur too late
615 to collect the ideal moribund specimens. Even if samples are correctly prepared
616 and preserved, it could be that the causative agent has passed through the
617 system and is no longer detectable in the environment or mussel tissues.

618 If sampling occurs soon enough to capture moribund mussels while the
619 stressor is still present, our procedure may reveal common potential causes
620 across multiple MMEs. This is an important step for understanding freshwater
621 mussel MMEs further (Waller & Cope, 2019). Even so, our methods alone cannot
622 provide definitive evidence of the cause of an MME. Rather, the methods can

inform future investigations of the MME, such as experimental infections, to prove the causative role of an identified stressor in inducing mortality. These investigations could lead to the development and application of rapid specific tests for important pathogens (Leis, Dziki, Standish, et al., 2023), the avoidance of translocations of diseased or parasitised individuals (Brian et al., 2021), or the reduction of the impacts of multiple stressors (Tyack et al., 2022).

Investigating MMEs should only be one part of the regular monitoring of populations. Indeed, a critical need for freshwater mussel conservation lies in the periodic application of the methods discussed in this paper to populations not experiencing MMEs or declines, especially those of high conservation status. This would help identify 'background' conditions and microbiota (Brian & Aldridge, 2023), better understand threats to mussel health, improve early detection of populations under stress, facilitate the establishment of proactive measures before MMEs occur, and improve pathological interpretations during MMEs (Burcham et al., 2023). In particular, during regular monitoring, the application of biomarker assays (e.g., clinical chemistry or metabolomics) to measure health status could be considered (Devin et al., 2023; Fritts et al., 2015; Gustafson, Stoskopf, Showers, et al., 2005; Legrand et al., 2023; Putnam et al., 2023).

Biomarkers were not specifically considered in our MME sampling procedures because, although useful during regular monitoring, these assays

644 are unable to unequivocally identify the chemicals or other stressors potentially
645 responsible for mortality. This is because most parameters measured can be
646 modulated by different classes of pollutants and are also influenced by
647 environmental factors (temperature, food availability, etc.) (Devin et al., 2023).
648 Therefore, biomarker assays are not an essential diagnostic tool to identify
649 potential causes of MMEs. However, they can still serve as a valuable
650 supplementary tool during an MME investigation, providing insights into mussel
651 health status if there is sufficient haemolymph or solid tissue available.
652 Considering the time, laboratory processing, and expertise required to
653 undertake biomarker assays, the development of a standardised, accurate,
654 widely applicable, rapid, and non-destructive field test of mussel health would
655 aid in diagnosing mussels at earlier stages of sickness and monitoring baseline
656 conditions in healthy populations.

657 Our sampling methods are not restricted to only MMEs but can be applied
658 to cases of unusual mortality. Freshwater mussel populations can be impacted
659 by unusual mortality events that may not be considered 'massive' but involve
660 atypical conditions concerning the mortality. For example, the mortality of one
661 species amongst a community of other unimpacted mussel species, mortality in
662 threatened or endangered species, temporal or spatial changes in mortality, or
663 unusual pathological findings (e.g., deformed shells (Pekkarinen, 1993; Strayer,
664 2008)). Our methods can be readily applied to these cases as well as MMEs.

By assembling into one place the range of widely used tools and protocols that are available, and by further tailoring the protocols towards a specific taxon and to address a specific need, we have produced an important framework for enabling fieldworkers to contribute to our understanding of the drivers behind the numerous MMEs within freshwater mussel populations. Although our focus is on freshwater mussels, the principles we outline can be applied to many taxa, both in wild and cultured populations. Indeed, the protocols would require relatively little modification to be applicable to studying MMEs in marine bivalves (Carella et al., 2023; Lupo et al., 2021; Soon & Ransangan, 2019) and may be especially useful in the management of bivalve populations within aquacultural systems which can experience catastrophic MMEs (Guillotreau et al., 2017; Pernet et al., 2016; Robledo et al., 2014; Soon & Ransangan, 2019).

In addition to further diagnostic investigations of MMEs using the procedures we have outlined, MME reporting should be improved and accelerated for freshwater mussels and across all taxa. Alongside the publication of MME reports in scientific journals, which can involve long delays between the initial report and the data becoming publicly available, we encourage the development of an accessible database for reporting MMEs as soon as they are observed. The creation of such a database first requires a standardised, graded MME definition and reporting framework. Synthesising MME reports in an

685 accessible database would improve MME response and monitoring, as well as
686 inform wider population- or species-level threat assessments.

687 6 CONCLUSIONS

688 With the ongoing rise in the frequency of MME reports, there is a pressing
689 need for an increased capacity to promptly respond to and investigate such
690 occurrences, particularly in understudied species that lack commercial
691 significance or charismatic appeal (Hamilton et al., 2021). We have bolstered this
692 capacity by delineating sample collection and preservation methods that can be
693 used by biologists and conservationists observing MMEs of freshwater mussels,
694 an important ecosystem engineer with a concerning and declining conservation
695 status. Considering the wider application of our methods to other taxa, the
696 protocol we have outlined has the potential to inform the investigation of MMEs
697 in a range of species, enhancing conservation efforts across diverse ecosystems.

698 7 DISCLAIMERS

699 Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only and
700 does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. The findings and
701 conclusions in this article are those of the authors and the U.S. Geological Survey
702 and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

8 REFERENCES

- Abila, R., Cocks, P. C., Stevenson, M., Kadohira, M., Tornimbene, B., & Miller, C. (2018). *A Field Manual for Animal Disease Outbreak Investigation and Management*. O.I.E (World Organisation for Animal Health). <https://doi.org/10.20506/standz.2801>
- Alfjorden, A., Brännström, I. O., Wengström, N., Kristmundsson, A., Jamy, M., Persson, D., & Burki, F. (2023). *Identification of a new gregarine parasite in mass mortality events of freshwater pearl mussels (Margaritifera margaritifera) in Sweden* (p. 2023.09.26.559503). bioRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.09.26.559503>
- Atkinson, C. L., Julian, J. P., & Vaughn, C. C. (2014). Species and function lost: Role of drought in structuring stream communities. *Biological Conservation*, 176, 30–38. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.04.029>
- Baruzzi, C., Mason, D., Barton, B., & Lashley, M. (2018). Effects of increasing carrion biomass on food webs. *Food Webs*, 17, e00096. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fooweb.2018.e00096>
- Berg, D. J., Haag, W. R., Guttman, S. I., & Sickle, J. B. (1995). Mantle Biopsy: A Technique for Nondestructive Tissue-Sampling of Freshwater Mussels. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*, 14(4), 577–581. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1467542>
- Brian, J. I., & Aldridge, D. (2020). A rapid, non-destructive method for sampling castrating parasites in endangered bivalve molluscs. *Aquatic Conservation Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 31(3), 729–735. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3505>

723 Brian, J. I., & Aldridge, D. C. (2023). Enigmatic freshwater mussel declines could be
 724 explained by the biodiversity-disease relationship. *Journal of Applied Ecology*,
 725 60(9), 1771–1777. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14479>
 726 Brian, J. I., Ollard, I. S., & Aldridge, D. C. (2021). Don't move a mussel? Parasite and
 727 disease risk in conservation action. *Conservation Letters*, 14(4). Scopus.
 728 <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12799>
 729 Brian, J. I., Reynolds, S. A., & Aldridge, D. C. (2022). Parasitism dramatically alters the
 730 ecosystem services provided by freshwater mussels. *Functional Ecology*, 36(8),
 731 2029–2042. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.14092>
 732 Bridgewater, L. L., Baird, R. B., Eaton, A. D., Rice, E. W., American Public Health
 733 Association, American Water Works Association, & Water Environment
 734 Federation (Eds.). (2017). *Standard methods for the examination of water and*
 735 *wastewater* (23rd edition). American Public Health Association.
 736 British Environmental Agency. (2003). *River Habitat Survey in Britain and Ireland*.
 737 Burcham, G. N., Fisher, B., & Boedeker, N. (2023). Histopathologic survey of free-living
 738 populations of 2 species of freshwater mussels in Indiana. *Veterinary Pathology*,
 739 60(5), 628–639. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03009858231185872>
 740 Campisano, R., Hall, K., Griggs, J., Willison, S., Reimer, S., Mash, H., Magnuson, M.,
 741 Boczek, L., & Rhodes, E. (2017). Selected analytical methods for environmental
 742 remediation and recovery (SAM) 2017. *US Environmental Protection Agency*,
 743 *Washington, DC*.

744 Carballal, M. J., Barber, B. J., Iglesias, D., & Villalba, A. (2015). Neoplastic diseases of
 745 marine bivalves. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology*, 131, 83–106.
 746 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jip.2015.06.004>

747 Carella, F., Palić, D., Šarić, T., Župan, I., Gorgoglione, B., Prado, P., Andree, K. B., Giantsis,
 748 I. A., Michaelidis, B., Lattos, A., Theodorou, J. A., Luis Barja Perez, J., Rodriguez, S.,
 749 Scarpa, F., Casu, M., Antuofermo, E., Sanna, D., Otranto, D., Panarese, R., ... Vico,
 750 G. D. (2023). Multipathogen infections and multifactorial pathogenesis involved
 751 in noble pen shell (*Pinna nobilis*) mass mortality events: Background and current
 752 pathologic approaches. *Veterinary Pathology*, 03009858231186737.
 753 <https://doi.org/10.1177/03009858231186737>

754 Carson, F. L., & Cappellano, C. H. (2019). *Histotechnology: A Self-Instructional Text* (4th
 755 edition). ASCP Press.

756 Charles, M., Bernard, I., Villalba, A., Oden, E., Burioli, E. A. V., Allain, G., Trancart, S.,
 757 Bouchart, V., & Houssin, M. (2020). High mortality of mussels in northern Brittany
 758 – Evaluation of the involvement of pathogens, pathological conditions and
 759 pollutants. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology*, 170, 107308.
 760 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jip.2019.107308>

761 Christie, A. P., Amano, T., Martin, P. A., Shackelford, G. E., Simmons, B. I., & Sutherland,
 762 W. J. (2019). Simple study designs in ecology produce inaccurate estimates of
 763 biodiversity responses. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 56(12), 2742–2754.
 764 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13499>

765 Cummings, K. S., Jones, H. A., & Lopes-Lima, M. (2016). Rapid bioassessment methods
 766 for freshwater molluscs. *Core Standardized Methods*, 186, 1–23.

767 Curley, E. A. M., Thomas, R., Adams, C. E., & Stephen, A. (2021). Behavioural and
 768 metabolic responses of Unionida mussels to stress. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine*
 769 *and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 31(11), 3184–3200. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3689>

770 Devin, S., Potet, M., Louis, F., Pauly, D., Rocher, B., Wagner, P., Giambérini, L., & Pain-
 771 Devin, S. (2023). Spatial and seasonal use of biomarkers in dreissenids:
 772 Implications for biomonitoring. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*.
 773 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-28126-3>

774 Donaghy, L., Hong, H.-K., Kim, M., Park, H.-S., & Choi, K.-S. (2016). Assessment of the
 775 fitness of the mussel *Mytilus galloprovincialis* two years after the Hebei Spirit oil
 776 spill. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 113(1), 324–331.
 777 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.10.007>

778 Downing, J. A., Van Meter, P., Woolnough, D. A., & Central Michigan Univ., Mount
 779 Pleasant, USA. (2010). Suspects and evidence: A review of the causes of
 780 extirpation and decline in freshwater mussels. *Animal Biodiversity and*
 781 *Conservation*, 33(2), 151–185. <https://doi.org/10.32800/abc.2010.33.0151>

782 DuBose, T., Atkinson, C., Vaughn, C., & Golladay, S. (2019). Drought-Induced, Punctuated
 783 Loss of Freshwater Mussels Alters Ecosystem Function Across Temporal
 784 ScalesTable_1.docx. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 7.
 785 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2019.00274>

786 EURL for Molluscs Diseases. (2020). *Sample processing in the context of mollusc mortality*
 787 *events*. <https://www.eurl-mollusc.eu/SOPs>

788 Fey, S. B., Gibert, J. P., & Siepielski, A. M. (2019). The consequences of mass mortality
789 events for the structure and dynamics of biological communities. *Oikos*, 128(12),
790 1679–1690. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.06515>

791 Fey, S. B., Siepielski, A. M., Nusslé, S., Cervantes-Yoshida, K., Hwan, J. L., Huber, E. R., Fey,
792 M. J., Catenazzi, A., & Carlson, S. M. (2015). Recent shifts in the occurrence, cause,
793 and magnitude of animal mass mortality events. *Proceedings of the National*
794 *Academy of Sciences*, 112(4), 1083–1088.
795 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1414894112>

796 Fleming, W. J., Augspurger, T. P., & Alderman, J. A. (1995). Freshwater mussel die-off
797 attributed to anticholinesterase poisoning. *Environmental Toxicology and*
798 *Chemistry*, 14(5), 877–879. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.5620140520>

799 Fritts, A. K., Peterson, J. T., Hazelton, P. D., & Bringolf, R. B. (2015). Evaluation of methods
800 for assessing physiological biomarkers of stress in freshwater mussels. *Canadian*
801 *Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 72(10), 1450–1459.
802 <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2014-0564>

803 García-March, J. R., Tena, J., Henandis, S., Vázquez-Luis, M., López, D., Téllez, C., Prado, P.,
804 Navas, J. I., Bernal, J., Catanese, G., Grau, A., López-Sanmartín, M., Nebot-
805 Colomer, E., Ortega, A., Planes, S., Kersting, D., Jimenez, S., Hendriks, I., Moreno,
806 D., ...Deudero, S. (2020). Can we save a marine species affected by a highly
807 infective, highly lethal, waterborne disease from extinction? *Biological*
808 *Conservation*, 243, 108498. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108498>

809 Guilloreau, P., Bihan, V. L., & Pardo, S. (2017). Mass mortality of farmed oysters in
 810 France: Bad responses and good results. In *Global Change in Marine Systems*.
 811 Routledge.

812 Gustafson, L. L., Stoskopf, M. K., Bogan, A. E., Showers, W., Kwak, T. J., Hanlon, S., &
 813 Levine, J. F. (2005). Evaluation of a nonlethal technique for hemolymph collection
 814 in *Elliptio complanata*, a freshwater bivalve (Mollusca: Unionidae). *Diseases of*
 815 *Aquatic Organisms*, 65(2), 159–165. <https://doi.org/10.3354/dao065159>

816 Gustafson, L. L., Stoskopf, M. K., Showers, W., Cope, G., Eads, C., Linnehan, R., Kwak, T. J.,
 817 Andersen, B., & Levine, J. F. (2005). Reference ranges for hemolymph chemistries
 818 from *Elliptio complanata* of North Carolina. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms*, 65(2),
 819 167–176. <https://doi.org/10.3354/dao065167>

820 Haag, W. R. (Ed.). (2012). The decline of the North American mussel fauna: Chronology
 821 and causes. In *North American Freshwater Mussels: Natural History, Ecology, and*
 822 *Conservation* (pp. 316–390). Cambridge University Press.
 823 <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139048217.011>

824 Hamilton, S. L., Saccomanno, V. R., Heady, W. N., Gehman, A. L., Lonhart, S. I., Beas-Luna,
 825 R., Francis, F. T., Lee, L., Rogers-Bennett, L., Salomon, A. K., & Gravem, S. A. (2021).
 826 Disease-driven mass mortality event leads to widespread extirpation and
 827 variable recovery potential of a marine predator across the eastern Pacific.
 828 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 288(1957), 20211195.
 829 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2021.1195>

830 Hewson, I., Johnson, M. R., & Reyes-Chavez, B. (2024). Lessons Learned from the Sea
 831 Star Wasting Disease Investigation. *Annual Review of Marine Science*.
 832 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-marine-040623-082617>

833 Howard, D. W., & Smith, C. S. (1983). *Histological techniques for marine bivalve mollusks*.

834 Hudnell, H. K. (2008). Cynobacterial Harmful Algal Blooms: State of the Science and
 835 Research Needs. In *Adv Exp Med Assoc* (Vol. 619). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-75865-7)
 836 [387-75865-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-75865-7)

837 Jonsson, P. R., & Andé, C. (1992). Mass mortality of the bivalve *Cerastoderma edule* on
 838 the swedish west coast caused by infestation with the digenean trematode
 839 *Cercaria cerastodermæ* I. *Ophelia*.
 840 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00785326.1992.10430365>

841 Karlsson, S., Larsen, B. M., Eriksen, L., & Hagen, M. (2013). Four methods of
 842 nondestructive DNA sampling from freshwater pearl mussels *Margaritifera*
 843 *margaritifera* L. (Bivalvia:Unionoida). *Freshwater Science*, 32(2), 525–530.
 844 <https://doi.org/10.1899/12-079.1>

845 Knowles, S., Dennis, M., McElwain, A., Leis, E. M., & Richard, J. (2023). Pathology and
 846 infectious agents of unionid mussels: A primer for pathologists in disease
 847 surveillance and investigation of mortality events. *Veterinary Pathology*,
 848 03009858231171666. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03009858231171666>

849 Kock, R. A., Orynbayev, M., Robinson, S., Zuther, S., Singh, N. J., Beauvais, W., Morgan, E.
 850 R., Kerimbayev, A., Khomenko, S., Martineau, H. M., Rystaeva, R., Omarova, Z.,
 851 Wolfs, S., Hawotte, F., Radoux, J., & Milner-Gulland, E. J. (2018). Saigas on the

852 brink: Multidisciplinary analysis of the factors influencing mass mortality events.
853 *Science Advances*, 4(1), eaao2314. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aao2314>
854 Kubota, K., Shirai, K., Murakami-Sugihara, N., Seike, K., Minami, M., Nakamura, T., &
855 Tanabe, K. (2021). EVIDENCE OF MASS MORTALITY OF THE LONG-LIVED BIVALVE
856 MERCENARIA STIMPSONI CAUSED BY A CATASTROPHIC TSUNAMI. *Radiocarbon*,
857 63(6), 1629–1644. <https://doi.org/10.1017/RDC.2021.98>
858 Legrand, E., Bayless, A. L., Bearden, D. W., Casu, F., Edwards, M., Jacob, A., Johnson, W. E.,
859 & Schock, T. B. (2023). Untargeted metabolomics analyses and contaminant
860 chemistry of Dreissenid mussels at the Maumee River Area of Concern in the
861 Great Lakes. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 57(48), 19169–19179.
862 Leis, E. M., Dziki, S., Richard, J., Agbalog, R., Waller, D., Putnam, J., Knowles, S., &
863 Goldberg, T. (2023). Further Bacteriological Analysis of Annual Pheasantshell
864 (*Actinonaias Pectorosa*) Mussel Mortality Events in the Clinch River
865 (Virginia/Tennessee), USA, Reveals a Consistent Association with *Yokenella*
866 *regensburgei*. *Freshwater Mollusk Biology and Conservation*, 26(1), 1–10.
867 <https://doi.org/10.31931/fm bc-d-22-00001>
868 Leis, E. M., Dziki, S., Standish, I., Waller, D., Richard, J., Weinzinger, J., Harris, C., Knowles,
869 S., & Goldberg, T. (2023). A Bacteriological Comparison of the Hemolymph from
870 Healthy and Moribund Unionid Mussel Populations in the Upper Midwestern
871 U.S.A. Prompts the Development of Diagnostic Assays to Detect *Yokenella*
872 *regensburgei*. *Microorganisms*, 11(4), Article 4.
873 <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms11041068>

874 Leis, E. M., Erickson, S., Waller, D., Richard, J., & Goldberg, T. (2019). A Comparison of
 875 Bacteria Cultured from Unionid Mussel Hemolymph between Stable Populations
 876 in the Upper Mississippi River Basin and Populations Affected by a Mortality
 877 Event in the Clinch River. *Freshwater Mollusk Biology and Conservation*, 22(2), 70–
 878 80. <https://doi.org/10.31931/fmbc.v22i2.2019.70-80>
 879 Lopes-Lima, M., Burlakova, L. E., Karatayev, A. Y., Mehler, K., Seddon, M., & Sousa, R.
 880 (2018). Conservation of freshwater bivalves at the global scale: Diversity, threats
 881 and research needs. *Hydrobiologia*, 810(1), 1–14. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-017-3486-7)
 882 017-3486-7
 883 Lupo, C., Bougeard, S., Le Bihan, V., Blin, J. L., Allain, G., Azéma, P., Benoit, F., Béchemin,
 884 C., Bernard, I., Blachier, P., Brieau, L., Danion, M., Garcia, A., Gervasoni, E., Glize,
 885 P., Lainé, A., Lapègue, S., Mablouké, C., Poirier, L., ...Le Bouquin, S. (2021).
 886 Mortality of marine mussels *Mytilus edulis* and *M. galloprovincialis*: Systematic
 887 literature review of risk factors and recommendations for future research.
 888 *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 13(1), 504–536. <https://doi.org/10.1111/raq.12484>
 889 Marchowski, D., Szlauer-Łukaszewska, A., Ławicki, Ł., Engel, J., Drewniak, E., & Ciężak, K.
 890 (2024). Methods of quantifying a mass mortality event in freshwater wildlife
 891 within the river ecosystem. *MethodsX* 12, 102567.
 892 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2024.102567>
 893 McCartney, M. A., Sommer, K., & Wilbur, A. E. (2009). Field Evaluation of Mortality from
 894 Hemolymph Extraction as a Source of DNA, and Application to PCR-RFLP
 895 Identification of Threatened Freshwater Mussel Species. *Journal of Shellfish*
 896 *Research*, 28(2), 345–354. <https://doi.org/10.2983/035.028.0217>

897 McDowell, W. G., & Sousa, R. (2019). Mass Mortality Events of Invasive Freshwater
898 Bivalves: Current Understanding and Potential Directions for Future Research.
899 *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 7, 331. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2019.00331>

900 McGladdery, S. E., Reinisch, C. L., MacCallum, G. S., Stephens, R. E., Walker, C. L., &
901 Davidson, J. (2001). Haemic neoplasia in soft-shell clams (*Mya arenaria*): Recent
902 outbreaks in Atlantic Canada and discovery of a p53 gene homologue associated
903 with the condition. *Bulletin of the Aquaculture Association of Canada*, 101(3), 19–26.

904 Meyer, F. P., & Barclay, L. A. (1990). Field manual for the investigation of fish kills. In
905 *Resource Publication* (177). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
906 <https://pubs.usgs.gov/publication/70006350>

907 Naimo, T. J., Damschen, E. D., Rada, R. G., & Monroe, E. M. (1998). Nonlethal Evaluation
908 of the Physiological Health of Unionid Mussels: Methods for Biopsy and Glycogen
909 Analysis. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*, 17(1), 121–128.
910 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1468056>

911 Neto, J. G. D. S., Hardman, R. H., Engman, A. C., Dinkins, G. R., Lane, T. W., Fry, M. M.,
912 Rines, C., Bisenieks, A., Rajeev, S., & Dennis, M. M. (2024). *Multisystemic*
913 *inflammatory disease in Pheasantshell (Unionidae, Actinonaias pectorosa) associated*
914 *with Yokenella regensburgei infection at sites experiencing seasonal mass mortality*
915 *events* (p. 2024.03.14.585088). bioRxiv.
916 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.14.585088>

917 Neves, R. J. (1987). *Proceedings of the Workshop on Die-offs of Freshwater Mussels in the*
918 *United States, June 23-25, 1986, Davenport, Iowa.*

919 Ollard, I., & Aldridge, D. C. (2023). Declines in freshwater mussel density, size and
 920 productivity in the River Thames over the past half century. *Journal of Animal*
 921 *Ecology*, 92(1), 112–123. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13835>

922 Pekkarinen, M. (1993). Reproduction and condition of unionid mussels in the Vantaa
 923 River, South Finland. *Archiv Für Hydrobiologie*, 127(3), 357–375.

924 Pernet, F., Lupo, C., Bacher, C., & Whittington, R. J. (2016). Infectious diseases in oyster
 925 aquaculture require a new integrated approach. *Philosophical Transactions of the*
 926 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 371(1689), 20150213.
 927 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0213>

928 Putnam, J. G., Steiner, J. N., Richard, J. C., Leis, E., Goldberg, T. L., Dunn, C. D., Agbalog, R.,
 929 Knowles, S., & Waller, D. L. (2023). Mussel mass mortality in the Clinch River, USA:
 930 Metabolomics detects affected pathways and biomarkers of stress. *Conservation*
 931 *Physiology*, 11(1), coad074. <https://doi.org/10.1093/conphys/coad074>

932 Raley, M. E., Levine, J. F., & Bogan, A. E. (2006). Hemolymph as a nonlethal and minimally
 933 invasive source of DNA for molecular systematic studies of freshwater mussels.
 934 *Tentacle*, 14, 33–35.

935 Richard, J. C. (2018). Clinch River Mussel Die-Off. *Ellipsaria*, 20.

936 Richard, J. C., Campbell, L. J., Leis, E. M., Agbalog, R. E., Dunn, C. D., Waller, D. L., Knowles,
 937 S., Putnam, J. G., & Goldberg, T. L. (2021). Mussel Mass Mortality and the
 938 Microbiome: Evidence for Shifts in the Bacterial Microbiome of a Declining
 939 Freshwater Bivalve. *Microorganisms*, 9(9), 1976.
 940 <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms9091976>

941 Richard, J. C., Leis, E. M., Dunn, C. D., Agbalog, R., Waller, D., Knowles, S., Putnam, J., &
 942 Goldberg, T. L. (2020). Mass mortality in freshwater mussels (*Actinonaias*
 943 *pectorosa*) in the Clinch River, USA, linked to a novel densovirus. *Scientific*
 944 *Reports*, *10*(1), 14498. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-71459-z>
 945 Richard, J. C., Leis, E. M., Dunn, C. D., Harris, C., Agbalog, R. E., Campbell, L. J., Knowles, S.,
 946 Waller, D. L., Putnam, J. G., & Goldberg, T. L. (2022). Freshwater Mussels Show
 947 Elevated Viral Richness and Intensity during a Mortality Event. *Viruses*, *14*(12),
 948 Article 12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/v14122603>
 949 Rimondi, A., Vanstreels, R. E. T., Olivera, V., Donini, A., Lauriente, M. M., & Uhart, M. M.
 950 (2024). Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza A(H5N1) Viruses from Multispecies
 951 Outbreak, Argentina, August 2023. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, *30*(4), 812–814.
 952 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid3004.231725>
 953 Robledo, J. A. F., Vasta, G. R., & Record, N. R. (2014). Protozoan Parasites of Bivalve
 954 Molluscs: Literature Follows Culture. *PLOS ONE*, *9*(6), e100872.
 955 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0100872>
 956 Saha, S., & Layzer, J. B. (2008). Evaluation of a nonlethal technique for determining sex
 957 of freshwater mussels. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*, *27*(1),
 958 84–89. <https://doi.org/10.1899/07-004R.1>
 959 Smith, D. R., Villella, R. F., & Lemarié, D. P. (2001). Survey protocol for assessment of
 960 endangered freshwater mussels in the Allegheny River, Pennsylvania. *Journal of*
 961 *the North American Benthological Society*, *20*(1), 118–132.
 962 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1468193>

963 Sobieraj, J., & Metelski, D. (2023). Insights into Toxic *Prymnesium parvum* Blooms as a
 964 Cause of the Ecological Disaster on the Odra River. *Toxins*, 15(6), 403.
 965 <https://doi.org/10.3390/toxins15060403>

966 Soon, T. K., & Ransangan, J. (2019). Extrinsic Factors and Marine Bivalve Mass
 967 Mortalities: An Overview. *Journal of Shellfish Research*, 38(2), 223–232.
 968 <https://doi.org/10.2983/035.038.0202>

969 Sousa, R., Varandas, S., Cortes, R., Teixeira, A., Lopes-Lima, M., Machado, J., &
 970 Guilhermino, L. (2012). Massive die-offs of freshwater bivalves as resource
 971 pulses. *Annales de Limnologie - International Journal of Limnology*, 48(1), Article 1.
 972 <https://doi.org/10.1051/limn/2012003>

973 Southwick, R. I., & Loftus, A. J. (2017). *Investigation and monetary values of fish and*
 974 *freshwater mollusk kills*. American Fisheries Society.

975 Strayer, D. L. (2008). A New Widespread Morphological Deformity in Freshwater Mussels
 976 from New York. *Northeastern Naturalist*, 15(1), 149–151.
 977 [https://doi.org/10.1656/1092-6194\(2008\)15\[149:ANWMDI\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1656/1092-6194(2008)15[149:ANWMDI]2.0.CO;2)

978 Strayer, D. L., Downing, J. A., Haag, W. R., King, T. L., Layzer, J. B., Newton, T. J., & Nichols,
 979 J. S. (2004). Changing Perspectives on Pearly Mussels, North America's Most
 980 Imperiled Animals. *BioScience*, 54(5), 429–439. [https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2004)054[0429:CPOPMN]2.0.CO;2)
 981 [3568\(2004\)054\[0429:CPOPMN\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2004)054[0429:CPOPMN]2.0.CO;2)

982 Szlauer-Łukaszewska, A., Ławicki, Ł., Engel, J., Drewniak, E., Ciężak, K., & Marchowski, D.
 983 (2024). Quantifying a mass mortality event in freshwater wildlife within the Lower
 984 Odra River: Insights from a large European river. *Science of The Total Environment*,
 985 907, 167898. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.167898>

986 Thieltges, D. W. (2006). Parasite Induced Summer Mortality in the Cockle *Cerastoderma*
987 edule by the Trematode *Gymnophallus choledochus*. *Hydrobiologia*, 559(1), 455–
988 461. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-005-1345-4>

989 Tiemann, J. S., Dodd, H. R., Owens, N., & Wahl, D. H. (2007). Effects of Lowhead Dams on
990 Unionids in the Fox River, Illinois. *Northeastern Naturalist*, 14(1), 125–138.
991 [https://doi.org/10.1656/1092-6194\(2007\)14\[125:EOLDOU\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1656/1092-6194(2007)14[125:EOLDOU]2.0.CO;2)

992 Tsakiris, E. T., Randklev, C. R., & Conway, K. W. (2016). Effectiveness of a nonlethal
993 method to quantify gamete production in freshwater mussels. *Freshwater*
994 *Science*, 35(3), 958–973. <https://doi.org/10.1086/687839>

995 Tyack, P. L., Thomas, L., Costa, D. P., Hall, A. J., Harris, C. M., Harwood, J., Kraus, S. D.,
996 Miller, P. J. O., Moore, M., Photopoulou, T., Pirotta, E., Rolland, R. M., Schwacke, L.
997 H., Simmons, S. E., & Southall, B. L. (2022). Managing the effects of multiple
998 stressors on wildlife populations in their ecosystems: Developing a cumulative
999 risk approach. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 289(1987),
1000 20222058. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2022.2058>

1001 Vaughn, C. C., Atkinson, C. L., & Julian, J. P. (2015). Drought-induced changes in flow
1002 regimes lead to long-term losses in mussel-provided ecosystem services. *Ecology*
1003 *and Evolution*, 5(6), 1291–1305. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.1442>

1004 Vaughn, C. C., & Taylor, C. M. (1999). Impoundments and the Decline of Freshwater
1005 Mussels: A Case Study of an Extinction Gradient. *Conservation Biology*, 13(4), 912–
1006 920. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.1999.97343.x>

1007 Waller, D. L., & Cope, W. G. (2019). The Status of Mussel Health Assessment and a Path
 1008 Forward. *Freshwater Mollusk Biology and Conservation*, 22(2), 26.
 1009 <https://doi.org/10.31931/fmbc.v22i2.2019.26-42>

1010 Watters, G. T. (1996). Small dams as barriers to freshwater mussels (Bivalvia, Unionoida)
 1011 and their hosts. *Biological Conservation*, 75(1), 79–85.
 1012 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207\(95\)00034-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(95)00034-8)

1013 Watters, G. T., & Flaute, C. J. M. (2010). Dams, Zebras, and Settlements: The Historical
 1014 Loss of Freshwater Mussels in the Ohio River Mainstem. *American Malacological*
 1015 *Bulletin*, 28(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.4003/006.028.0201>

1016 Wengström, N., Söderberg, H., Höjesjö, J., & Alfjorden, A. (2019). Mass Mortality Events in
 1017 Freshwater Pearl Mussel (*Margaritifera margaritifera*) Populations in Sweden: An
 1018 Overview and Indication of Possible Causes. *Freshwater Mollusk Biology and*
 1019 *Conservation*, 22(2), 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.31931/fmbc.v22i2.2019.61-69>

1020 Werner, S., & Rothhaupt, K.-O. (2008). Mass mortality of the invasive bivalve *Corbicula*
 1021 *fluminea* induced by a severe low-water event and associated low water
 1022 temperatures. In K. M. Wantzen, K.-O. Rothhaupt, M. Mörtl, M. Cantonati, L. G. -
 1023 Tóth, & P. Fischer (Eds.), *Ecological Effects of Water-Level Fluctuations in Lakes* (pp.
 1024 143–150). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9192-6_14

1025 Woolnough, D. A., Bellamy, A., Hummel, S. L., & Annis, M. (2020). Environmental
 1026 exposure of freshwater mussels to contaminants of emerging concern:
 1027 Implications for species conservation. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 46(6),
 1028 1625–1638. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jglr.2020.10.001>

1029 Work, T. M. (2015). Mortality investigation. In *Techniques and Methods* (15-B3). U.S.
1030 Geological Survey. <https://doi.org/10.3133/tm15B3>

1031 Young, T. P. (1994). Natural Die-Offs of Large Mammals: Implications for Conservation.
1032 *Conservation Biology*, 8(2), 410–418.

1033 Zhong, L., Xu, B., Yan, D., Xiao, T., & Liu, Q. (2016). Pathogen isolation and pathologic
1034 observation on explosive epidemics of *Hyriopsis cumingii* Lea. *Turkish Journal of*
1035 *Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 16, 935–945. [https://doi.org/10.4194/1303-2712-](https://doi.org/10.4194/1303-2712-v16_4_21)
1036 [v16_4_21](https://doi.org/10.4194/1303-2712-v16_4_21)

1037 Zieritz, A., Sousa, R., Aldridge, D. C., Douda, K., Esteves, E., Ferreira-Rodríguez, N.,
1038 Mageroy, J. H., Nizzoli, D., Osterling, M., Reis, J., Riccardi, N., Daill, D., Gumpinger,
1039 C., & Vaz, A. S. (2022). A global synthesis of ecosystem services provided and
1040 disrupted by freshwater bivalve molluscs. *Biological Reviews*, 97(5), 1967–1998.
1041 <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12878>

1042

1043 TABLE 1

1044 Essential preliminary data to collect or collate during a diagnostic investigation of a freshwater mussel mass

1045 mortality event (MME).

Parameter	Purpose	Methodological guidance
Prevalence and timeframe of mortality	Knowing the proportion of mussels affected by the MME provides key information about its extent and likely effect on the population, Knowing the timeframe of mortality places the event relative to surrounding environmental changes and gives insights about the causative agent regarding its speed of action	Section 4.3 (for diagnosing moribund vs. healthy mussels), Marchowski et al., 2024 and Southwick and Loftus (2017) (for quantifying dead mussels)
Size/age	Knowing whether the MME disproportionately affects old or young mussels could help diagnostics and predict long-term population outcomes	Ollard and Aldridge 2023 (for estimating age from size)
Mortality in other taxa	Knowing the specificity of the MME helps diagnostics and predict community-level effects	At least note any mortality in other taxa, refer to Marchowski et al., 2024 for quantifying mortality in other aquatic taxa (e.g., fish, snails)
Impacted mussel density and abundance	Helps provide information about the total impact of the MME and insights into possible causes, such as the potential for transmission of infectious agents	Refer to examples in Smith et al. 2001 and Brian et al. 2022
Obvious environmental changes	Provides information on potential causes	Record any obvious environmental changes such as habitat destruction by humans (e.g., construction activities)

1046

1047 TABLE 2

1048 Outline of the diagnostic tests used when studying freshwater mussel mass mortality events (MMEs). TEM:

1049 transmission electron microscopy.

1050

Diagnostic test	Information obtained	Advantages	Disadvantages	Target organ/s to sample ^s	Long term preservation of samples	Are there non-lethal sampling options
Essential, sample preparation is part of the core procedure						
Molecular (e.g., metagenomics or qPCR)	Identification of both micro and macro parasites	Holistic view of microbes, Can be non-destructive	Expense, General lack of knowledge on microbes/viruses that are pathogenic to mussels, Difficult to interpret the significance of a disease without pathological assessment, Errors in species identification	Haemolymph [#] , Biopsies from multiple organs	Frozen at -80°C (or in liquid nitrogen ^{&})	Yes
Chemical analysis (e.g., mass spectroscopy, colourimetric assays)	Identification of substances toxic to mussels such as metals, pesticides, PAHs, ammonia, and biotoxins (e.g., microcystin)	Very reliable quantitative result, Several toxic substances (e.g., metals, pesticides) have well-established analyses	Needs a relatively large amount of tissue (0.5-1 g), Destructive, Likely requires pooling tissues, A large range of different analyses for different chemicals necessitates some prior hypothesis regarding what to target, which will likely involve consultation with an expert laboratory, Clear evidence of the involvement of pollutants in mussel declines is difficult to establish (e.g., Woolnough et al., 2020), Health impacts of many toxins (especially biotoxins) are poorly understood, most lack established thresholds for healthy levels in mussels, and synergistic adverse effects have barely been considered	Tissue homogenates of parts of or whole mussels	Frozen at -20°C or colder	No

Histology	Visualisation of etiologic agents (macro and most micro parasites) and lesions associated with pathology, Diagnosis of specific diseases	Only method that can specify type of disease according to pathological process, thus, helpful in determining the significance of a broad range of potential causes, Samples preserved for histology can be utilised for other methods such as TEM if prepared correctly	Destructive, Requires toxic chemicals for preservation, Requires specialised processing and expertise to interpret histological sections	Sections of the key organs of the body.	In 10% neutral buffered formalin or similar*	No
Non-essential, ancillary methods that can be done if specialists are available						
Haemocytology	Identification of disseminated neoplasia, abnormal haemocyte morphology or composition, and pathogens in the haemolymph	Non-destructive, Gives results relatively quickly	Requires specialist knowledge for sample collection and interpretation, Requires immediate processing, Difficult to obtain equipment/reagents in time, References ranges are not well-established, Characteristic haemocytic responses to different types of host injury are not well established	Haemolymph	Immediately process onto slides	Yes
Culture	Identification of microbial pathogens	Provides isolates of microbes which can allow future experimental infection and/or the sequencing of longer fragments with Sanger sequencing, Can be non-destructive	Understudied aquatic pathogens may require unusual culture conditions, Requires specialist knowledge for sample collection to prepare plates for immediate sample processing, Large biases in what will grow on the plates mean this method should not be used in isolation	Haemolymph	Immediately add to culture plates	Yes
Cytology (e.g., wet mount preparations of tissue clippings or scrapings and/or stained	Identification of surface-associated protistan parasites, macroparasites (e.g., trematodes), fungi, and large bacteria,	Gives a rapid indication of potential problems, Inexpensive, Conventional method to detect organisms that may dissociate from	Wet mount preparations require specialist knowledge for sample collection and interpretation Requires immediate processing and identification of parasites/abnormalities, Most ectoparasites are not expected to have a large causative role in MMEs,	Multiple organs and sample types (scrapings, fluid, tissue clips, etc)	Immediately process	Yes

preparations of tissue imprints)	Identification of gross abnormalities of tissue, cellular infiltrates, and disseminated neoplasia	surface tissues when in fixative, Stained preparations can be stored for later analysis	Stained preparations require an extra step to prepare slides during sampling and some level of specialised knowledge			
Non-essential, alternative use for haemolymph or tissue collected if enough remains after other diagnostic methods						
Biomarker assays (including clinical chemistry)	Gives insights into general health status of the mussel through various potential assays such as, metabolomics, protein content, glucose content, or acetylcholinesterase activity	Screens for biomarkers of health and organ function, Provides a finer characterisation of health status than visual symptoms	Limited reference ranges are available for freshwater mussels, Does not provide specific diagnostics as multiple stressors can impact the same parameter	Haemolymph or tissue biopsies	Frozen at -80°C	Yes

1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056

#Haemolymph can be drawn non-lethally in the field if non-lethal methods are required. However, lethal sampling is recommended for other diagnostic procedures. Refer to text (Section 4.4) for more detail on haemolymph sample transport and preservation if non-lethal sampling is required.

*10% neutral buffered formalin is the most widely used solution for routine fixation. Other fixatives can be used (Section 4.4.1). It is recommended to wash samples out of formalin into ethanol after at least 24-48 hours of fixation (Section 4.4.1).

\$A description of the best way to combine samples from these organs for the diagnostic tests can be found in the main text (Section 4.4).

&Other options are discussed in Section 4.4