**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Aggregations of brittle stars can provide similar ecological roles as mussel reefs

Geraldi, N. R., Bertolini, C., Emmerson, M. C., Roberts, D., Sigwart, J. D., & O'Connor, N. E. (2017). Aggregations of brittle stars can provide similar ecological roles as mussel reefs. *MARINE ECOLOGY-PROGRESS SERIES*, 563, 157-167. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps11993>

Published in:
MARINE ECOLOGY-PROGRESS SERIES

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

© 2017 Inter-Research.

This work is made available online in accordance with the publisher's policies. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Aggregations of brittle stars can provide similar ecological roles as mussel reefs.

Nathan R. Geraldi^{1,2,3*}, Camilla Bertolini^{1,2} Mark C. Emmerson^{1,2}, Dai Roberts^{1,2}, Julia D. Sigwart^{1,2}, and Nessa E. O'Connor^{1,2}

1 Queen's University Marine Laboratory, 12-13 the Strand, Portaferry, BT22 1PF, Northern Ireland, UK. 2: Institute of Global Food Security, School of Biological Sciences, Queen's University Belfast, 97 Lisburn Road, Belfast, BT9 7BL, Northern Ireland, UK 2). 3: Present address- Red Sea Research Center, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, Thuwal, Saudi Arabia

*Corresponding author: nathan.r.geraldi@gmail.com,

Running header: Aggregations of mussels and brittle stars

Key-words: benthic-pelagic coupling, biogenic habitat, bivalve, brittle star, foundation species, ophiuroids, organic matter, reef

Abstract

Biogenic habitats, such as coral reefs, facilitate diverse communities. In aquatic systems, aggregations of mobile benthic species may play a similar ecological role to that of typically sessile biogenic habitats, however, this has rarely been considered. We quantified the abundance of sessile mussels (*Modiolus modiolus*) and aggregating brittle stars (*Ophiotrix fragilis*) and tested for correlations between the density of mussels (live and dead) and brittle stars each with: 1) abundance, biomass, diversity and assemblage structure of associated benthic macrofauna; and 2) percent organic matter of the sediment. We found that the abundance of live *M. modiolus* was positively associated with the abundance and biomass of macrofauna. The positive association between *M. modiolus* and macrofauna abundance was further amplified with an increase in brittle stars and a decrease in dead mussel shells. Macrofauna biomass was lower with more dead mussel shells and macrofauna diversity increased with more live *M. modiolus* and brittle stars. Sediment organic matter was positively related with brittle star density, but not with the abundance of live or dead mussels. The positive relationship between brittle stars and sediment organic matter suggests that brittle stars could enhance rates of benthic-pelagic coupling. Given the importance of understanding the functional role of threatened habitats, it is essential that the underlying community patterns be understood through robust observational studies to then derive testable hypotheses to determine drivers. These findings provide novel insight into the ecological role of aggregations of mobile species, which is essential to prioritize conservation and restoration strategies.

21 **Introduction**

22 Habitat-forming species, such as corals or trees, are widespread in terrestrial and aquatic
23 ecosystems worldwide. These species create complex biogenic habitats, which are the foundation
24 of communities that do not exist in their absence (Bertness & Callaway 1994, Stachowicz 2001).
25 Increased habitat complexity facilitates increased species richness by reducing predation,
26 competition and disturbance pressure (Stachowicz 2001, Bruno et al. 2003). In aquatic
27 ecosystems, biogenic habitats such as seagrass, saltmarsh, mangroves, and bivalve reefs provide
28 multiple ecosystem services including, the enhanced production of economically important
29 species, reduced erosion rates, and nutrient removal (Costanza et al. 1997, Grabowski &
30 Peterson 2007, Barbier et al. 2011). Unfortunately, these marine species are impacted heavily by
31 human activities and most are reduced to a fraction of their historical abundance globally
32 (Waycott et al. 2009, Beck et al. 2011, De'ath et al. 2012). The loss of biogenic habitats has in
33 some instances negated their ecological roles and severely diminished the benefits they provide
34 to society (Waycott et al. 2009, Ermgassen et al. 2012, 2013).

35 Aggregations of mobile fauna are generally considered deleterious to ecosystems; for
36 example outbreaks of urchins can denude large areas once covered with macroalgae (Steneck et
37 al. 2004). However, aggregations of mobile species can potentially provide similar functions as
38 sedentary, foundation species and create biogenic habitats. For instance, aggregations of urchins
39 can increase biodiversity and provide shelter for prey (Altieri & Witman 2014).

40 Mussel reefs, similar to oyster reefs, have been depleted worldwide (Lotze et al. 2006).
41 The horse mussel, *Modiolus modiolus*, forms reefs in the North Atlantic ocean (Sanderson et al.
42 2008, Wildish et al. 2009) and its abundance has declined most likely from habitat destruction
43 following fishing practices (Magorrian & Service 1998, Strain et al. 2012, Cook et al. 2013) and

global warming (Gormley et al. 2013). The complex habitat that *M. modiolus* reefs create is known for its high diversity of organisms (Rees et al. 2008, Ragnarsson & Burgos 2012, Fariñas-Franco et al. 2013). The loss of live mussels can result in a matrix of dead shell. Experimental studies that held shell structure constant found that loss of live blue mussels reduce abundance but not diversity of macrofauna (Norling & Kautsky 2007, Norling et al. 2015), but the loss of live *M. modiolus* on reef ecology in natural settings is unknown.

Brittle stars occur in dense aggregations throughout the globe (Fedra 1977, Fratt & Dearborn 1984). In particular, the suspension feeding brittle star, *Ophiothrix fragilis*, exists in dense beds of more than 1,000 individuals m⁻² around Britain and Ireland (Warner 1971, Aronson 1989, Dauvin et al. 2013). *Ophiothrix fragilis* beds exist in similar environments as *M. modiolus* reefs and co-occur in some areas (Sanderson et al. 2008, Ragnarsson & Burgos 2012). Although it was thought that aggregations of *O. fragilis*, which often overlay *M. modiolus* reefs, may have negative effects on benthic macrofauna from smothering and competition effects, many species of macrofauna were recorded beneath brittle star beds (Warner 1971). Brittle stars could facilitate benthic fauna by enhancing deposition of organic material (Warner 1971, Murat et al. 2016) and provide refuge from predators. Dense aggregations of this mobile species could provide ecological benefits similar to sessile reef forming species. In addition, there could be emergent properties when dense aggregations of both sessile and mobile species exist together (Angelini et al. 2011). However, our understanding of ecological roles associated with these two habitats, beds of mobile species and reefs of sessile species, is limited.

Modiolus modiolus is protected in Europe under Annex I of the EU Habitats Directive (Directive 93/43/EEC) and the OSPAR convention (Rees et al. 2008). Therefore a survey based on benthic grabs was designed to determine the extent and condition of *M. modiolus* reefs in

Northern Ireland to inform management decisions about their conservation. This intensive survey allowed an unprecedented opportunity to study this heavily protected biogenic habitat and determine ecological patterns which are a necessary precursor to conducting manipulative experiments to pinpoint underlying mechanisms (Underwood et al. 2000). Our aim was to characterize the ecological roles of a declining biogenic-reef forming species, *M. modiolus*, and a common co-occurring benthic species, *O. fragilis*. We quantified how the abundance of live *M. modiolus*, *M. modiolus* shell (dead *M. modiolus*) and *O. fragilis* was related with: (i) macro-benthic species abundance, biomass, richness, diversity and assemblage structure; and (ii) sedimentary organic matter. We hypothesized that the abundance of live *M. modiolus* and *O. fragilis* would have a similar positive relationship with the abundance, biomass, richness and diversity of the benthic macrofauna, and the sediment organic matter. Moreover, the abundance of *M. modiolus* shell would not have a correlation with the abundance, biomass, richness, and diversity of the benthic macrofauna, and the sediment organic matter because shell has less structural complexity compared to live mussels and does not produce fecal matter (as would be expected in reefs comprised of mainly live animals). Finally, prevalence of live *M. modiolus*, *M. modiolus* shell and *O. fragilis* will explain a similar amount of variation in the macrofauna assemblage.

Materials and Methods

Data collection

To quantify the variation in benthic fauna and sediment organic matter related with the abundance of *M. modiolus*, *M. modiolus* shell, and *O. fragilis*, a grab sampler was used to sample 53 sites at two locations off the east coast of Northern Ireland at depths of 20-30 m (Fig. 1).

Sampling sites were dispersed evenly within different acoustic signatures of a single beam sonar survey conducted by Northern Ireland Agri-Food and Biosciences Institute in 2014 (unpub. data). Samples were collected over 5 days between the 9th of September and the 16th of December 2014. The Day grab used in this study removed approximately 0.1 m² area of substratum (approximately 2 l of sediment; Appendix S1). Grabs with minimal sediment (< 1 L of sediment) were recorded as misfires and the grab was deployed again. Three replicate grabs were taken at each site unless 3 successive misfires were recorded and no more samples were taken at that site. The environment of these locations made diver surveys impractical (depth and currents) and although larger grab samples would have been optimal, a day grab was used to remove a minimal amount of the protected *M. modiolus* reef. Each sample was photographed and the percentage cover of *M. modiolus* shell, mud, and sand were estimated visually based on the grab surface (Appendix 2). Sediment samples were taken from the top 2 cm of 2 haphazardly chosen grabs from each site. However, sediment was collected from all three samples from 9 sites because live *M. modiolus* was present in the grabs. Sediment organic matter was collected from 101 grabs at 46 sites. Sediment samples were freeze dried, sieved through 1 mm mesh, and placed in a combustion oven at 500°C for 6 hours (Dean 1974). The percent organic matter was determined by dividing the difference in mass of the sediment before and after combustion by the mass of the sediment before combustion.

Conspicuous macrofauna were quantified from 140 grab samples at 53 sites, which were searched thoroughly on the boat after the grab sample was sieved through 1 mm mesh and all bivalves, crustaceans, echinoderms, fish, gastropod, and polychaetes were collected and frozen. Macrofauna were identified to the lowest practical taxon, counted and wet weight recorded for a total taxon biomass. Macrofauna identification was based on morphological characteristics

following guides (Hayward & Ryland 1995). A subset of grab samples (approximately 1 grab from each site) were returned to the laboratory and cryptic species, which were not attached to the substratum, were quantified in addition to the conspicuous macrofauna (Appendix S3).

Results of analyses from these samples were consistent with those based on conspicuous fauna thus for clarity we are presenting only the findings for the conspicuous fauna. Animal handling protocols followed the ethical guidelines of Queen's University Belfast.

Data Analysis

We tested effect of substrate type (live *M. modiolus*, *M. modiolus* shell, or *O. fragilis*) on benthic macrofauna abundance, biomass, taxon richness, diversity and assemblage structure.

The abundance of *M. modiolus* and *O. fragilis* in grab samples were *a priori* determined as predictor variables and not included as benthic fauna in the analyses. Generalized linear models were used to test for variations in total faunal abundance and taxon richness associated with changes of the three habitat types (*M. modiolus*, *M. modiolus* shell, and *O. fragilis*) with Poisson distributions because data were skewed towards zero. General linear models were used to test for variations in non-integer dependent variables (biomass and diversity) associated with changes in the three habitat types. Diversity for each sample was calculated with the Shannon-Weaver index. Multi-collinearity between predictor variables was tested using the variance inflation factor (VIF) and < 10 indicated minimal multi-collinearity (Hair 2006). Site within location (North or South as shown in Fig. 1) was included as random variables in the model to account for the nested sampling design. All interactions were included in the models and the predictor variables were centred (the mean was subtracted from each value) to reduce multi-collinearity between predictor variables and interactions (Quinn & Keough 2002) and scaled (divided by the standard deviation) to reduce the difference in magnitude among the predictor variables (Bates et

al. 2014). All analyses were conducted in R (R Development Core Team 2012). Diversity was calculated using the `div` function within the *vegan* package (Oksanen et al.). The `glmer` function within the *lme4* package (Bates et al. 2014 4) was used for both abundance and richness of benthic fauna. Biomass, diversity and organic matter were analysed using `lmer` function within the *lme4* package to calculate *t* values, while the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) function within the *car* package was used to generate *p* values and test for significance (Fox & Weisberg 2011). Interactions and random variables (site nested in location) were included in the organic matter model. Models were checked to ensure an adequate fit by visually inspecting residuals vs fitted (randomly distributed points) and Q-Q (points were near 1:1 ratio) plots (Crawley 2007). Biomass of macrofauna was log transformed to improve model fit.

To quantify the amount of variation in benthic fauna assemblage explained by the abundance of *M. modiolus*, *M. modiolus* shell, and *O. fragilis*, which were all continuous variables, we used Permutational Analysis of Variance (PERMANOVA, McArdle & Anderson 2001, Anderson 2001) and redundancy analysis (RDA, Legendre & Anderson 1999). PERMANOVA partitions the variation of a resemblance matrix among sources of variation and fits linear models to test hypotheses and build models without ordination. RDA performs ordination of fitted values to test hypotheses, build models, and create visualizations of the data (Legendre & Anderson 1999). RDA reduces the variance into dimensions, which makes visualizations of the data possible but may reduce the amount of variance explained by predictor variables. However, PERMANOVA analyzes the data without constraining the variance into dimensions so that the relationship between community structure and predictor variables is probably closer to what exists naturally. Histograms of each predictor variable and scatter plots of all combinations of predictor variables were examined to ensure there were no extreme

outliers. Linear-based analyses can be biased by multi-collinearity (Legendre & Anderson 1999), we tested for multi-collinearity as previously described using VIF. Multivariate analyses used the *vegan* package version 2.2-0 (Oksanen et al. 2010).

Taxon-specific abundances were log-transformed to reduce the influence of abundant taxa in the analyses, and a Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrix was created (Anderson et al. 2008, Legendre & De Cáceres 2013). The mean of taxon abundance per site was used to remove the possibility of non-independent samples within each site. Interactions were included in the sequential PERMANOVA and predictor variables were centred and scaled to reduce multicollinearity between variables and interactions. A second PERMANOVA was run with taxon-specific biomass following the same procedure described for abundance.

Results

Modiolus modiolus was present in 45 of the samples and ranged from 1 to 65 individuals per grab (~ 10 to 650 m^{-2}). *Ophiotrix fragilis* was present in 81 (out of 140) of the samples which ranged from 1-203 individuals per grab (~ 10 to $2,030 \text{ m}^{-2}$). Fifty-seven different taxa were quantified in the samples (Appendix S3). The substratum of the grabs was primarily *M. modiolus* shell and mud, with sand being less prevalent (Appendix 4). The abundance of live *M. modiolus* and *O. fragilis* had similar patterns with changes in the different types of substratum. The abundance of benthic fauna increased with the number of live *M. modiolus* and there were interactions between *M. modiolus* and *O. fragilis*, and *M. modiolus* and *M. modiolus* shell (Table 1; Fig. 2A, D and G; Fig. 3). The interaction between *M. modiolus* and *O. fragilis* resulted from a greater increase in fauna abundance as *M. modiolus* increased when there were more *O. fragilis* (Fig 3A). The opposite trend existed for the interaction between *M. modiolus* and *M. modiolus*

shell; there was a greater increase in fauna abundance as *M. modiolus* increased when there was less shell (Fig 3B). Biomass of macrofauna increased with *M. modiolus*, but decreased with *M. modiolus* shell (Table 1; Fig 2B and E). The interaction between all predictor variables was also significant for the biomass of macrofauna (Table 1).

The three predictor variables did not explain a significant amount of variation in the number of taxon (richness) in a sample and there were no significant interactions (Table 1). *M. modiolus* and *O. fragilis* were associated with an increase in the macrofauna diversity (Table 1, Fig 2C and I). *O. fragilis* was positively related with organic matter, while the prevalence of *M. modiolus* or *M. modiolus* shell did not explain a significant amount of variation in organic matter (Table 1; Fig. 4A-C). The three-way interaction was significant for organic matter and resulted from a positive relationship between *O. fragilis* and organic matter, which was greatly reduced with an increase in *M. modiolus* abundance and reduced with an increase in *M. modiolus* shell cover (Fig. 4D).

The amount of variation in faunal assemblage using abundance explained by *M. modiolus*, *O. fragilis*, and *M. modiolus* shell was quantified using a PERMANOVA. *Modiolus modiolus* ($F_{1,52} = 3.16$; $P < 0.001$), *O. fragilis* ($F_{1,52} = 5.45$; $P < 0.001$), and *M. modiolus* shell ($F_{1,52} = 5.11$; $P < 0.001$) were significant and explained more variation in fauna assemblage than would be expected by random chance. No interactions were significant. *Modiolus modiolus* shell explained the most variation in macrofauna assemblage of the 3 continuous predictor variables ($R^2 = 8.4\%$), followed by *O. fragilis* ($R^2 = 5.7\%$), and *M. modiolus* ($R^2 = 5.2\%$). The RDA represents the relationship between predictor variables and individual taxon. RDA explained 10.7% of the variation in fauna assemblage. The first and second axes explained 6.5 and 2.9% of the variation respectively. *Modiolus modiolus* was positively related with axis 1 and *M. modiolus*

shell was positively related with axis 2 (Appendix S5). *Ophiocomina nigra* (a brittle star) was positively related with the second axis, and *Ophiura* spp. (a brittle star) and *Timoclea ovata* (a bivalve) were negatively related with the second axis (Appendix S5). The fauna assemblage based on biomass had similar findings as the assemblage using abundance with all three predictor variables explaining a significant amount of variation. *Modiolus modiolus* shell explained the most variation in macrofauna assemblage of the 3 continuous predictor variables ($R^2 = 8.7\%$), followed by *O. fragilis* ($R^2 = 6.3\%$), and *M. modiolus* ($R^2 = 4.1\%$).

Discussion

Biogenic habitats composed of aggregations of sessile species, often referred to as meadows or reefs, are touted for their ecological and economic benefits (Anton et al. 2011, Barbier et al. 2011, Firth et al. 2015). On the other hand, dense aggregations of mobile species are generally viewed negatively; however, this study indicates that increasing densities of *O. fragilis* were associated with greater macrofauna diversity and organic matter, and had a positive emergent effect on the total abundance of fauna within *M. modiolus* reefs. Although these results are correlations, they could suggest that aggregates of brittle stars enhance diversity of macrofauna and increase sediment organic matter similar to or more than filter feeding bivalves.

The ecological effect of a single foundation species on the local community has been extensively studied (Grabowski et al. 2005, Geraldi et al. 2009), however, multiple species often coexist together and little is known about potential interactions among different species (Angelini et al. 2011, Donadi et al. 2015). One study that included multiple ecosystem engineers found that the presence of *Caulerpa taxifolia*, a macroalgae, near *Anadara trapezia*, a clam, increased diversity and abundance of epibiota on the bivalve (Gribben et al. 2009). Most of these

studies focused on relatively sessile species and there is the potential for mobile species to also enhance both density and diversity of associated fauna (Altieri & Witman 2014). The abundance of *O. fragilis* was related with enhanced diversity of macrofauna and had a positive emergent effect with *M. modiolus* reefs on the abundance of macrofauna. In addition, minimal multicollinearity among predictor variables indicates that there was no facilitation between *O. fragilis* and *M. modiolus*, and that abundances of live and dead *M. modiolus* were independent. Finally, all three habitat types measured had similar influence on the macrofauna assemblage (explained between 5 and 8% of the variation in assemblage).

Our conclusions are based on a robust survey, which aimed to identify ecological patterns associated with different dominant species (mussels and/or brittle stars). Experimental manipulation is required to determine the mechanisms driving these differences, which is difficult given the ethical and logistical limitations of manipulating a rare species that primarily exist in areas with high currents and deeper than 20 m. Given our existing knowledge, aggregations of brittle stars and other mobile species appear to share similar roles as some well-described sessile foundation species. For example, positive effects on the macrofauna community associated with aggregations of mobile fauna could result from reduced predation from provision of shelter (Bruno et al. 2003) or from increased food provision via biodeposition (Norling & Kautsky 2007).

Understanding how the loss of individual bivalves from reefs affects ecological functioning is important given the prevalence of reef degradation (Beck et al. 2011, Ermgassen et al. 2012). Teasing apart the provision of habitat by the physical structure from the biotic function of bivalve reefs has been studied using experimental reefs. For example, the diversity of macrofauna was similar on blue mussel (*Mytilus edulis*) reefs compared to reefs made of intact

shells, while the abundance was greater on live reefs possibly because of resources supplied by biodeposition (Norling & Kautsky 2007). Similarly, another study found that diversity of epibenthic fauna was similar among live and dead experimental reefs of oysters or mussels, while abundance of epibenthic fauna was greatest on oyster shell, moderate on live bivalve reefs and lowest on mussel shell reefs (Norling et al. 2015). We found that the amount of naturally occurring dead shell was not related with the abundance, richness and diversity of benthic macrofauna, and that dead shell cover was negatively related with the biomass of macrofauna. Separating the role of the physical reef structure from associated biotic functioning is necessary to identify ecological mechanisms, and also to predict changes in ecosystem functioning associated to bivalve mortality from direct or indirect anthropogenic impacts.

Biodeposition by filter feeding bivalves is an important process in coastal ecosystems because it couples pelagic and benthic communities. Benthic-pelagic coupling may reduce occurrences of hypoxia by directly reducing phytoplankton abundance (Dame & Olenin 2005, Grizzle et al. 2008) and indirectly through nitrogen removal by enhancing denitrification on the sediment because of the high quality resources provided by biodeposits (Kellogg et al. 2013, Smyth et al. 2013, 2015). *Modiolus modiolus* produce nutrient rich biodeposits (Navarro & Thompson 1997), however, we did not identify a relationship between *M. modiolus* density and sediment organic matter content. We did find a positive relationship between brittle star density and organic matter content. This relationship could have resulted from brittle stars preferring benthos with greater organic matter. However, our results indicate that *O. fragilis* and *M. modiolus* have similar abundance patterns in shell, mud and sandy substratum suggesting that brittle stars are not preferentially selecting one type of substratum that could be causing this relationship, which is likely driven by benthic-pelagic coupling. A positive relationship between

total organic carbon and brittle star density was found in stable environments (Murat et al. 2016) and benthic-pelagic coupling associated with brittle star beds was suggested to reduce eutrophication in coastal bays (Hily 1991). Both *M. modiolus* and *O. fragilis* are suspension feeders but use entirely different mechanisms to collect suspended particles. *M. modiolus* is an active filter feeder while *O. fragilis* passively feeds on phytoplankton (Roushdy & Hansen 1960, Migne et al. 2012, BlanchetAurigny et al. 2015). The stronger association between brittle stars and sediment organic matter compared to *M. modiolus* could result from *O. fragilis* having a low absorption efficiency (Migné & Davoult 1998) or that aggregations reduce water motion and the erosion of biodeposits (Warner 1971) more than mussel reefs. Our findings, that organic matter was positively related with brittle star abundance and not *M. modiolus* density, may suggest that benthic-pelagic coupling in brittle star beds is potentially greater than in bivalve reefs and this should be investigated further.

The ecological and economic benefits of marine biogenic habitats, such as coral reefs, salt marshes and bivalve reefs, are well known and are the impetus for their conservation and restoration (Brumbaugh & Coen 2009, Barbier et al. 2011, Geraldi et al. 2013, La Peyre et al. 2014). Beds of brittle stars may enhance the diversity of macrofauna and increase benthic-pelagic coupling equal to or greater than bivalve reefs. The carbon budgets associated with biomass production and calcification has been quantified for brittle star beds (Migne et al. 1998, Davoult et al. 2009, Lebrato et al. 2010), however, their potential importance for other rates of ecosystem functioning and associated services is relatively unknown. The ecosystem functions provided by brittle stars are probably context-dependent, but the global functional role of these taxa may be equal to or greater than other sessile foundation species for multiple reasons. First, brittle star beds are prevalent around the globe given that they have been documented from the

Arctic (Piepenburg & Schmid 1996, Blicher & Sejr 2011) to the Antarctic (Fratt & Dearborn 1984) and throughout the mid-latitudes (Haedrich et al. 1980, Fujita 1990). They are also present at broad depth ranges (Lebrato et al. 2010) and not restricted to estuaries and coasts like traditional biogenic habitats.

Determining the ecological functions provided by aggregations of mobile species and comparing these to functions provided by traditional biogenic habits, as well as potential emergent effects between the two are needed to understand the relative importance of these species to broader ecosystem processes and functions. This is of utmost importance as humans are constantly altering the abundance and extent of both sessile and mobile species. The applied implications of these results, if confirmed by manipulative experiments, include assigning aggregates of mobile species similar conservation status as sessile foundation species (Peterson & Lipcius 2003, Byers et al. 2006, Lampert & Hastings 2014).

Acknowledgements

We than all those that assisted with the organization and collection of data for this project including H. Van Rein, T. Mackie, M. Service, R. Schneider, M. Allen, J. Breen and the captain and crew of the FPV *Banrion*. The manuscript was improved by comments from A. Anton. This study was made possible in part by a grant from the Northern Ireland Department of the Environment.

316 **Literature cited**

- 317 Altieri AH, Witman JD (2014) Modular mobile foundation species as reservoirs of biodiversity.
318 Ecosphere 5:art124-art124
- 319 Anderson MJ (2001) A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance. Austral
320 Ecol 26:32–46
- 321 Anderson MJ, Gorley R, Clarke KR (2008) PERMANOVA+ for PRIMER: Guide to software
322 and statistical Methods.
- 323 Angelini C, Altieri AH, Silliman BR, Bertness MD (2011) Interactions among foundation
324 species and their consequences for community organization, biodiversity, and
325 conservation. BioScience 61:782–789
- 326 Anton A, Cebrian J, Heck KL, Duarte CM, Sheehan K, Miller M, Foster D (2011) Decoupled
327 effects (positive and negative) of nutrient enrichment on ecosystem services. Ecol Appl
328 21:991–1009
- 329 Aronson RB (1989) Brittlestar beds: low-predation anachronisms in the British Isles. Ecology
330 70:856–865
- 331 Barbier E, Hacker S, Kennedy C, Koch E, Stier A, Silliman B (2011) The value of estuarine and
332 coastal ecosystem services. Ecol Monogr 81:169–193
- 333 Bates DM, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S (2014) lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using
334 Eigen and S4. R package version 1.1-7, <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4>.
- 335 Beck MW, Brumbaugh RD, Airoidi L, Carranza A, Coen LD, Crawford C, Defeo O, Edgar GJ,
336 Hancock B, Kay MC, Lenihan HS, Luckenbach MW, Toropova CL, Zhang G, Guo X
337 (2011) Oyster reefs at risk and recommendations for conservation, restoration, and
338 management. BioScience 61:107–116
- 339 Bertness MD, Callaway R (1994) Positive interactions in communities. Trends Ecol Evol 9:191–
340 193
- 341 BlanchetAurigny A, Dubois SF, Qur C, Guillou M, Pernet F (2015) Trophic niche of two co-
342 occurring ophiuroid species in impacted coastal systems, derived from fatty acid and
343 stable isotope analyses. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 525:127–141
- 344 Blicher ME, Sejrk MK (2011) Abundance, oxygen consumption and carbon demand of brittle
345 stars in Young Sound and the NE Greenland shelf. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 422:139–144
- 346 Brumbaugh R, Coen L (2009) Contemporary approaches for small-scale oyster reef restoration
347 to address substrate versus recruitment limitation: a review and comments relevant for the
348 olympia oyster, *Ostrea lurida* carpenter 1864. J Shellfish Res 28:147–161

- 349 Bruno JF, Stachowicz JJ, Bertness MD (2003) Inclusion of facilitation into ecological theory.
350 Trends Ecol Evol 18:119–125
- 351 Byers JE, Cuddington K, Jones CG, Talley TS, Hastings A, Lambrinos JG, Crooks JA, Wilson
352 WG (2006) Using ecosystem engineers to restore ecological systems. Trends Ecol Evol
353 21:493–500
- 354 Cook R, Fariñas-Franco JM, Gell FR, Holt RHF, Holt T, Lindenbaum C, Porter JS, Seed R,
355 Skates LR, Stringell TB, Sanderson WG (2013) The substantial first impact of bottom
356 fishing on rare biodiversity hotspots: a dilemma for evidence-based conservation. PLoS
357 ONE 8:e69904
- 358 Costanza R, Arge R d', Groot R de, Farber S, Grasso M, Hannon B, Limburg K, Naeem S,
359 O'Neill RV, Paruelo J, Raskin RG, Sutton P, Belt M van den (1997) The value of the
360 world's ecosystem services and natural capital. Nature 387:253–260
- 361 Crawley MJ (2007) The R book. Wiley, Hoboken, N.J.
- 362 Dame RF, Olenin S (Eds) (2005) The Comparative Roles of Suspension-Feeders in Ecosystems.
363 Springer-Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg
- 364 Dauvin J-C, Méar Y, Murat A, Poizot E, Lozach S, Beryouni K (2013) Interactions between
365 aggregations and environmental factors explain spatio-temporal patterns of the brittle-star
366 *Ophiothrix fragilis* in the eastern Bay of Seine. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 131:171–181
- 367 Davoult D, Harlay J, Gentil F (2009) Contribution of a dense population of the brittle star
368 *acrocnida brachiata* (montagu) to the biogeochemical fluxes of CO₂ in a temperate
369 coastal ecosystem. Estuaries Coasts 32:1103–1110
- 370 Dean WE (1974) Determination of carbonate and organic matter in calcareous sediments and
371 sedimentary rocks by loss on ignition; comparison with other methods. J Sediment Res
372 44:242–248
- 373 De'ath G, Fabricius KE, Sweatman H, Puotinen M (2012) The 27-year decline of coral cover on
374 the Great Barrier Reef and its causes. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 109:17995–17999
- 375 Donadi S, Heide T van der, Piersma T, Zee EM van der, Weerman EJ, Koppel J van de, Olf H,
376 Devine C, Hernawan UE, Boers M, Planthof L, Klemens Eriksson B (2015) Multi-scale
377 habitat modification by coexisting ecosystem engineers drives spatial separation of
378 macrobenthic functional groups. Oikos:doi: 10.1111/oik.02100
- 379 Ermgassen PSEZ, Spalding MD, Blake B, Coen LD, Dumbauld B, Geiger S, Grabowski JH,
380 Grizzle R, Luckenbach M, McGraw K, Rodney W, Ruesink JL, Powers SP, Brumbaugh
381 R (2012) Historical ecology with real numbers: past and present extent and biomass of an
382 imperiled estuarine habitat. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci 279:3393–3400

- 383 Ermgassen P, Spalding M, Grizzle R, Brumbaugh R (2013) Quantifying the loss of a marine
384 ecosystem service: filtration by the eastern oyster in US estuaries. *Estuaries Coasts*
385 36:36–43
- 386 Fariñas-Franco JM, Allcock L, Smyth D, Roberts D (2013) Community convergence and
387 recruitment of keystone species as performance indicators of artificial reefs. *J Sea Res*
388 78:59–74
- 389 Fedra K (1977) Structural features of a North Adriatic benthic community. In: *Biology of*
390 *benthic organisms*. Pergamon, Oxford, England, p 233–246
- 391 Firth LB, Mieszkowska N, Grant LM, Bush LE, Davies AJ, Frost MT, Moschella PS, Burrows
392 MT, Cunningham PN, Dye SR, Hawkins SJ (2015) Historical comparisons reveal
393 multiple drivers of decadal change of an ecosystem engineer at the range edge. *Ecol Evol*
394 5:3210–3222
- 395 Fox J, Weisberg S (2011) *An R Companion to Applied Regression*, Second Edition.
- 396 Fratt DB, Dearborn JH (1984) Feeding biology of the Antarctic brittle star *Ophionotus victoriae*
397 (Echinodermata: Ophiuroidea). *Polar Biol* 3:127–139
- 398 Fujita T (1990) Size structure of dense populations of the brittle star *Ophiura sarsii*
399 (Ophiuroidea:Echinodermata) in the bathyal zone around Japan. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser*
400 64:113–122
- 401 Geraldi NR, Powers SP, Heck KL, Cebrian J (2009) Can habitat restoration be redundant?
402 Response of mobile fishes and crustaceans to oyster reef restoration in marsh tidal creeks.
403 *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 389:171–180
- 404 Geraldi NR, Simpson M, Fegley SR, Holmlund P, Peterson CH (2013) Addition of juvenile
405 oysters fails to enhance oyster reef development in Pamlico Sound. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser*
406 480:119–129
- 407 Gormley KSG, Porter JS, Bell MC, Hull AD, Sanderson WG (2013) Predictive habitat modelling
408 as a tool to assess the change in distribution and extent of an OSPAR priority habitat
409 under an increased ocean temperature scenario: consequences for marine protected area
410 networks and management. *PLoS ONE* 8:e68263
- 411 Grabowski JH, Hughes A, Kimbro D, Dolan M (2005) How habitat setting influences restored
412 oyster reef communities. *Ecology* 86:1926–1935
- 413 Grabowski JH, Peterson C (2007) Restoring oyster reefs to recover ecosystem services. In:
414 *Ecosystem Engineers*. Academic Press, p 281–298
- 415 Gribben PE, Byers JE, Clements M, McKenzie LA, Steinberg PD, Wright JT (2009) Behavioural
416 interactions between ecosystem engineers control community species richness. *Ecol Lett*
417 12:1127–1136

- 418 Grizzle R, Greene J, Coen L (2008) Seston removal by natural and constructed intertidal eastern
419 oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) reefs: a comparison with previous laboratory studies, and
420 the value of in situ methods. *Estuaries Coasts* 31:1208–1220
- 421 Haedrich RL, Rowe GT, Polloni PT (1980) The megabenthic fauna in the deep sea south of New
422 England, USA. *Mar Biol* 57:165–179
- 423 Hair JF (2006) *Multivariate data analysis.*, 6th ed. Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River,
424 N.J
- 425 Hayward PJ, Ryland JS (1995) *Handbook of the Marine Fauna of North-West Europe.* OUP
426 Oxford
- 427 Hily C (1991) Is the activity of benthic suspension feeders a factor controlling water-quality in
428 the Bay of Brest. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 69:179–188
- 429 Kellogg ML, Cornwell JC, Owens MS, Paynter KT (2013) Denitrification and nutrient
430 assimilation on a restored oyster reef. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 480:1–19
- 431 La Peyre M, Furlong J, Brown LA, Piazza BP, Brown K (2014) Oyster reef restoration in the
432 northern Gulf of Mexico: Extent, methods and outcomes. *Ocean Coast Manag* 89:20–28
- 433 Lampert A, Hastings A (2014) Optimal control of population recovery – the role of economic
434 restoration threshold. *Ecol Lett* 17:28–35
- 435 Lebrato M, Iglesias-Rodríguez D, Feely RA, Greeley D, Jones DOB, Suarez-Bosche N, Lampitt
436 RS, Cartes JE, Green DRH, Alker B (2010) Global contribution of echinoderms to the
437 marine carbon cycle: CaCO₃ budget and benthic compartments. *Ecol Monogr* 80:441–
438 467
- 439 Legendre P, Anderson MJ (1999) Distance-based redundancy analysis: testing multispecies
440 responses in multifactorial ecological experiments. *Ecol Monogr* 69:1–24
- 441 Legendre P, De Cáceres M (2013) Beta diversity as the variance of community data:
442 dissimilarity coefficients and partitioning. *Ecol Lett* 16:951–963
- 443 Lotze H, Lenihan H, Bourque B, Bradbury R, Cooke R, Kay M, Kidwell S, Kirby M, Peterson C,
444 Jackson J (2006) Depletion, degradation, and recovery potential of estuaries and coastal
445 seas. *Science* 312:1806–1809
- 446 Magorrian B., Service M (1998) Analysis of underwater visual data to identify the impact of
447 physical disturbance on horse mussel (*Modiolus modiolus*) beds. *Mar Pollut Bull* 36:354–
448 359
- 449 McArdle BH, Anderson MJ (2001) Fitting multivariate models to community data: a comment
450 on distance-based redundancy analysis. *Ecology* 82:290–297

- 451 Migné A, Davoult D (1998) Macrobenthic metabolism as carbon and nitrogen fluxes in a coastal
452 area exposed to strong tidal currents (Dover Strait, eastern English Channel).
453 *Hydrobiologia* 375–376:307
- 454 Migne A, Davoult D, Gattuso JP (1998) Calcium carbonate production of a dense population of
455 the brittle star *Ophiothrix fragilis* (Echinodermata : Ophiuroidea): role in the carbon cycle
456 of a temperate coastal ecosystem. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 173:305–308
- 457 Migne A, Riera P, Janquin MA, Leroux C, Muths D, Davoult D (2012) Carbon and Nitrogen
458 Assimilation by the Suspension-Feeding Brittle-Star *Ophiothrix Fragilis* from Two
459 Localities in the English Channel. *Vie Milieu-Life Environ* 62:47–53
- 460 Murat A, Méar Y, Poizot E, Dauvin JC, Beryouni K (2016) Silting up and development of
461 anoxic conditions enhanced by high abundance of the geoengineer species *Ophiothrix*
462 *fragilis*. *Cont Shelf Res* 118:11–22
- 463 Navarro JM, Thompson RJ (1997) Biodeposition by the horse mussel *Modiolus modiolus*
464 (Dillwyn) during the spring diatom bloom. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 209:1–13
- 465 Norling P, Kautsky N (2007) Structural and functional effects of *Mytilus edulis* on diversity of
466 associated species and ecosystem functioning. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 351:163–175
- 467 Norling P, Lindegarth M, Lindegarth S, Strand A (2015) Effects of live and post-mortem shell
468 structures of invasive Pacific oysters and native blue mussels on macrofauna and fish.
469 *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 518:123–138
- 470 Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Kindt R, Legendre P, O’Hara RB, Simpson GL (2010) vegan:
471 Community ecology package.
- 472 Peterson CH, Lipcius RN (2003) Conceptual progress towards predicting quantitative ecosystem
473 benefits of ecological restorations. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 264:297–307
- 474 Piepenburg D, Schmid MK (1996) Brittle star fauna (Echinodermata: Ophiuroidea) of the arctic
475 northwestern Barents sea: composition, abundance, biomass and spatial distribution.
476 *Polar Biol* 16:383–392
- 477 Quinn GP, Keough MJ (2002) Experimental design and data analysis for biologists. Cambridge
478 University Press, Cambridge :
- 479 R Development Core Team (2012) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
480 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Available at: [http://www.R-](http://www.R-project.org)
481 [project.org](http://www.R-project.org).
- 482 Ragnarsson SA, Burgos JM (2012) Separating the effects of a habitat modifier, *Modiolus*
483 *modiolus* and substrate properties on the associated megafauna. *J Sea Res* 72:55–63

- 484 Rees E i. s., Sanderson W g., Mackie A s. y., Holt R h. f. (2008) Small-scale variation within a
485 *Modiolus modiolus* (Mollusca: Bivalvia) reef in the Irish Sea. III. Crevice, sediment
486 infauna and epifauna from targeted cores. J Mar Biol Assoc U K 88:151–156
- 487 Roushdy HM, Hansen VK (1960) Ophiuroids feeding on Phytoplankton. Nature 188:517–518
- 488 Sanderson W g., Holt R h. f., Kay L, Ramsay K, Perrins J, McMath A j., Rees E i. s. (2008)
489 Small-scale variation within a *Modiolus modiolus* (Mollusca: Bivalvia) reef in the Irish
490 Sea. II. Epifauna recorded by divers and cameras. J Mar Biol Assoc U K 88:143–149
- 491 Smyth AR, Geraldi NR, Piehler MF (2013) Oyster-mediated benthic-pelagic coupling modifies
492 nitrogen pools and processes. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 493:23–30
- 493 Smyth AR, Piehler MF, Grabowski JH (2015) Habitat context influences nitrogen removal by
494 restored oyster reefs. J Appl Ecol 52:716–725
- 495 Stachowicz JJ (2001) Mutualism, facilitation, and the structure of ecological communities.
496 BioScience 51:235–246
- 497 Steneck RS, Vavrinec J, Leland AV (2004) Accelerating trophic-level dysfunction in kelp forest
498 ecosystems of the western North Atlantic. Ecosystems 7:323–332
- 499 Strain EMA, Allcock AL, Goodwin CE, Maggs CA, Picton BE, Roberts D (2012) The long-term
500 impacts of fisheries on epifaunal assemblage function and structure, in a Special Area of
501 Conservation. J Sea Res 67:58–68
- 502 Underwood AJ, Chapman MG, Connell SD (2000) Observations in ecology: you can't make
503 progress on processes without understanding the patterns. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 250:97–
504 115
- 505 Warner GF (1971) On the ecology of a dense bed of the brittle-star *Ophiothrix fragilis*. J Mar
506 Biol Assoc U K 51:267–282
- 507 Waycott M, Duarte CM, Carruthers TJB, Orth RJ, Dennison WC, Olyarnik S, Calladine A,
508 Fourqurean JW, Heck KL, Hughes AR, Kendrick GA, Kenworthy WJ, Short FT,
509 Williams SL (2009) Accelerating loss of seagrasses across the globe threatens coastal
510 ecosystems. Proc Natl Acad Sci 106:12377–12381
- 511 Wildish DJ, Fader GBJ, Parrott DR (2009) A model of horse mussel reef formation in the Bay of
512 Fundy based on population growth and geological processes. Atl Geol 45:157–170
- 513
- 514

Table 1. Summary of statistical models to assess the relationship between the predictor variables (abundance of *M. modiolus*, *M. modiolus* shell, and *O. fragilis*) and the abundance, biomass, richness, and diversity of benthic fauna, and organic matter collected in samples (significant predictor variables and interactions are bold).

Dependent variable	Independent variable	Estimate	Std. Error	z or t value	p value
# of individuals	<i>M. Modiolus</i>	0.981	0.111	8.81	<0.001
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> shell	0.004	0.066	0.06	0.957
	<i>O. fragilis</i>	-0.083	0.061	-1.35	0.178
	<i>M. Modiolus</i>: <i>M. Modiolus</i> shell	-0.678	0.106	-6.38	<0.001
	<i>M. Modiolus</i>: <i>O. fragilis</i>	0.162	0.078	2.07	0.038
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> shell: <i>O. fragilis</i>	0.012	0.045	0.27	0.789
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> : <i>M. Modiolus</i> shell: <i>O. fragilis</i>	-0.004	0.075	-0.06	0.954
Biomass	<i>M. Modiolus</i>	0.009	0.028	0.32	<0.001
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> shell	-0.008	0.003	-2.39	<0.001
	<i>O. fragilis</i>	0.002	0.001	1.52	0.214
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> : <i>M. Modiolus</i> shell	0.001	0.001	1.18	0.744
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> : <i>O. fragilis</i>	0.001	0.000	1.67	0.920
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> shell: <i>O. fragilis</i>	0.000	0.000	0.90	0.230
	<i>M. Modiolus</i>: <i>M. Modiolus</i> shell: <i>O. fragilis</i>	0.000	0.000	-2.09	0.037
# of species	<i>M. Modiolus</i>	0.090	0.095	0.95	0.344
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> shell	-0.022	0.050	-0.44	0.662
	<i>O. fragilis</i>	0.016	0.040	0.40	0.691
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> : <i>M. Modiolus</i> shell	-0.062	0.093	-0.66	0.508
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> : <i>O. fragilis</i>	0.027	0.084	0.33	0.744
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> shell: <i>O. fragilis</i>	0.003	0.038	0.09	0.928
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> : <i>M. Modiolus</i> shell: <i>O. fragilis</i>	0.029	0.087	0.33	0.739
Diversity	<i>M. Modiolus</i>	0.256	0.170	1.51	0.032
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> shell	-0.116	0.086	-1.35	0.069
	<i>O. fragilis</i>	0.129	0.068	1.90	0.021
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> : <i>M. Modiolus</i> shell	-0.127	0.166	-0.77	0.335
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> : <i>O. fragilis</i>	0.042	0.145	0.29	0.963
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> shell: <i>O. fragilis</i>	0.081	0.066	1.23	0.235
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> : <i>M. Modiolus</i> shell: <i>O. fragilis</i>	-0.055	0.152	-0.36	0.719
Organic matter	<i>M. Modiolus</i>	0.001	0.002	0.61	0.605
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> shell	-0.002	0.001	-1.16	0.636
	<i>O. fragilis</i>	0.002	0.001	1.72	0.048
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> : <i>M. Modiolus</i> shell	-0.001	0.002	-0.69	0.928
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> : <i>O. fragilis</i>	-0.005	0.002	-2.95	0.388
	<i>M. Modiolus</i> shell: <i>O. fragilis</i>	-0.002	0.001	-1.36	0.677
	<i>M. Modiolus</i>: <i>M. Modiolus</i> shell: <i>O. fragilis</i>	0.006	0.002	3.79	<0.001

524 Figure legends

525 Fig. 1. Sampling sites near the Outer Ards Peninsula, east coast of Northern Ireland. Three
526 replicate grab samples were taken at each site

527 Fig. 2. The relationship between the abundance (left column), biomass (middle column), and
528 diversity (right column) of benthic fauna quantified in day grabs, and *M. modiolus*, *M. modiolus*
529 shell or *O. fragilis*. Predictor variables that were significant are indicated by black lines (See
530 Table 1 for statistical summary).

531 Fig. 3. The interactions between the abundance of *M. modiolus* and *O. fragilis* (A) and between
532 *M. modiolus* and *M. modiolus* shell (B) in explaining variation in the abundance of benthic fauna.
533 The data points and trend lines were categorized based on abundance of *O. fragilis* (A) or
534 percent shell cover (B).

535 Fig. 4. The relationship between the abundance of *M. modiolus* (A), *M. Modiolus* shell (B), *O.*
536 *fragilis* (C), and the percent organic matter in sediment collected in day grabs. The interaction
537 between all three predictor variables and the percent organic matter (D). *O. fragilis* and the
538 interaction between the three predictor variables explained a significant amount of variation in
539 percent organic matter. Predictor variables that were significant are indicated by black lines (See
540 Table 1 for statistical summary).

541

542 Fig. 1

543

544

545

546 Fig. 2

547
548

549 Fig. 3

550

551

552 Fig. 4

554 Appendices

555 Appendix S1. Picture of the day grab used to sample fauna. Photo credit: C. Bertolini

556

557 Appendix S2. Day grabs illustrating typical samples with *M. modiolus* and *O. fragilis* (A), *M.*
558 *modiolus* shell (B), *O. fragilis* (C), and mud (D). The grab sampled 0.1m². Photo credits: C.
559 Bertolini and N. Gerdali.

560

561

Appendix S3. Taxon and their respective groups quantified in the grab samples. The proportion for each taxon of the total number of individuals for the grabs that had all taxon quantified and for the grabs that only conspicuous taxon were quantified. Only data from conspicuous taxon were used for all analyses.

Taxa	Taxa group	Full	Conspicuous
<i>Abra alba</i>	Bivalve	0.248	0.254
<i>Amphipholis squamata</i>	Echinoderm		0.002
<i>Amphiura chiajei</i>	Echinoderm		0.008
<i>Amphiura filiformis</i>	Echinoderm		0.010
Anomiidae	Bivalve	0.018	
<i>Aphrodita aculeata</i>	Polychaete	0.001	0.001
<i>Astarte sulcata</i>	Bivalve	0.033	0.036
<i>Atelecyclus rotundatus</i>	Crustacean		0.001
<i>Buccinum undatum</i>	Gastropod	0.005	0.012
Capitellidae	Polychaete	0.046	
<i>Caprella acanthifera</i>	Crustacean		0.001
<i>Clausinella fasciata</i>	Bivalve	0.009	0.015
<i>Crossaster papposus</i>	Echinoderm		0.003
<i>Diodera graeca</i>	Gastropod		0.001
<i>Ebalia tuberosa</i>	Crustacean		0.003
<i>Echinocardium cordatum</i>	Echinoderm		0.001
<i>Emarginula fissura</i>	Gastropod	0.003	
<i>Eschinus esculentus</i>	Echinoderm	0.003	0.003
<i>Eteone longa</i>	Polychaete	0.004	
<i>Eunereis longissima</i>	Polychaete	0.004	
Eunicidae	Polychaete	0.005	
<i>Euspira nitida</i>	Gastropod	0.002	
<i>Galathea</i>	Crustacean		0.017
<i>Galathowenia oculata</i>	Polychaete	0.002	
Gammaridae	Crustacean		0.008
<i>Gari depressa</i>	Bivalve	0.024	0.021
<i>Gari tellinella</i>	Bivalve	0.027	0.030
<i>Gattyana cirrhosa</i>	Polychaete	0.002	
<i>Gibbula cineraria</i>	Gastropod	0.002	
<i>Glycera spp.</i>	Polychaete	0.004	
<i>Glycimeris glycimeris</i>	Bivalve	0.004	0.003
Gobiesocidae	Fish		0.004
Golfingiidae	Sipunocla	0.005	0.005
Harmothoe	Polychaete	0.014	0.009
Hesionidae	Polychaete	0.002	
<i>Hiatella arctica</i>	Bivalve	0.013	0.010
Hippolytidae	Crustacean		0.017

Running header: Aggregations of mussels and brittle stars

<i>Lepidonotus squamatus</i>	Polychaete	0.013	0.010
<i>Leptochiton asellus</i>	Chiton	0.029	0.018
<i>Limaria sp.</i>	Bivalve	0.010	0.007
<i>Liocarcinus spp.</i>	Crustacean		0.004
<i>Lumbrineridae</i>	Polychaete	0.015	
<i>Marthasterias glacialis</i>	Echinoderm		0.008
<i>Mediomastus fragilis</i>	Polychaete	0.002	
<i>Mimachlamys varia</i>	Bivalve	0.018	0.017
<i>Mya arenaria</i>	Bivalve	0.009	0.009
<i>Mya truncata</i>	Bivalve	0.009	0.007
<i>Myrtea spinifera</i>	Bivalve	0.003	
<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Bivalve		0.006
Nemertea	Nematode	0.001	0.003
Nephtheidae	Polychaete	0.027	0.018
Nereis spp.	Polychaete	0.001	0.001
<i>Nucula nucleus</i>	Bivalve	0.079	0.069
Nuculanidae	Bivalve	0.002	
Oeonidae	Polychaete	0.003	
<i>Onchidoris spp.</i>	Nudibranch	0.001	
<i>Onoba semicostata</i>	Gastropod	0.002	
<i>Ophelina acuminata</i>	Polychaete	0.009	
<i>Ophiocomina nigra</i>	Echinoderm		0.057
<i>Ophiura spp.</i>	Echinoderm		0.062
Orbiniidae	Polychaete	0.003	
<i>Owenia fusiformis</i>	Polychaete	0.013	0.008
Paguridae	Crustacean		0.024
<i>Parvicardium pinnulatum</i>	Bivalve	0.004	
<i>Pecten maximus</i>	Bivalve	0.003	
<i>Pectinariidae</i>	Polychaete	0.004	
<i>Pherusa plumosa</i>	Polychaete	0.058	0.038
<i>Pholas dactylus</i>	Bivalve		0.014
<i>Pilumnus hirtellus</i>	Crustacean		0.003
<i>Pisa spp.</i>	Crustacean		0.009
<i>Pisidia longicornis</i>	Crustacean		0.006
<i>Platyhelminthes</i>	Platyhelminthes	0.001	
Polynoidae	Polychaete	0.016	0.013
<i>Psammechinus miliaris</i>	Echinoderm	0.001	0.002
Sabellidae	Polychaete	0.045	
<i>Scalibregma inflatum</i>	Polychaete	0.011	
<i>Scoloplos armiger</i>	Polychaete	0.004	
<i>Sepiolo spp.</i>	Cephalopod	0.001	
Serpulidae	Polychaete	0.005	0.006
<i>Spatangus purpureus</i>	Echinoderm		0.001

Running header: Aggregations of mussels and brittle stars

Spionidae	Polychaete	0.001	0.001
<i>Talochlamys pusio</i>	Bivalve		0.001
<i>Tapes aureus</i>	Bivalve	0.002	
<i>Tapes rhomboides</i>	Bivalve	0.005	
Terebellidae	Polychaete	0.020	0.017
<i>Timoclea ovata</i>	Bivalve	0.087	0.085
<i>Tritia incrassata</i>	Gatropod	0.001	0.005
<i>Trivia arctica</i>	Gatropod	0.002	
<i>Tubificoides spp.</i>	Polychaete	0.001	
<i>Velutina velutina</i>	Gatropod	0.002	

567

568

569 Appendix S4

570 The abundance of *M. modiolus* (left column) and *O. fragilis* (right column) in grab samples

571 compared to the percent cover of 3 substrate categories. Substrate type was determined from

572 photos of grabs. Fitted lines were determined by the lowess function in R.

573

574

575 Appendix S5. The first and second axis of RDA of the fauna assemblage in grab samples
 576 overlaid with vectors of predictor variables (A) and taxon centroids (B). The first axis explained
 577 6.5% and the second explained 2.9% of the variation respectively. To make taxon labels readable
 578 and to reduce clutter in B, only the most abundant taxon that did not overlap with other taxon
 579 labels are shown. Grey dots represent individual samples and vector length is relative to the
 580 variance explained by the variable.