



**HAL**  
open science

## Benthic control freaks: Effects of the tubicolous amphipod *Haploops nirae* on the specific diversity and functional structure of benthic communities

Carinne Rigolet, Stanislas F. Dubois, Éric Thiébaud

### ► To cite this version:

Carinne Rigolet, Stanislas F. Dubois, Éric Thiébaud. Benthic control freaks: Effects of the tubicolous amphipod *Haploops nirae* on the specific diversity and functional structure of benthic communities. *Journal of Sea Research (JSR)*, 2014, 85, pp.413-427. 10.1016/j.seares.2013.07.013 . hal-01140607

**HAL Id: hal-01140607**

**<https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-01140607>**

Submitted on 9 Apr 2015

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 Benthic control freaks: Effects of the tubicolous amphipod *Haploops*  
2  
3 *nirae* on the structural and functional diversity of benthic communities  
4  
5  
6  
7

8 Carinne Rigolet <sup>a,b</sup>, Stanislas F. Dubois <sup>a</sup>, Eric Thiébaud <sup>b,c</sup>  
9

10 5

11  
12 <sup>a</sup> IFREMER, DYNECO, Laboratoire Ecologie benthique, Technopole Brest-Iroise, BP70, 29280

13 Plouzané, France  
14

15  
16  
17  
18 <sup>b</sup> CNRS, UMR 7144, Adaptation et Diversité en Milieu Marin, Station Biologique de Roscoff, 29680

19 Roscoff (France)  
20

21  
22  
23  
24 10 <sup>c</sup> UPMC Univ Paris 06, UMR 7144, Station Biologique de Roscoff, 29680 Roscoff, France  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 **ABSTRACT**  
30  
31

32  
33  
34  
35 *Haploops nirae* is a gregarious tubicolous amphipod which extended its habitat over thousands of  
36  
37 15 hectares in shallow waters of South Brittany bays (Bay of Biscay, Atlantic) over the last decades and  
38  
39 created uniquely large and dense tube mats. In the bay of Concarneau, we investigated the structural  
40  
41 (i.e. species richness and species composition) and functional (i.e. biological traits) diversity of the  
42  
43 macrofauna associated with this *Haploops* community as a comparison with several surrounding soft-  
44  
45 sediment communities to determine the effect of this engineer species on ecosystem functions.  
46  
47

48 20 We showed that the occurrence of *Haploops* tubes and individuals significantly modify sediment  
49  
50 features (e.g. change in sediment grain size, increase in C and N organic content) but also largely  
51  
52 affect species diversity and benthic composition. The species richness is significantly higher but most  
53  
54 importantly the species assemblage associated with *Haploops* habitat is very homogeneous and unique  
55  
56 with 33% of all species exclusively found in this community. We also tested the effect of tube density  
57  
58  
59 25 on species diversity and abundances and the intermediate disturbance hypothesis but we showed  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 surprisingly no significant changes. Multivariate analysis (dbRDA) revealed that *Haploops* density  
2 was by far the factor explaining most of the variation in species composition of benthic communities.  
3  
4 A biological trait analysis performed on selected traits revealed that the functional structure of the  
5  
6 *Haploops* community was characterized by a greatly reduced proportion of small to medium long  
7  
8  
9 30 lived, sensitive to disturbance, free living or burrowing/tube-building filter-feeding species. *Haploops*  
10  
11 *nirae* appears to be a bioengineer and a foundation species that largely modifies its hydro-sedimentary  
12  
13 features, controlling diversity and abundances of associated species, and creating a complex set of  
14  
15 positive and negative interactions so that a unique benthic assemblage is found in sediments they  
16  
17 colonized.  
18

19  
20 35  
21  
22 *Keywords:*

23  
24 Engineer species

25  
26 Ampeliscidae tube mats

27  
28 Macroinfauna diversity

29  
30  
31 40 Intermediate disturbance hypothesis

32  
33 Biological trait analysis

34  
35 Bay of Biscay  
36  
37  
38  
39

## 40 **1. Introduction**

41  
42  
43 45  
44  
45 Ecosystem engineering is a concept introduced by Jones et al. (1994) who described  
46  
47 ecosystem engineers as organisms that cause a biologically mediated habitat modification. By altering  
48  
49 biotic or abiotic materials that compose a habitat, these organisms directly or indirectly influence  
50  
51 resource availability to other organisms. Ecosystem engineers therefore have the capacity to modify,  
52  
53  
54 50 maintain and/or create habitats for other organisms (Jones et al., 1994; 1997). Many studies have  
55  
56 shown that ecosystem engineers affect neighboring organisms and local biodiversity, thus having  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 significant impacts throughout the biological community and the entire ecosystem (Stachowicz, 2001;  
2 Crooks, 2002).

3  
4 A large diversity of marine organisms physically engineers marine ecosystems and play key  
5  
6 55 functional roles. Examples include salt marsh plants (e.g. mangroves), seagrasses, reef-forming coral  
7  
8 species, mussel beds, burrowing crustaceans, colonial ascidians and burrowing or tubicolous  
9  
10 polychaetes (Wright and Jones, 2006; Voultziadou et al., 2007; Reise et al., 2009). Not only do they  
11  
12 physically modify the structure of their habitat (e.g. burrow nets, reef-like bioconstructions, tube mats,  
13  
14 rock boring), but they also modify hydro-sedimentary features and ultimately impact ecological  
15  
16 processes (nutrient cycling, erosion and sediment stability for example) and associated species  
17  
18 60 (Gutiérrez et al, 2012). In this context, special attention has been given to several tubicolous  
19  
20 gregarious polychaete species that increase habitat complexity, modify the sediment dynamics and  
21  
22 strongly influence micro- and macro-invertebrate diversity and composition (e.g. Woodin, 1978; 1981;  
23  
24 Dubois, 2002; Callaway, 2006). Less is known about other taxonomic groups, especially small tube-  
25  
26 building crustaceans (but see Mills, 1967).  
27  
28 65

29  
30 Ampeliscids are tubicolous amphipods commonly found in shallow environments in temperate  
31  
32 and subarctic waters, where they can reach high densities and form dense tube mats (Bellan-Santini  
33  
34 and Dauvin, 1988; Dauvin, 1988; Franz and Tanacredi, 1992; Sudo and Azeta, 1996; Göransson,  
35  
36 2002). In those cases, they create a very unique habitat, considerably more complex and  
37  
38 heterogeneous than the adjacent homogeneous soft-bottom areas and potentially play significant roles  
39  
40 70 in different ecosystem processes. Many authors revealed that Ampeliscids constitute a major food  
41  
42 source for higher-level consumers (Franz and Tanacredi, 1992; Highsmith and Coyle, 1992; Stoner,  
43  
44 2001) and are in some cases major contributors to the highest production levels observed for benthic  
45  
46 invertebrate communities (Carrasco and Arcos, 1984; Franz and Tanacredi, 1992). By feeding  
47  
48 primarily on phytodetritus, they also greatly influence the pelagic-benthic coupling (Grebmeier and  
49  
50 McRoy, 1989). On the other hand, through the tube building and the bioturbation activity,  
51  
52 75 Ampeliscids could be seen as infaunal hydraulic ecosystem engineers that physically modify their  
53  
54 habitat by altering the biogeochemistry fluxes and the composition of the surface sediments (Woodin  
55  
56 et al., 2010). How large tube mats affect the composition of benthic communities is less investigated.  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

80 The ampeliscid *Haploops nira*e was first recorded in 1884 in the shallow waters of South  
1 Brittany (France) (Bonnier, 1887). Recent acoustic surveys revealed that this species is spreading and  
2 proliferate over large areas of the entire South Brittany coast. For example, the mapping of the bay of  
3 Concarneau revealed a 5-fold increase in *Haploops nira*e habitat surface between 1963 (650 ha in  
4 Glémarec, 1969) and 2003 (3680 ha in Ehrhold et al., 2006). Similar patterns were observed for the  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 85 bay of Vilaine (ca. 7000 ha in 2010) and other muddy coastal environments (unpublished reports). As  
12 many gregarious species, *Haploops nira*e exhibits dense populations, spanning from 6 800 to 25 500  
13 ind. m<sup>-2</sup> (Rigolet et al., 2012). In comparison, densities did not exceeded 5 000 ind. m<sup>-2</sup> 25 years ago  
14 (Glémarec et al., 1986). Although the environmental causes of these recent changes remain unknown,  
15 the increase in density and the spreading of this engineer species provides a backdrop to investigate  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 90 the effects of large tubicolous species mats on ecosystems, and especially regarding major changes in  
23 communities' structure, on local and regional diversity, and ultimately on the functioning of the  
24 ecosystem. While the link between species richness and diversity, and ecosystem functions is still  
25 debated in marine ecology (Stachowicz et al., 2007), increasing attention has been paid to investigate  
26 the functional diversity in communities (Mouillot et al., 2011) and to develop relevant approaches to  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 95 assess marine ecosystem functioning. Biological Traits Analysis (BTA) has proven to be a very useful  
34 tool for identifying changes in functioning of benthic assemblages exposed to disturbance such as  
35 bottom trawling (e.g. Tillin et al., 2006; De Juan et al., 2007) and marine aggregate dredging (e.g.  
36 Barrio Frojan et al., 2011). Based on the assumption that functional roles performed by species are  
37 determined by the species biological traits (Bremner et al., 2006), BTA utilizes species traits (e.g. life  
38 history, morphological and behavioral characteristics) as a proxy for functional roles to determine the  
39 occurrence of these traits over assemblages (Bremner, 2008). However, Lepš et al. (2006) pointed out  
40 that the functional diversity of a community is dependent on the context of the study because the  
41 number of traits selected and their identity depends on the question asked and on which processes  
42 being investigated in the study. As a result, ecological functions of structuring species (bioengineers)  
43  
44 100 may be overlooked if irrelevant combinations of traits are used, providing therefore erroneous  
45 information about the ecological functioning of the ecosystem studied.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2 The present study addresses the question of the effects of a widely dispersed tubicolous  
3 gregarious species – namely the Ampeliscid amphipod *Haploops nirae* – on the structural and  
4 functional diversity of soft-bottom muddy communities. We use complementary estimates of diversity  
5  
6 110 and species composition to test whether tube mats enhance or adversely affect local and regional  
7  
8 diversity. Amphipod species are sensitive to human activity and the former largest European *Haploops*  
9 habitat has largely decreased in the Øresund area (Baltic Sea), likely because of human developments  
10 and resulting eutrophication (Göransson et al., 2002). We discuss here potential consequences of the  
11 loss (or conversely further spreading) of dense tubicolous bioturbators on species richness and  
12  
13 ecosystem functions.  
14  
15  
16  
17 115  
18  
19  
20  
21

## 22 **2. Materials and methods**

### 23 24 25 26 2.1. Study area

27  
28 120  
29  
30  
31 This study was conducted in the bay of Concarneau, situated in the Northern part of the Bay of  
32 Biscay (France) (Fig. 1). This area reflects many coastal embayments in Brittany as it is sheltered by a  
33 succession of rocky islets and is characterized by soft-bottom substrates, spanning from muddy to  
34 muddy-sand, with a depth ranging from 15 to 35 m (Ménesguen, 1980). The westernmost part (north  
35  
36 Mouton islets and Glénan Islands) is composed of muddy sands and sandy muds. The central part of  
37  
38 the bay, where currents are strongly reduced, is composed of pure muds supporting a dense population  
39  
40 125 of the tubicolous amphipod *Haploops nirae*. The western edges of the *Haploops* habitat are  
41  
42 surrounded by patchy muddy sediments (Ehrhold et al., 2006).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 130 2.2 Sampling strategy and laboratory analyses

52  
53  
54  
55 To investigate the effects of *Haploops* on benthic diversity and species assemblages, we  
56 compared the macrofauna associated with *Haploops* with the adjacent benthic communities. A recent  
57 mapping survey of the seabed using geoaoustic approaches and complementary benthic biological  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

135 grab samples was conducted in the bay of Concarneau (Ehrhold et al., 2006). Preliminary macrofauna  
1 analysis reported 4 benthic communities in the bay: the *Sternaspis scutata* muddy community, the  
2  
3  
4 *Amphiura filiformis* sandy-mud community, the *Owenia fusiformis* muddy-sand community and the  
5  
6 *Haploops* muddy community (Fig. 1). Using this map contours, 18 stations were randomly distributed  
7  
8 in each of the 4 communities. To investigate the effects of changes in *Haploops* density on diversity  
9  
10 and benthic assemblages, the sampling effort was increased in the *Haploops* community and 9 stations  
11 140 (among 18 stations) were sampled in this community. Three stations were then distributed in each of  
12  
13 the other communities (i.e. the *Sternaspis* community, the *Amphiura* community and the *Owenia*  
14  
15 community) (Fig. 1). The 18 stations (3 replicates per station) were sampled during summer time (July  
16  
17 2009) using a 0.1 m<sup>2</sup> Van Veen grab. Samples were sieved on a 1 mm circular mesh-size screen and  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 145 fixed with a 5% buffered formalin solution. In the laboratory, samples were rinsed, sorted and the  
23  
24 macrofauna was identified to the lowest taxonomic level (i.e. generally the species level) and counted.  
25  
26

To characterize each community, environmental parameters from the sediment were sampled  
27  
28 at each station using a Reineck box-corer (2 replicates) to collect undisturbed samples. Chlorophyll *a*,  
29  
30 phaeopigments, organic matter concentration (C and N) and sediment grain size were analyzed from  
31  
32 the first 5 cm layer of sediment. Sediment samples were first frozen at -20°C and then freeze-dried to  
33 150 perform analyses, except for granulometry for which samples were kept at 4°C to prevent bias in  
34  
35 measurements of silt and clay proportion. Grain size distribution was analyzed using a laser particle  
36  
37 analyzer (Malvern Mastersizer 2000). Granulometric parameters (i.e. mean grain size in µm, % of  
38  
39 mud, % of sand, sorting index, clay:silt ratio) were estimated using the GRADISTAT software (Blott  
40  
41 and Pye, 2001). Nitrogen and carbon organic content in sediment were measured with an elemental  
42  
43 analyser after acidification with 1M HCl to remove inorganic calcium carbonates. Primary producer  
44 155 pigments (i.e. chlorophyll *a* and phaeopigments) were estimated using the monochromatic technique  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 (Lorenzen, 1967) as described in Aminot and K erouel (2004).  
52  
53

### 54 55 160 2.3. Data analysis 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

**Community structure.** To check for the validity of the *a priori* grouping stations for each community, a non-metric multi dimensional scaling (nMDS) combined with a cluster analysis was first used. Analyses were conducted on a Bray-Curtis similarity matrix calculated from log-transformed abundances to downweigh the influence of abundant species. Species that appeared once in the dataset (i.e. occurring in less than 2% of the samples) were removed from multivariate analyses. According to the role of *Haploops* as an ecosystem engineer, we assume that *Haploops* densities correspond primarily to an environmental parameter. Consequently, *Haploops* individuals were removed from multivariate analyses so that only the associated species were considered. Cluster analyses were performed using the group average linkage method. A similarity profile test was performed to test the null hypothesis that a single set of samples, which are not *a priori* divided into groups do not differ from each other in the multivariate structure using the SIMPROF routine of the PRIMER 6 software package (Clarke and Gorley, 2006). To conduct this test, an “observed” similarity profile was firstly generated in which all Bray-Curtis similarities between the samples were plotted against their rank. A permutation procedure (based on 1000 permutations) was then used to produce the “mean” similarity profile in which all resemblances in the subset of samples were equally plotted against their rank. The statistical test corresponds to the sum of the absolute distance ( $\pi$ ) between the “observed” similarity profile and the simulated mean profile. A further 999 simulated profiles were then generated and  $\pi$  was computed between each of these and the mean simulated profile, defining therefore the range of likely values under the null hypothesis.

In addition, taxa that contributed the most to the observed differences between communities (expressed as %) were determined from the Bray-Curtis similarity matrix using the SIMPER procedure of the PRIMER 6 software package (Clarke and Gorley, 2006).

**Macrofauna diversity.** The macrofauna diversity of the sampled communities as defined from the multivariate analyses, was assessed using indices recommended by Gray (2000) for characterizing local diversity, namely Hill’s indices (N0, N1 and N2) (Hill, 1973). As described in Hill (1973), N0 corresponds to the species richness (number of species), N1 =  $\exp(H')$  where  $H'$  is Shannon-Wiener diversity ( $\log_e$ ) and N2 =  $1/SI$ , where SI is the Simpson’s dominance Index. The N1



190 index is affected by species situated in the middle of the rank sequence, while the Simpson index used  
1  
2 in the calculation of N2 addresses the degree of dominance of one or a few very abundant species  
3  
4 (Whittaker, 1972). The N1 and N2 indices are two measures of heterogeneity diversity. *Haploops*  
5  
6 individuals were also removed from the dataset so that only the associated fauna was considered. A  
7  
8 one-way ANOVA was used to test for significant differences between benthic communities in  
9  
10  
11 195 diversity indices and macrofauna abundances. Normality of data was assessed using the Kolmogorov-  
12  
13 Smirnov test and homogeneity of variance was tested using the Levene test. When significant  
14  
15 differences occurred between communities, a pairwise multiple comparison procedure (Holm-Sidak  
16  
17 Test) was used. All statistical analyses were performed using the Sigmastat 3.5 software (Systat  
18  
19 Software, Inc., CA, USA).

22 200 As suggested by Gray (2000), diversity indices can meaningfully be estimated at a larger level  
23  
24 than at the sample scale. We therefore also calculated the diversity indices at the whole community  
25  
26 scale. Since the number of sampled stations differed between communities, diversity measures such as  
27  
28 N0, N1 and N2 were assessed using a bootstrap procedure. This method estimates diversity indices for  
29  
30 each community through the use of accumulation curves for randomised samples. Bootstrap  
31  
32 calculations (50 randomisations) were performed using the EstimateS Win 8.20 software (Colwell,  
33 205  
34  
35 2009).

37  
38 Furthermore, as a measure of beta diversity, the taxonomic similarity between the  
39  
40 communities was assessed. According to Whittaker (1960), beta diversity is the extent of change in  
41  
42 species composition from one location to another. The Jaccard index of similarity which is commonly  
43  
44 210 used in beta diversity analyses (Nekola and White, 1999; Qian, 2009; Condit et al., 2002) was used as  
45  
46 a measure of macrofaunal similarity between the benthic communities sampled. The Jaccard's index  
47  
48 (coefficient of community CC) is defined as  $CC = S_s / (S_j + S_k - S_s)$ , where  $S_s$  is the number of species  
49  
50 shared by two samples,  $S_j$  the number in the first sample and  $S_k$  the number in the second sample  
51  
52 (Jaccard, 1912; Whittaker, 1972). This index ranges from 0 (no species shared) to 1 meaning that all  
53  
54  
55 215 species are shared by two samples. A low number of shared species between two communities  
56  
57 corresponds to a high turnover in species composition between the two communities, reflecting high  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2 beta diversity. To overcome the problem related to a non-homogeneous sampling effort, we calculated  
3 the number of species common to two stations for all pairwise permutations of stations.  
4  
5

6 **220 Linking assemblage species to environmental parameters.** A one-way ANOVA was used  
7  
8 to determine whether environmental parameters (Chl *a*, phaeopigments concentration, organic C and  
9 N concentrations and grain size descriptors) differed between the benthic communities. Normality of  
10 data was assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and homogeneity of variance was tested using  
11 the Levene test. To fulfil conditions of normality and homogeneity of variances, the environmental  
12 parameter Mean grain size was log transformed. When significant differences occurred between  
13 communities, a pairwise multiple comparison procedure (Holm-Sidak Test) was used. To determine  
14 the relationships between environmental variables and macrofauna assemblages, a distance-based  
15 redundancy analysis (dbRDA) was performed using the PERMANOVA + software (Anderson et al.,  
16 2008). The dbRDA is a method of constrained ordination, which displays the relationships among  
17 samples points from a fitted model (Legendre and Anderson, 1999). The DISTLM (distance-based  
18 linear modeling) routine of the software was therefore used first to analyze and model the linear  
19 relationships between multivariate data (community composition) and predictor variables  
20 (environmental variables) (Anderson et al., 2008). The parsimonious model built by the DISTLM  
21 routine provides a reduced number of environmental variables that best correlate with macrofauna  
22 data. The “Akaike Information Criterion” (AIC) which is a measure of the relative goodness of fit of a  
23 statistical model was used to determine this model. The selection procedure used calculates the AIC  
24 criterion for all possible models (i.e. combinations of predictor variables) and provides the overall 10  
25 best models that were found using the AIC criterion. The model that achieved the lowest AIC value  
26 can be considered as the best of the candidate models. The dbRDA routine was then used to perform  
27 an ordination of fitted values from the given model built by the DISTLM routine. Before doing the  
28 DISTLM and dbRDA routines, preliminary diagnostics have to be made to avoid multi-collinearity  
29 (strong inter-correlations) among predictor (environmental) variables. Thus, when two environmental  
30 variables showed strong correlation (i.e.  $R > 0.95$ ), one of these two variables was removed from the  
31 analysis, since they contain redundant information. Moreover, environmental variables that show a  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

245 great deal of skewness (identified by the use of Draftman Plots) were transformed to approach  
1 normality. In this way, from the 12 environmental variables submitted to the dbRDA analysis (i.e. Chl  
2 *a*, phaeopigments, %C, %N, C:N ratio, mean grain size, % Mud, % Sand, sorting index, clay:silt ratio,  
3  
4 *a*, phaeopigments, %C, %N, C:N ratio, mean grain size, % Mud, % Sand, sorting index, clay:silt ratio,  
5  
6 water depth and *Haploops* tube density), only 7 (Chl *a*, phaeopigments, %C, C:N ratio, mean grain  
7  
8 size (log transformed), water depth and *Haploops* tube density (fourth root transformed)) were  
9  
10 selected to be processed by the DISTLM routine for the dbRDA analysis. It is worth noting that  
11 250  
12  
13 *Haploops* tubes physically modify their habitat and could be considered a source of disturbance in  
14  
15 bare sediment, therefore we chose to consider the density of tubes as an environmental variable.  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 **Biological Traits Analysis (BTA).** As suggested by Bremner (2008), the initial stage of traits  
21  
22 255 analysis involves the identification of key aspects of functioning in the ecosystem under consideration  
23  
24 and the selection of suitable indicator traits. In this perspective, traits that are functionally important  
25  
26 have to be selected to provide a relevant picture of the ecosystem functioning. While morphological  
27  
28 characteristics of species are commonly used in BTA analyses (Bremner et al., 2006; Paganelli et al.,  
29  
30 2012), such characteristics are strongly related to the taxonomic classification of species and could  
31  
32 potentially hamper the functional approach: for example, the body form “laterally compressed” or  
33 260  
34  
35 “vermiform” is usually very close to the composition in amphipods and polychaetes, respectively. To  
36  
37 assess the functional diversity associated with each community, we selected 7 biological and  
38  
39 ecological traits that reflect ecological processes that we consider functionally important to understand  
40  
41 how an ecosystem engineering, bioturbating amphipod may induce changes in the functional  
42  
43 characteristics of the ecosystem. We choose to gather information concerning (1) the feeding strategy  
44 265  
45  
46 of the taxa (i.e. trophic group) to provide important information about resource utilisation in each  
47  
48 community as well as its availability, (2) the life cycle (i.e. lifespan and adult individual size) because  
49  
50 those traits are directly related to the secondary production (Brey, 1990; Cusson and Bourget, 2005)  
51  
52 and provide information related to the amount of organic matter and energy produced by the  
53  
54 community and (3) the behavior (i.e. type of movement, life mode, bioadvective activity) to provide  
55 270  
56  
57 details on overall activity such as the mode of movement of species and how species occupy their area  
58  
59 and contribute to sediment reworking and biogeochemical fluxes at the water-sediment interface.  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Biological traits are listed in Table 1. As suggested by Paganelli et al. (2012), we also included the AMBI Index (AZTI's Marine Biotic Index) as a biological trait, as it classifies the species according to their tolerance to disturbance (Borja and Muxika, 2005). Each trait was then sub-divided into modalities and a fuzzy coding procedure (Chevenet et al., 1994) was used to assign a score to each modality of a trait. The species traits were fuzzy coded on a 0 to 3 scale with "0" indicating "no affinity" to "3" indicating "high affinity" of the taxon for the modality. This approach avoids the assignment of a taxon to a single category, allows taxa to exhibit modalities to different degrees and incorporates information on intraspecific variability in trait expression. In this way, the fuzzy coding procedure leads to a more precise description of species traits. Biological and ecological information on species were gathered from a variety of literature sources, from general handbooks to specialized papers (i.e. taxonomic guides with descriptions of species). We used the Biological Traits Information Catalogue developed by the Marine Life Information Network ([www.marlin.ac.uk/biotic/](http://www.marlin.ac.uk/biotic/)) as well as the AZTI list for the AMBI Index (Borja and Muxika, 2005 and see also [www.azti.es](http://www.azti.es)) for complementary information, as well as expert input. In rare cases, no information was found. Similarly to the analysis of benthic assemblages, the *Haploops* species was removed from the dataset and taxa that were found only once in the samples were not retained for the biological traits analysis; we thus constitute an array of 211 taxa by biological traits with 7 variables (traits) and 30 modalities. This "species by traits" array was ordinated using a Fuzzy coded multiple Correspondence Analysis (FCA) which is well adapted for fuzzy coded table (Chevenet et al., 1994). Before FCA calculation, a fuzzy coded file is processed and computes the frequency of use of each modality per trait so that the sum of values by group of modalities is equal to 1. If the affinity of a species for a variable (trait) is unknown, it is coded "0" for all the modalities. The missing values (2% of cases) were thus replaced by the average profile for the corresponding variable during the computation of the fuzzy coded file. In this way, a species with such a score is not taken into account in the calculation of the column weight (Chevenet et al., 1994). We then constituted clusters of species with similar associations of traits using the output of the Fuzzy Correspondence Analysis (i.e. the scores of taxa on the first four axes of the FCA) using Ward's linkage method (Ward, 1963) on Euclidean distances (Usseglio-Polatera et al., 2000). The two first axes of the FCA explained 27.1% of the variance, in order to take into account a

1 larger amount of explained variance to constitute the clusters we decided to use the first four axes  
2 explaining 43 % of the variance. Functional groups of species with similar associations of traits were  
3 identified and plotted on the two first axes of the Fuzzy Correspondence Analysis at the weighted  
4 average of their taxa and constituted the reference typology of functional groups (Usseglio-Polatera et  
5 al., 2000). For each functional group identified, we generated a biological profile which indicates for  
6 each trait the proportion of trait modalities exhibited by the group.  
7  
8  
9 305

10  
11  
12 To compare the functional diversity among the benthic communities studied, we calculated  
13 (from the log-transformed abundances of species per sampling station) the relative frequency of each  
14 functional group in the four communities (i.e. *Sternaspis*, *Amphiura*, *Owenia* and *Haploops*). To test  
15 for significant differences in the relative frequency of functional group between benthic communities,  
16 a one-way ANOVA was performed. Normality of data was assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov  
17 test and homogeneity of variance was tested using the Levene test. When the conditions of normality  
18 and homogeneity of variances were not fulfilled even after data transformation, we used the  
19 nonparametric test Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance on Ranks. When significant differences  
20 310 occurred between communities, a pairwise multiple comparison procedure (Holm-Sidak Test) was  
21 used. Finally, the relative frequency distribution of functional groups in sampling stations was used to  
22 plot stations on the reference typology of functional groups, so that the stations are located at the  
23 center of the relative frequency distribution of functional groups (Usseglio-Polatera et al., 2000).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 315

32 Calculations were performed using the statistical software R 2.11.1 (R Development Core  
33 Team, 2008 – [www.R-project.org](http://www.R-project.org)) with the ade4 package (Thioulouse et al., 1997).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 320

### 43 44 45 46 **3. Results**

#### 47 48 49 *3.1. Community structure*

50  
51  
52  
53  
54 325 Hierarchical cluster analysis and SIMPROF test revealed that 4 main clusters, i.e. species  
55 assemblages that correspond to communities are grouped at a similarity level of 60%. In agreement  
56 with the mapping of the bay of Concarneau, the four communities described *a priori* (i.e. *Sternaspis*,  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 330 *Amphiura*, *Owenia* and *Haploops*) are well separated on the nMDS plot (Fig. 2). Except for the  
5  
6 *Sternaspis* community, each benthic community constituted a separate cluster. One station (CO3)  
7  
8 sampled in the *Sternaspis* community exhibited a species assemblage that shared strong similarity to  
9  
10 the species assemblage associated with the *Haploops* stations. Data revealed that this station actually  
11  
12 had a relatively low density of *Haploops* ( $2\ 000 \pm 930$  ind.m<sup>2</sup>). In the following diversity analyses, we  
13  
14 will therefore consider the *Sternaspis* community as a group of 2 stations (instead of 3) and exclude  
15  
16 station CO3. The nMDS plot also showed that *Haploops* stations are well discriminated, even though a  
17  
18 larger sampling effort was made. Species assemblages associated with *Haploops* community are very  
19  
20 different from surrounded benthic assemblages but also very homogeneous.

21  
22 Species that contributed the most to the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity between communities are  
23  
24 listed in Table 2. In all cases between 7 and 9 species represented ca. 20 % of the dissimilarity  
25  
26 between the communities, each species contributing approximately the same to the dissimilarity.  
27 340 *Polychaetes Terebellides stroemi*, *Schistomeringos rudolphii* and *Mediomastus fragilis* typified the  
28  
29 fauna associated with *Haploops* community. Overall, amphipods other than *Haploops* contributed  
30  
31 largely to dissimilarity between communities: *Ampelisca* species (Ampeliscids tubicolous amphipods)  
32  
33 are in part responsible for differences between the *Owenia* community (where they were abundant)  
34  
35 and the surrounding communities (where *Ampelisca* were relatively scarce). Commensal organisms  
36  
37 such as the small bivalve *Kurtiella bidentata* and the brittle star *Amphiura filiformis* were found in all  
38 345 communities except in the *Haploops* community. Moreover, the highest density of the polychaete  
39  
40 *Maldane glebifex* (that lives in a consolidated mud tube) in the *Amphiura* community is in part  
41  
42 responsible for the differences with the *Sternaspis* and *Owenia* communities. Finally, the presence of  
43  
44 the bivalve *Abra alba* and the small cirratulid *Chaetozone gibber* contributed to distinguish the  
45  
46 *Owenia* community from the *Sternaspis* community.  
47  
48  
49 350

### 50 51 52 53 3.2. Structural diversity 54 55 56 57

58  
59 Mean values of macrofauna diversity measures and abundances within each community are  
60 355 reported in Table 3. For all tested parameters, overall significant differences between communities  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 were observed (ANOVA,  $p < 0.05$ ). Total abundance of individuals was the highest in the *Amphiura*  
2 community and was significantly different from the low abundances reported from the *Haploops*  
3 community (*Haploops* being excluded). Indeed, the macrofauna abundance associated with *Haploops*  
4 community was estimated at  $157 \pm 37 \text{ ind.} \cdot 0.1\text{m}^{-2}$  and was 1.5 to 3 times lower than those reported in the  
5  
6 adjacent areas. *Owenia* and *Sternaspis* communities exhibited intermediate densities which did not  
7  
8 significantly differ from *Amphiura* and *Haploops* communities. When the *Haploops* individuals are  
9 360 included, the abundances in this community are far higher than those from adjacent areas ( $p < 0.001$ ,  
10 ANOVA) with a mean density of  $1\,208 \pm 317 \text{ ind.} \cdot 0.1\text{m}^{-2}$ . While the number of stations sampled in the  
11  
12 *Haploops* community was the highest (9 stations), a very low standard error in abundances was  
13  
14 observed, revealing that the *Haploops* community is characterized by a high homogeneity in the  
15  
16 abundances of associated fauna.  
17  
18  
19  
20 365  
21  
22  
23

24 Mean species richness (N0) was higher in the *Owenia* and *Haploops* communities compared  
25  
26 to the *Sternaspis* community and the *Amphiura* community. N1 and N2 indices exhibited the same  
27  
28 pattern and indicated significantly lower diversity in *Sternaspis* and *Amphiura* than in the two others  
29  
30 communities. *Haploops* community showed the highest value for N1 but no significant differences  
31 370 were reported between the high values of N2 in *Owenia* and *Haploops* communities.  
32  
33

34 At a larger scale (i.e. community scale), cumulated values of N0, N1 and N2 based on 50  
35  
36 randomisation bootstraps revealed that for the same sampling effort, highest species richness and  
37  
38 diversity values distinguished the *Haploops* community from all adjacent areas.  
39  
40  
41

42 375 The mean proportion of shared species between two communities assessed with the Jaccard's  
43  
44 index spanned from  $0.16 \pm 0.03$  to  $0.41 \pm 0.04$  (Table 4). *Owenia* and *Haploops* communities had a  
45  
46 mean of 16% species in common, while *Sternaspis* shared 41% of species with the *Amphiura*  
47  
48 community. With a slight turnover of species from one community to another (Jaccard's index ranging  
49  
50 from 0.26 to 0.41), *Sternaspis*, *Amphiura* and *Owenia* communities showed a relatively high similarity  
51  
52 in species composition. In contrast, lowest values of the Jaccard's index (ranging from 0.16 to 0.21)  
53 380 were recorded when the *Haploops* community was compared with the adjacent areas, implying a high  
54  
55 turnover of species and very few species shared. Moreover, on the 274 species recorded in the four  
56  
57 benthic communities of the bay of Concarneau during this study, 90 species (i.e. 33 % of the total  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

number of species) were exclusively found in the *Haploops* community. Among these species, some are consistently found in all samples collected in the *Haploops* community such as the predatory polychaetes of the family *Eunicidae* (i.e. *Eunice vittata* and *Nematonereis hebes*), Terebellidomorph polychaetes (i.e. *Lysippe labiata*, *Amaeana trilobata*, *Axionice maculata*, *Pista cristata* and *Trichobranchus glacialis*), the Maldanid polychaete *Praxillella gracilis*, the Paraonid polychaete *Aricidea sp.*, some amphipod species such as *Leptocheirus pectinatus*, *Lysianassa insperata* and *Photis inornatus* but also the small brittle star *Amphipholis squamata* and the large bivalve *Polititapes virgineus*.

### 3.3. Linking species assemblages to environmental parameters

The comparison of sedimentary features revealed that strong differences occurred between the four studied communities (Table 5). The mud content was overall important but was the lowest in the *Owenia* community (19%), and significantly increasing from *Sternaspis* and *Amphiura* communities (58% and 49% respectively) to the *Haploops* community (72%). In good agreement with the mud content, the mean grain size followed the same pattern, with significantly lower values in *Haploops* stations. All communities significantly differed in organic N% and C% in sediment. Values were significantly higher in the *Haploops* area (N% = 0.30 and C% = 1.85) and lower in the *Owenia* community (N% = 0.07 and C% = 0.47) suggesting that organic loads were the highest in the *Haploops* community. The *Haploops* area was moreover characterized by the lowest C:N ratio, which is a proxy for higher organic matter quality. Finally, while no significant differences in chlorophyll *a* were evidenced between communities, the highest content of phaeopigments in sediment was reported in the *Haploops* area.

Environmental variables that best explained the relationships between environmental parameters and macrofauna assemblages were as followed: (1) *Haploops* density (fourth root transformed), (2) mean grain size (log transformed) and (3) water depth. These three variables composed the parsimonious model which explained a very large part (70.3 %) of the total variation in species assemblages. The distance-based redundancy analysis (dbRDA) plot is illustrated in Fig. 3.



1  
2 The first two axes explained 95.3 % of the fitted variation and 67 % of the total variation. On the  
3 dbRDA plot, macrofauna samples modelled by the 3 predictor variables exhibited a “V” shape, hence  
4 suggesting that macrofauna assemblages are divided up according to two gradients. The first gradient  
5  
6 415 was largely driven by *Haploops* density and to a lesser extent by water depth, which kept *Haploops*  
7  
8 stations separated from *Sternaspis*, *Amphiura* and *Owenia* stations. The second gradient was mainly  
9  
10 driven by mean grain size and water depth and discriminated *Sternaspis* and *Amphiura* stations from  
11  
12 the *Owenia* stations. Although faunal differences between communities were associated with mean  
13  
14 grain size and water depth, the greatest proportion of differences in macrofauna assemblages was  
15  
16 explained by the density of *Haploops*. This variable alone explained 54.1 % of the total variation in  
17  
18 420 macrofauna assemblages, far beyond the % variation explained by the mean grain size (11.5%) and the  
19  
20 water depth (4.8%). Considering that *Haploops* individuals were removed from the species matrix and  
21  
22 that only associated species were processed, this approach revealed that *Haploops* density is the  
23  
24 parameter that best explained variations in species assemblages.  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 425 Variations in species richness and abundance of macrofauna (*Haploops* individuals excluded)  
30  
31 as a function of *Haploops* density are plotted in Fig. 4. With a density of *Haploops* ranging from 920  
32  
33 ind.m<sup>2</sup> to 22 000 ind.m<sup>2</sup>, the species richness (N0) did not show significant differences (Pearson  
34  
35 correlation coefficient, p=0.234). Moreover, no significant relationship was found between the  
36  
37 abundance of associated macrofauna and *Haploops* density (Pearson correlation coefficient, p=0.232).  
38  
39  
40 430 Similarly, N1 and N2 diversity indices were not affected by an increase in *Haploops* density (Pearson  
41  
42 correlation coefficient, p=0.678 and p=0.725 respectively).  
43  
44  
45  
46

### 47 3.4. Functional diversity

48  
49  
50  
51 435 The first two factorial axes of the fuzzy correspondence analysis (FCA) explained respectively  
52  
53 15.8 and 11.3% of the total variability in species biological traits (Fig. 5). The correlation ratios issued  
54  
55 from this analysis revealed which variables (traits) were best explained by the first two axes of the  
56  
57 analysis (Table 6). On the F1 axis of the FCA, the modalities of the variables ‘trophic group’, ‘type of  
58  
59 movement’, ‘habit’, ‘bioturbation’ and ‘ecological group (AMBI)’ are well separated with 41 to 80%  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

440 of the variance explained. On the F2 axis, the modalities of the variable ‘bioturbation’ are well  
1 separated with a percentage of explained variance of 48%. The modalities of variables ‘life span’,  
2  
3  
4 ‘ecological group (AMBI)’ and ‘individual size’ are less well separated on this axis, but better  
5  
6 explained on the F3 and F4 axes.  
7

8  
9 Overall, the F1 axis of the FCA separated carnivore-omnivore free living organisms from sessile  
10  
11 445 tube or burrow-dwellers organisms (Fig. 5). Positive F1 scores are associated with free living  
12  
13 carnivorous species that move by crawling and walking, which create diffusive mixing and bulldozing  
14  
15 at the sediment surface. Negative F1 scores were associated with sessile deposit- or filter-feeders,  
16  
17 which are tube-dwellers and burrowers. The F2 axis separated crawler and/or burrower species with  
18  
19 medium life spans, which are disturbance tolerant and of relatively large size to fixed, swimmer and/or  
20  
21  
22 450 walker species, which are of small size and sensitive to disturbance.  
23

24 From FCA results, the cluster revealed five groups of taxa that each exhibit similar associations of  
25  
26 biological traits (Fig. 6). These five groups are relatively well separated on the F1-F2 factorial plane  
27  
28 and each of these groups presents a unique set of biological traits (Fig. 7). The group 1 is composed  
29  
30 exclusively of sub-surface deposit-feeders which are mainly burrowers (burrow-dwellers or tube-  
31  
32 dwellers) and create almost exclusively a translocation of sediment from lower layers to the surface  
33 455 and *vice versa* (conveyer belt transport). They exhibit short to medium life span, are mainly sensitive  
34  
35 or tolerant to disturbance and of a medium to large size. Species that are most representative of the  
36  
37 functional group 1 are Maldanid polychaetes such as *Maldane glebifex* and *Euclymene oerstedii* but  
38  
39 also Orbiniid species such as *Orbinia cuvieri* and Capitellid species (i.e. *Notomastus latericeus* and  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 460 *Heteromastus filiformis*). The group 2 is composed of burrowing organisms that are mainly deposit-  
45  
46 feeders and/or filters-feeders in a lesser extent. Organisms from this group live in tube or burrow and  
47  
48 create a deposition of particles and a diffusive mixing at the sediment surface. Most species of this  
49  
50 group are short-lived species and are of small to medium size; their sensitivity to disturbance varied  
51  
52 from sensitive to opportunistic. Species that are most representative of this functional group are small  
53  
54  
55 465 burrowing suspension- and deposit-feeding bivalves (such as *Kurtiella bidentata* and *Abra alba*) but  
56  
57 also polychaetes such as *Ampharete finmarchica* and *Chaetozone gibber* for example. The group 3 is  
58  
59 mainly composed of burrowing filter-feeders, living in tubes, burrows or free living. They induced no  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 470  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 475  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

bioturbation nor create a surface deposition or bulldoze the sediment. The species from this group have long lifespan, are of medium size and are mainly sensitive to disturbance. Species typifying this group are the brittle star *Amphiura filiformis*, large bivalves such as *Dosinia lupinus* and *Polititapes virgineus* and sabellid polychaetes. The group 4 is composed of species with diverse trophic guilds, type of movement, habit and mode of bioturbation. All species in this group have a short lifespan, are sensitive to disturbance and of very small size. Its representative species are almost exclusively crustaceans such as amphipods and isopods. Finally, the group 5 is composed exclusively of carnivorous-omnivorous, free living species that mainly move by crawling and create a diffusive mixing at the sediment surface. They are mainly indifferent to disturbance and of small size. Predatory-omnivorous polychaetes constitute almost exclusively this functional group; some scavenger gastropods such as *Nassarius incrassatus* and *Euspira pulchella* are also included in this group.

26 480  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 485  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 490  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Significant differences between communities were observed in the proportions of the 5 functional groups: the proportion of the group 1 was significantly lower in the *Owenia* community compared to the *Amphiura* and *Haploops* communities ( $p < 0.001$ , ANOVA). Functional group 2 was significantly greater in the *Owenia* community, with a higher proportion of short-lived burrowing species ( $p < 0.001$ , ANOVA). Also, the relative proportion of the functional group 3 significantly differed for all communities ( $p < 0.001$ , ANOVA) except between the *Amphiura* and the *Owenia* communities. The *Sternaspis* community showed the highest relative proportion of group 3. The *Haploops* community is only composed of a small proportion of species from this group. No significant differences in the proportion of the functional group 4 were observed between communities. Finally, group 5 is better represented in the *Haploops* community as compared to the *Amphiura* and *Owenia* communities ( $p < 0.001$ , ANOVA on ranks) but did not significantly differ from the *Sternaspis* community.

51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60 495  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Based on the relative frequencies of the 5 functional groups in each sampling station, samples are plotted along with the reference typology of groups on the F1-F2 factorial plane (Fig. 9). The relative positions of stations in this space provide information about the functional structure of the benthic macrofauna communities and the functional resemblance between communities. While the relative grouping of all the stations revealed functional redundancy between the four communities, it is worth

1  
2 noting that stations from the *Haploops* community slightly differed from the others, mainly because of  
3 its large proportions of species from groups 1 and 5, and small proportion of species from group 3.  
4  
5  
6

## 7 **4. Discussion**

8  
9  
10 500  
11  
12 Dense and extensive tube mats created by the tubicolous ampeliscid *Haploops nirae* in the bay  
13 of Concarneau (South Brittany) were investigated here to determine the effects of a dense bioengineer  
14 species on benthic assemblages, from both a structural and a functional perspective. This species is a  
15 good candidate because (1) Ampeliscidae is one of the largest amphipod families which may form  
16 dense populations (Dauvin and Bellan-Santini, 1996) and is commonly considered to be composed of  
17 important bioengineers due to their ability to construct dense tubes mats (MacKenzie et al., 2006), and  
18 (2) this species is reportedly spreading over large geographical scales in South Brittany raising  
19 questions on the consequences of the proliferation of a native species in coastal embayments.  
20  
21  
22 505  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 4.1. Impact of *Haploops nirae* on benthic macrofauna community

33  
34  
35  
36

37 Using an extensive spatial sampling approach, this study demonstrated that species  
38 assemblages associated with *Haploops nirae* strongly differed from those in adjacent communities  
39 even when removing *Haploops nirae* individuals from the species matrix. The distance based  
40 redundancy analysis (dbRDA) revealed that the environmental parameter mainly responsible for  
41 macrofauna differences between the *Haploops* community and the surrounding communities is  
42 actually the density of *Haploops*: 54 % of the total variation in species assemblages is explained by  
43 this variable, well above the percentage of variance explained by factors commonly reported to  
44 primarily influence macrofauna distribution, i.e. the mean grain size and the water depth (Ellingsen,  
45 2002). This result highlights that the abundance of *Haploops* individuals is not the prime reason for  
46 the uniqueness of species assemblages in *Haploops* habitat, but that this engineer species strongly  
47 affects and controls the species colonizing this habitat. Through the construction of dense tube mats  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55 520  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 (around 10 000 ind.m<sup>2</sup>) *Haploops* individuals actively build a physically complex and heterogeneous  
2 environment comparatively very different from the adjacent, less heterogeneous substrates. These tube  
3  
4 525 aggregations also affect environmental parameters, by increasing the quantity and quality (low CN  
5  
6 ratio) of the organic matter or by modifying the granulometry of this muddy habitat (see Table 5 for  
7  
8 example). Ultimately, *Haploops nirae* seems to facilitate the settlement and further development of a  
9  
10 peculiar macrofauna species assemblage. The consequences of the sole occurrence of *Haploops nirae*  
11  
12 on the structure of benthic communities are well illustrated from the data for the station CO3. This  
13  
14 station originally reported as a *Sternaspis* community-station from an exhaustive mapping of the area  
15 530  
16 (Ehrhold et al., 2006) exhibited small but significant *Haploops* densities (ca 200 ind. 0.1 m<sup>2</sup>) which  
17  
18 cause sharp changes in associated fauna. It harbored then a species assemblage which is intermediate  
19  
20 between both communities even though *Haploops* individuals were removed from the analyses.  
21  
22

23  
24 Other dense Ampeliscid habitats shared similarities with *Haploops* community, especially  
25  
26 535 large *Ampelisca abdita* community from the North-American coast (Franz and Harris, 1988, Larsen  
27  
28 and Gilfillan, 2004). Benthic surveys revealed that the *Ampelisca abdita*-dominated community in  
29  
30 Jamaica bay (New York, USA) was clearly different from the adjacent uncolonized communities  
31  
32 (Franz and Harris, 1988). Mills (1967) also showed that colonization of dense aggregations of  
33  
34 *Ampelisca abdita* in the Barnstable Harbor (Massachusetts, USA) was followed by marked changes in  
35  
36 the macrofauna. Similarly, engineer species *de facto* strongly influence associated fauna, as reported  
37 540  
38 for reef-building bivalves aggregating into beds and hardening soft sedimentary systems (Tsuchiya  
39  
40 and Nishihira, 1985; Gutiérrez et al, 2012) or seagrass beds stabilizing soft sediment and preventing  
41  
42 erosion (Edgar, 1990). A large body of literature also reported that tubicolous polychaete species such  
43  
44 as *Lanice conchilega* and *Owenia fusiformis* profoundly change associated species assemblages  
45  
46 (Somaschini, 1993; Zühlke, 2001; Callaway et al., 2010).  
47 545  
48

49  
50 Not only did we demonstrate the uniqueness of species assemblages when the sediment is  
51  
52 colonized by *Haploops* but we also showed that the *Haploops* community is characterized by a strong  
53  
54 homogeneity in species assemblages, as evidenced by the very low variability in spatial changes and  
55  
56 the high similarity indices in macrobenthic comparison. Similar results were observed by Castilla et al.  
57  
58 (2004) for the mounts formed by the ascidia *Pyura praeputialis*, which exhibit highly similar species  
59  
60 550  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 assemblages. We can therefore assume that engineered habitat promotes the stability and the  
2 constancy of the community structure. Jones et al. (1997) indicated that in the absence of severe  
3 abiotic environmental disturbance, many engineers create very stable conditions for those species that  
4 are dependent upon them for habitat. In that perspective, the physical constraints created by tubes  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 555 likely provides a stable environment for a particular combination of species.

#### 13 4.2. Impact of *Haploops nirae* on species diversity and abundances

17 Our results demonstrated a larger cumulated species richness in the *Haploops* community (i.e.  
18  
19  
20 560 130 species) compared to adjacent communities where the total species richness was estimated at 80,  
21  
22 95 and 103 species respectively for the same sampling effort. Diversity indices (N1 and N2) equally  
23  
24 showed that the *Haploops* community was more diversified than the adjacent communities when  
25  
26 *Haploops* densities are not included. Similar results were found in literature: Larsen and Gilfillan  
27  
28 (2004) who used the species richness as indicator of diversity, showed that among 11 benthic stations  
29  
30  
31 565 sampled in the Cobscook bay (Maine, USA), the highest species richness occurred in stations  
32  
33 colonized by ampeliscids. Sanders (1958) also reported the greatest species richness in stations  
34  
35 dominated by three ampeliscid species in the Buzzards bay (Massachusetts, USA). The vast majority  
36  
37 of studies have reported positive effects of biogenic habitat structures on diversity indices, species  
38  
39 richness and abundances (Crooks, 2002; Godet et al., 2011). This study is thus in agreement with the  
40  
41  
42 570 general idea that tubes of any taxonomic group increase both the sediment stability and the spatial  
43  
44 complexity of the bottom and ultimately promote the diversity and the abundances of the associated  
45  
46 species (Young and Rhoads, 1971). But interestingly, we also demonstrated that within the *Haploops*  
47  
48 community, both species richness and diversity indices are not affected by an increase in *Haploops*  
49  
50 tube density. Even at very high tubes densities (i.e. 22 000 tubes.m<sup>2</sup>), species diversity levels remain  
51  
52  
53 575 high. Assuming that the occurrence of tube-building species can be considered as a disturbance, this  
54  
55 result is not in agreement with the intermediate disturbance hypothesis model which states that species  
56  
57 richness is maximized when ecological disturbance is neither too rare nor too frequent. For example,  
58  
59 even small densities of tubicolous Terebellids increase local species richness up to a certain point, but  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

that richness decreases past an apparent tube density threshold (e.g. Trueblood, 1991; Zühlke, 2001).

1  
2 580 Similarly, Dubois et al. (2006) evidenced that only an intermediate covering of the *Sabellaria* reefs by  
3  
4 epibionts (oysters) is correlated with the greatest reef species richness and heterogeneity of diversity  
5  
6 index values. Unexpectedly, this investigation showed that the density of *Haploops* (i.e. the level of  
7  
8 disturbance) did not matter, because species richness and other diversity measurements remain  
9  
10 unchanged, while consistently supporting unique and homogeneous species assemblages. We are  
11  
12 confident that the range of *Haploops* density (i.e. 920 to 22 000 ind.m<sup>-2</sup>) is large enough to encompass  
13 585  
14 areas with a lot of available space and scarce tubes as well as densely colonized areas where bare  
15  
16 sediment is no longer visible and where *Haploops* tubes attach to each other. As pointed out by  
17  
18 Stachowicz (2001) in a review of positive interactions in ecological communities, *Haploops* could be  
19  
20 seen as a foundation species offering refuges from predation and a larger trophic niche by creating a  
21  
22 new habitat on which numerous species depend, and ultimately increasing species richness compared  
23  
24 590  
25 to the surrounding bare sediment. Positive interactions may then modify the intermediate disturbance  
26  
27 hypothesis by broadening the conditions under which higher diversity is maintained. However, we  
28  
29 hypothesized here that the modification of the environment (e.g. sediment features, processes at the  
30  
31 sediment water interface etc.) with only a very low density of *Haploops* would generate new stresses  
32  
33 so that only a few species could settle and develop in a newly colonized area. *Haploops nirae* can have  
34  
35 595  
36 then antagonistic effects on local diversity: a stressor at low densities and a foundation species at  
37  
38 moderate to very high densities.  
39  
40  
41

42 The beta diversity is not specifically tied to a spatial scale but refers to the turnover of species  
43  
44 between different habitats composing the ecosystem (Colwell, 2009). The analysis of the turnover of  
45  
46 600  
47 species between the four studied communities showed that the community that shared the lowest  
48  
49 number of species with the adjacent areas was the *Haploops* community. While this community  
50  
51 adjoined the surrounding communities, very few species are held in common, reflecting high beta  
52  
53 diversity and low connectivity. The presence of the *Haploops* community in the bay of Concarneau  
54  
55 seems therefore to bring new species to the ecosystem that would otherwise remain excluded from the  
56  
57 bay: a third of all species recorded were exclusively found in the *Haploops* community. A newly  
58 605  
59 discovered species of amphipod (*Photis inornatus sp. nov.*) was for example consistently found in the  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 *Haploops* community but not in surrounding muddy environments (Myers et al., 2012). This engineer  
2 species contributes to increase the turnover of species in the bay at a previously unseen level and  
3  
4 appears to play a crucial role in term of regional biodiversity.  
5

6 610

#### 7 8 4.3. Impact of *Haploops nira* on habitat characteristics 9

10  
11  
12  
13 The diversity of organisms and uniqueness of species assemblages recorded within the  
14  
15 *Haploops* habitat can be related to the resources (food or space) available for the macrofauna. The  
16  
17 large set of environmental parameters analyzed here showed significant differences between all  
18 615  
19 sampled communities for almost all parameters. The *Haploops* habitat is characterized by an enriched  
20  
21 sediment, as the amount of organic carbon and nitrogen are significantly higher, with the lowest C:N  
22  
23 ratio, and the highest chlorophyll *a* and phaeopigment concentrations. As a result, the organic matter is  
24  
25 more abundant and of better quality (higher digestibility correlates with lower C:N ratio) when the  
26  
27 sediment is colonized by *Haploops*. Tubes commonly alter flow patterns at the sediment-water  
28  
29 620 interface and ultimately affect the flux of sedimented particles (Friedrichs et al., 2009). Reducing  
30  
31 interface currents and increasing sedimentation processes both contribute to trap suspended organic  
32  
33 matter (phytoplankton and marine snow) but the biological activity of *Haploops* individuals also need  
34  
35 to be considered. By actively filtering the water column with their antennae and producing large  
36  
37 quantity of pseudofeces (and feces) (Rigolet et al., 2011), *Haploops* contribute to enrich the sediment  
38  
39 625 they colonized. In Raritan Bay (New Jersey, USA) where a dense population of *Ampelisca abdita* was  
40  
41 observed (about 24 000 ind. m<sup>-2</sup>), McKenzie et al. (2006) reported that the sediment surface of the mud  
42  
43 was mostly composed of fecal pellets of *A. abdita* mixed with a relatively small mixture of silt and  
44  
45 clay. Likewise, while investigating *Ampelisca abdita* community in Jamaica bay (New York, USA),  
46  
47 Franz and Harris (1988) also showed that %C in sediment spanning from 0.9 to 4.4% (i.e. higher than  
48  
49 630 for *Haploops* community) were greater than in the adjacent uncolonized areas.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55  
56 *Haploops* habitat offers hence potentially rich sediment for an abundant macrofauna.  
57  
58 Paradoxically, abundances of associated fauna in *Haploops* habitat are the lowest. This is not in  
59  
60 accordance with a common result for similar sediment features where the quantity and quality of  
61  
62



635 organic matter largely affect the diversity (Wiekling and Kroncke, 2005). For example, Grebmeier et  
1 al. (1989) found positive correlations between diversity and sediment total organic carbon, silt and  
2 clay content and concluded that low food supply is related to low faunal diversity. However, the space  
3 available is probably inversely linked with the quantity of organic matter trapped by tube mats. This  
4 factor is then a likely explanation for the limited abundance in associated fauna. Numerous inhabitants  
5 of engineered habitats are dependent upon the physical conditions modulated by engineer species, and  
6 upon resource flows which they influence but do not directly provide; without the engineers, most of  
7 these other organisms would disappear (Jones et al. 1994). *Haploops* tubes and *Haploops* biological  
8 activity engineer a unique habitat that is suitable for a unique set of species to settle, but the  
9 competition for space with this engineer species controls the development of other populations and  
10 probably limits their abundances.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 645

#### 23 24 25 26 4.4. Impact of *Haploops nirae* on functional diversity 27 28 29 30

31 Changes in species assemblages are not necessarily linked with changes in ecological  
32 functions played by organisms and assessing functional diversity has become of primary importance to  
33 650 fully understand the consequence of changes in benthic assemblages (see for example Bremner, 2008).  
34 We investigated whether a complete shift in species assemblages following a colonization of sediment  
35 by the amphipod *Haploops nirae* is ultimately also associated with a change in functional diversity.  
36 Analyses of ecosystem functions through biological traits and ecosystem functions revealed that the  
37 change in the species richness and benthic composition is much deeper than the change in the  
38 functional diversity. Of course, the massive colonization of the sediment by a gregarious suspension-  
39 feeder such as *Haploops nirae* has led to a massive increase in suspension-feeding organisms but as  
40 for the associated fauna, we showed that contrary to the adjacent sandy and muddy communities (i.e.  
41 *Sternaspis*, *Amphiura* and *Owenia*), the functional structure of the *Haploops* community was  
42 characterized by a greatly reduced proportion of organisms from the functional group 3. Long-lived,  
43 burrower, filter-feeders are therefore proportionally less represented in the *Haploops* community  
44 655 compared to the adjacent areas. The establishment of *Haploops* communities thus controls and  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 prevents other suspension-feeders – burrowers or other tubicolous species – from colonizing. While  
2 competition for food and space is often mentioned as a driving factor to explain variations in sessile  
3  
4 665 suspension-feeding invertebrate assemblages (e.g. Buss, 1979; Lesser, 1992), it has been shown that  
5  
6 one suspension-feeding species may completely exclude another species by competition for feeding  
7  
8 space. Sanders et al. (1962) indicated that the suspension-feeding bivalve *Gemma gemma* is taking  
9  
10 over the dominant suspension-feeders (such as *Mya arenaria*) in some stations of Barnstable Harbor  
11  
12 (Massachusetts) making up more than 94% of the individuals of that feeding type, hence explaining  
13  
14  
15 670 why other suspension-feeders are not commonly represented in areas where *G. gemma* is represented  
16  
17 in large numbers. Similarly, one should consider that *Haploops* could exclude or limit other  
18  
19 suspension-feeding species. By contrast, there was a greater proportion of small mobile predators (i.e.  
20  
21 functional group 5) in the *Haploops* community which may directly predate *Haploops* or other small  
22  
23 organisms associated to this habitat.  
24

25  
26 675 A marked reduction in the proportion of long-lived burrowing suspension-feeders may have  
27  
28 major consequences in benthic functioning as it is well known that such organisms represent an  
29  
30 important link in the food chain, contributing to the benthic-pelagic coupling and providing food  
31  
32 sources for demersal finfishes (Sköld et al., 1994). Moreover, large and long-lived organisms are  
33  
34 commonly considered to be productive organisms since the size and the lifespan are directly related to  
35  
36 the secondary production of species (Brey, 1990). They represent therefore an important biomass and  
37  
38 680 provide significant energy transfer to higher trophic levels. This could in turn explain why the  
39  
40 secondary production of this *Haploops* community negatively compares with the production of  
41  
42 surrounding muddy communities (i.e. *Amphiura* and *Owenia* communities), as estimated in a previous  
43  
44 study from the same area (Rigolet et al., 2012).  
45  
46  
47

#### 48 685 49 50 51 4.5. Consequences of further *Haploops* expansion 52 53 54

55  
56 *Haploops* communities have been reported in a few locations all over the world: the bay of  
57  
58 Fundy (Canada) (Wildish and Dickinson, 1982), the East Siberian Sea (Russia) (Gukov, 2011), the  
59  
60 690 Øresund and Kattegat (Sweden) (Göransson, 2002) and the Northumberland coast (Scotland)  
61  
62

(Buchanan, 1963). Densities of *Haploops* recorded in South Brittany are the highest reported for the genus *Haploops* (Rigolet et al, 2012). Unlike the dramatic decline in *Haploops* densities that occurred in the Øresund during the last 100 years (decreasing from 3500 to 100 ind. m<sup>-2</sup> today), along with a drastic shrinking of their distribution area (Göransson, 2002) in response to the alteration of environmental conditions (e.g. eutrophication), it is likely that the *Haploops* community will continue to expand in the whole Bay of Biscay (Atlantic). The *Haploops* community occupies a wide area in the Bay of Concarneau (ca. 3600 hectares) which has increased by 400 % since the 1960s (Glémarec, 1969). Complementary acoustic mapping surveys conducted in the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive revealed that *Haploops* communities are spreading over larger areas in South Brittany. This investigation addresses a crucial issue related to the spreading of an ecosystem engineer species: *Haploops* habitat contributes to the seascape diversity and to the overall regional increase in species diversity. If the importance of an ecosystem habitat is linked to the uniqueness of its associated fauna, then *Haploops* are of primary importance in the seascape of the shallow water of South Brittany in the fight against the loss of biodiversity. However, the strong spatial stability and homogeneity in macrofauna assemblages associated with *Haploops* habitats could adversely affect the total species diversity in the ecosystem as the connectivity between adjacent habitats and *Haploops* habitat is low. The expansion of *Haploops* habitat could then ultimately increase the homogenization in benthic habitats at large scale. Similar results have been reported in different coastal embayments of the Atlantic coasts following the introduction and the proliferation of the invasive slipper limpet *Crepidula fornicata*. By increasing the sediment heterogeneity, the presence of *C. fornicata* stimulates zoobenthic community diversity and abundance in muddy sediments while its expansion promoted the habitat homogenization (de Montaudoin and Sauriau, 1999). Models of habitat-dependant species-area relationships predict biodiversity losses when biogenic habitats in soft-sediments are homogenized or conversely when they are colonizing an entire ecosystem (Thrush et al., 2006). Franz and Harris (1988) suggested that the permanent loss of one or more superdominants such as *Ampelisca abdita* in Jamaica bay (New York) coupled with a further reduction in species richness could lead to more unstable benthic associations, in which short-term and random species invasions might dominate the benthic community structure. Our results provide evidence that small densities of *Haploops* would

1  
2 720 cause a complete change in species assemblages, hence suggesting that *Haploops* is highly controlling  
3 species assemblages and ultimately forcing a one-way succession in its benthic habitat, as many  
4 abundant species structuring other adjacent communities (such as *Amphiura filiformis* and *Kurtiella*  
5 *bidentata*, or *Nucula nitidosa*) were not even found in *Haploops* samples. In that case, even a decrease  
6 in *Haploops* density would not allow other species to take over and somehow balance benthic  
7 successional stages.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 725

### 14 **Acknowledgements**

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 This work was funded by the Programme National sur l'Environnement Côtier (PNEC) and by the  
21 Total Foundation for the Biodiversity and the Sea (10/2 211 201/F). The authors thank X. Caisey and J.  
22 D. Gaffet for technical support, as well as the crew of the R.V. Thalia during the PLOOPS campaigns.  
23  
24 730 We are also grateful to Dr. C.G. Gelpi for commenting upon and editing the English grammar.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **References**

- 32  
33 Aminot, A., Kérouel, R., 2004. Hydrologie des écosystèmes marins. Paramètres et analyses. Ed.  
34 Ifremer. 336 pp.  
35 735  
36  
37 Anderson, M.J., Gorley, R.N., Clarke, K.R., 2008. PERMANOVA + for PRIMER: Guide to Software  
38 and Statistical Methods, PRIMER-E, Plymouth.  
39  
40 Barrio Frojan, C.R.S., Cooper, K.M., Bremner, J., Defew E.C., Wan Hussin W.M.R., Paterson D.M.,  
41  
42 2011. Assessing the recovery of functional diversity after sustained sediment screening at an  
43 aggregate dredging site in the North Sea. Est. Coast. Shelf Sci. 92: 358-366.  
44 740  
45  
46 Bellan-Santini, D., Dauvin, J.-C., 1988. Eléments de synthèse sur les Ampelisca du nord-est  
47 Atlantique. Crustaceana 13, 20–60.  
48  
49 Blott, S.J., Pye, K., 2001. GRADISTAT: a grain size distribution and statistics package for the  
50 analysis of unconsolidated sediments. Earth Surf. Process. Landf. 26, 1237–1248.  
51  
52 745  
53  
54 Bonnier, J., 1887. Catalogue des crustacés malacostracés recueillis dans la Baie de Concarneau.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 750  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 755  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 760  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 765  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 770  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Borja, A., Muxika, I., 2005. Guidelines for the use of AMBI (AZTI's Marine Biotic Index) in the assessment of the benthic ecological quality. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 50, 787–789.
- Bremner, J., 2008. Species' traits and ecological functioning in marine conservation and management. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* 366, 37–47.
- Bremner, J., Rogers, S.I., Frid, C.L.J., 2006. Methods for describing ecological functioning of marine benthic assemblages using biological traits analysis (BTA). *Ecol. Indic.* 6, 609–622.
- Brey, T., 1990. Estimating productivity of macrobenthic invertebrates from biomass and mean individual weight. *Meeresforschung/Rep. Mar. Res.* 32, 329–343.
- Buchanan, J.B., 1963. The Bottom Fauna Communities and Their Sediment Relationships off the Coast of Northumberland. *Oikos* 14, 154–175.
- Buss, L.W., 1979. Bryozoan overgrowth interactions – the interdependence of competition for space and food. *Nature* 281, 475–477.
- Callaway, R., 2006. Tube worms promote community change. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 308, 1616–1599.
- Callaway, R., Desroy, N., Dubois, S., Fournier, J., Frost, M., Godet, L., Hendrick, V.J., Rabaut, M., 2010. Ephemeral Bio-engineers or Reef-building Polychaetes: How Stable are Aggregations of the Tube Worm *Lanice conchilega* (Pallas, 1766)? *Integr. Comp. Biol.* 50, 237–250.
- Carrasco, F., Arcos, D., 1984. Life history and production of a cold-temperate population of the sublittoral amphipod *Ampelisca araucana*. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 14, 245–252.
- Castilla, J.C., Lagos, N.A., Cerda, M., 2004. Marine ecosystem engineering by the alien ascidian *Pyura praeputialis* on a mid-intertidal rocky shore. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 268, 119–130.
- Chevenet, F., Dolédec, S., Chessel, D., 1994. A fuzzy coding approach for the analysis of long-term ecological data. *Freshw. Biol.* 31, 295–309.
- Clarke, K.R., Gorley, R.N., 2006. *PRIMER v6: User Manual/Tutorial*, PRIMER-E, Plymouth.
- Colwell, R.K., 2009. Statistical estimation of species richness and shared species from samples, Version 8.2. User's Guide and application published at: <http://purl.oclc.org/estimates>.
- Condit, R., Pitman, N., Leigh, E.G., Chave, J., Terborgh, J., Foster, R.B., Núñez, P., Aguilar, S., Valencia, R., Villa, G., Muller-Landau, H.C., Losos, E., Hubbell, S.P., 2002. Beta-Diversity in Tropical Forest Trees. *Science* 295, 666–669.

- 775 Crooks, J.A., 2002. Characterizing ecosystem-level consequences of biological invasions: the role of  
ecosystem engineers. *Oikos* 97, 153–166.
- Cusson, M., Bourget, E., 2005. Global patterns of macroinvertebrate production in marine benthic  
habitats. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 297, 1–14.
- Dauvin, J.-C., 1988. Biologie, dynamique, et production de populations de crustacés amphipodes de la  
Manche occidentale. I: *Ampelisca tenuicornis* Liljeborg. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* 118, 55–84.
- 780 Dauvin, J.-C., Bellan-Santini, D., 1996. Ampeliscidae (Amphipoda) from the Bay of Biscay. *J.*  
*Crustac. Biol.* 16, 149–168.
- De Juan, S., Thrush, S.F., Demestre, M., 2007. Functional changes as indicators of trawling  
disturbance on a benthic community located in a fishing ground (NW Mediterranean Sea). *Mar.*  
785 *Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 334, 117–129.
- De Montaudouin, X., Sauriau, P.G., 1999. The proliferating Gastropoda *Crepidula fornicata* may  
stimulate macrozoobenthic diversity. *J. Mar. Biol. Ass. UK* 79, 1069–1077.
- Dubois, S., Commito, J.A., Olivier, F., Retière, C., 2006. Effects of epibionts on *Sabellaria alveolata*  
(L.) biogenic reefs and their associated fauna in the Bay of Mont Saint-Michel. *Est. Coast. Shelf*  
790 *Sci.* 68, 635–646.
- Dubois, S., Retière, C., Olivier, F., 2002. Biodiversity associated with *Sabellaria alveolata*  
(Polychaeta: Sabellariidae) reefs: effects of human disturbances. *J. Mar. Biol. Ass. UK* 82, 817–  
826.
- Edgar, G.J., 1990. The influence of plant structure on the species richness, biomass and secondary  
795 production of macrofaunal assemblages associated with Western Australian seagrass beds. *J. Exp.*  
*Mar. Biol. Ecol.* 137, 215–240.
- Ehrhold, A., Hamon, D., Guillaumont, B., 2006. The REBENT monitoring network, a spatially  
integrated, acoustic approach to surveying nearshore macrobenthic habitats: application to the Bay  
of Concarneau (South Brittany, France). *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 63, 1604–1615.
- 800 Ellingsen, K.E., 2002. Soft-sediment benthic biodiversity on the continental shelf in relation to  
environmental variability. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 232, 15–27.
- Franz, D.R., Harris, W.H., 1988. Seasonal and spatial variability in macrobenthos communities in

Jamaica Bay, New York, an urban estuary. *Estuaries* 11, 15–28.

1  
2 Franz, D.R., Tanacredi, J.T., 1992. Secondary production of the amphipod *Ampelisca abdita* Mills and  
3  
4 805 its importance in the diet of juvenile winter flounder (*Pleuronectes americanus*) in Jamaica Bay,  
5  
6 New York. *Estuaries* 15, 193–203.  
7

8  
9 Friedrichs, M., Leipe, T., Peine, F., Graf, G., 2009. Impact of macrozoobenthic structures on near-bed  
10  
11 sediment fluxes. *J. Mar. Syst.* 75, 336–347.  
12

13  
14 Glémarec, M., 1969. . Les peuplements benthiques du plateau continental Nord-Gascogne. PhD thesis  
15 810 Faculty of Sciences Paris, 167 pp.  
16

17  
18 Glémarec, M., Le Bris, H., Le Guellec, C., 1986. Modifications des écosystèmes des vasières côtières  
19  
20 du sud-Bretagne. *Hydrobiologia* 142, 159–170.  
21

22  
23 Godet, L., Fournier, J., Jaffré, M., Desroy, N., 2011. Influence of stability and fragmentation of a  
24  
25 worm-reef on benthic macrofauna. *Est. Coast. Shelf Sci.* 92, 472–479.  
26

27 815 Göransson, P., 2002. Petersen's benthic macrofauna stations revisited in the Öresund area (southern  
28  
29 Sweden) and species composition in the 1990s - signs of decreased biological variation. *Sarsia* 87,  
30  
31 263–280.  
32

33  
34 Gray, J.S., 2000. The measurement of marine species diversity, with an application to the benthic  
35  
36 fauna of the Norwegian continental shelf. *J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol.* 250, 23–49.  
37

38 820 Grebmeier, J.M., Feder, H.M., McRoy, C.P., 1989. Pelagic-benthic coupling on the shelf of the  
39  
40 northern Bering and Chukchi Seas. II. Benthic community structure. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 51, 253–  
41  
42 268.  
43

44  
45 Grebmeier, J.M., McRoy, C.P., 1989. Pelagic-benthic coupling on the shelf of the northern Bering and  
46  
47 Chukchi Seas. III. Benthic food supply and carbon cycling. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 53, 79–91.  
48

49 825 Gukov, A.Y., 2011. Monitoring of the Bottom Biocenoses of the Novosibirsk Polynya. *Oceanology*  
50  
51 51, 443–448.  
52

53  
54 Gutiérrez, J.L., Jones, C.G., Byers, J.E., Arkema, K.K., Berkenbusch, K., Commito, J.A., Duarte,  
55  
56 C.M., Hacker, S.D., Lambrinos, J.G., Hendriks, I.E., Hogarth, P.J., Palomo, M.G., Wild, C., 2011.  
57  
58 7.04 - Physical Ecosystem Engineers and the Functioning of Estuaries and Coasts, in: Editors-in-  
59  
60 830 Chief: Eric Wolanski, Donald McLusky (Eds.), *Treatise on Estuarine and Coastal Science.*  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Academic Press, Waltham, pp. 53–81.

1  
2 Highsmith, R.C., Coyle, K.O., 1992. Productivity of arctic amphipods relative to gray whale energy  
3 requirements. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 83, 141–150.

4  
5  
6 Hill, M.O., 1973. Diversity and evenness: a unifying notation and its consequences. *Ecology* 54, 427–  
7  
8 835 432.

9  
10 Jaccard, P., 1912. The distribution of the flora in the alpine zone. *New Phytol.* 11, 37–50.

11  
12 Jones, C.G., Lawton, J.H., Shachak, M., 1994. Organisms as Ecosystem Engineers. *Oikos* 69, 373–  
13  
14 386.

15  
16  
17 Jones, C.G., Lawton, J.H., Shachak, M., 1997. Positive and Negative Effects of Organisms as Physical  
18  
19 840 Ecosystem Engineers. *Ecology* 78, 1946–1957.

20  
21 Larsen, P.F., Gilfillan, E.S., 2004. A Preliminary Survey of the Subtidal Macrobenthic Invertebrates of  
22  
23 Cobscook Bay, Maine. *Northeast. Nat.* 11, 243–260.

24  
25  
26 Legendre, P., Anderson, J., 1999. Distance-based redundancy analysis: Testing multispecies responses  
27  
28 in multifactorial ecological experiments. *Ecol. Monogr.* 69, 1–24.

29  
30 845 Lepš, J., De Bello, F., Lavorel, S., Berman, S., 2006. Quantifying and interpreting functional diversity  
31  
32 of natural communities: practical considerations matter. *Preslia* 78, 481–501.

33  
34  
35 Lesser, M.P., Shumway, S.E., Cucci, T., Smith, J., 1992. Impact of fouling organisms on mussel rope  
36  
37 culture: interspecific competition for food among suspension-feeding invertebrates. *J. Exp. Mar.*  
38  
39 *Biol. Ecol.* 165, 91–102.

40  
41  
42 850 Lorenzen, C.J., 1967. Determination of chlorophyll and phaeopigment spectrophotometric equations.  
43  
44 *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 12, 343–346.

45  
46  
47 MacKenzie, C.L., Jr., Pikanowski, R., McMillan, D.G., 2006. *Ampelisca* amphipod tube mats may  
48  
49 enhance abundance of northern quahogs *Mercenaria mercenaria* in muddy sediments. *J. Shellfish*  
50  
51 *Res.* 25, 841–847.

52  
53 855 Ménesguen, A., 1980. La macrofaune benthique de la baie de Concarneau: peuplements, dynamique  
54  
55 de populations, prédation exercée par les poissons. PhD thesis University of Western Brittany. 127  
56  
57 pp.

58  
59  
60 Mills, E.L., 1967. The biology of an ampeliscid crustacean sibling species pair. *J. Fish. Res. Board*  
61  
62



Can. 24, 305–355.

- 1  
2 860 Mouillot, D., Villéger, S., Scherer-Lorenzen, M., Mason, N.W.H., 2011. Functional Structure of  
3  
4 Biological Communities Predicts Ecosystem Multifunctionality. PLoS One 6, e17476.  
5  
6 Myers, A., Rigolet, C., Thiébaud, E., Dubois, S.F., 2012. A new species of amphipod, *Photis inornatus*  
7  
8 sp. nov. (Corophiidea, Photidae) from a “*Haploops* community” in Brittany. Zootaxa 3236, 55–61.  
9  
10 Nekola, J.C., White, P.S., 1999. The distance decay of similarity in biogeography and ecology. J.  
11  
12 Biogeogr. 26, 867–878.  
13 865  
14  
15 Paganelli, D., Marchini, A., Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A., 2012. Functional structure of marine benthic  
16  
17 assemblages using Biological Traits Analysis (BTA): A study along the Emilia-Romagna coastline  
18  
19 (Italy, North-West Adriatic Sea). Est. Coast. Shelf Sci. 96, 245–256.  
20  
21  
22 Qian, H., 2009. Global comparisons of beta diversity among mammals, birds, reptiles, and amphibians  
23  
24 870 across spatial scales and taxonomic ranks. J. Syst. Evol. 47, 509–514.  
25  
26  
27 Reise, K., Bouma, T., Olenin, S., Ysebaert, T., 2009. Coastal habitat engineers and the biodiversity in  
28  
29 marine sediments. Helgoland Mar. Res. 63, 1–2.  
30  
31 Rigolet, C., Dubois, S.F., Droual, G., Caisey, X., Thiébaud, E., 2012. Life history and secondary  
32  
33 production of the amphipod *Haploops nirae* (Kaim-Malka, 1976) in the Bay of Concarneau (South  
34  
35 875 Brittany). Est. Coast. Shelf Sci. 113, 259–271.  
36  
37  
38 Rigolet, C., Le Souchu, P., Caisey, X., Dubois, S.F., 2011. Group sweeping: Feeding activity and  
39  
40 filtration rate in the tubiculous amphipod *Haploops nirae* (Kaim-Malka, 1976). J. Exp. Mar. Biol.  
41  
42 Ecol. 406, 29–37.  
43  
44 Sanders, H., 1958. Benthic studies in Buzzards Bay. I. Animal-sediment relationships. Limnol.  
45  
46 880 Oceanogr. 3, 245–258.  
47  
48  
49 Sanders, H.L., Goudsmit, E.M., Mills, E.L., Hampson, G.E., 1962. A Study of the Intertidal Fauna of  
50  
51 Barnstable Harbor, Massachusetts. Limnol. Oceanogr. 7, 63–79.  
52  
53 Sköld, M., Loo, L.O., Rosenberg, R., 1994. Production, dynamics and demography of an *Amphiura*  
54  
55 *filiformis* population. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 103, 81–90.  
56  
57 885 Somaschini, A., 1993. A Mediterranean fine-sand polychaete community and the effect of the tube-  
58  
59 dwelling *Owenia fusiformis* (Delle Chiaje) on community structure. Int. Rev. Gesamten  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Hydrobiol., 78, 219-233.

1  
2 Stachowicz, J.J., 2001. Mutualism, Facilitation, and the Structure of Ecological Communities.  
3  
4 BioScience 51, 235–246.  
5

6 890 Stachowicz, J.J., Bruno, J.F., Duffy J.E., 2007. Understanding the effects of marine biodiversity on  
7  
8 communities and ecosystems. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst., 38: 739-766.  
9

10  
11 Stoner, A.W., Manderson, J.P., Pessutti, J.P., 2001. Spatially explicit analysis of estuarine habitat for  
12  
13 juvenile winter flounder: combining generalized additive models and geographic information  
14  
15 systems. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 213, 253–271.  
16

17 895 Sudo, H., Azeta, M., 1996. Life history and production of the amphipod *Byblis japonicus* Dahl  
18  
19 (Gammaridea: Ampeliscidae) in a warm temperate zone habitat, Shijiki Bay, Japan. J. Exp. Mar.  
20  
21 Biol. Ecol. 198, 203–222.  
22  
23

24 Thioulouse, J., Chessel, D., Dolédec, S., Olivier, J.-M., 1997. “ADE-4: a multivariate analysis and  
25  
26 graphical display software”. Stat. Comput. 7, 75–83.  
27

28 900 Thrush, S.F., Gray, J.S., Hewitt, J.E., Uglund, K.I., 2006. Predicting the effects of habitat  
29  
30 homogenization on marine biodiversity. Ecol. Appl. 16, 1636–1642.  
31  
32

33 Tillin, H., Hiddink, J., Jennings, S., Kaiser, M., 2006. Chronic bottom trawling alters the functional  
34  
35 composition of benthic invertebrate communities on a sea-basin scale. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 318,  
36  
37 31–45.  
38  
39

40 905 Trueblood, D.D., 1991. Spatial and temporal effects of terebellid polychaete tubes on soft-bottom  
41  
42 community structure in Phosphorescent Bay, Puerto Rico. J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 149, 139–159.  
43

44 Tsuchiya, M., Nishihira, M., 1985. Islands of *Mytilus* as a habitat for small intertidal animals: effect of  
45  
46 island size on community structure. Deep-Sea Res. Oceanogr., B 25, 71–81.  
47  
48

49 Usseglio-Polatera, P., Bournaud, M., Richoux, P., Tachet, H., 2000. Biological and ecological traits of  
50  
51 910 benthic freshwater macroinvertebrates: relationships and definition of group with similar traits.  
52  
53 Freshw. Biol. 43, 175–205.  
54

55 Voultziadou, E., Pyrounaki, M.-M., Chintiroglou, C.H., 2007. The habitat engineering tunicate  
56  
57 *Microcosmus sabatieri* (Roule, 1885) and its associated peracarid epifauna. Est. Coast. Shelf Sci.  
58  
59 74, 197–204.  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 915 Ward, J.H., 1963. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.  
12 58, 236–244.  
13  
14  
15 Whittaker, R.H., 1960. Vegetation of the Siskiyou Mountains, Oregon and California. Ecol. Monogr.  
16 30, 279–338.  
17  
18  
19 Whittaker, R.H., 1972. Evolution and Measurement of Species Diversity. Taxon 21, 213–251.  
20  
21  
22 920 Wieking, G., Kroncke, I., 2005. Is benthic trophic structure affected by food quality? The Dogger  
23 Bank example. Mar. Biol. 146, 387–400.  
24  
25 Wildish, D.J., Dickinson, J.J., 1982. A new species of *Haploops* (Amphipoda, Ampeliscidae) from the  
26 Bay of Fundy. Can. J. Zool. 60, 962–967.  
27  
28  
29 Woodin, S.A., 1978. Refuges, Disturbance, and Community Structure: A Marine Soft-Bottom  
30 Example. Ecology 59, 274–284.  
31  
32  
33 925 Woodin, S.A., 1981. Disturbance and Community Structure in a Shallow Water Sand Flat. Ecology  
34 62, 1052–1066.  
35  
36  
37 Woodin, S.A., Wethey, D.S., Volkenborn, N., 2010. Infaunal Hydraulic Ecosystem Engineers: Cast of  
38 Characters and Impacts. Integr. Comp. Biol. 50, 176–187.  
39  
40  
41  
42 930 Wright, J.P., Jones, C.G., 2006. The concept of organisms as ecosystem engineers ten years on:  
43 progress, limitations and challenges. BioScience 56, 203–209.  
44  
45  
46  
47 Young, D.K., Rhoads, D.C., 1971. Animal-sediment relations in Cape Cod Bay, Massachusetts. I. A  
48 transect study. Mar. Biol. 11, 242–254.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 940 Zühlke, R., 2001. Polychaete tubes create ephemeral community patterns: *Lanice conchilega* (Pallas,  
57 1766) associations studied over six years. J. Sea Res. 46, 261–272.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Figure captions

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 945 **Fig.1.** Spatial distribution of the four sampled benthic communities (i.e. *Owenia fusiformis*, *Amphiura*  
7  
8 *filiformis*, *Sternaspis scutata* and *Haploops nirae* communities) in the bay of Concarneau (South  
9  
10 Brittany, Bay of Biscay). Sampling stations (3 reps per stations) are indicated by a black triangle. The  
11  
12 map was issued from a benthic survey conducted in 2003 (Ehrhold et al., 2006).  
13  
14

15  
16  
17  
18 950 **Fig.2.** Non-metric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) plot of the benthic macrofauna of the *Sternaspis*,  
19  
20 *Amphiura*, *Owenia* and *Haploops* communities. The groupings (grey circles) resulted from the  
21  
22 SIMPROF test and significantly differs from each other. The community symbols are related to  
23  
24 benthic communities defined *a priori* on the basis of the study investigated in 2003 by Ehrhold et al.  
25  
26 (2006). Note that the station CO3 *a priori* belonging to the *Sternaspis* community significantly differs.  
27  
28

29  
30 955  
31  
32  
33 **Fig.3.** dbRDA ordination of macrofauna community composition as predicted by the DISTLM model.  
34  
35 It shows the relationship between environmental predictors that best explain the variation in  
36  
37 macrofauna composition in the four communities studied. Note that *Haploops* individuals were  
38  
39 removed from the species matrix and that *Haploops* density was used as a factor (see data analyses  
40  
41 section). Symbols represent macrofauna samples and vectors represent environmental variables  
42 960  
43  
44 included in the parsimonious model. The length of the vector is related to the effect induced by the  
45  
46 environmental variable on species assemblages. Note that symbols are related to benthic communities  
47  
48 *a priori* defined on the basis of the study investigated in 2003 by Ehrhold et al. (2006).  
49  
50

51  
52  
53  
54  
55 965 **Fig.4.** Relationship between species richness (N0) or macrofauna abundances (*Haploops* individuals  
56  
57 excluded) and *Haploops* density (ranging from 920 to 22 000 ind.m<sup>2</sup>) in the bay of Concarneau. Note  
58  
59 that the same pattern applied for other diversity indices (N1 and N2).  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 970 **Fig.5.** Ordination of taxa and biological traits by Fuzzy Correspondence Analysis. a) Histogram of  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 975  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 980  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 985  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 990  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Correspondence Analysis. c) Distribution of the modalities of the 7 biological traits on the 2 first factorial plane of the analysis. Each modality was located at the weighted average of taxa positions that are presenting this modality.

**Fig.6.** Reference typology of groups of similar traits on the F1-F2 factorial plane of Figure 5. Functional groups (open squares) were positioned at the weighted average of their taxa (solid circles). Lines correspond to the link of the mean location of each group to its taxa (solid circles). Dendrogram which results from the clustering analysis processed on the FCA results. The vertical line indicated the partitioning level selected to define groups of similar association of biological traits.

**Fig.7.** Mean biological profiles of the 5 groups of similar traits showing for the 7 traits the proportion of trait modalities exhibited by each group. Numbers at the top of the graphic corresponded to the labels of the functional groups.

**Fig.8.** Relative frequency distribution of the five groups of similar traits in the four benthic communities (i.e. *Sternaspis*, *Amphiura*, *Owenia* and *Haploops*) of the Bay of Concarneau.

**Fig.9.** Relative positions of sampling stations in relation to the reference typology of groups with similar traits. Functional groups are represented by open squares with numbers inside the open squares corresponding to the labels of the functional groups. Stations are located at the weighted average of its group frequency distribution.

**Table 1**

Biological traits and modalities of species selected for the biological traits analysis.

No.	Traits	No.	Modalities
1	Trophic group	1	Filter feeder
		2	Carnivore-omnivore
		3	Surface deposit feeder
		4	Sub-surface deposit feeder
2	Type of movement	1	Swimmer
		2	Burrower
		3	Crawler
		4	Walker
		5	None
3	Habit	1	Tube dwelling
		2	Burrow dwelling
		3	Free living
4	Bioturbation	1	Diffusive mixing
		2	Surface deposition
		3	Conveyer belt transport
		4	No bioturbation
		5	Buldozing
5	Life span	1	Short (<2 years)
		2	Medium (2-5 years)
		3	Long (>5 years)
6	Ecological group (AMBI)	1	Sensitive (I)
		2	Indifferent (II)
		3	Tollerant (III)
		4	Second-order opportunistic (IV)
		5	First order opportunistic (V)
7	Individual size	1	Very small (<1 cm)
		2	Small (1-2 cm)
		3	Small-medium (3-10 cm)
		4	Medium (11-20 cm)
		5	Medium-large (21-50 cm)

Table 2

Main species contributing to the dissimilarity between sampled communities (cut-off 20%):

Community pairwise comparisons		Species	Average abundance in 1 <sup>st</sup> community (ind/0.1m <sup>2</sup> )	Average abundance in 2 <sup>nd</sup> community (ind/0.1m <sup>2</sup> )	Cumulative contribution (%)
<i>Sternaspis</i>	<i>Amphiura</i>	<i>Maxmuelleria lankesteri</i>	0	4	3.34
		<i>Maldane glebifex</i>	4	22	6.67
		<i>Labidoplax digitata</i>	4	0	9.93
		<i>Ampelisca typica</i>	0	3	13.04
		<i>Abra alba</i>	1	6	15.86
		<i>Ampelisca tenuicornis</i>	0	2	18.25
		<i>Phoronis spp.</i>	0	3	20.42
<i>Sternaspis</i>	<i>Owenia</i>	<i>Abra alba</i>	1	22	3.10
		<i>Chaetozone gibber</i>	0	11	6.00
		<i>Ampelisca spinifer</i>	0	8	8.78
		<i>Ampelisca brevicornis</i>	0	9	11.47
		<i>Labioleanira yhleni</i>	7	0	14.07
		<i>Ampelisca tenuicornis</i>	0	7	16.59
		<i>Spio decoratus</i>	0	6	19.07
		<i>Ampelisca spinipes</i>	1	11	21.37
<i>Amphiura</i>	<i>Owenia</i>	<i>Maldane glebifex</i>	22	0	4.45
		<i>Ampelisca brevicornis</i>	0	9	7.41
		<i>Kurtiella bidentata</i>	218	31	10.26
		<i>Spio decoratus</i>	0	6	12.91
		<i>Ampelisca spinifer</i>	1	8	15.43
		<i>Maxmuelleria lankesteri</i>	4	0	17.78
		<i>Photis longicaudata</i>	6	1	20
<i>Sternaspis</i>	<i>Haploops</i>	<i>Kurtiella bidentata</i>	97	0	4.86
		<i>Amphiura filiformis</i>	26	0	8.6
		<i>Nucula nitidosa</i>	20	0	12.01
		<i>Terebellides stroemi</i>	0	12	14.94
		<i>Mediomastus fragilis</i>	0	7	17.23
		<i>Labioleanira yhleni</i>	7	0	19.51
		<i>Schistomeringos rudolphii</i>	0	8	21.78
<i>Amphiura</i>	<i>Haploops</i>	<i>Kurtiella bidentata</i>	218	0	5.23
		<i>Amphiura filiformis</i>	46	0	9.16
		<i>Terebellides stroemi</i>	0	12	11.52
		<i>Nucula nitidosa</i>	8	0	13.77
		<i>Schistomeringos rudolphii</i>	0	8	15.97
		<i>Pholoe inornata</i>	8	0	17.98
		<i>Mediomastus fragilis</i>	0	7	19.96
<i>Owenia</i>	<i>Haploops</i>	<i>Amphiura filiformis</i>	26	0	2.75
		<i>Kurtiella bidentata</i>	31	0	5.38
		<i>Abra alba</i>	22	0	7.96
		<i>Terebellides stroemi</i>	0	12	10.14
		<i>Pholoe inornata</i>	15	0	12.24
		<i>Chaetozone gibber</i>	11	0	14.19
		<i>Ampelisca brevicornis</i>	9	0	16.1
		<i>Ampelisca spinifer</i>	8	0	17.96
		<i>Schistomeringos rudolphii</i>	0	8	19.77

**Table 3**

Mean values ( $\pm$  standard errors) of abundance, N0 (species richness), N1 ( $\exp(H')$ ), N2 (1/SI) (at station and community scales) within the 4 communities studied (*Sternaspis*, *Amphiura*, *Owenia* and *Haploops*). Note that because of different number of stations, diversity indices at the community scale were assessed using a bootstrap approach. Significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) are in bold and *post-hoc* results of ANOVA are reported as superscript letters. *Haploops* were removed from the macrofauna data set of all benthic communities to achieve calculations of diversity indices.

	STATION Diversity					COMMUNITY diversity			
	Number of stations	Abundances (0.1 m <sup>2</sup> )	N0	N1	N2	Total species richness	N0	N1	N2
<i>Sternaspis</i>	2	235 $\pm$ 108 <sup>ab</sup>	59 $\pm$ 9 <sup>a</sup>	11.5 $\pm$ 6.0 <sup>a</sup>	4.8 $\pm$ 2.2 <sup>a</sup>	84	80 $\pm$ 9 <sup>a</sup>	10.4 $\pm$ 2.4 <sup>a</sup>	4.2 $\pm$ 1.2 <sup>a</sup>
<i>Amphiura</i>	3	466 $\pm$ 272 <sup>a</sup>	74 $\pm$ 3 <sup>ab</sup>	9.6 $\pm$ 5.4 <sup>a</sup>	3.7 $\pm$ 1.9 <sup>a</sup>	113	95 $\pm$ 13 <sup>b</sup>	7.2 $\pm$ 2.3 <sup>a</sup>	2.8 $\pm$ 0.8 <sup>a</sup>
<i>Owenia</i>	3	279 $\pm$ 102 <sup>ab</sup>	80 $\pm$ 7 <sup>b</sup>	31.9 $\pm$ 7.1 <sup>b</sup>	19.4 $\pm$ 7.2 <sup>b</sup>	119	103 $\pm$ 10 <sup>b</sup>	31.7 $\pm$ 3.2 <sup>b</sup>	18.1 $\pm$ 2.9 <sup>b</sup>
<i>Haploops</i>	9	157 $\pm$ 37 <sup>b</sup>	85 $\pm$ 9 <sup>b</sup>	43.2 $\pm$ 6.0 <sup>c</sup>	26.4 $\pm$ 3.8 <sup>b</sup>	183	130 $\pm$ 9 <sup>c</sup>	51.1 $\pm$ 4.0 <sup>c</sup>	32.0 $\pm$ 3.4 <sup>c</sup>
p-value		<b>p=0.016</b>	<b>p=0.006</b>	<b>p&lt;0.001</b>	<b>p&lt;0.001</b>		<b>p&lt;0.001</b>	<b>p&lt;0.001</b>	<b>p&lt;0.001</b>



**Table 4**

Jaccard's index (mean values  $\pm$  standard error) of the four communities pairwise comparisons (i.e. *Sternaspis*, *Amphiura*, *Owenia* and *Haploops*).

Community pairwise comparisons		Number of comparisons	Mean Jaccard's index
<i>Sternaspis</i>	<i>Amphiura</i>	6	0.410 $\pm$ 0.038
<i>Sternaspis</i>	<i>Owenia</i>	6	0.260 $\pm$ 0.015
<i>Amphiura</i>	<i>Owenia</i>	9	0.352 $\pm$ 0.033
<i>Sternaspis</i>	<i>Haploops</i>	18	0.182 $\pm$ 0.022
<i>Amphiura</i>	<i>Haploops</i>	27	0.209 $\pm$ 0.025
<i>Owenia</i>	<i>Haploops</i>	27	0.159 $\pm$ 0.027

**Table 5**

Mean values ( $\pm$  standard errors) for sediment characteristics between the benthic communities of the bay of Concarneau (*Sternaspis*, *Amphiura*, *Owenia* and *Haploopsis*). Significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) are in bold and *post-hoc* results of one-way ANOVA are reported with superscript letters

	<i>Sternaspis</i>	<i>Amphiura</i>	<i>Owenia</i>	<i>Haploopsis</i>	p-value
Mud %	58.3 $\pm$ 1.2 <sup>b</sup>	49.3 $\pm$ 4.7 <sup>b</sup>	18.6 $\pm$ 0.9 <sup>a</sup>	72.4 $\pm$ 5.8 <sup>c</sup>	<b>P&lt;0.001</b>
Mean grain size ( $\mu$ m)	34 $\pm$ 1 <sup>b</sup>	39 $\pm$ 5 <sup>b</sup>	152 $\pm$ 17 <sup>a</sup>	23 $\pm$ 4 <sup>c</sup>	<b>P&lt;0.001</b>
N %	0.22 $\pm$ 0.03 <sup>c</sup>	0.13 $\pm$ 0.02 <sup>b</sup>	0.07 $\pm$ 0.01 <sup>a</sup>	0.30 $\pm$ 0.03 <sup>d</sup>	<b>P&lt;0.001</b>
C %	1.48 $\pm$ 0.14 <sup>c</sup>	0.92 $\pm$ 0.02 <sup>b</sup>	0.47 $\pm$ 0.04 <sup>a</sup>	1.85 $\pm$ 0.16 <sup>d</sup>	<b>P&lt;0.001</b>
C:N ratio	6.9 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	7.1 $\pm$ 0.8 <sup>a</sup>	7.2 $\pm$ 1.2 <sup>a</sup>	6.1 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>b</sup>	<b>P=0.010</b>
Chlorophyll <i>a</i> ( $\mu$ g/g sediment)	0.72 $\pm$ 0.41	0.46 $\pm$ 0.23	0.13 $\pm$ 0.22	1.35 $\pm$ 0.81	P=0.061
Pheopigments <i>a</i> ( $\mu$ g/g sediment)	18.19 $\pm$ 0.76 <sup>a</sup>	13.07 $\pm$ 1.91 <sup>a</sup>	10.82 $\pm$ 1.14 <sup>a</sup>	27.51 $\pm$ 4.29 <sup>b</sup>	<b>P&lt;0.001</b>

**Table 6**

Correlation ratios of each biological trait with axes F1 and F2 of the FCA.

	F 1	F 2
Trophic group	<b>0.804</b>	0.319
Type of movement	<b>0.407</b>	0.236
Habit	<b>0.629</b>	0.009
Bioturbation	<b>0.473</b>	<b>0.484</b>
Life span	0.001	0.316
Ecological group (AMBI)	<b>0.464</b>	0.298
Individual size	0.038	0.351

Figure1

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure2

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure3  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure4

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 5  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)








Figure6  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure7

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure8

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure9  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

