

Allometric relationships for intertidal macroalgae species of commercial interest

Doriane Stagnol, Marine Macé, Christophe Destombe, Dominique Davoult

► To cite this version:

Doriane Stagnol, Marine Macé, Christophe Destombe, Dominique Davoult. Allometric relationships for intertidal macroalgae species of commercial interest. Journal of Applied Phycology, 2016, pp.1-5. 10.1007/s10811-016-0860-1. hal-01318013

HAL Id: hal-01318013 https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-01318013

Submitted on 19 May 2016

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 Allometric relationships for intertidal macroalgae species of commercial interest

2 Doriane Stagnol^{a,b}, Marine Macé^{a,b}, Christophe Destombe^{a,c}, Dominique Davoult^{a,b}

^a Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 6, Station Biologique, Place Georges Teissier, F-29682
 Roscoff, France

- ^b CNRS, UMR 7144 AD2M, Place Georges Teissier, F-29682, Roscoff, France
- 6 c CNRS, UMI 3614 EBEA, Place Georges Teissier, F-29682, Roscoff, France
- ^{*} Corresponding author: doriane.stagnol@gmail.com Tel: +33 2 98 29 23 23 Fax: +33 2 98 29 23 24
- 8

9 Abstract

The demand for seaweeds has intensified in recent decades and will most certainly continue to 10 11 expand. Several methods exist to evaluate the biomass of seaweeds in the field but most of them are destructive. The objectives of this study were (1) to develop and evaluate allometric 12 equations for estimating seaweed biomass in the field for some harvested species, and (2) to 13 provide uniform calculated dry/wet biomass ratios to estimate the relative water content of 14 these seaweeds. Sampling and measurements of more than 350 seaweeds individuals were 15 carried out for 8 species of commercial interest. Our models were fitted for both power and 16 17 linear equations and were tested for different explanatory variables. While the power equation was found to be the best for predicting biomass of all species, we found that the best 18 descriptive biometric variable varies according to seaweed morphology. Species with a bushy 19 20 morphology were best described by the volume, while long stringy species were best described by the length and flat species by the surface. This study attempts to provide 21 nondestructive tools that could be used by professional seaweed harvesters, their employers as 22 23 well as scientists and public regulators, to assess the harvest potential of a field of seaweed in 24 a nondestructive approach.

25 Keywords: biometrics, biomass, allometry, harvesting

26 Acknowledgements

The authors thank all the people who helped carry out the fieldwork. Our study was funded by the ALGMARBIO project, InitiativeBioBretagne (IBB), FranceAgriMer (National Institute of Agricultural and Marine Products), the Brittany Regional Council, the Côte d'Armor Departmental Council, the European Fisheries Fund (EFF), and benefited from the support of the French Government run by the National Research Agency and with regards to the investment expenditure programme IDEALG ANR-10-BTBR-04.

33 Introduction

Seaweed diversity and community structure are highly impacted and threatened by physical 34 and/or anthropic forcing such as climatic changes (Airoldi and Beck 2007; Mangialajo et al. 35 2008). These continued stressors cause the fragmentation and loss of canopy-forming algae 36 worldwide (Connell et al. 2008; Airoldi et al. 2008), and even could lead to their extinction 37 (Estes et al. 1989). Besides producing a valuable crop to the seaweed harvesters, macroalgae 38 plays an important role in the primary production of nearshore ecosystems (Golléty et al. 39 2008; Migné et al. 2015). Within this context of increasing pressures, one can wonder about 40 the effects of the loss of canopy-forming algae on primary production and on carbon and 41 nitrogen biochemical cycles. Accurate and efficient estimation of biomass in such populations 42 is central to understand and monitor their net contribution in providing these ecosystem 43 services. 44

Ecologists, botanists and foresters estimate biomass for a wide range of purposes, such as 45 assessment of crop value, site productivity, as well as nutrient recycling. Destructive sampling 46 has generally been used to obtain an accurate measure of biomass at a particular sampling 47 point, including in seaweed populations (Mathieson and Guo 1992; Vadas, Sr. et al. 2004). 48 49 However, these destructive approaches can have short and long-term consequences on the associated ecosystem, including decrease in invertebrate abundance and richness (Benedetti-50 Cecchi et al. 2001; Watt and Scrosati 2013), replacement by grazers or turfs (Perkol-Finkel 51 and Airoldi 2010), or reduction in algal biomass and primary productivity (Golléty et al. 52 53 2008; Tait and Schiel 2011). In order to reduce these effects, nondestructive methods were developed to answer specific questions in plants (Niklas and Enquist 2002; Sack et al. 2003; 54 55 Scrosati et al. 2005; Mccarthy and Enquist 2007; Poorter et al. 2012). Without losing their scientific rigor, the use of nondestructive sampling methods permits the absence of laboratory 56 work, simplifying data processing and reducing the total monitoring costs. One of these 57

nondestructive methods is based on fitting so-called allometric equations to convert field 58 59 inventory data to biomass estimates (Chave et al. 2005; Jonson and Freudenberger 2011; Paul et al. 2013). In seaweeds, this method was mainly applied in population dynamics of red and 60 brown algae (Åberg 1990; Lindgren et al. 1998; Engel et al. 2001) or to estimate growth 61 during two sampling events (Vaz-Pinto et al. 2014). Allometric equations are particularly 62 useful to evaluate biomass allocation pattern (i.e. the relative amount of biomass present in 63 the various organs; Niklas and Enquist 2002), to measure the temporal evolution of the 64 biomass on a specific field, or to adjust the harvesting pressure according to biomass 65 estimates at a given time. Biological ratios are often used in the literature to standardize 66 67 biological data. Dry/wet biomass ratios, are generally used to estimate the relative water content in plants and to homogenize the parameters found in the literature (which may be 68 expressed either in dry or wet biomass). Moreover, this ratio can be used by professional 69 70 seaweed harvesters (or their employers) that are required, under French law, to report monthly the quantities of algae they have harvested, in fresh biomass. 71

72 Seaweeds are a polyphyletic group that displays a wide diversity of life cycles and morphologically diverse thalli with variable growth rates. Because seaweeds species are 73 highly diverse, estimation of their biomass through allometric relationships is a challenging 74 75 task. The overall objective of this study was to develop and evaluate allometric equations for estimating the biomass in the tree main groups of harvested seaweed (three red algal species 76 (Chondrus crispus, Mastocarpus stellatus, Palmaria palmata), four brown algal species 77 (Fucus serratus, Fucus vesiculosus, Himanthalia elongata, Saccharina latissima) and one 78 green algal species (Ulva sp.). We also provide uniform calculated dry/wet biomass ratios to 79 estimate the relative water content of seaweeds. 80

81

82

83 Materials and methods

Samples were collected in Brittany (Northern France) where more than 80% of macroalgae are harvested in France. We pooled datasets obtained across several years (2004 to 2015), in order to create sufficiently powered samples that are large enough to allow for meaningful analysis. An attempt was made to obtain samples representative of the full length range of each species. All datasets were obtained between March and November, the time when most of the biomass is extracted due to greater harvestable biomass and legal harvest period.

In this study, we measured individuals, as defined by Scrosati (2005). The whole thallus 90 91 corresponding to all the fronds that arise from one holdfast was measured for clonal seaweeds (Chondrus crispus, Mastocarpus stellatus, Palmaria palmata) and the whole thallus 92 corresponding to the only upright that arises from one holdfast was measured for unitary 93 94 seaweeds (Fucus serratus, F. vesiculosus, Himanthalia elongata and Ulva sp.). For each individual, the maximal length (L) and the dry biomass (DW), after drying at 60°C for 48h, 95 were recorded. For some species, the maximal circumference (C), the maximal width (w) and 96 the fresh biomass (FW) were also recorded, prior to the drying. 97

98

Length-biomass relationships

Allometric length-biomass equations were obtained by regressing dry biomass on maximal
length (L), maximal circumference (C), volume (LC²), or surface (Lw). We wrote the models
using R to obtain both linear (Eq 1) and power law equation (Eq 2):

102
$$DW = a \times X + b$$
 Eq 1

103 $DW = a \times X^b$ Eq 2

where DW = dry biomass (g), X = variable or combination of variables (L, C, LC², Lw), and aand b are constants. Then we selected for each species the best model using the Akaike

information criterion (AIC) and the determination coefficient (\mathbb{R}^2). The best statistical model 106 107 minimizes the value of AIC and maximizes the value of R². It is important to note that we also determined the length-biomass relationship of C. crispus and M. stellatus blended, because in 108 109 the field they usually form a mixed canopy that could not be harvested separately. We also made a seasonal distinction for *H. elongata* by calculating the allometric equation for only 110 individuals harvested from March to June on one side (i.e. the harvestable individuals truly 111 harvested) and the allometric equation for all the individuals harvested between March and 112 October on the other side. After June or July, large individuals are no more harvested because 113 they are thick and grainy, thus less appealing for human consumption. Essentially, the first 114 115 equation (March-June) should be used by professional seaweed harvesters while the second equation (March-October) could be better suited for scientist interest. 116

All statistical analyses were carried out with the R software package (http://www.r-project.org/).

119

Mean water content

The mean water content of the algae was determined by weighing before and after drying. In 120 order to quantify the relationship between fresh biomass and dry biomass, we used 121 standardized major axis (SMA) regression (also referred to as reduced major axis regression). 122 This method is more appropriate than least-squares regression for estimating the line of best 123 fit for the relationship between two variables (Warton et al. 2006). The obtained fitted line 124 does not change if the roles of "predictor" and "response" variables are switched; in contrast, 125 126 ordinary least squares regression yields a different fitted line if the y-axis and x-axis are switched (Warton et al. 2006). 127

128

129 Results and discussion

Relationships between mass (expressed as dry biomass) and biometrics were established. We 131 tested linear and power models for more than 350 individuals from 8 different species. For 132 each model, we tested several explanatory variables: L, C, and LC² for C. crispus, P. palmata 133 F. serratus, and F. vesiculosus; L, w and Lw for Ulva sp.; and L for H. elongata and 134 S. latissima. The 10 selected length-biomass relationships are shown in Fig. 1 and their 135 respective parameters are given in Table 1. These inclusive relationships were all expressed as 136 a power model. The best descriptive biometric variable varied according to the seaweed 137 morphology. Species with a bushy morphology were best described by the volume (LC^{2}), 138 while long stringy species were best described by the length (L) and flat species by the 139 surface (Lw). All the relationships of the seaweed species analysed in this paper were highly 140 significant ($0.77 < R^2 < 0.96$) and could consequently be reliably applied (Table 1). Besides, 141 Gevaert et al. (2001) provided an allometric equation for the species S. latissima with a 142 143 scaling exponent really close (b = 1.357) to the one we calculated (b = 1.358). Allometric equations (DW = $a \times X^b$) were not found for any other species studied. 144

145 Nondestructive methods of seaweed biomass estimation have successfully been applied in the 146 past. For example Scrosati and DeWreede (1997) have successfully applied nondestructive 147 methods to estimate stand biomass in a biomass-density study that was based on the fronds 148 and not on the individuals of one species (*Mazzaella cornucopiae*).

The two allometric equations obtained for *H. elongata* showed different allometric parameter values, with the scaling exponent (b) of harvestable individuals (March-June) being lower (-57%) than the one calculated with all individuals (March-October). This difference reveals an ontogenetic shift, partly because in late summer and autumn, individuals of *H. elongata* get thicker which increases their biomass, become not consumable and so are no more harvestedafter June-July.

With the exception of *H. elongata*, seasonal variations were not completely taken into account 155 (no sampling in winter), which may potentially cause a difference between the predicted DW 156 and the observed DW at the individual scale, due to differences in tissue density (Åberg 157 1990). However, as stated above, most of the seaweed harvesting occurs between March and 158 November, which corresponds to the period when we made our samples. Also, we do believe 159 than any potential biases should be reduced at the scale of the quadrat or seaweed field. 160 Therefore, these tools can be applied to large populations and are relevant to provide accurate 161 estimates of the standing biomass of a seaweed field, in a rapid and nondestructive way. 162

163

164 Development of ratios for estimating water content

Relationships between DW and FW were expressed as a linear relation and were also highly 165 166 significant ($\mathbb{R}^2 > 0.90$). They showed that mean water content ranged from 71.7% (M. stellatus) to 88.5% (S. latissima) (Table 2). While DW:FW ratios may vary depending on the 167 season, our results are quite consistent with those found in the literature: Scrosati (2006) 168 described a mean water content of 76.1% for C. crispus, 79.3% for F. vesiculosus and 87.6% 169 170 for S. latissima; Gevaert et al. (2001) found a mean water content of 89% for S. latissima; and 171 Alveal and Ponce (1997) estimated a mean water content of 72% for M. stellatus. Due to 172 technical, commercial and infrastructural reasons, harvesters dry some harvested algae prior to weighing them, and then convert the dry biomass into fresh biomass with a ratio that is 173 174 specific to each harvester or employer. These ratios are often confidential and may lead to over- or underestimate the quantities of algae that are actually harvested. Here we attempt to 175

provide uniform and rigorously calculated ratios that could be used by all the professionalseaweed harvesters and their employers.

178 Global environment change coupled to the increased demand for seaweeds are likely to exert 179 some significant pressure on the standing seaweed biomass. The relationships established in 180 the study will provide a basis for future studies to estimate more easily and by a 181 nondestructive way the biomass of seaweed populations.

201 **References**

- Åberg P (1990) Measuring size and choosing category size for a transition matrix study of the
 seaweed *Ascophyllum nodosum*. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 63:281–287
- Airoldi L, Balata D, Beck MW (2008) The Gray Zone: Relationships between habitat loss and
 marine diversity and their applications in conservation. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 366:8–15
- Airoldi L, Beck MW (2007) Loss, status and trends for coastal marine habitats of Europe.
 Oceanogr Mar Biol 45:345–405
- Alveal K, Ponce F (1997) Determination of water content in seaweeds. Gayana Oceanol 5:1–
 11
- Benedetti-Cecchi L, Pannacciulli F, Bulleri F, et al (2001) Predicting the consequences of
 anthropogenic disturbance: large-scale effects of loss of canopy algae on rocky shores.
 Mar Ecol Prog Ser 214:137–150
- Chave J, Andalo C, Brown S, et al (2005) Tree allometry and improved estimation of carbon
 stocks and balance in tropical forests. Oecologia 145:87–99
- Connell S, Russell B, Turner D, et al (2008) Recovering a lost baseline: missing kelp forests
 from a metropolitan coast. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 360:63–72
- Engel C, Åberg P, Gaggiotti OE, et al (2001) Population dynamics and stage structure in a
 haploid-diploid red seaweed, *Gracilaria gracilis*. J Ecol 89:436–450
- Estes JA, Duggins DO, Rathbun GB (1989) The Ecology of Extinctions in Kelp Forest
 Communities. Conserv Biol 3:252–264
- Gevaert F, Davoult D, Creach A, et al (2001) Carbon and nitrogen content of *Laminaria saccharina* in the eastern English Channel: biometrics and seasonal variations. J Mar
 Biol Assoc UK 81:727–734
- Golléty C, Migné A, Davoult D (2008) Benthic metabolism on a sheltered rocky shore: role of
 the canopy in the carbon budget. J Phycol 44:1146–1153
- Jonson JH, Freudenberger D (2011) Restore and sequester: estimating biomass in native
 Australian woodland ecosystems for their carbon-funded restoration. Aust J Bot
 59:640-653
- Lindgren A, Bouza N, Åberg P, Sosa PA (1998) Spatial and temporal variation in distribution
 of *Gelidium canariensis* (Rhodophyta) from natural populations of the Canary Islands.
 J Appl Phycol 10:273–278
- Mangialajo L, Chiantore M, Cattaneo-Vietti R (2008) Loss of fucoid algae along a gradient of
 urbanisation, and structure of benthic assemblages. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 358:63-74
- Mathieson AC, Guo Z (1992) Patterns of fucoid reproductive biomass allocation. Br Phycol J 27:271–292

- Mccarthy MC, Enquist BJ (2007) Consistency between an allometric approach and optimal
 partitioning theory in global patterns of plant biomass allocation. Funct Ecol 21:713–
 720
- Migné A, Delebecq G, Davoult D, Spilmont N, Menu D, Gevaert F (2015) Photosynthetic
 activity and productivity of intertidal macroalgae: in situ measurements, from thallus
 to community scale. Aquat Bot 123:6–12
- Niklas KJ, Enquist BJ (2002) On the Vegetative Biomass Partitioning of Seed Plant Leaves,
 Stems, and Roots. Am Nat 159:482–497
- Paul KI, Roxburgh SH, England JR, Ritson P, Hobbs T, Brooksbank K, Raison RJ, Larmour
 JS, Murphy S, Norris J, Neumann C, Lewis T, Jonson J, Carter JL, McArthur G,
 Barton C, Rose B (2013) Development and testing of allometric equations for
 estimating above-ground biomass of mixed-species environmental plantings. For Ecol
 Manag 310:483–494
- Perkol-Finkel S, Airoldi L (2010) Loss and Recovery Potential of Marine Habitats: An
 Experimental Study of Factors Maintaining Resilience in Subtidal Algal Forests at the
 Adriatic Sea. PLoS ONE 5:e10791.
- Poorter H, Niklas KJ, Reich PB, Oleksyn J, Poot P and Mommer L (2012), Biomass
 allocation to leaves, stems and roots: meta-analyses of interspecific variation and
 environmental control. New Phytol, 193: 30–50
- Sack L, Grubb PJ, Marañón T (2003) The functional morphology of juvenile plants tolerant of
 strong summer drought in shaded forest understories in southern Spain. Plant Ecol
 168:139–163
- Santelices B, Hormazábal M, Correa J & Flores V (2004). The fate of overgrown germlings in
 coalescing Rhodophyta. Phycologia43:346–52.
- 260 Scrosati R, DeWreede RE (1997) Dynamics of the biomass-density relationship and frond
- biomass inequality for *Mazzaella cornucopiae* (Rhodophyta, Gigartinaceae): implications for
 the understanding of frond interactions. Phycol 36: 506-516
- Scrosati R (2005) Review of studies on biomass-density relationships (including self-thinning
 lines) in seaweeds: main contributions and persisting misconceptions. Phycol. Res. 53:224–33
- Scrosati R (2006) Length-biomass allometry in primary producers: predominantly
 bidimensional seaweeds differ from the "universal" interspecific trend defined by
 microalgae and vascular plants. Can J Bot 84:1159–1166
- Tait LW, Schiel DR (2011) Dynamics of productivity in naturally structured macroalgal
 assemblages: importance of canopy structure on light-use efficiency. Mar Ecol Prog
 Ser 421:97–107
- Vadas, Sr. RL, Wright WA, Beal BF (2004) Biomass and Productivity of Intertidal
 Rockweeds (*Ascophyllum nodosum* LeJolis) in Cobscook Bay. Northeast Nat 11:123–
 142

- Vaz-Pinto F, Martínez B, Olabarria C, Arenas F (2014) Neighbourhood competition in
 coexisting species: The native *Cystoseira humilis* vs the invasive *Sargassum muticum*.
 J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 454:32–41
- Warton DI, Wright IJ, Falster DS, Westoby M (2006) Bivariate line-fitting methods for
 allometry. Biol Rev 81:259–291
- 279 Watt CA, Scrosati RA (2013) Bioengineer effects on understory species richness, diversity,
- and composition change along an environmental stress gradient: experimental and
 mensurative evidence. Estuar Coast Mar Sci 123: 10-18

Species	Date of sampling	п	Mean total length (cm)	Total length range (cm)	Explanatory - variable			
						а	b	R ²
Chondrus crispus & Mastocarpus stellatus	April-May-July- Oct.	66	10.02	3.5-16	LC ²	0.0034	0.8259	0.93
Chondrus crispus	May	35	8.70	3.5-13	LC ²	0.0006	1.0318	0.95
Mastocarpus stellatus	April-July	31	11.52	9-16	LC ²	0.0067	0.7493	0.93
Fucus serratus	April-Oct.	60	36.50	8-70	LC ²	0.1763	0.5996	0.92
Fucus vesiculosus	Nov.	48	41.44	13-117	LC ²	0.0188	0.8028	0.87
Himanthalia elongata	March-June	65	79.58	8-232	L	0.0319	1.2878	0.77
Himanthalia elongata	March-June- AugOct.	75	98.20	8-281	L	0.0005	2.2323	0.81
Palmaria palmata	July-Oct.	40	29.73	10-65	LC ²	0.0006	1.4183	0.91
Saccharina latissima	April	30	97.90	22-214	L	0.0155	1.3587	0.95
Ulva sp.	Oct.	37	21.10	2-87	Lw	0.0077	0.8921	0.93

Table 1 Length-biomass relationships of macroalgal species collected in Brittany (NW France). Power equation: $DW = a \times X^b$.

Table 2 Mean water content of macroalgal species collected in Brittany (NW France).

Species	n	Mean water content	а	b	R²
Chondrus crispus & Mastocarpus stellatus	66	74.4%	0.257	-0.034	0.96
Chondrus crispus	35	77.4%	0.226	0.048	0.99
Mastocarpus stellatus	31	71.7%	0.284	-0.139	0.96
Fucus serratus	30	78.4%	0.216	0.694	0.99
Himanthalia elongata	37	83.3%	0.167	-1.365	0.90
Palmaria palmata	40	87.3%	0.127	0.777	0.95
Saccharina latissima	30	88.5%	0.116	0.107	0.99



Fig. 1 Relationships between dry biomass (g) and biometric variables (in cm, cm², or cm³). For *Himanthalia elongata*, the plain line represents individuals harvested between March and June (i.e. the harvestable individuals truly harvested; round data points), while the dotted line also includes the older large individuals (cross-shaped data points) harvested in October.