# 1 Warming affects predatory faunal impacts upon microbial

## 2 carbon cycling

- 3 William Ross Hunter<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Neil Ogle<sup>3</sup>; Nessa O'Connor<sup>2,4</sup>.
- <sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup>School of Geography and Environmental Science, Ulster University, Coleraine,
- 5 BT52 1SA, Northern Ireland (*Present Address*).
- 6 <sup>2</sup>Queen's University Marine Laboratory, School of Biological Sciences, Queen's
- 7 University of Belfast, Portaferry, BT22 1PF, Northern Ireland.
- 8 <sup>3</sup>Queen's University Stable Isotope Facility, School of Natural and Built
- 9 Environment, Queen's University of Belfast, Belfast, BT7 1NN, Northern Ireland.
- 10 <sup>4</sup>School of Natural Sciences, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland (*Present*
- 11 Address).
- 12 \**Corresponding author: Email: w.hunter@ulster.ac.uk*

## 1 Abstract

2	1.	Ocean warming and the loss of larger (often predatory) fauna are major threats
3		to seabed (benthic) ecosystem functioning. Yet we know little about the
4		combined effects of warming and faunal species loss upon the marine carbon
5		cycle.
6	2.	Using stable-isotope pulse-chase experiments, we tested how faunal species
7		loss affects microbial carbon sequestration and retention in intertidal
8		sediments, under both ambient and predicted future warming conditions
9		(ambient + $2^{\circ}$ C), using the shore crab <i>Carcinus maenas</i> as a model predator.
10		We traced the fixation and retention of a fixed dose of <sup>13</sup> C-labelled sodium
11		bicarbonate within sediment organic matter and microbial biomass.
12	3.	Carcinus presence was associated with higher total organic carbon
13		concentration within the mesocosm sediments. Temperature had no significant
14		effect upon sediment total organic carbon concentrations. Temperature and
15		Carcinus presence had no significant effect on polar lipid fatty acids (PLFAs)
16		concentrations within the sediment, which is a proxy for microbial biomass.
17	4.	Carcinus presence increased retention of <sup>13</sup> C-labelled carbon within the
18		sediment organic matter pool under future warming conditions. Retention of
19		the <sup>13</sup> C-label within the microbial PLFAs decreased significantly under future-
20		warming conditions.
21	5.	Changes in the relative abundance of PLFAs reveals increased contribution of
22		microeukaryotes to the microbial community under ambient conditions, in the
23		absence of <i>Carcinus</i> . PLFA profiles revealed significant changes in <sup>13</sup> C-label
24		retention within the bacteria and microeukaryotes, driven by interactions
25		between Carcinus presence and temperature.
26	6.	Given that temperature is a fundamental control on the metabolic activity of
27		marine organisms (from bacteria to metazoans), we propose that interactions
28		between faunal species loss and ocean warming will have a pronounced effect
29		upon marine carbon budgets.
30		
31	Key-	words Blue Carbon; Carbon Cycle; Carcinus maenas; Faunal loss;
32	Micro	phytobenthos; PLFA; Predator; Sediment; Stable isotope

#### 1 1. Introduction

2 Present estimates indicate that global temperatures will rise by at least 2°C by the end 3 of the twenty-first century (IPCC 2014). This will have pronounced impacts upon the 4 species distributions, phenology and the metabolic activity of many organisms, in 5 particular those in marine ecosystems (Pauly et al. 1998; Burrows et al. 2011; Bellard 6 et al. 2012; Poloczanska et al. 2013a; Payne et al. 2016). Through its effects upon the 7 metabolic demands of organisms, ocean warming will alter the strength of 8 interactions between autotrophic (primary producer) and heterotrophic (consumer) 9 organisms and affect the rates and pathways for carbon and nutrient cycling 10 (Daufresne, Lengfellner & Sommer 2009; López-Urrutia et al. 2009; O'Connor et al. 11 2009). Metabolic theory predicts that the influence of temperature upon organismal 12 metabolism is negatively associated with body-size (Ernest et al. 2003). 13 Consequently, microbial processes that dominate carbon and nutrient cycling in 14 marine sediments are predicted to be particularly sensitive to ocean warming 15 (Gillooly et al. 2001; Weston & Joye 2005; Daufresne et al. 2009; Morán et al. 2015). 16 Current rates of marine species loss are comparable with past mass extinctions, 17 although the present situation is unique in disproportionately affecting larger 18 organisms living at the seabed (Payne et al. 2016). These benthic fauna are 19 functionally important as predators and ecosystem engineers (Jones, C. G., Lawton & 20 Shachak 1994; O'Connor et al. 2009; van Nugteren, Herman et al. 2009; Atwood et al. 21 2013; O'Connor et al. 2013). Faunal activity has cascading effects through benthic 22 food-webs potentially affecting organic matter preservation (Spivak et al. 2007; 23 Jeffreys, Rachel M., Wolff & Murty 2009; Fanjul et al. 2015), microbial activity (e.g. 24 van Nugteren, Herman et al. 2009; Hunter, Veuger & Witte 2012; Hunter et al. 2013) 25 the trophic transfer of carbon and other nutrients (e.g. O'Connor et al. 2009; 26 O'Connor et al. 2013; O'Connor & Donohue 2013; Atwood et al. 2013) and, the 27 energetic demands of seafloor ecosystems (Piepenburg et al. 1995). Larger predatory 28 fauna, such as crabs, typically exhibit patchy spatial distributions at the seafloor and 29 are highly mobile (Jones, D. O. B. et al. 2014; Atwood et al. 2015; Yool et al. 2017). 30 To counter this, experimental manipulations provide a robust methodology to test 31 how the loss of large fauna affects ecosystem functioning under different 32 environmental contexts (Canuel et al. 2007; Spivak et al. 2007; O'Connor et al. 2013; 33 O'Connor & Donohue 2013).

1 Non-vegetated coastal sediments are important to the global carbon cycle, accounting 2 for between 13 and 28 % of total marine carbon burial [ $\sim$  226 - 418 Tg C yr<sup>-1</sup>] (Cai 3 2011; Bauer et al. 2013; Atwood et al. 2015). Over the past 50 years, their areal 4 coverage has increased by between 25 and 50%, driven by changes in land use, 5 climate change and nutrient enrichment (Atwood et al. 2015). In coastal sediments, 6 the microphytobenthos (MPB) are an assemblage of unicellular eukaryotic algae and 7 cyanobacteria that grow in the upper millimetres of illuminated sediments (MacIntyre, 8 Geider & Miller 1996). As such, the MPB are the main primary producers in non-9 vegetated sediments, contributing up to 50% of the primary productivity in coastal 10 ecosystems (Underwood, G. J. C. & Kronkamp 1999). The MPB play a critical role in 11 carbon fixation and storage in the sediment organic matter pool (Middelburg et al. 12 2000; Evrard et al. 2010), provide a food source for benthic fauna (Miller, Geider & 13 MacIntyre 1996; Middelburg et al. 2000; Evrard et al. 2010) and, produce 14 extracellular polysaccharides that contribute to sediment stabilisation (Miller et al. 15 1996; Tolhurst et al. 2006; Spears et al. 2008) and provide a labile organic matter 16 source for heterotrophic microorganisms (Oakes & Eyre 2014). As the area of non-17 vegetated coastal sediments continues to grow, their responses to the cumulative 18 impacts of faunal species loss and ocean warming will have major implications for 19 carbon cycling in the future ocean.

20 The impacts of environmental change upon ecosystem processes remains a ecological 21 'black box' (Burrows et al. 2011; Cardinale et al. 2012; Poloczanska et al. 2013b; 22 Halpern et al. 2015). Stable-isotope labelling experiments provide a powerful tool to 23 open the box, by empirically tracing carbon and energy flow through a biological 24 systems (Middelburg et al. 2000; Boschker, Kromkamp & Middelburg 2005; van 25 Nugteren et al. 2009; Evrard et al. 2010; Hunter et al. 2012; Mayor, Thornton & Zuur 26 2012; Hunter et al. 2013). By tracing the incorporation and transfer of a carbon source enriched in the rare stable isotope carbon-13 (<sup>13</sup>C), over a fixed time period, we can 27 28 test how environmental changes affect various aspects of the carbon cycle, such as 29 carbon fixation and retention (Middelburg et al. 2000; Evrard et al. 2010) or the 30 pathways for organic matter degradation (van Nugteren et al. 2009; van Nugteren, 31 Moodley et al. 2009; Hunter et al. 2012; Mayor et al. 2012; Hunter et al. 2013). In 32 this study, we test how the presence of a benthic predator affected carbon fixation and 33 retention rates in coastal sediments and, whether these putative effects differ between

1 present climatic conditions and predicted future warming (ambient + 2 °C) conditions 2 (IPCC 2014). We focus upon the impacts of the shore crab Carcinas maenas 3 (Linnaeus, 1758) [hereafter *Carcinus*] a globally distributed predator / scavenger, 4 commonly found on both soft and hard substrata in coastal habitats (Crothers 1968). 5 *Carcinus* is an active bioturbator that excavates soft sediments, transporting buried 6 sediment back to the surface (Queiros et al. 2013). We predict that the effects of 7 Carcinus upon carbon fixation and retention within coastal sediments will be 8 mediated by ocean warming. We hypothesise that under ambient conditions, physical 9 disturbance of the sediment surface by Carcinus limit the carbon fixation by the 10 microphytobenthos, reducing <sup>13</sup>C-retention within the sediment organic matter pool. 11 Based on previous studies (Canuel et al. 2007; Spivak et al. 2007; Fanjul et al. 2015) 12 we hypothesise that Carcinus presence will promote the preservation of non-13 isotopically labelled organic matter within the sediment and limit the accumulation of 14 heterotrophic microbial biomass. As ocean warming is predicted to increase both 15 faunal and microbial metabolic demands, we hypothesise that under future warming 16 conditions (ambient + 2°C) the direct (and indirect) effects of *Carcinus* presence upon 17 carbon fixation and retention within coastal sediments will be amplified.

### 18 **2. Materials and Methods**

## 19 2.1 Experimental Design and Set-up

Stable isotope (<sup>13</sup>C) pulse-chase experiments were conducted during February and 20 21 March 2015 using outdoor flow-through mesocosms at Queen's University Marine 22 Laboratory (Portaferry, Northern Ireland (Mrowicki & O'Connor 2015)). We 23 assembled 20 mesocosms containing intertidal sediment manipulating two factors: 1. 24 Presence of *Carcinus* [two levels, present (single crab) and absent] and 2. temperature 25 [two levels, ambient and warming (ambient  $+ 2^{\circ}$ C)]. Mesocosms were arranged across 26 four outdoor water baths, supplied with a constant flow of sand-filtered water from 27 the adjacent Strangford Lough [flow rate =  $27.84 (\pm 4.89) \text{ l} \cdot \text{h}^{-1}$ ] and enclosed with 28 plastic mesh lids, with a mesh size of 5 mm, to prevent the crabs from escaping. 29 Elevated temperature treatments were maintained using aquarium heaters (Elite 30 Submersible 300W, Hagen Inc., USA) to warm two of the water baths. Mesocosms 31 received a daily water change, leaving the sediment for 4 hours to simulate low tide. 32 Prior to the daily water change, temperature, salinity, dissolved oxygen and pH were

- 1 recorded within each mesocosm using a YSI 6-series sonde and multi-meter [YSI Inc.
- 2 Ohio, USA] (Supplementary Table 1).

3 Sediment and *Carcinus* were collected from the Dorn mudflats, Strangford Lough

4 (54° 25' 44" N; 5° 32' 34" W) between the 2<sup>nd</sup>–6<sup>th</sup> February 2015. Sediments (less

5 than 10 cm depth) were collected, homogenised and packed to 10 cm depth, in twenty

6 45 L opaque polypropylene boxes "mesocosms" (with internal dimensions 55.5 x 35.5

- 7 x 22.0 cm). Collected sediments were a fine muddy-sand composed of  $4.40 \pm 1.69$  %
- 8 coarse sand (> 1000 um),  $69.22 \pm 3.20$  % fine sand (> 63 um) and  $26.37 \pm 2.69$  % silt
- 9 (< 63 um), with a sand: silt ratio of  $2.85 \pm 0.25$ . Sediment pore water content was

10  $35.29 \pm 0.87$  % and porosity was calculated as  $0.04 \pm 0.01$ .

11 Experiments were conducted over 4 weeks (28 days). A single male crab [carapace

12 width =  $3.47 (\pm 0.14)$  cm, wet biomass =  $9.66 (\pm 2.21)$  g] placed into five ambient and

13 five warmed mesocosms 7 days after the incubations commenced; a 24 mg  $(0.1 \text{ g.m}^{-2})$ 

14 dose of <sup>13</sup>C-labelled sodium bicarbonate was sprayed directly onto the sediment

15 surface of all mesocosms on day 21. The experiments were then incubated for a

16 further 5 days and then destructively sampled to quantify <sup>13</sup>C-incorporation and

17 retention in microbial biomass and the sediment organic matter pool, following

18 Middelburg et al. (Middelburg et al. 2000).

19 Changes in the biomass and spatial variability of the sediment microphytobenthos

20 (MPB) were measured within each mesocosm using a BBE Moldänke BenthoTorch

21 [BBE Moldänke Gmbh, Schwentinental, Germany] to quantify surficial chlorophyll a

22 (Chl<sub>a</sub>) concentrations after 7 (Week 0), 14 (Week 1), 21 (Week 2) and 28 (Week 3)

23 days (Kahlert & McKie 2014). At each interval five replicate measurements of the

surficial Chl<sub>a</sub> were made, within each mesocosm. Mean Chl<sub>a</sub> concentrations within

25 each mesocosm were estimated as a proxy for MPB biomass, with the coefficient of

26 variation of the Chl<sub>a</sub> measurements within each mesocosm providing a metric for

27 MPB patchiness within each mesocosm.

28 After 28 days, the mesocosm sediments were randomly sampled using four 8 cm

diameter push cores. These were horizontally sectioned into 0-0.5; 0.5-2; 2-5; 5-10

30 cm depth fractions. Depth fractions from each of the four cores were pooled,

31 homogenised and lyophilised (-68 °C; 0.0001 mbar), then stored frozen (-20 °C) prior

32 to further analysis (Hunter et al. 2012; Hunter et al. 2013). Total organic carbon

(TOC) and the retention of the <sup>13</sup>C-label into the sediment organic carbon pool were
determined using a Thermo Flash1112 Elemental Analyser interfaced with a Delta V
Isotope Ratio Mass Spectrometer [EA-IRMS]. Analytical precision, based on regular
replicated analysis of two international standards (USGS 41 and CH7) was < ±0.1 ‰.</li>
Prior to analysis, sediment samples were lyophilised, acid fumed with 6 mol l<sup>-1</sup>
hydrochloric acid to remove inorganic carbon following Hedges and Stern (1984) and

7 dried to constant weight at 60 °C.

8 Microbial biomass and retention of the <sup>13</sup>C-label within the surficial (0-0.5 cm)

9 sediments were quantified, using polar lipid fatty acids (PLFAs) as biomarkers.

10 PLFAs were extracted from 3 g of lyophilized sediment using a modified Bligh-Dyer

11 extraction protocol (White et al. 1979). Briefly, lipids were extracted over 2 hours

12 using a single-phase extraction mixture of chloroform, methanol and citrate buffer

13 (1:2:0.8 v/v/v). Lipid extracts were fractionated on silicic acid columns (6 ml

14 ISOLUTE SIS PE columns, International Sorbent Technologies Ltd, Ystrad Mynach,

15 UK) via sequential elution with chloroform (neutral lipid fatty acids), acetone

16 (glycolipid fatty acids) and methanol (PLFAs). PLFAs were transmethylated to fatty

17 acid methyl esters for analysis. PLFA concentrations and  ${}^{13}C/{}^{12}C$ -ratios were

18 determined on a Thermo GC Trace Ultra gas chromatograph combustion interfaced to

19 a Thermo Delta V Advantage isotope ratio mass spectrometer via a Thermo GC

20 Combustion III (following Thornton et al. 2011). The <sup>13</sup>C-enrichment of the TOC and

21 PLFAs were then determined from the  ${}^{12}C/{}^{13}C$  ratios, following Hunter et al. (2013),

22 correcting for background isotopic ratios of each material (Supplementary tables 2 &

23 3). All data were scaled to the areal cover (per mesocosm) by converting to values per

24 cm<sup>-3</sup> of wet sediment, pooling the data for from each sediment depth fraction (0-0.5;

25 0.5-2; 2-5; 5-10 cm) and normalised to total mesocosm area (0.24 m<sup>2</sup>).

26 2.2 Data Analysis

27 We tested for significant interactions and independent effects of *Carcinus* presence

and temperature by analysis of variance, treating *Carcinus* presence (2 levels:

29 presence, absence) and temperature (2 levels: ambient, ambient + 2 °C) as fixed

30 effects. We included water bath as a random error term within the ANOVA models to

31 account for the potential effects of mesocosm location (Underwood, A. J. 1997;

32 Crawley 2007). ANOVA model structure may, thus, be expressed as  $y \sim C * T + \text{Error}$ 

33 (*WB*), where C = Carcinus presence, T = Temperature and *WB* is the Water Bath.

1 Data and residuals were visually explored to ensure they met assumptions of 2 normality and homoscedacity (following Zuur, Ieno & Elphick 2010). We tested for 3 the effects of Carcinus presence and temperature upon MPB biomass (sediment 4 chlorophyll *a* concentrations) and the spatial variability of the MPB community 5 independently during each four weeks of the experiment. The inclusion of week as a 6 covariate would have required the extension of the ANOVA model to include a 3-way 7 interaction term and a temporal autocorrelation structure. This was deemed 8 inappropriate given the sample size within each our treatments (n=5). 9 We tested for treatment effects upon sediment TOC and TO<sup>13</sup>C concentrations, total 10 PLFA and <sup>13</sup>C-labelled PLFA concentrations as proxies for microbial biomass and 11 microbial carbon retention at the end of the experimental incubations, and the relative 12 abundance bacterial and microeukaryote fatty acid biomarkers (Supplementary Table 13 4) within both the total and <sup>13</sup>C-labelled PLFA pools. We tested for statistical 14 significance at p < 0.05, as a reasonable compromise between the risk of false 15 rejection of the null hypothesis (Type I error) and failure to detect a significant effect 16 (Type II error), given the limited replication (n=5) within each treatment (Underwood, 17 A. J. 1997). Where we detect a significant p-value, we calculated the effect size  $(\eta^2)$ 18 as the sum of squares for any significant effect(s) / total sum of squares for the 19 ANOVA model, following Cohen (1988). Effect sizes are reported alongside the p-20 values for each ANOVA in tables 1, 2 and 3. We consider a small effect size where  $\eta^2$ 21 < 0.15; with the associated p-values interpreted with caution (Cohen 1988). Data 22 analysis were conducted in R, using the base and Sciplot packages (R Development 23 Core Team 2009; Morales 2012). All data are publicly available through the Pangaea 24 data repository, under a CC-BY creative commons license 25 (https://doi.pangaea.de/10.1594/PANGAEA.892199).

## **3. Results**

27 Differences in the concentration and spatial variability of Chl<sub>a</sub> within surficial

sediments were tested independently during each of the four time points (weeks 0, 1,

29 2, 3 and 4), with *Carcinus* introduced to the mesocosms during week 1. *Carcinus* 

30 presence resulted in a significant decrease in MPB biomass during weeks 1 and 2 of

- 31 the experiment, with no effects detected during weeks 0 and 3 (Fig 1a; Table 1a). Our
- 32 data suggests a significant interaction between *Carcinus* presence and temperature
- 33 affected MPB patchiness during week 1 (Fig 1b; Table 1b), albeit with a small effect

1 size ( $\eta^2 = 0.112$ , Table 1b). No significant effects of *Carcinus* presence and

2 temperature upon MPB patchiness were detected during weeks 2 or 3 (Fig 1b). We,

3 thus, infer that *Carcinus* presence negatively affected the growth of the MPB during

4 weeks 1 and 2 of the experiment. No significant effects of water bath, as a nesting

5 factor, were detected upon either MPB biomass or patchiness.

6 We observed a significant effect of *Carcinus* presence upon sediment TOC

7 concentrations (Fig. 2a; Table 2a), which decreased by  $\sim 15$  % when crabs were

8 absent. <sup>13</sup>C-label retention within the sediment ( $TO^{13}C$ ) accounted for between 0.02

9 and 0.42 % of the <sup>13</sup>C-labelled bicarbonate dose added to each mesocosm (Fig. 2b;

10 Table 2b). We identified a significant interaction between *Carcinus* presence and

11 temperature on sediment TO<sup>13</sup>C. *Carcinus* presence decreased sediment TO<sup>13</sup>C

12 concentrations but only under ambient conditions. Under the future warming

13 conditions, by contrast,  $TO^{13}C$  concentration within the sediments was greater in the

14 presence of *Carcinus*.

15 We used the concentrations of PLFAs in surficial sediments as a proxy for total

16 microbial biomass. Total PLFA concentrations ranged between 11 and 26 mg C

17 mesocosm<sup>-1</sup>, equating to between 15 and 36 g microbial biomass within each

18 mesocosm (following Middelburg et al., 2000; Evrard et al., 2010). Within this study,

19 we detected no effects of either *Carcinus* presence or temperature upon microbial

20 biomass (Fig. 2c; Table 2c). Microbial <sup>13</sup>C-retention was negatively affected by

21 increased temperature (Fig. 2d; Table 2d).

22 In total, 31 individual PLFA were detected, of which five were identified as bacteria-

23 specific fatty acids and three polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFAs) as microeukaryote-

24 specific biomarkers (*Supplementary Table 4*). Bacterial contributions to the PLFAs

25 exhibited a significant increase in response to warming, with no effects of *Carcinus* 

26 presence (Fig 3a; Table 3a). Bacterial contributions to the <sup>13</sup>C-labelled PLFAs were

27 affected by significant interactions between *Carcinus* presence and temperature (Fig.

28 3b; Table 3b). *Carcinus* presence reduced <sup>13</sup>C-labelling of the bacterial PLFAs under

ambient conditions, and increased <sup>13</sup>C-labelling of the bacterial PLFAs under the

30 warming treatment.

31 Significant interactions between *Carcinus* presence and warming affected the relative

32 abundance of both the microeukaryote PUFAs (Fig. 3c; Table 3c) and their

contribution to the <sup>13</sup>C-labelled PLFA pool (Fig. 3d; Table 3d) in both cases *Carcinus* presence and warming resulted in significant decreases in PUFA concentrations and
 13C-labelling relative to the ambient-no crab treatment. The most commonly detected
 polyunsaturated PLFA was 18:2ω6,9, which is widely recognised as a fungal
 biomarker (Stoeck et al. 2002; Kaiser et al. 2010; Frostegård, Tunlid & Bååth 2011),
 accounting for between 39.45 (± 1.81) % and 46.02 (± 2.69 %) of the total PUFAs.

#### 7 **4. Discussion**

8 The study shows that the presence of the mobile epibenthic predator, Carcinus 9 maenas, mediates the retention of newly fixed (<sup>13</sup>C-labelled) carbon within intertidal 10 sediments, with faunal impacts altered by changes to the ambient temperature. MPB 11 biomass and patchiness, as (proxies for assessing the productive potential of coastal 12 sediments, Hicks et al. 2009; Kahlert & McKie 2014), were both initially affected by 13 the introduction of Carcinus to the mesocosms. Where Carcinus were present, the 14 sediment surface was visibly disturbed with track marks, and appeared loss cohesive 15 in texture. Alongside this disturbance the MPB biomass increased and MPB 16 patchiness decreased over the subsequent two weeks, suggesting that faunal 17 reworking of the sediment had little long term effects upon the MPB. This is 18 surprising given that faunal disturbance tends to limit the accumulation of MPB 19 biomass or fresh algal phytodetritus at the sediment surface (Canuel et al. 2007; 20 Spivak et al. 2007; Hicks et al. 2009; Jeffreys et al. 2011; Fanjul et al. 2015). Benthic 21 diatoms, however, can switch between autotrophy at the sediment surface and 22 heterotrophic fermentation within oxygen and light limited sub-surface sediments 23 (Bourke et al. 2016). We postulate that faunal reworking of the sediments provides a 24 mechanism for the transfer of active MPB cells between the sediment surface and 25 deeper sediment layers, which allows MPB biomass to recover from the initial 26 disturbance event.

Coastal regions are important in the global carbon cycle, where organic matter burial
exceeds 226 Tg C yr<sup>-1</sup>, of which up to 50 % may be recycled back to the water
column as carbon dioxide (Middelburg, Soetaert & Herman 1997; Bauer et al. 2013).
Understanding how fauna influence these processes is critical if we are to predict the
impacts of the current high rates of biodiversity loss. Within our study, the bulk of the
sediment TOC pool consisted of non-labelled organic matter and can, thus, be
considered analogous with 'old' carbon stored within the sediment. *Carcinus* absence

1 was associated with a small, but significant, decrease in the retention of this 'old' 2 carbon within the sediment (Fig 2a). As an active bioturbator, *Carcinus* plays a key 3 role reworking coastal sediments (Queiros et al. 2013). Given that sediment and crabs 4 were collected from the same field site, it is reasonable to infer that sediment carbon 5 stocks are in equilibrium with the presence of *Carcinus*. Consequently, the decrease 6 in TOC associated with the absence of *Carcinus* suggests that faunal disturbance may 7 limit microbial activity within the mesocosm sediments. This provides further 8 evidence that benthic fauna, such as crabs, play an important role regulating microbial 9 activity and the preservation of organic matter within coastal sediments (Mermillod-10 Blondin & Rosenberg 2006; Canuel et al. 2007; Spivak et al. 2007; Fanjul et al. 11 2015).

12 The <sup>13</sup>C-labelled organic matter represents a sedimentary carbon pool that has been 13 "recently-fixed" by the MPB. This 'recently-fixed' carbon pool is likely to be 14 composed of relatively labile short-chain organic molecules (e.g. lipids, amino acids), 15 which may be preferentially utilised as a carbon source by the sediment microbial 16 community (e.g. van Nugteren et al. 2009; Miyatake et al. 2014). Our study identified 17 contrasting effects of Carcinus presence upon the concentrations of this 'recently-18 fixed' carbon under both the present and future warming conditions (Fig. 2b). No 19 significant differences in surficial MPB biomass were observed during the isotope-20 labelling phase of the experiment (Fig. 1a) and, under ambient conditions, Carcinus 21 presence had no effect upon <sup>13</sup>C-fixation into the organic matter pool (Fig. 2B) 22 Consequently, crab activity had no effect upon C-fixation by the MPB contrasting 23 with previous studies that have identified faunal disturbance of the sediment surface 24 as an important control upon microbial carbon fixation (Mermillod-Blondin & Rosenberg 2006). Under the predicted future-warming treatment, however, the 25 26 absence of *Carcinus* is associated with reduced retention of <sup>13</sup>C-labelled carbon in the 27 sediment. This indicates that under the predicted warming conditions tested, increased 28 metabolic activity by the sediment microbial community, leading to more rapid fixation of the <sup>13</sup>C-label by the MPB and more rapid mineralisation of 'recently-fixed' 29 30 carbon by heterotrophic microorganisms (Gillooly et al. 2001; Weston & Joye 2005; 31 Daufresne et al. 2009; Morán et al. 2015).

The microbial response to *Carcinus* presence and warming were tested in the surficial
 sediment layer (0-0.5 cm), using PLFAs as biomarkers. PLFAs provide a powerful

1 tool in this context, allowing both microbial biomass and incorporation of the <sup>13</sup>C-2 label to be quantified (Middelburg et al. 2000; Mayor et al. 2012; Hunter et al. 2013). 3 Microbial biomass (estimated from PLFA concentrations) was unaffected by either 4 Carcinus presence or temperature (Fig. 2c), however, we observed a significant 5 decrease in <sup>13</sup>C-label retention within the PLFAs (Fig 2d). This is likely to reflect 6 increased metabolic activity within the microbial community as a response to ocean 7 warming (Weston & Joye 2005). Carcinus presence played no significant role in 8 determining <sup>13</sup>C-label retention within the PLFAs. We suggest that turnover of 9 microbial biomass at the sediment surface (reviewed in Mermillod-Blondin & 10 Rosenberg 2006), combined with temperature-dependent increases in microbial 11 metabolism (Weston & Joye 2005; Arndt et al. 2013) may explain this observation. 12 Our results show that faunal species loss has pronounced effects upon microbial 13 community responses to ocean warming. In this context, Carcinus presence had a 14 significant influence upon both the structure of the microbial community and its 15 active component, as revealed from the relative abundance of bacteria-specific FAs and PUFAs within the total PLFA and <sup>13</sup>C-labelled PLFA profiles. PLFAs can 16 17 provide useful information on microbial community structure in aquatic sediments 18 (e.g. Stoeck et al. 2002; Boschker et al. 2005; Mayor et al. 2012), albeit with caveats 19 regarding their limited taxonomic resolution (Frostegård et al. 2011). We observed 20 broad trends in the response of the microbial community within our mesocosms. This 21 is characterised by temperature-driven decreases in the bacterial FAs, which reflect 22 the impacts of ocean warming on microbial cell-size (Morán et al. 2015). There was a 23 strong negative effect of crab presence upon the PUFAs under ambient conditions. 24 PUFAs can be considered both as a biomarker of microeukaryote biomass (Stoeck et 25 al. 2002; Kaiser et al. 2010; Frostegård et al. 2011) and an indicator of the relative 26 lability of the sediment organic matter pool (Canuel et al. 2007; Spivak et al. 2007). 27 Within our study, PUFAs were dominated by a single fungal biomarker (18:2 $\omega$ 7) 28 suggesting that, under ambient conditions *Carcinus*, may suppress the accumulation 29 of fungal biomass within surficial sediments. By contrast, PUFA concentrations were 30 lower under future warming conditions, perhaps as a consequence of increases in 31 resource competition and biomass turnover within the microbial community 32 (Daufresne et al. 2009; Sarmento et al. 2010).

12

1 The active microbial community, as revealed by <sup>13</sup>C-labelling of the PLFAs, were 2 sensitive to changes in *Carcinus* presence under both ambient and future-warming 3 conditions. Both bacterial and microeukaryote biomarkers exhibited similar 4 responses, with Carcinus presence associated with decreased contribution to the 5 active microbial community under ambient conditions, but increasing their 6 contributions under warming conditions. Our study builds upon previous studies 7 which demonstrate that crabs play a key role in coastal sediments, controlling 8 accumulation of microbial biomass and the preservation of organic matter (Canuel et 9 al. 2007; Spivak et al. 2007; Fanjul et al. 2015). This reinforces the concept of the 10 benthic fauna as a 'gearbox' that regulates microbial activity in marine sediments (van Nugteren et al. 2009; Hunter et al. 2012) and support the observation that the 11 12 responses of faunal communities to rising ocean temperature will have cascading 13 effects upon benthic primary producers (O'Connor et al. 2009; Mrowicki & O'Connor 14 2015).

15 Retention of the <sup>13</sup>C-label within the mesocosm sediment was low compared with 16 other studies that investigated label uptake by the MPB (e.g. Middelburg et al. 2000; 17 Boschker et al. 2005; van Oevelen et al. 2006). This reflects the relatively low dose of 18 <sup>13</sup>C-labelled sodium bicarbonate introduced into each mesocosm, and potential losses 19 associated with washout of unused <sup>13</sup>C-labelled sodium bicarbonate; mineralisation of 20 <sup>13</sup>C-labelled organic matter and flux of dissolved organic carbon between the 21 sediment and overlying water (e.g. Middelburg et al. 2000; Evrard et al. 2010). Given 22 that coastal sediments are typically respiration-dominated systems (Woulds et al. 23 2009; Woulds et al. 2016), mineralisation of <sup>13</sup>C-labelled organic matter is likely to 24 represent a major un-quantified process within our study. Caution is therefore advised 25 in comparing these data with other sediment carbon budgets, derived using similar 26 methodologies (Middelburg et al. 2000; Evrard et al. 2010; Woulds et al. 2016). Our 27 study builds upon observations of cascading effects of crab predation upon sediment 28 organic matter composition in coastal sediments (Canuel et al. 2007; Spivak et al. 29 2007; Fanjul et al. 2015), and provides a direct test of how faunal species loss affects 30 sediment carbon sequestration under both present climatic conditions and predicted 31 future-warming conditions.

Our study demonstrates that both faunal presence and temperature are important
 regulators organic matter retention within coastal sediments. Faunal presence was the

primary driver of changes in 'old' organic carbon within the mesocosm, whilst strong 1 2 interactions between faunal presence and temperature determine the fate of 'recently-3 fixed' organic matter. Bulk analysis of the TOC and total PLFAs was, however, 4 limited in its scope to identify the interacting effects of Carcinus presence and 5 temperature. Compound-specific analysis of the PLFA profiles, allowed us, to discern 6 how faunal presence stimulated <sup>13</sup>C-incorporation by heterotrophic microbes under 7 the predicted-future warming treatment, and suppressed the accumulation of 8 microeukaryote (fungal) biomass under ambient conditions. These effects are clearly 9 driven by changes in faunal bioturbation and the rate-limiting effects of temperature 10 upon microbial activity.

11 We acknowledge that the results of mesocosm experiments are largely illustrative, 12 and cannot easily be scaled to natural systems (Oviatt 1994; Carpenter 1996; Queiros 13 et al. 2015). If we are to mitigate the impacts of global biodiversity loss, however, 14 manipulative experiments are an important tool to test potential impacts on ecosystem 15 processes (Duffy 2009; Cardinale et al. 2012; Stewart et al. 2013; Donohue et al. 16 2017). Previous mesocosm studies highlight the importance of epibenthic predators, 17 such as crabs, as mediators of organic matter preservation in coastal sediments 18 (Canuel et al. 2007; Spivak et al. 2007; Atwood et al. 2015; Donohue et al. 2017; 19 Fanjul et al. 2015). Here we demonstrate that under future warming conditions, 20 epibenthic predator loss leads to an increase in the relative importance of microbial C 21 cycling pathways in coastal sediments. Whilst we cannot easily predict ecosystem-22 scale responses, this may result in decreasing carbon storage within coastal sediments. 23 Consequently the combined effects of predator loss and ocean warming are likely to 24 have adverse effects upon a range of coastal ecosystem services that are relevant for 25 climate regulation, waste processing, flood protection and support of fisheries 26 (reviewed in Lopes & Vidiera 2013; Isbell et al. 2017).

## 27 Acknowledgements

We thank Henk Van Rein, Brendan MacNamara, Lydia White and Camilla Bertolini for the their help with the experimental work. We also thank the editor and reviewers, for their constructive comments, which greatly improved this paper. We acknowledge Barry Thornton and Maureen Procee at the James Hutton Institute for their assistance with compound-specific stable isotope analysis. Crab symbols were created by Hea Poh Lin from the Noun Project (https://thenounproject.com) and are used under a

- 1 Creative Commons Licence (CC-BY). This study was funded through a Leverhulme
- 2 Trust Early Career Fellowship (ECF-2014-057) to WRH and a Royal Society
- 3 Research Grant (RG-120432) to NEO'C. The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## 4 Author Contributions

- 5 Experiments were designed by WRH and NO'C, and conducted by WRH. Analytical
- 6 work was carried out by WRH and NO. WRH, NO and NO'C all contributed to the
- 7 writing of the manuscript.

## 8 **References**

- 9 Arndt, S., Jørgensen, B.B., LaRowe, D.E., Middelburg, J.J., Pancost, R.D. & Regnier,
- 10 P. (2013) Quantifying the degradation of organic matter in marine sediments: A
- 11 review and synthesis. *Earth-Science Reviews*, **123**, 53-86.
- 12 Atwood, T.B., Hammill, E., Greig, H.S., Katina, P., Shurin, J.B., Srivastava, D.S. &
- 13 Richardson, J.S. (2013) Predator-induced reduction of freshwater carbon dioxide
- 14 emissions. *Nature Geoscience*, **6**, 191-194.
- 15 Atwood, T.B., Connolly, R.M., Ritchie, E.G., Lovelock, C.E., Heithaus, M.R., Hays,
- 16 G.C., Fourqurean, J.W. & Macreadie, P.I. (2015) Predators help protect carbon stocks
- 17 in blue carbon ecosystems. *Nature Climate Change*, **5**, 1038-1045.
- 18 Bauer, J.E., Cai, W.J., Raymond, P.A., Bianchi, T.S., Hopkinson, C.S. & Regnier,
- 19 P.A.G. (2013) The changing carbon cycle of the coastal ocean. *Nature*, **504**, 61-70.
- 20 Bellard, C., Bertelsmeier, C., Leadley, P., Thuiller, W. & Courchamp, F. (2012)
- 21 Impacts of climate change on the future of biodiversity. *Ecology Letters*, **15**, 365-377.
- 22 Boschker, H.T.S., Kromkamp, J.C. & Middelburg, J.J. (2005) Biomarker and carbon
- 23 isotopic constraints on bacterial and algal community structure and functioning in a
- turbid, tidal estuary. *Limnology and Oceanography*, **50**, 70-80.
- 25 Bourke, M.F., Marriott, P.J., Glud, R.N., Hasler-Sheetal, H., Kamalanathan, M.,
- 26 Beardall, J., Greening, C. & Cook, P.L.M. (2016) Metabolism in anoxic permeable
- 27 sediments is dominated by eukaryotic dark fermentation. *Nature Geoscience*, **10**, 30-
- 28 35.
- 29 Burrows, M.T., Schoeman, D.S., Buckley, L.B., Moore, P., Poloczanska, E.S.,
- 30 Brander, K.M., Brown, C., Bruno, J.F., Duarte, C.M., Halpern, B.S., Holding, J.,
- 31 Kappel, C.V., Kiessling, W., O'Connor, M.I., Pandolfi, J.M., Parmesan, C., Schwing,
- 32 F.B., Sydeman, W.J. & Richardson, A.J. (2011) The pace of shifting climate in
- 33 marine and terrestrial ecosystems. *Science*, **334**, 652-655.
- Cai, W.J. (2011) Estuarine and coastal ocean carbon paradox: CO2 sinks or sites of
- 35 terrestrial carbon incineration? Annual Reviews of Marine Science, 3, 123-145.

- 1 Canuel, E.A., Spivak, A.C., Waterson, E.J. & Duffy, J.E. (2007) Biodiversity and
- 2 food web structure influence short-term accumulation of sediment organic matter in
- 3 an experimental seagrass system. *Limnology and Oceanography*, **52**, 590-602.
- 4 Cardinale, B.J., Duffy, J.E., Gonzalez, A., Hooper, D.U., Perrings, C., Venail, P.,
- 5 Narwani, A., Mace, G.M., Tilman, D., Wardle, D.A., Kinzig, A.P., Daily, G.C.,
- 6 Loreau, M., Grace, J.B., Larigauderie, A., Srivastava, D.S. & Naeem, S. (2012)
- 7 Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. *Nature*, **486**, 59-67.
- 8 Carpenter, S.R. (1996) Microcosm experiments have limited relevance for community
- 9 and ecosystem ecology. *Ecology*, **77**, 677-680.
- 10 Cohen, J. (1988) The analysis of variance and covariance (chapter 8). *Statistical*
- *Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, pp. 273-406. Routledge, New York,
   USA.
- 13 Crawley, M.J. (2007) *The R Book*, 950 pp. John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Chichester, UK.
- 14 Crothers, J.H. (1968) The biology of the shore crab *Carcinus maenas* (L.) 2. the life 15 of the adult crab. *Field Studies*, **2**, 579-614.
- 16 Daufresne, M., Lengfellner, K. & Sommer, U. (2009) Global warming benefits the
- small in aquatic ecosystems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106,
  12788-12793.
- 19 Donohue, I., Petchey, O.L., Kéfi, S., Génin, A., Jackson, A.L., Yang, Q. & O'Connor,
- 20 N.E. (2017) Loss of predator species, not intermediate consumers, triggers rapid and
- 21 dramatic extinction cascades. *Global Change Biology*, **23**, 2962-2972.
- Duffy, J.E. (2009) Why biodiversity is important to the functioning of real-world ecosystems. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, **7**, 437-444.
- 23 ecosystems. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 7, 437-444.
- 24 Ernest, S.K.M., Enquist, B.J., Brown, J.H., Charnov, E.L., Gillooly, J.F., Savage,
- 25 V.M., White, E.P., Smith, F.A., Hadly, E.A., Haskell, J.P., Lyons, S.K., Maurer, B.A.,
- 26 Niklas, K.J. & Tiffney, B. (2003) Thermodynamic and metabolic effects on the
- scaling of production and population energy use. *Ecology Letters*, **6**, 990-995.
- 28 Evrard, V., Soetaert, K., Heip, C.H.R., Huettel, M., Xenopoulos, M.A. & Middelburg,
- 29 J.J. (2010) Carbon and nitrogen flows through the benthic food web of a photic
- 30 subtidal sandy sediment. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 416, 1-16.
- 31 Fanjul, E., Escapa, M., Montemayor, D., Addino, M., Alvarez, M.F., Grela, M.A. &
- 32 Iribarne, O. (2015) Effect of crab bioturbation on organic matter processing in south
- 33 west atlantic intertidal sediments. *Journal of Sea Research*, **95**, 206-216.
- Frostegård, A., Tunlid, A. & Bååth, E. (2011) Use and misuse of PLFA measurements
  in soils. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 43, 1621-1625.
- 36 Gillooly, J.F., Brown, J.H., West, G.B., Savage, V.M. & Charnov, E.L. (2001) Effects
- 37 of size and temperature on metabolic rate. *Science*, **293**, 2248-2251.

- 1 Halpern, B.S., Frazier, M., Potapenko, J., Casey, K.S., Koenig, K., Longo, C.,
- 2 Lowndes, J.S., Rockwood, R.C., Selig, E.R., Selkoe, K.A. & Walbridge, S. (2015)
- 3 Spatial and temporal changes in cumulative human impacts on the world's ocean.
- 4 Nature Communications, 6, 7615.
- 5 Hedges, J.I. & Stern, J.H. (1984) Carbon and nitrogen determinations of carbonate-6 containing solids. *Limnology and Oceanography*, **29**, 657-663.
- 7 Hicks, N., Bulling, M.T., Solan, M., Raffaelli, D.I., White, P.C.L. & Paterson, D.M.
- 8 (2009) Impact of biodiversity-climate futures on primary production and metabolism
- 9 in a model benthic estuarine system. BMC Ecology, 11, 7.
- 10 Hunter, W.R., Veuger, B. & Witte, U. (2012) Macrofauna regulate heterotrophic
- bacterial carbon and nitrogen incorporation in low-oxygen sediments. *ISME Journal*,
   6, 2140-2151.
- 13 Hunter, W.R., Jamieson, A., Huvenne, V.A.I. & Witte, U. (2013) Sediment
- 14 community responses to marine vs. terrigenous organic matter in a submarine canyon.
- 15 *Biogeosciences*, **10**, 67-80.
- 16 IPCC. (2014) Climate change synthesis report. *contribution of working groups I, II*
- 17 and III to the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate
- 18 change. [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva,
- 19 Switzerland, 151 pp.
- 20 Isbell, F., Gonzalez, A., Loreau, M., Cowles, J., Diaz, S., Hector, A., Mace, G.M.,
- 21 Wardle, D.A., O'Connor, M.I., Duffy, J.E., Turnbull, L.A., Thompson, P.L. &
- 22 Larigauderie, A. (2017) Linking the influence and dependence of people on
- 23 biodiversity across scales. *Nature*, **546**, 65-72.
- 24 Jeffreys, R.M., Lavaleye, M.S.S., Bergman, M.J.N., Duineveld, G.C.A. & Witbaard,
- R. (2011) Do abyssal scavengers use phytodetritus as a food resource? video and
- biochemical evidence from the atlantic and mediterranean. Deep Sea Research Part I:
- 27 Oceanographic Research Papers, **58**, 415-428.
- 28 Jeffreys, R.M., Wolff, G.A. & Murty, S.J. (2009) The trophic ecology of key
- 29 megafaunal species at the pakistan margin: Evidence from stable isotopes and lipid
- 30 biomarkers. Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers, 56, 1816-
- 31 1833.
- Jones, C.G., Lawton, J.H. & Shachak, M. (1994) Organisms as ecosystem engineers. *Oikos*, 69, 373-386.
- Jones, D.O.B., Yool, A., Wei, C.L., Henson, S.A., Ruhl, H.A., Watson, R.A. &
- Gehlen, M. (2014) Global reductions in seafloor biomass in response to climate
  change. *Global Change Biology*, 20, 1861-1872.
- 37 Kahlert, M. & McKie, B.G. (2014) Comparing new and conventional methods to
- 38 estimate benthic algal biomass and composition in freshwaters. *Environmental*
- 39 Science: Processes & Impacts, **16**, 2627-2634.

- 1 Kaiser, C., Frank, A., Wild, B., Koranda, M. & Richter, A. (2010) Negligible
- 2 contribution from roots to soil-borne phospholipid fatty acid fungal biomarkers 18:
- 3 2ω6,9 and 18:1ω9. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*, **42**, 1650-1652.
- 4 Lopes, R. & Vidiera, N. (2013) Valuing marine and coastal ecosystem services: An
- 5 integrated participatory framework. Ocean and Coastal Management, 153e162.
- 6 López-Urrutia, A., San Martin, E., Harris, R.P. & Irigoien, X. (2009) Scaling the
- metabolic balance of the oceans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.*,
  103, 8739-8744.
- 9 MacIntyre, H.L., Geider, R.J. & Miller, D.C. (1996) Microphytobenthos: The
- 10 ecological role of the "secret garden" of unvegetated, shallow-water marine habitats.
- 11 I. distribution, abundance and primary production. *Estuaries and Coasts*, **19**, 186-201.
- 12 Mayor, D.J., Thornton, B. & Zuur, A.F. (2012) Resource quantity affects benthic
- 13 microbial community structure and growth efficiency in a temperate intertidal
- 14 mudflat. *PLoS ONE*, **7**, e38582.
- 15 Mermillod-Blondin, F. & Rosenberg, R. (2006) Ecosystem engineering: The impact

16 of bioturbation on biogeochemical processes in marine and freshwater benthic

- 17 habitats. *Aquatic Science*, **68**, 434-442.
- 18 Middelburg, J.J., Soetaert, K. & Herman, P.M.J. (1997) Empirical relationships for
- 19 use in global diagenetic models. Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research
- 20 Papers, 44, 327-344.
- 21 Middelburg, J.J., Barranguet, C., Boschker, H.T.S., Herman, P.M.J., Moens, T. &
- Heip, C.H.R. (2000) The fate of intertidal microphytobenthos carbon: An in situ
- 23 labeling study. *Limnology and Oceanography*, **45**, 1224-1234.
- 24 Miller, D.C., Geider, R.C. & MacIntyre, H.L. (1996) Microphytobenthos: The
- 25 ecological role of the "secret garden" of unvegetated, shallow-water marine habitats.
- II role in sediment stability and shallow water food webs. *Estuaries and Coasts*, 19, 202-212.
- 28 Miyatake, T., Moerdijk-Poortvliet T.C.W., Stal, L.J. & Boschker, H.T.S. (2014)
- 29 Tracing carbon flow from microphytobenthos to major bacterial groups in an
- 30 intertidal marine sediment by using an *in situ*<sup>n</sup>C pulse-chase method. *Limnology and*
- 31 Oceanography, **59**, 1275-1287.
- Morales, M. (2012) Sciplot: Scientific graphing functions for factorial designs. URL
   https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=sciplot
- 34 Morán, X.A.G., Alonso-Sáez, L., Nogueira, E., Ducklow, H.W., González, N., López-
- 35 Urrutia, Á, Díaz-Pérez, L., Calvo-Díaz, A., Arandia-Gorostidi, N. & Huete-Stauffer,
- 36 T.M. (2015) More, smaller bacteria in response to ocean's warming? Proceedings of
- 37 *the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **282**.

- 1 Mrowicki, R.J. & O'Connor, N.E. (2015) Wave action modifies the effects of
- 2 consumer diversity and warming on algal assemblages. *ecology*. *Ecology*, **96**, 1020-
- 3 1029.
- 4 O'Connor, N.E. & Donohue, I. (2013) Environmental context determines multi-
- 5 trophic effects of consumer species loss. *Global Change Biology*, **19**, 431-440.
- 6 O'Connor, N.E., Emmerson, M.C., Crowe, T.P. & Donohue, I. (2013) Distinguishing
- 7 between direct and indirect effects of predators in complex ecosystems. *Journal of*
- 8 Animal Ecology, **82**, 438-448.
- 9 Oakes, J.M. & Eyre, B.D. (2014) Transformation and fate of microphytobenthos
- 10 carbon in subtropical, intertidal sediments: Potential for long-term carbon retention
- 11 revealed by <sup>B</sup>C-labeling. *Biogeosciences*, **11**, 1927-1940.
- 12 O'Connor, M.I., Piehler, M.F., Leech, D.M., Anton, A. & Bruno, J.F. (2009)
- Warming and resource availability shift food web structure and metabolism. *PLOS Biology*, 7, e1000178.
- 15 Oviatt, C.A. (1994) Biological considerations in marine enclosure experiments:
- 16 Challenges and revelations. *Oceanography*, **7**, 45-51.
- Pauly, D., Christensen, V., Dalsgaard, J., Froese, R. & Torres, F. (1998) Fishing down
  marine food webs. *Science*, 279, 860-863.
- 19 Payne, J.L., Bush, A.M., Heim, N.A., Knope, M.L. & McCauley, D.J. (2016)
- Ecological selectivity of the emerging mass extinction in the oceans. *Science*, 353, 1284-1286.
- 22 Piepenburg, D., Blackburn, T.H., von Dorrien, C.F., Gutt, J., Hall, P.O., Hulth, S.,
- 23 Kendall, M.A., Opalinski, K.W., Rachor, E. & Schmid, M.K. (1995) Partitioning of
- 24 benthic community respiration in the arctic (northwestern barents sea). *Marine*
- 25 Ecology Progress Series, **118**, 199-214.
- 26 Poloczanska, E.S., Brown, C.J., Sydeman, W.J., Kiessling, W., Schoeman, D.S.,
- 27 Moore, P.J., Brander, K., Bruno, J.F., Buckley, L.B., Burrows, M.T., Duarte, C.M.,
- 28 Halpern, B.S., Holding, J., Kappel, C.V., O/'Connor, M.I., Pandolfi, J.M., Parmesan,
- 29 C., Schwing, F., Thompson, S.A. & Richardson, A.J. (2013a) Global imprint of
- 30 climate change on marine life. *Nature Clim Change*, **3**, 919-925.
- 31 Poloczanska, E.S., Brown, C.J., Sydeman, W.J., Kiessling, W., Schoeman, D.S.,
- 32 Moore, P.J., Brander, K., Bruno, J.F., Buckley, L.B., Burrows, M.T., Duarte, C.M.,
- 33 Halpern, B.S., Holding, J., Kappel, C.V., O/'Connor, M.I., Pandolfi, J.M., Parmesan,
- 34 C., Schwing, F., Thompson, S.A. & Richardson, A.J. (2013b) Global imprint of
- 35 climate change on marine life. *Nature Clim Change*, **3**, 919-925.
- 36 Queiros, A.A., Birchenough, S.N.R., Bremner, J., Godbold, J.A., Parker, R.E.,
- 37 Romero-Ramirez, A., Reiss, H., Solan, M., Somerfield, P.J., Van Colen, C., Van
- 38 Hoey, G. & Widdicombe, S. (2013) A bioturbation classification of european marine
- 39 infaunal invertebrates. *Ecology and Evolution*, **3**, 1958-1985.

- 1 Queiros, A.A., Fernandes, J.A., Faulwetter, S., Nunes, J., Rastrick, S.P.S.,
- 2 Mieszkowska, N., Artioli, Y., Yool, A., Calosi, P., Arvanitidis, C., Findlay, H.S.,
- 3 Barange, M., Cheung, W.W.L. & Widdicombe, S. (2015) Scaling up experimental
- 4 ocean acidification and warming research: From individuals to the ecosystem. *Global*
- 5 *Change Biology*, **21**, 130-143.
- R Development Core Team. (2009) R: A language and environment for statistical
   computing. Vienna, Austria. URL http://www.R-project.org/.
- 8 Sarmento, H., Montoya, J.M., Vázquez-Domínguez, E., Vaqué, D. & Gasol, J.M.
- 9 (2010) Warming effects on marine microbial food web processes: How far can we go
- 10 when it comes to predictions? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 365,
- 11 2137-2149.
- 12 Spears, B.M., Saunders, J.E., Davidson, I. & Paterson, D.M. (2008) Microalgal
- 13 sediment biostabilisation along a salinity gradient in the eden estuary, scotland:
- 14 Unravelling a paradox. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, **59**, 313-321.
- 15 Spivak, A.C., Canuel, E.A., Duffy, J.E. & Richardson, J.P. (2007) Top-down and
- 16 bottom-up controls on sediment organic matter composition in an experimental
- 17 seagrass ecosystem. *Limnology and Oceanography*, **52**, 2595-2607.
- 18 Stewart, R.I.A., Dossena, M., Bohan, D.A., Jeppesen, E., Kordas, R.L., Ledger, M.E.,
- 19 Meerhoff, M., Moss, B., Mulder, C., Shurin, J.B., Suttle, B., Thompson, R., Trimmer,
- 20 M. & Woodward, G. (2013) Mesocosm experiments as a tool for ecological climate-
- 21 change research. Advances in Ecological Research, 48, 71-181.
- 22 Stoeck, T., Kröncke, I., Duiniveld, G.C.A. & Palojärvi, A. (2002) Phospholipid fatty
- 23 acid profiles at depositional and non-depositional sites in the north sea. *Marine*
- 24 Ecology Progress Series, 241, 57-70.
- 25 Thornton, B., Zhang, Z., Mayes, R.W., Högberg, M.N. & Midwood, A.J. (2011) Can
- 26 gas chromatography combustion isotope ratio mass spectrometry be used to quantify
- organic compound abundance? *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectroscopy*, 25,
  2433-2438.
- 29 Tolhurst, T.J., Friend, P.L., Watts, C., Wakefield, R., Black, K.S. & Paterson, D.M.
- 30 (2006) The effects of rain on the erosion threshold of intertidal cohesive sediments.
- 31 Aquatic Ecology, **40**, 533-541.
- 32 Underwood, A.J. (1997) *Experiments in Ecology: Their logical design and*
- *interpretation using analysis of variance*, 524 pp. Cambridge University Press.
   Cambridge, UK.
- Underwood, G.J.C. & Kronkamp, J. (1999) Primary production by phytoplankton and
   microphytobenthos in estuaries. *Advances in Ecological Research*, 29, 93-153.
- 37 van Nugteren, P., Herman, P.M.J., Moodley, L., Middelburg, J.J., Vos, M. & Heip,
- 38 C.H.R. (2009) Spatial distribution of detrital resources determines the outcome of

- 1 competition between bacteria and a facultative detritivorous worm. *Limnology and*
- 2 Oceanography, **54**, 1413-1419.
- 3 van Nugteren, P., Moodley, L., Brummer, G.-., Heip, C.H.R., Herman, P.M.J. &
- 4 Middelburg, J.J. (2009) Seafloor ecosystem functioning: The importance of organic
- 5 matter priming. *Marine Biology*, **156**, 2277-2287.
- 6 van Oevelen, D., Soetaert, K., Middelburg, J.J., Herman, P.M.J., Moodley, L.,
- 7 Hamels, I., Moens, T. & Heip, C.H.R. (2006) Carbon flows through a benthic food
- 8 web: Integrating biomass, isotope and tracer data. *Journal of Marine Research*, **64**,
- 9 453-482.
- 10 Weston, N.B. & Joye, S.B. (2005) Temperature-driven decoupling of key phases of
- 11 organic matter degradation in marine sediments. Proceedings of the National
- 12 Academy of Sciences, **102**, 17036-17040.
- 13 White, D.C., Davis, W.M., Nickels, J.S., King, J.D. & Bobbie, R.J. (1979)
- 14 Determination of the sedimentary microbial biomass by extractable lipid phosphate.
- 15 *Oecologia*, **40**, 51-62.
- 16 Woulds, C., Bouillon, S., Cowie, G.L., Drake, E., Middelburg, J.J. & Witte, U. (2016)
- 17 Patterns of carbon processing at the seafloor: The role of faunal and microbial
- 18 communities in moderating carbon flows. *Biogeosciences*, **13**, 4343-4357.
- 19 Woulds, C., Andersson, J.H., Cowie, G.L., Middelburg, J.J. & Levin, L.A. (2009) The
- 20 short-term fate of organic carbon in marine sediments: Comparing the pakistan
- 21 margin to other regions. Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in
- 22 *Oceanography*, **56**, 393-402.
- 23 Yool, A., Martin, A.P., Anderson, T.R., Bett, B.J., Jones, D.O.B. & Ruhl, H.A. (2017)
- 24 Big in the benthos: Future change of seafloor community biomass in a global, body
- size-resolved model. *Global Change Biology*, **23**, 3554-3566.
- Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N. & Elphick, C.S. (2010) A protocol for data exploration to avoid
  common statistical problems. *Methods Ecology and Evolution*, 1, 3-14.
- 28

## **Tables Legends**

**Table 1.** ANOVA summary tables of the effects of *Carcinus* presence and temperature upon a) MPB Biomass (Chlorophyll a) and b) the spatial variability of the MPB during each of the four weeks of the experiment. *Abbreviations:* T = Temperature; C = Carcinus; WB = Water Bath.

a) MP	'B Bio	omass (C	hlorophyll a)	
Week 0 T C T x C Resid.	<b>df</b> 1 1 1 15	<b>SS</b> 0.199 0.002 0.014 0.661	MS         F         p         η           0.199         4.526         0.050         -           0.002         0.045         0.835         -           0.014         0.323         0.578         -           0.044         -         -         -	2
<b>Error</b> WB	<b>df</b> 1	<b>SS</b> 0.271	<b>MS</b> 0.271	
Week 1 T C T x C Resid.	<b>df</b> 1 1 1 15	<b>SS</b> 0.028 0.353 0.001 0.532	MS         F         p         η           0.028         0.787         0.389         -           0.353         9.951         0.007         0.           0.001         0.004         0.948         -           0.036         -         -         -	2 .298
Error WB	<b>df</b> 1	<b>SS</b> 0.271	<b>MS</b> 0.271	
Week 2 T C T x C Resid.	<b>df</b> 1 1 1 15	<b>SS</b> 0.019 0.953 0.124 1.064	MS         F         p         77           0.019         0.268         0.612         -           0.953         13.439         0.002         0.           0.124         1.741         0.207         -           0.071         -         -         -	2 .359
<b>Error</b> WB	<b>df</b> 1	<b>SS</b> 0.496	<b>MS</b> 0.496	
Week 3 T C T x C Resid.	<b>df</b> 1 1 1 15	<b>SS</b> 0.129 0.299 0.011 1.656	MS         F         p         η           0.129         1.165         0.298         -           0.299         2.711         0.120         -           0.011         0.104         0.752         -           0.110         -         -         -	2
<b>Error</b> WB	<b>df</b> 1	<b>SS</b> 0.016	<b>MS</b> 0.0163	

Week 0       df       SS       MS       F $p$ $\eta^2$ T       1       0.001       0.001       0.127       0.726       -         C       1       0.003       0.003       0.347       0.565       -         T x C       1       0.005       0.005       0.521       0.482       -         Resid.       15       0.149       0.009       -       -       -         Error       MS       MS       WB       1       0.003       0.003       -         Week 1       Main       Main       Main       Main       Main       -       -	b) MPB Patchiness						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Week 0						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		df	SS	MS	F	р	$\eta^2$
C       1       0.003       0.003       0.347       0.565       -         T x C       1       0.005       0.005       0.521       0.482       -         Resid.       15       0.149       0.009       -       -       -         Error	Т	1	0.001	0.001	0.127	0.726	-
T x C       1       0.005       0.005       0.521       0.482       -         Resid.       15       0.149       0.009       -       -       -         Error       df       SS       MS       -       -       -         WB       1       0.003       0.003       -       -       -         Week 1       -       -       -       -       -       -	С	1	0.003	0.003	0.347	0.565	-
Resid.       15       0.149       0.009         Error       df       SS       MS         WB       1       0.003       0.003         Week 1       International State       International State	T x C	1	0.005	0.005	0.521	0.482	-
Error         df         SS         MS           WB         1         0.003         0.003           Week 1         SS         MS         SS         MS	Resid.	15	0.149	0.009			
df         SS         MS           WB         1         0.003         0.003           Week 1         I	Error						
WB         1         0.003         0.003           Week 1         I		df	SS	MS			
Week 1	WB	1	0.003	0.003			
	Week 1						
df SS MS F $p \eta^2$		df	SS	MS	F	р	$\eta^2$
T 1 0.019 0.019 1.353 0.263 -	Т	1	0.019	0.019	1.353	0.263	-
C 1 0.255 0.255 17.997 <0.001 0.447	С	1	0.255	0.255	17.997	<0.001	0.447
T x C 1 0.064 0.064 4.524 0.049 0.112	ТхС	1	0.064	0.064	4.524	0.049	0.112
Resid. 15 0.212 0.014	Resid.	15	0.212	0.014			
Error	Error						
df SS MS		df	SS	MS			
WB 1 0.021 0.021	WB	1	0.021	0.021			
Week 2	Week 2						
df SS MS F p n <sup>2</sup>		df	SS	MS	F	p	$n^2$
T 1 0.043 0.043 1.337 0.266 -	Т	1	0.043	0.043	1.337	0.266	-
C 1 0.015 0.015 0.471 0.503 -	С	1	0.015	0.015	0.471	0.503	-
T x C 1 0.001 0.001 0.037 0.851 -	ТхС	1	0.001	0.001	0.037	0.851	-
Resid. 15 0.485 0.032	Resid.	15	0.485	0.032			
Fror	Frror						
df SS MS	LIIUI	df	SS	MS			
WB 1 0.024 0.024	WB	1	0.024	0.024			
Week 3							
df SS MS F $p \eta^2$		df	SS	MS	F	р	$\eta^2$
T 1 0.003 0.003 0.090 0.768 -	Т	1	0.003	0.003	0.090	0.768	-
C 1 0.008 0.008 0.273 0.609 -	С	1	0.008	0.008	0.273	0.609	-
T x C 1 0.104 0.104 3.728 0.073 -	ТхС	1	0.104	0.104	3.728	0.073	-
Resid. 15 0.420 0.028	Resid.	15	0.420	0.028			
Error	Error						
df SS MS		df	SS	MS			
WB 1 0.001 0.001	WB	1	0.001	0.001			

**Table 2.** ANOVA summary tables of the effects of *Carcinus* presence and temperature upon the sediment a) TOC, b)  $TO^{13}C$ , c) PLFA, d) <sup>13</sup>C-labelled PLFA concentration. *Abbreviations:* T = Temperature; C = Carcinus; WB = Water Bath.

a) Sediment TOC concentrations						
Т	df 1	<b>SS</b> 11.140	<b>MS</b> 11,145	F 3.585	<b>p</b> 0.078	$\eta^2$
Ċ	1	15.330	15.328	4.930	0.042	0.198
ТхС	1	0.020	0.021	0.007	0.935	_
Resid.	15	46.630	3.109			
Funan						
Error	df	22	MS			
WB	1	4.144	4.144			
b) Sed	limer	t TO <sup>13</sup> C	concen	tratio	ns	
	df	SS	MS	F	n	$n^2$
Т	1	2105	2105	5.107	0.039	0.149
С	1	103	103	0.249	0.625	-
ТхС	1	4939	4939	11.984	0.003	0.352
Resid.	15	6183	412			
Error						
	df	SS	MS			
WB	1	706	706			
c) Tot	al PL	<b>JFAs</b>				
	df	SS	MS	F	р	$\eta^2$
Т	1	0.296	0.297	2.806	0.115	-
С	1	0.006	0.006	0.053	0.822	-
ТхС	1	0.166	0.166	1.573	0.229	-
Resid.	15	1.581	0.105			
-						
Error	16	00	MC			
WD	<b>d</b> I 1	<b>88</b> 0.262	MS 0.262			
w D	1	0.302	0.302			
d) "C	-labe	lied PLF.	AS			
-	df	SS	MS	F	p	$\eta^2$
Т	1	45950	45950 2	0.887	< 0.001	0.472
C T = C	1	17/6 (197	1//6 (	J.807	0.383	-
	1 15	018/	018/ 2	2.812	0.114	-
Kesia.	13	33000	2200			
Error						
21101	df	SS	MS			
WB	1	10530	10530			

**Table 3.** ANOVA summary tables of the effects of *Carcinus* presence and temperature upon the relative contribution of a) bacterial fatty acids, b) <sup>13</sup>C-labelled bacterial fatty acids, c) microeukaryote fatty acids PUFAs and d) <sup>13</sup>C-labelled PUFAs, to the total PLFA and <sup>13</sup>C-labelled PLFA pools. *Abbreviations:* T = Temperature; C = Carcinus; WB = Water Bath.

a) Bacterial FAs					
	df	SS	MS F $p \eta^2$		
Т	1	25.96	25.956 10.942 <b>0.005 0.3</b> (	)1	
С	1	1.56	1.565 0.660 0.429 -		
ТхС	1	6.61	6.609 2.786 0.115 -		
Resid.	15	35.58	2.372		
Error		~~			
т	df	SS 16.46	MS		
	1	16.46	16.46		
b) <sup>13</sup> C	-labe	lled Bact	erial FAs		
	df	SS	MS F $p \eta^2$		
Т	1	315.5	315.52 7.888 <b>0.013 0.2</b> 4	19	
С	1	17.5	17.49 0.437 0.519 -		
ТхС	1	244.8	244.77 6.120 <b>0.026 0.1</b> 9	)4	
Resid.	15	600.0	40.00		
Error					
	df	SS	MS		
Т	1	86.2	86.2		
c) PU	FAs				
	df	SS	MS F $p \eta^2$		
Т	1	0.609	0.609 40.77 <b>&lt;0.001</b> 0.11	17	
С	1	2.421	2.421 162.02 <b>&lt;0.001</b> 0.46	53	
ТхС	1	1.644	1.644 110.02 <b>&lt; 0.001</b> 0.31	5	
Resid.	15	0.224	0.015		
Error					
LIIVI	df	SS	MS		
Temp	1	0.329	0.329		
d) <sup>13</sup> C	-labe	lled PUF	As		
	df	SS	MS F $p \eta^2$		
Т	1	0.539	0.539 1.559 0.231 -		
С	1	2.806	2.806 8.120 <b>0.012 0.16</b>	57	
ТхС	1	7.533	7.533 21.796 <b>&lt;0.001</b> 0.44	17	
Resid.	15	5.184	0.346		
Freeze					
FILOL.	Df	22	MS		
т	1	<b>33</b> 0 770	1 <b>VI</b> IS 0.770		
1	1	0.779	0.//9		

## **Figures**

Figure 1. Effects of *Carcinus* presence and temperature upon the microphytobenthos. Temporal changes in mean ( $\pm$  standard error) a) MPB Biomass (surficial chlorophyll a concentrations) and b) spatial variation in the MPB assemblage between *Carcinus* present (white +  $\clubsuit$ ) and absent (grey) treatments, under both ambient ( $\emptyset$ ) and warming ( $\clubsuit$ ) temperature treatments. Inserts show pooled means ( $\pm$  standard error) where significant independent effects of either *Carcinus* presence (white) / absence (grey) or temperature (labelled) where detected. Significance levels: \*\*\* p < 0.001; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\* p < 0.05. Where significant interactions were identified, groups labeled with the same lowercase letter are not significantly different (p > 0.05; Tukey's tests).



#### Figure 2. Effects of Carcinus presence and temperature upon the sediment

**geochemistry.** Mean ( $\pm$  standard error) concentrations of a) Total Organic Carbon b) <sup>13</sup>C-labelled Organic Carbon (TO<sup>13</sup>C) c) Total PLFAs and d) <sup>13</sup>C-labelled PLFAs between *Carcinus* present (white +  $\bigstar$ ) and absent (grey) treatments, under both ambient ( $\emptyset$ ) and warming ( $\clubsuit$ ) temperature treatments. Inserts show pooled means ( $\pm$ standard error) where significant independent effects of either *Carcinus* presence (white) / absence (grey) or temperature (labelled) where detected. Significance levels: \*\*\* p < 0.001; \*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05. Where significant interactions were identified, groups labeled with the same lowercase letter are not significantly different (p > 0.05; Tukey's tests).



**Figure 3. Effects of Carcinus presence and temperature upon the sediment microbial community.** Mean (± standard error) contributions of a) bacterial fatty

acids b) <sup>13</sup>C-labelled bacterial Fatty Acids, c) microeukaryote PUFAs and d) <sup>13</sup>C-labelled microeukaryote PUFAs [relative to the total PLFA or <sup>13</sup>C-labelled PLFA pools] between *Carcinus* present (white + w) and absent (grey) treatments, under both ambient ( $^{\circ}$ ) and warming ( $^{\circ}$ ) temperature treatments. Inserts show pooled means ( $\pm$  standard error) where significant independent effects of either *Carcinus* presence (white) / absence (grey) or temperature (labelled) where detected. Significance levels: \*\*\* *p* < 0.001; \*\* *p* < 0.01; \* *p* < 0.05. Where significant interactions were identified, groups labeled with the same lowercase letter are not significantly different (*p* > 0.05; Tukey's tests).

