Allometric scaling of faunal-mediated ecosystem functioning: a case study on two bioturbators in contrasting sediments
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Highlights

- Allometric scaling predicts faunal population effects on seafloor metabolism
- Stimulatory effects on sediment metabolism depend on species bioturbation traits
- Stimulatory faunal effects on sediment metabolism can vary between sand and mud
- Bio-irrigation effects on seafloor metabolism depend on species and sediment type
Abstract

Soft-sediment biogeochemistry is influenced by the bioturbation activity of benthic invertebrates. We investigated whether the effect of two macrobenthos bioturbators, *Limecola balthica* and *Hediste diversicolor*, on sediment oxygen uptake can be described by allometric principles of metabolic activity scaling with animal body size and population biomass. Microcosms containing reconstructed populations to control density and individual body size were used to compare bioturbation effects and allometric scaling principles between a sandy and muddy sediment. Both species facilitated oxygen uptake in both sediment types, and a major portion of the variance in sediment metabolism (60-98%) could be explained by the per capita body size and density, and total population biomass. The allometric relationship with the stimulated sediment metabolism was similar in sand and mud for *Hediste* and strongly related to the increasing burrow ventilation rate with population biomass. *Limecola* irrigated less in mud but stimulated sediment metabolism more in mud in comparison to in sand. We discuss how physico-chemical differences between both sediment types, possible changes in activity, and size-dependent irrigation dynamics can explain the variable effects of *Limecola* on sediment metabolism. Overall, we provide empirical evidence that allometric laws can be used to upscale bioturbation effects on ecosystem functioning in marine soft sediments from the individual to the population level.
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1. Introduction

Estuaries and coastal marine ecosystems are among the most productive biomes of the world and serve as important life-support ecosystems (Costanza et al., 1997). The biogeochemical cycling of elements that support these productive food webs is influenced by different seabed biota whose activities are directly and indirectly involved in the burial and mineralization of the organic matter settling to the seabed (Kristensen, 2000a; Levinton, 2011; Meysman et al., 2006). Whereas microbial organisms directly govern a variety of biogeochemical reactions, macrobenthos are a group of large (i.e. retained on a 1-mm mesh-sized sieve) sediment-dwelling animals that affect benthic metabolism via aerobic respiration and indirectly via their bioturbation activities. The aerobic metabolism in the sediment community that is stimulated by macrobenthos bioturbation can outweigh the direct O₂ consumption by macrobenthos for respiration purposes (Glud 2008 and references therein). Bioturbation encompasses two main processes: particle reworking and bio-irrigation (Kristensen et al. 2012). Particle reworking results from a series of sediment mixing processes that transport particles and associated living and non-living substances through faunal feeding, defaecation and burrowing activities. Bio-irrigation is the ventilation of burrows with water by the fauna, providing dissolved substances for respiration and particles for feeding. Bioturbation therefore redistributes reduced compounds and aerates the sediment, thereby providing microbial habitats for intensified biogeochemistry (e.g. Mermillod-Blondin et al., 2004; Nielsen et al. 2004; Volkenborn et al. 2012).

Activity of organisms relate to their metabolism that scales with individual body size or mass (Brown et al., 2004; Kooijman 2000). An allometric scaling exponent of approximately 0.75 is evidenced across taxonomic groups, and this ‘universal’ 3/4 –power law of metabolic rate is often considered as one of the fundamental principles in ecology (West et al. 1997). However, existing taxonomic, environmental and phenotypic (e.g. Barneche et al., 2014; Yvon-Durocher et al., 2012; Clark et al., 2016) variability in metabolic scaling exponents within and among species support ongoing debate (e.g. Glazier, 2015), and other theories that allow for more dynamic body size scaling relationships in function of life stage and environmental conditions have equally found their application in ecology (e.g. Kooijman, 2000). Yet if the bioturbation activity of macrobenthos is proportional to its energetic requirements, the cascading facilitative effect on sediment metabolism can theoretically be assumed to change proportionally to the metabolic rate of the bioturbator. Cozzoli et al. (2018, 2019) support this theory by empirically demonstrating that sediment resuspension can be ascribed to the overall metabolic rate of the bioturbating populations. Furthermore, Wrede et al. (2018) successfully applied a scaling of 0.75 to weigh the effect of body mass on bio-irrigation rates across a range of macrobenthos species populations and communities. The above examples support the idea that (1) an allometric scaling of macrobenthos body size on sediment metabolism can be assumed, and (2) that this metabolic body size
relationship can be scaled as the product of the individual metabolic rate and the population density. However, species metabolic rates depend on abiotic conditions, such as temperature (Clark and Johnston, 1999) and pH (Ong et al., 2017), and variable outcomes of bioturbation effects on sediment metabolism can thus likewise be expected. Indeed, bioturbation activity responds quickly to changes in temperature to support elevated physiological demands at higher temperature (Ouellette et al., 2004), and in general bioturbation rates can respond quickly to changing environmental conditions (Levinton and Kelaher, 2004; Van Colen, Ong et al., 2020, Mestdagh et al. 2020a). Besides inter- and intraspecific variability in stimulatory effects on sediment metabolism related to species biological (e.g. body size) and functional (e.g. sediment reworking mode) traits (Queirós et al. 2013), the local sediment habitat can be important as well. For example, stimulatory effects of macrobenthos on sediment metabolism were shown to be limited in permeable, well-oxygenated sediments as compared to cohesive, organically enriched sediments (Mermillod-Blondin and Rosenberg, 2006). In conclusion, the contribution of macrobenthos to sediment metabolism may vary between species and change considerably over time and across space (Godbold et al., 2011; Needham et al., 2010).

Oxygen is the most favourable electron acceptor in biogeochemical reactions, and the sediment community O$_2$ consumption (SCOC) is the most widely used measure of aerobic benthic metabolism (Glud, 2008; Thamdrup and Canfield, 2011). SCOC represents a good proxy for the total benthic carbon mineralization rate or sediment metabolism (Canfield et al., 1993) and integrates the re-oxidation of reduced metabolites and the aerobic respiration of benthic organisms. In this study, we quantified the influence of the ragworm Hediste (formerly Nereis) diversicolor and the Baltic tellin Limecola (formerly Macoma) balthica (hereafter referred to as Hediste and Limecola) on the sediment metabolism of an estuarine muddy and sandy sediment. Both species are common in temperate estuaries where they typically constitute a significant part of the macrobenthos biomass (e.g. Ysebaert et al., 2003) and bioturbate the sediment matrix (Fang et al. 2019). Microcosms with various densities and sizes of animals were used to quantify the stimulatory effect of both species on sediment metabolism (measured as SCOC) in both sediment types. We hypothesized that (1) allometric principles of metabolic scaling with population density can be applied to quantify the faunal effects on sediment metabolism; but also that (2) dissimilar porewater solute dynamics related to different bioturbation modalities of both species (see 2.1), and (3) contrasting physico-chemical conditions between sandy and muddy sediments, would affect faunal-mediated sediment metabolism. Finally, we evaluated whether the stimulated sediment metabolism can be explained by the variability in bio-irrigation measured across microcosms.
2. Materials and methods

2.1 Model organisms

*Hediste* is a highly mobile polychaete that lives in a mucus-lined gallery of semi-permanent U or Y shaped burrows extending 6 to 12 cm into the sediment (Davey, 1994). Muscular movements of the body create currents of oxygen-rich water and suspended food particles into the burrow; active ventilation periods last about 10 minutes and are alternated with 5-minute resting periods (Riisgård 1991; Kristensen, 2001). *Hediste* obtains food from deposit and suspension feeding, as well as via active scavenging and predation on small invertebrates (Scaps 2002 and references therein). The species’ sediment reworking and ventilation activities affect other benthos populations, biogeochemistry and sediment erodibility (Hiddink et al., 2002; Kristensen and Mikkelsen, 2003; Widdows et al., 2009). *Limecola* is a facultative surface deposit feeding tellinid bivalve, foraging on microphytobenthos, bacteria and labile organic matter present on the sediment surface or suspended in the water column (Kamermans, 1994; Rossi et al., 2004). The living depth in the sediment depends on the length of the inhalant siphon (Zwarts et al., 1994) that is used to feed and respire on the sediment-water interface. *Limecola* intermittently irrigates the sediment during feeding and respiration via the release of water and solutes through the exhalent siphon just below the sediment surface (Volkenborn et al., 2012), thereby affecting sediment biogeochemistry (Michaud et al., 2006). Resting periods between the irrigation bouts are short (< 2 minutes) and can result in an almost continuous oxygenation in permeable sediments (Volkenborn et al., 2012).

2.2 Sediment and animal collection

Sediments were collected in May 2017 from the Paulina intertidal flat in the polyhaline reach of the Scheldt estuary, SW Netherlands. There are a variety of habitats on this tidal flat, varying from mud to sands almost devoid of silt (Gallucci et al., 2005; Van Colen et al. 2010). A sandy (51°21' 00.2" N, 3° 43' 54.9" E) and a muddy location (51° 20' 57.1" N, 3° 43' 35.4" E) were chosen. The sediment at the sandy location had a higher permeability and oxygen penetration depth but a lower organic carbon content as compared to the muddy location (Table 1). Sediments were collected through coring (inner diameter: 9 cm) and subsequently sectioned into 0-1, 1-2, 2-4, 4-6 cm sediment fractions before macrobenthos and large particles were removed through wet sieving (1 mm mesh size). Each sediment section was incubated at 15°C in aerated seawater collected from the sampling location and allowed to settle prior to reconstruction of the vertical sediment matrix in a rectangular polypropylene box (19.4×29.4×15 cm). Therefore, the 2-4 cm layer was put on top of the deepest layer (4-6 cm) followed by the subsequent deposits of the 1-2 cm and 0-1 cm sediment layers. For each sampling location, two boxes with
reconstructed sediment without macrobenthos were acclimated in aerated seawater at 15°C for 4-5 weeks before the start of the experiments to maximize stabilisation of the sediment matrix and restoration of biogeochemical gradients before usage in the microcosms (see 2.3).

*Limecola* and *Hediste* are ubiquitous and abundant in the polyhaline reach of the Scheldt estuary, occupying both muddy and sandy sediments. In the polyhaline zone of the Scheldt estuary, mean density of *Hediste* is 466 ind. m\(^{-2}\) with maxima up to 3928 ind.m\(^{-2}\) (corresponding to 13.7 g ash-free dry weight (AFDW) m\(^{-2}\)), while *Limecola* attains a mean density of 855 ind. m\(^{-2}\) with a maximal density up to 5217 ind. m\(^{-2}\) (corresponding to 15.9 g. AFDW m\(^{-2}\); after Ysebaert et al., 1998). Individuals of *Hediste* and *Limecola* were collected on 15\(^{th}\) June 2017 and left to acclimatize in the natural sediments at 15°C in containers with aerated seawater collected from the sampling location (salinity = 20) until the start of the experiments, which begun within two weeks after collection from the field.

### 2.3 Experimental design

To provide mechanistic insight into the relationship between aerobic sediment metabolism, individual body size, population density, and sediment type, we experimentally tested single-species treatments spanning a broad range of natural body sizes and densities in a muddy and sandy sediment. For each sediment type × species combination, the total sediment O\(_2\) consumption and bio-irrigation were measured in plexiglass cylindrical microcosms (height 12.2 cm, inner diameter 3.6 cm) collected through coring from the boxes with macrobenthos-free sediment (depth 6 cm) and overtopped with *in situ* collected 1-mm sieved seawater. Each series included in total eleven microcosms; one without macrobenthos and ten with combinations of variable densities and a gradient of similarly sized individuals per treatment, yielding a natural density and biomass range for both species (Table 2a, b).

The microcosm without macrobenthos was included to distinguish the faunal stimulatory effect by *Hediste* and *Limecola* from the single contribution of microbes and meiofauna activities. The microcosms were aerated, and the organisms were carefully put on top of the sediment and left to acclimatize and burrow overnight into the sediment.

The O\(_2\) consumption in the water column was measured using O\(_2\) optodes (Pyroscience OXROB10) connected to a FireSting O\(_2\) meter (FSO\(_2\)-4). After a two-point calibration, each O\(_2\) optode was inserted through a rubber cap keeping the microcosms airtight during O\(_2\) consumption measurements. Microcosms were put on a platform shaker to assure homogenous mixing of O\(_2\) in the water column; the incubation lasted till O\(_2\) concentration had dropped to 60% of the initial concentration. Sediment oxygen consumption was calculated from the decline in dissolved O\(_2\) concentrations over time, considering both the sediment surface and the volume of the overlying water. Macrobenhos-mediated O\(_2\) uptake in the microcosms was calculated by subtracting the O\(_2\) uptake measured in the microcosm
without macrobenthos from that experiment. This faunal-mediated \( \text{O}_2 \) uptake includes both \textit{Hediste} or \textit{Limecola} respiration and stimulation of respiration by bacteria and meiobenthos.

Following the SCOC measurements, microcosms were aerated and left to acclimatise overnight. The following day, seawater was replaced by an aerated solution of seawater and uranine (10 \( \mu \text{g.L}^{-1} \) \( \text{C}_{26}\text{H}_{20}\text{NaO}_{5} \)). Subsequently, 1.5-ml water samples were taken from the water column by Pasteur pipettes at 0, 2, 4, 22.5, 24 h and the uranine concentrations were measured at 520 nm using a Turner QuanTech Digital Fluorometer (FM 109530-33) with 490 nm as the excitation wavelength. Uranine fluxes were estimated from the linear decrease of water column tracer concentration over time and used as a proxy for sediment community irrigation rates (Meysman et al. 2007), after standardization per surface area.

Total biomass (g AFDW.m\(^{-2}\)) of \textit{Hediste} and \textit{Limecola} individuals from each microcosm was measured at the end of the irrigation measurements by loss on ignition after muffling of dried organisms for 3 h at 550°C. Individual body size (mg AFDW) was estimated by dividing the total biomass per treatment by the number of individuals.

2.4 Data analysis

Following ecological scaling theory (e.g. Brown et al., 2004), the mediating effect on sediment metabolism performed by a homogeneous population can be expressed as a power function \( Y = aM^bA \) [1], where \( Y \) is the faunal-mediated \( \text{O}_2 \) uptake, and \( M \) and \( A \) are the respective individual body size (mg AFDW) and the density of the examined animals; \( a \) is the coefficient quantified in the model, and \( b \) is the allometric exponent relating body size to individual activity. Equation [1] can be modified to include population biomass \( W \): \( Y = cW^d \) [2], where \( c \) is the quantified coefficient and \( d \) is the biomass-dependent scaling exponent.

Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to compare the faunal-mediated \( \text{O}_2 \) uptake between sediment types while controlling for the biomass range across treatments. Biomass of \textit{Hediste} and \textit{Limecola} were normalized using log transformation in all experiments to meet assumptions of the homogeneity of regression slopes and the homogeneity of variances. Finally, simple linear regression was used to determine to what extent the variance of faunal-mediated \( \text{O}_2 \) uptake can be explained by bio-irrigation of the sediment community. P-P plots and scatterplots of residuals against the explanatory variable revealed that no further data transformation was needed to meet assumptions of normality and homoscedasticity. The level for statistical significance was set at 0.05 in all analyses.
3. Results and discussion

Sediment $O_2$ consumption by microbial and meio-benthos communities alone was $8.8 \pm 2.3$ SD mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ (n = 2) and $1.9 \pm 0.3$ SD mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ (n = 2) in muddy and sandy sediments, respectively, which was marginal in comparison to the SCOC rates in microcosms with macro-benthos (Figure 1a,b). In situ measurements and experimental data show that faunal respiration typically accounts for 10-40% of the faunal-mediated $O_2$ consumption (e.g. Glud et al. 2003; Glud, 2008; Dunn et al. 2009; Kristensen 1985); the remaining portion is then ascribed to the stimulated microbial activity related to the bioturbation activity, i.e. particle mixing and bio-irrigation. Bio-irrigation rates by meio-benthos alone were $12.7 \pm 0.2$ SD L.m$^{-2}$.d$^{-1}$ (n = 2) and $2.7 \pm 1.0$ SD L.m$^{-2}$.d$^{-1}$ (n = 2) in muddy and sandy sediments, respectively. The additional irrigation by *Hediste* and *Limecola* explained a significant portion of the faunal-mediated $O_2$ uptake ($R^2 = 0.55 – 0.77$, p < 0.01) in all experimental series, except for the stimulated sediment metabolism by *Limecola* in the muddy sediments ($R^2 = 0.10$, p = 0.37) (Figure 2a,b). Irrigation rates for *Limecola* across body size × density combinations in the muddy sediments were generally lower as compared to the sandy sediments, and in the same order of magnitude as for irrigation by meio-benthos alone. Irrigation by *Limecola* mainly occurs when the water that is inhaled during feeding is injected into the sediment via the exhalent siphon (Volkenborn et al. 2012). It is therefore likely that *Limecola* individuals reduced feeding (and irrigating) events in organically enriched muddy sediment as compared to the food poor sandy sediment. We furthermore hypothesize that limited porewater advection (e.g. Hedman et al., 2011) reduced the relative importance of bio-irrigation for organic matter mineralisation in the muddy sediment. Despite the limited contribution of bio-irrigation, the *Limecola*-mediated sediment $O_2$ uptake was significantly higher in muddy as compared to sandy sediments when considering the population biomass variation across treatments ($0.9 \pm 0.3$ mmol O$_2$ gAFDW$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$ and $0.4 \pm 0.2$ mmol O$_2$ gAFDW$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$ in muddy and sandy sediments respectively; ANCOVA: Sediment type p < 0.001, Table 3), which might be explained by the higher availability of reduced metabolites in muddy sediments (e.g. Kristensen et al. 2000b). In comparison, the stimulated $O_2$ uptake by *Hediste* was higher than that of *Limecola* ($2.6 \pm 1.8$ mmol O$_2$ gAFDW$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$ and $2.5 \pm 0.9$ mmol O$_2$ gAFDW$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$ in muddy and sandy sediments respectively), but did not vary between sediment types (ANCOVA: Sediment type p = 0.678, Table 3). The stronger enhancement of aerobic sediment metabolism by gallery-burrowing polychaetes in comparison to biodiffusing bivalves corroborates earlier findings by Michaud et al. (2005) for populations from the St. Lawrence estuary. The periodic ventilation of the deep *Hediste* gallery burrow system (Kristensen, 1981; Pishedda et al., 2012) in comparison to the more continuous diffusion that is limited to the surface sediment by *Limecola* (Volkenborn et al. 2012) can explain this species effect. The creation of the gallery burrow system expands the sediment–seawater interface for solute exchange several-fold, and redox oscillations such as those generated through periodic
ventilation activities are known to strongly stimulate microbial organic matter mineralisation (e.g. Aller, 1994). Indeed, *Hediste* was detected as a key irrigator in intertidal sediments along the Scheldt estuary (Fang et al., 2019), where irrigation contributed significantly to the sediment metabolism (Mestdagh et al., 2020b). The fact that oxygen dynamics generated by *Hediste* irrigation are restricted to the burrow lumen and a few mm in the burrow wall (Pischedda et al. 2012; Nielsen et al. 2004) may explain why cascading effects on sediment metabolism did not differ between sediments despite differences in sediment permeability and organic matter content (Table 1). However, longer incubations could have yielded different results because sediment type can affect body condition, which in turn influences burrowing depth (Esselink and Zwarts, 1989). Furthermore, the increasing depth and complexity of burrow structures with incubation time is known to increase oxygen uptake in marine sediments (e.g. Michaud et al. 2005, Gilbert et al. 1994, 1995).

For both species the faunal-mediated \(O_2\) consumption followed an allometric power law as a function of body size and density in both sediment types, supporting the metabolic theory of ecology (Brown et al. 2004) (Table 4). For both sediment types, the model based on population biomass explained the variability in *Hediste*-mediated \(O_2\) uptake better (adjusted \(R^2 > 0.95\)) as compared to the allometric model that considers the scaled body size component and population density (adjusted \(R^2 < 0.85\)). This suggests that for this species, non-linear density effects on solute exchange may exist, such as e.g. space limitation for burrow construction (Aller, 2004). The biomass size scaling exponents for *Hediste* (0.58 - 0.71, Table 4) are in accordance with the quantified relationships between oxygen consumption and body weight in eight marine polychaetes (0.61-0.69; Shumway, 1979), further supporting the metabolic basis of the stimulatory effect on sediment metabolism. In contrast, the predictive power of both allometric models for *Limecola* was similar, suggesting that density-dependent interference amongst *Limecola* individuals is less important than for a more mobile species like *Hediste*. On the other hand, the stimulated sediment metabolism in function of body size and density or population biomass of *Limecola* was clearly better explained for the muddy (adjusted \(R^2 > 0.88\)) than for the sandy sediments (adjusted \(R^2 < 0.64\)) (Table 4). This may result from constraints on depth distribution set by body size, and from environmental constraints on how metabolic activity and bioturbation affect sediment metabolism. That is, as shorter siphon lengths in small individuals decrease burrowing depth (Zwarts et al., 1994), the shallow advective irrigation flows generated by smaller individuals might not have contributed importantly to sediment metabolism in the sandy sediment that is characterized by a deeper diffusive oxygen penetration (Table 1).
4. Conclusion

We demonstrate that ecological scaling laws based on body size allometry can be applied to predict sediment metabolism based on the bioturbation effect of two macrobenthos species with different sediment particle reworking and ventilation traits. Similarly, Cozzoli et al. (2019) found that allometric principles of metabolic activity scaling and population size explained the bioturbation impact of different macrobenthos species on sediment resuspension. Allometric laws based on body size and population density can thus be used to upscale species effects on ecosystem functioning in marine soft sediments from the individual to the population level. However, this work also corroborates earlier findings that sediment texture can modify bioturbation effects on ecosystem functioning (e.g. Li et al., 2017; Joensuu et al., 2018; Van Colen et al., 2013), depending on how species interact with their environment. This demonstrates that insights into how environmental conditions can modify organism activity and metabolism (e.g. Halsey et al. 2015; Cornwell et al. 2020), and the cascading effects this may have on ecosystem functioning, are needed before allometric extrapolations can be applied to larger spatial (e.g. the entire estuary) and temporal scales, encompassing e.g. gradients in salinity, temperature and sediment composition.
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Table 1. Physico-chemical sediment characteristics for the two sampling locations: median grain size (in μm), mud content (in % < 63 μm), total organic carbon (in %), permeability (in m²) and oxygen penetration depth (in mm). Data were derived from a seasonal survey in the Scheldt estuary in 2015-2016 (Mestdagh et al. 2020b). All values are means ± standard deviations for characteristics obtained in September 2015, December 2015, March 2016, and June 2016. The total organic carbon (TOC) (FLASH 2000 NC Analyzer, Thermo Scientific, Wilmington, DE, United States), sediment grain size and mud content (Mastersizer 2000 particle analyser, Malvern Panalytical, Malvern, United Kingdom) were analysed by homogenising a 10 cm deep sample. Permeability was calculated based on Eggleston and Rojstaczer (1998): \( KH = 1.1019 \times 10^3 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{s} \times d_{10}^2 \times v \), where \( KH \) is the permeability (in m²), \( d_{10} \) is the first decile of the grain size distribution (in m), and \( v \) is kinematic viscosity (in m² s⁻¹) calculated from water temperature and salinity. Oxygen penetration depths were derived from the vertical oxygen profiles using Unisense oxygen microsensors (type OX100) in vertical increments of 250 μm.

Table 2: Overview of macrofaunal density (Ind.m⁻²), biomass (g AFDW.m⁻²) and individual body size (mg AFDW ind⁻¹) in the different treatments. Several combinations of densities and individual body sizes of the target organisms (a) \( H. \) diversicolor and (b) \( L. \) balthica were tested according to their natural density range in sandy and muddy sediments in the polyhaline zone of the Scheldt estuary.

Table 3: ANCOVA results in species subsets: (a) \( H. \) diversicolor and (b) \( L. \) balthica. Faunal-mediated \( \text{O}_2 \) uptake is the dependent variable, sediment type is the factor, and biomass is the covariate. Once the significant effect of sediment type was found in the \( L. \) balthica dataset, the estimated marginal means were analysed.

Table 4: Summary of allometric models to predict faunal-mediated \( \text{O}_2 \) uptake (mmol m⁻² d⁻¹).
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Sandy</th>
<th>Muddy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median grain size (µm)</td>
<td>226 ± 3</td>
<td>46 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud content (%)</td>
<td>3,7 ± 1,2</td>
<td>64,8 ± 1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC (%)</td>
<td>0,2 ± 0,1</td>
<td>1,2 ± 0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeability (m²)</td>
<td>8,17 $10^{11}$ ± 1,1 $10^{10}$</td>
<td>7,17 $10^{14}$ ± 1,9 $10^{14}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygen penetration depth (mm)</td>
<td>7,7 ± 3,2</td>
<td>3,9 ± 0,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

#### (a) *Hediste diversicolor*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Biomass</th>
<th>Body size</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Biomass</th>
<th>Body size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3774</td>
<td>114.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4717</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3774</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4717</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3774</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5660</td>
<td>127.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>5660</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (b) *Limecola balthica*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Biomass</th>
<th>Body size</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Biomass</th>
<th>Body size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2802</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2802</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2802</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4670</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4717</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4670</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>4717</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5604</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5660</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Hediste diversicolor</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>36660.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18330.4</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4416.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4416.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomass</td>
<td>36228.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36228.7</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment type</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>5897.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>346.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>197874.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>42558.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R Squared = 0.86 (Adjusted R² = 0.85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b) Limecola balthica</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>991.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>495.6</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomass</td>
<td>934.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>934.4</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment type</td>
<td>344.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>344.1</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>167.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5886.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>1158.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R Squared = 0.86 (Adjusted R² = 0.84)
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Sediment type</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Limecola balthica</em></td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muddy</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hediste diversicolor</em></td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muddy</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figures

Figure 1: Faunal-mediated O\textsubscript{2} uptake (mmol.m\textsuperscript{-2}.d\textsuperscript{-1}) measured in each microcosm as a function of *Hediste* (a) and *Limecola* (b) biomass (gAFDW.m\textsuperscript{-2}). Allometric model fits $Y = cW^d$ (see Table 3) are presented in blue (muddy sediment) and red (sandy sediment).

Figure 2: Scatterplots of faunal-mediated O\textsubscript{2} uptake (mmol.m\textsuperscript{-2}.d\textsuperscript{-1}) against *Hediste* (a) and *Limecola* (b) – mediated uranine flux (L.m\textsuperscript{-2}.d\textsuperscript{-1}) measured in muddy (blue) and sandy (red) sediments. Linear fits and regression statistics are presented in the figure legend.
Figure 1

**a)**

*Limecola balthica*

- Sandy: $y = 1.29x^{0.66}$ (R² = 0.63, p = 0.006)
- Muddy: $y = 2.58x^{0.62}$ (R² = 0.93, p < 0.001)

**b)**

*Hediste diversicolor*

- Sandy: $y = 9.75x^{0.53}$ (R² = 0.96, p < 0.001)
- Muddy: $y = 6.25x^{0.71}$ (R² = 0.99, p < 0.001)
Figure 2

(a) *Limnocal balthica*

- Sandy
- Muddy

$y = 0.8x - 2.27$ ($R^2 = 0.55, p = 0.01$)

$y = 0.44x + 13.05$ ($R^2 = 0.1, p = 0.37$)

(b) *Hediste diversicolor*

- Sandy
- Muddy

$y = 7.74x - 65.56$ ($R^2 = 0.72, p < 0.001$)

$y = 10.81x - 74.53$ ($R^2 = 0.77, p = 0.001$)