1	Running Head: Effects of matrix and environmental variability
2	MACROFAUNAL RESPONSES TO STRUCTURAL COMPLEXITY ARE MEDIATED
3	BY ENVIRONMENTAL VARIABILITY AND SURROUNDING HABITATS
4	Miguel G. Matias ^{1, *}
5	
6	¹ Centre for Research on Ecological Impacts of Coastal Cities, Marine Ecology Laboratories
7	A11, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia;
8	
9	Email address: miguel.matias@univ-montp2.fr
10	Keywords: habitat; benthic; context; matrix; coralline-turf;
11	Word Count: abstract (248), whole manuscript (5500); references (55), figures (4), tables (4)
12	
13	*Present address: Miguel Matias; Institut des Sciences de l'Evolution, UMR 5554, CNRS,
14	Université Montpellier 2, CC 065, Place Eugène Bataillon, 34095 Montpellier Cedex 05,
15	France. Tel: +33 4 67 14 92 38; Fax: +33 4 67 14 40 61
16	

ABSTRACT

18 Investigating the context that surrounds each habitat is crucial to understand local 19 responses of assemblages of species to habitats. Here, I tested whether responses of benthic 20 macro-invertebrates to the structural complexity of experimental habitats were mediated by 21 the characteristics of their surrounding habitats (i.e. rockpools or emergent-rock surfaces). 22 Each type of surrounding habitat provided particular biotic (e.g. algal growth) and abiotic 23 (e.g. temperature, water movement, etc.) conditions that were expected to affect benthic 24 assemblages. The results show that: 1) composition of entire assemblages was affected by the 25 matrix and type of habitat; 2) effects of the matrix on the number of species varied depending 26 on the different types of habitats; 3) abundant species showed specific responses to type of 27 habitat, independently of the matrix; and that 4) relationships between numbers of species and 28 two major environmental variables (i.e. micro-algal biomass and sediment) varied depending 29 on the type of habitats and the surrounding matrix. Generally, these findings demonstrate that 30 understanding the consequences of the spatial structure of these habitats is essential to 31 advance our knowledge on patterns of abundance and distributions of functionally important 32 species and ultimately the structure of intertidal assemblages.

INTRODUCTION

35 Ecologists have long been interested in species' associations with their habitats with 36 the aim of understanding spatial variability in abundances of species (e.g. MacArthur and 37 MacArthur 1961; MacArthur 1964; Pianka 1966). Habitats with different physical structure 38 generally offer different resources (i.e. food, shelter, etc.) that are, in turn, exploited by 39 different species (e.g. Downes et al. 2000). Local variation in the physical structure of 40 habitats does not, however, completely explain the distribution and abundance of species at 41 coarser scales, because the colonization of habitats is often greatly influenced by processes 42 operating at regional scales (e.g. MacArthur and Wilson 1967). Generally, the realization that 43 habitats may have different degrees of isolation depending on the nature of the surrounding 44 matrix has prompted a whole body of work investigating the role of the matrix in which 45 habitats are embedded (i.e. landscape context, Mazerolle and Villard 1999) and how it 46 mediates the level of connectivity with neighbouring habitats (i.e. "connectivity is the degree 47 to which the landscape facilitates or impedes movement among resource patches"; Taylor et 48 al. 1993). The extent to which connectivity is altered depends on scale and the organisms' 49 perception of changes in spatial patterns (e.g. Kotliar and Wiens 1990; Wiens 2002), the 50 spatial configuration of patches (e.g. Roberts and Poore 2006), the surrounding matrix (e.g. 51 Crowe 1996; Ricketts 2001; Debinski 2006; Tanner 2006) and dispersal among patches (e.g. 52 Ewers and Didham 2006).

53 Most organisms are more likely to interact with organisms in neighbouring habitats 54 than with more distant ones (Tilman 1994). Such interactions with surrounding habitats are 55 particularly important for sessile organisms (e.g. corals, Karlson and Cornell 2002; terrestrial 56 plants, Pacala and Silander 1990; macroalgae, Goodsell and Connell 2008; bryozoans, 57 terHorst and Dudgeon 2009). The magnitude of interactions with surrounding habitats across

habitat boundaries is also dependent on the quality of these surrounding habitats (Fagan et al. 58 59 1999; Ries and Sisk 2004). Dispersal and resource-use is strongly influenced by the spatial 60 structure of neighbouring habitats, which determines the structure and dynamics of natural 61 assemblages (Tilman 1994; Loreau and Mouquet 1999; Ricketts 2001). Empirical studies on 62 patterns of diversity and distribution of species in naturally isolated patches of habitat have 63 shown that the nature of the surrounding matrix determines the effective level of isolation of 64 natural patches of habitat (Ricketts 2001). Furthermore, the extent to which the surrounding 65 landscape, i.e. the matrix (Ricketts 2001; Murphy and Lovett-Doust 2004), may function as a 66 barrier to movement of animals between patches of habitats may depend on the extent and 67 type of habitat it contains (e.g. Goodsell and Connell 2008; Johnson et al. 1992). Investigating the matrix that surrounds each habitat is therefore crucial to understand local responses of 68 69 assemblages of species to habitats.

70 Historically, most studies of the roles of matrix have been done in terrestrial systems, 71 although there is growing evidence that matrix habitats are also a fundamental component of 72 connectivity (i.e. dispersal) within marine systems (e.g. Tanner 2006; Goodsell and Connell 73 2008; Hovel and Fonseca 2005). In marine systems, connectivity between patches of habitat 74 is generally thought to be great due to many marine species having planktonic larval stages 75 (Scheltema 1974). Consequently, most research on the effects of the type of the surrounding 76 matrix has been focused on differences in connectivity and colonization of patches. For 77 example, the matrix and structure of seagrass patches are important determinants of spatial 78 patterns and variability of fish assemblages (Gullstrom et al. 2008) and marine crustaceans 79 (Skilleter et al. 2005). Nevertheless, experimental manipulations to test hypotheses about the 80 effects of spatial arrangement and composition of habitats remain scarce (but see Tanner 81 2006; Goodsell and Connell 2008; Hovel and Lipcius 2001; Macreadie et al. 2009). It is

difficult to separate the effects of the matrix from those of changes in the habitats themselves (Macreadie et al. 2009; Macreadie et al. 2010). For example, finding differences among assemblages in seagrass patches near and far from mangroves could not be solely attributed to the effects of the matrix (i.e. mangroves). The seagrass patches – the focal habitat – could also be altered by their proximity to mangroves, which ultimately could explain the differences in assemblages. It is, therefore, essential to separate these effects to understand better how the matrix affects species' responses to different types of habitats.

89 Here, I investigated the responses of benthic assemblages to structural complexity 90 under different surrounding habitats. In particular, I tested the hypothesis that assemblages 91 should vary according to the matrix in which patches of habitats are embedded (Hypothesis 92 1). Alternatively, not all types of habitats may be affected in the same way by their matrix. 93 This model would be supported if there were an interaction between effects of type of habitat 94 and context (Hypothesis 2). I tested these predictions by deploying two types of experimental 95 habitats in two different matrices: rockpools and emergent-rock surfaces (i.e. open rock). 96 These two different matrices have consequences for assemblages colonizing experimental 97 habitats because it affects biotic (e.g. algal growth) and abiotic (e.g. temperature, water 98 movement, etc.) factors: rockpools are completely submerged during the tidal cycle and are 99 often covered by loosely compacted turfs (Akioka et al. 1999; Hull 1999; Worthington and 100 Fairweather 1989), whilst emergent-rock surfaces are exposed to air during low tides and thus 101 subject to desiccation. For example, the structure of biogenic habitats is affected by their 102 position in the shore (e.g. length and packedness of coralline turfs; Akioka et al. 1999), which, 103 in turn, might determine how organisms use these habitats (Worthington and Fairweather 1989). Such variability in the nature of the surrounding habitats is determinant for benthic 104

assemblages colonizing biogenic habitats since it affects colonization or movement oforganisms in focal patches of habitat (e.g. Cole 2009).

107

108

METHODS

Experimental design

109 This study was done on intertidal rock-platforms at the Cape Banks Special Scientific 110 Research Area, Botany Bay (NSW, Australia) from November 2009 to February 2010. I 111 surveyed areas 100's of metres apart with similar orientation and exposure to waves on gently 112 sloping low-shore rock platforms or large boulders, 0.3 to 0.6 m above mean low water. In 113 these areas, I selected rockpool and emergent-rock locations that had patches of *Corallina* 114 officinalis L. Rockpools were of similar size and depth; small (area $< 1 \text{ m}^2$) and/or deep 115 rockpools (depth > 0.5 m) were not included since these characteristics can have major effects 116 on the assemblages of macro-algae (Martins et al. 2007; Underwood and Skilleter 1996). 117 Emergent-rock surfaces were selected in areas that were completely emerged during low 118 tides. In total, there were 10 separate locations: 5 rockpools and 5 emergent-rock areas. 119 Thus, the factor *location* was necessarily nested in the type of matrix. Note that it would not 120 be feasible to find enough individual rockpools of appropriate dimensions to accommodate 121 each experimental habitat (see details below) separately. To control for possible confounding 122 effects of shading and wave-action, all locations were approximately horizontally oriented 123 and subject to moderate wave action. Care was taken to ensure that rockpool and emergent-124 rock locations were large enough to accommodate all experimental units while keeping 125 distances between experimental units similar to those outside rockpools (i.e. > 50 cm apart).

Experimental habitats were independently attached and interspersed amongst algal
turfs in rockpool or emergent-rock, using stainless steel screws and rubber washers.

128 Experimental habitats are uniform and have same general history (e.g. they are the same age), 129 which reduces the variability among experimental units (Underwood and Chapman 2006). 130 This is a central aspect of this study as it removes the confounding effect of variability in 131 natural coralline turfs between rockpools and on emergent rock, which would have 132 confounded the experiment because of structure of these turfs determines assemblages that 133 colonize these habitats (Kelaher et al. 2001). Thus, using experimental habitats, the 134 variability between assemblages in rockpools or on emergent-rock should be attributable to 135 environmental variables or resources associated with these surrounding habitats, rather than 136 any differences in structure of the focal patches of habitat.

137

Experimental habitats

138 Two types of artificial turf (Grassman Pty Ltd., NSW, Australia) were selected (Types 139 A and C in Matias et al. 2010) to the construct experimental habitats. These turfs were 140 chosen because of their differences in length (A < C) and also in density of fronds (A > C), 141 although they provide comparable amounts of surface of fronds to be colonized (i.e. 26.5 (A) 142 and 25.9 (C) cm²). These characteristics maximized the structural differences needed to test 143 hypotheses about different types of habitats (Matias et al. 2010, 2011). The variation between 144 types of habitat falls within the dimensions of naturally occurring coralline turfs on rocky 145 reefs (Akioka et al. 1999). Benthic assemblages in experimental habitats would therefore be 146 affected by the combined effect of density and length of fronds. A previous study using these 147 artificial habitats determined that these two types of habitats are colonized by significantly different numbers of species (C > A). Hereafter, for clarity, I refer to the types of fronds as 148 149 short (i.e. A) or long (i.e. C).

150 Experimental habitats were made of squares of artificial turf ($10 \times 10 \text{ cm}^2$) that were 151 attached to a base of wire mesh using cable-ties. Previous work has shown that experimental 152 habitats of this size are appropriate to test hypotheses about different types of habitats (Matias 153 et al. 2007; Matias et al. 2010). Numerous invertebrates rapidly colonize artificial turfs after 154 just 14 days of deployment (Olabarria 2002; Kelaher 2005). Fifty days after deployment, 155 there are significant differences between assemblages colonizing habitats with different 156 structural diversity (Matias et al. 2007). After 4 months, diversity and abundance of 157 invertebrates in artificial turfs are not different from those in natural turfs (i.e. Corallina sp; 158 Kelaher 2003a), which suggests that they are consistent with the natural assemblages. From 159 this, I considered 4 months as appropriate for testing hypotheses about the effects of matrix 160 and structure of habitats.

161 After 4 months, I carefully placed a plastic bag over the experimental habitat before 162 removing the screws. This procedure ensured that all epiphytes and fauna associated with 163 each sample were completely recovered. I cut two sub-samples $(2 \times 2 \text{ cm}^2)$ from the middle 164 of each artificial turf and placed them in separate labelled plastic bags for chlorophyll 165 extraction (see next section); all samples were immediately frozen at -80°C. I washed the 166 remainder of each artificial turf in a 500 µm sieve and all invertebrates were sorted and 167 counted under a binocular microscope at 16 x magnification. All molluscs were identified to 168 the finest possible taxonomic resolution, either species or morphospecies i.e. as surrogate for 169 taxonomic species when taxonomic classification is immediately available (e.g. Underwood 170 and Chapman 2006).

171

Estimating micro-algal biomass and sediment

172	I quantified micro-algal biomass and accumulated sediment on experimental habitats
173	to investigate how the variability in environmental variables is related to the variability
174	among assemblages (Kelaher et al. 2001). These environmental variables are important
175	because many of the marine gastropods colonizing these habitats feed on micro-algae,
176	diatoms and detritus (Beesley et al. 1998). Also, it has been shown experimentally that
177	sediment particles are structural components of coralline turfs and some species of gastropods
178	show preference for turfs with greater amounts of sediment (Olabarria and Chapman 2001).
179	To measure the variability of each of the environmental variables and how they related to the
180	variability of assemblages, I estimated micro-algal biomass and the amount of sediment in
181	each experimental habitat. Micro-algal biomass was estimated using the concentration of
182	chlorophyll-a as a proxy (Thompson et al. 1999; Murphy et al. 2005).

183 Preliminary trials were done to determine commonly used inorganic solvents (acetone, 184 methanol and dimethyl-formamide (DMF); Thompson et al. 1999; Murphy et al. 2005) would 185 degrade the synthetic turfs and modify spectrophotometric readings. Results showed that 186 extractions using DMF had no measurable differences in spectrophotometer readings when 187 compared with blanks (i.e. with no artificial turfs) and were therefore appropriate for this 188 study. Micro-algal biomass was estimated from chlorophyll-a (mg l⁻¹) overnight extraction in 189 dimethyl-formamide (DMF) from each of two sub-samples that had been previously frozen. 190 The concentration of chlorophyll-a in the solvent was calculated using the following equation 191 (Porra et al. 1989; Murphy et al. 2005):

192 chlorophyll-
$$a = 12(A_{664} - A_{750}) - 3.11(A_{647} - A_{750})$$
 (1)

193 where A is the absorbance at the indicated wavelength.

194	The amount of sediment in each experimental habitat was estimated by collecting
195	sediment particles using a 63 mm sieve. Sediment samples were then dried in an oven for 48
196	h at 80°C and weighted. The relationships between numbers of species and each of the two
197	environmental variables were examined by correlations ($n = 15$ in each correlation).
198	Analyses of data
199	Predictions about whether or not assemblages colonizing habitats with different
200	structure were different depending on their surrounding habitats were tested using
201	PERMANOVA (Anderson 2001) on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities calculated on Log(X+1)
202	transformed abundances of species; Type was a fixed factor (2 levels: short vs long); Matrix
203	was a fixed factor (2 levels: rockpool or emergent-rock). As explained in the previous
204	section, the experimental habitats that were attached in either rockpool or on emergent-rock
205	were in no way paired, so they were independent from each other. From this, Location was a
206	random factor nested in Matrix. All multivariate analyses were done using PRIMER 6.0 and
207	PERMANOVA+ (PRIMER-E Ltd, Plymouth).
208	Predictions about numbers of species in different types of habitats and matrices were
209	tested using ANOVA with Type, Matrix and Location as in previous analyses. When
210	appropriate, data were transformed following a Cochran's test for homogeneity of variances
211	(Underwood 1997). Additional ANOVAs comparing the densities of the most abundant
212	species to test whether these responded consistently to different types of habitats and
213	matrices. Post-hoc comparisons of means were done using Student-Newman-Keuls (SNK)
214	tests. All univariate tests were done using WinGMAV 5.0 (EICC, The University of Sydney).
215	RESULTS
216	Diversity and structure of assemblages

217	I collected 7,288 individuals belonging to 58 morphospecies (hereafter species), 44 of
218	which were found in rockpools, whereas only 38 species were found in open rock. The four
219	most abundant species (>85% individuals) were the bivalve Lasaea australis (Lamarck, 1818)
220	and the gastropods Amphithalamus incidata (Frauenfeld, 1867), Austrocochlea porcata
221	(Adams, 1851) and Eatoniella atropurpurea (Frauenfeld, 1867). The remainder of species
222	had relatively smaller abundances; 19 of these species were represented by a single one.
223	Entire assemblages varied depending on interaction between Type and Location
224	(PERMANOVA: Type x Location (Matrix) interaction, Table 1a, Fig. 1). Differences
225	between assemblages colonizing different types of turfs were consistent in rockpool or

emergent-rock (Pair-wise comparisons, Table 1b). In contrast, dissimilarity between
assemblages in rockpool or on emergent-rock were consistently greater in habitats with long
turfs (Table 1c). Generally, dissimilarity between assemblages in habitats with short versus
long turfs was consistent across different locations, but the magnitude of such differences
varied (Table 1d).

231 The number of species varied with matrix, although these differences depended on the 232 type of habitat (ANOVA: Type x Matrix interaction, Table 2a, Fig. 2). With regards to the 233 comparisons between each Matrix within each level of the factor Type, there were 234 significantly greater numbers of species in short turfs, whilst on emergent-rock, there were 235 significantly greater numbers of species in long turfs (SNK tests, Table 2b, Fig. 2). With 236 regards to the comparisons between each Types within each level of the factor Matrix, the 237 numbers of species in longer turfs were greater when these were on emergent rock; in 238 contrast, there were no differences in numbers of species in short turfs depending on the 239 matrix (SNK tests, Table 2b). These results suggest that effects of type of habitats were, in

241 habitats were affected in the same way by their matrix).

The most abundant species generally responded to the type of habitat and not the

243 matrix (Table 3, Fig. 3). There were larger densities of the bivalve *L. australis*, gastropods *E*.

244 *atropurpurea* and *A. porcata* in habitats with shorter turfs (SNK at P < 0.05, Table 3). *A.*

245 *incidatus* also occurred in greater numbers in habitats with shorter turfs, and in significantly

246 greater densities in location 3 (Table 3).

247

Environmental variables

248 There was considerable variability in dry weight of sediment across different 249 locations, although dry weight of sediment per patch was consistently greater in shorter turfs 250 (Table 4). The dry weight of sediment per patch varied between 74g (location 5) and 125g 251 (location 2). In contrast, the concentration of chlorophyll-a was not affected by type or 252 matrix of habitats, even though there was a Type x Location (Matrix) interaction (Table 4). 253 The concentration of chlorophyll-*a* per patch was relatively consistent across several locations 254 (53-74 µg.ml⁻¹), although, in location 4 there was a relatively high average value of 131 255 μ g.ml⁻¹. No significant differences or pattern was found in the rank order of means of 256 concentration of chlorophyll-a.

The strength of the relationship between numbers of species and sediment varied depending on Type and Matrix (Fig. 4). On emergent-rock, the relationship between sediment and numbers of species was different depending on the type of turfs (short: r = 0.19, $F_{1,15} = 0.5$, P > 0.4; long: r = 0.81, $F_{1,15} = 27.2$, P < 0.001). In rockpools, there were no significant relationships between amounts of sediment and numbers of species in either type of turfs (short: r = 0.003, $F_{1,15} = 0.0$, P > 0.9; long: r = 0.45, $F_{1,15} = 3.6$, P > 0.08). Most

263	patches with shorter turfs had approximately 40g of sediment, suggesting a maximal amount
264	of sediment that turfs can retain. Similarly, the relationship between chlorophyll-a and
265	numbers of species depended on the matrix and the type of turfs. In rockpools, there was no
266	significant relationship in either type of turfs (short: $r = 0.38$, $F_{1,15} = 2.47$, $P > 0.1$; long: $r =$
267	0.07, $F_{1,15} = 0.06$, $P > 0.8$) whilst on emergent-rock there was a significant relationship in
268	long-turfs ($r = -0.55$, $F_{1,15} = 6.16$, $P < 0.03$) but in short-turfs ($r = -0.36$, $F_{1,15} = 2.04$, $P > 0.03$)
269	0.1).

DISCUSSION

271 This study demonstrated that: 1) the composition of assemblages was affected by the 272 matrix (i.e. rockpools or emergent-rock) and type of habitat, but this varied in magnitude 273 among random locations; 2) the effects of the matrix on the number of species varied between 274 the different types of habitats; 3) abundant species showed specific responses to type of 275 habitat, independently of the matrix; 4) relationships between numbers of species and two 276 major environmental variables varied depending on the type of habitats and the matrix. 277 Generally, findings demonstrate that responses to different types of habitats are dependent on 278 the surrounding habitat, even though several common species did not show any particular 279 response to different matrices. The challenge for investigating biotic responses to structure of 280 natural habitats is therefore to determine whether the context in which these habitats occur 281 modifies the physical structure (e.g. Driscoll and Donovan 2004), the resources (e.g. Van 282 Elven et al. 2004); or the potential pool of species colonizing habitats (e.g. Lawton 1999).

The relationships between structure of habitat and patterns of diversity of benthic
invertebrates have been previously studied using coralline turfs naturally occurring on rock
platforms (e.g. Akioka et al. 1999; Kelaher et al. 2001) or in artificial turfs (Kelaher 2003a, b;

286 Matias et al. 2010). There have, however, been fewer studies that have investigated coralline 287 turfs in rock pools (but see Hull 1999; Bussell et al. 2007). Rockpools are extremely variable 288 (e.g. in size, depth and shade) which possibly explains why there is great variability in 289 composition of faunal assemblages colonizing algae in rockpools (Huggett and Griffiths 1986; Metaxas and Scheibling 1994; Hicks 1980; Hull 1999). The results of the current study 290 291 showed, in contrast, that assemblages colonising habitats in rockpools were considerably less 292 variable than those on emergent-rock surfaces. This discrepancy might be because several 293 natural species of macro-algae may change growth form as a result of physical characteristics 294 of rockpools (e.g. coralline turfs have different morphologies in rockpools and non-rockpools 295 surfaces; Akioka et al. 1999), which ultimately modifies the type of habitat provided for 296 invertebrate species (Metaxas and Scheibling 1994). In the present study, however, 297 experimental habitats had the same structure and period of colonization across different 298 matrices, which removed potential differences in habitat structure and therefore any 299 difference between the different matrices must be attributed to differences other than 300 differences in habitat structure.

301 An alternative explanation is that habitats under different contexts provide different 302 resources so that the assemblages colonizing such habitats are also different (e.g. Andren 303 1994; Steffan-Dewenter et al. 2002; Collinge et al. 2003; Skilleter et al. 2005). The 304 colonization of similar experimental habitats embedded in different matrices has been 305 previously studied (e.g. sand vs seagrass, Tanner 2006), although quantifications of resources 306 in different matrices remain scarce. In artificial seagrass beds, the diversity and biomass of 307 macro-algal epiphytes - an important resource associated with faunal assemblages - differ 308 depending on the context in which artificial patches are embedded (i.e. varying proximity to 309 rocky reefs, Van Elven et al. 2004). The present results showed that two environmental

310	variables shown to be important for many marine gastropods (i.e. microalgal biomass and
311	accumulated sediment; Beesley et al. 1998, Kelaher et al. 2001, Olabarria and Chapman
312	2001) were greatly influenced by the location on the shore, which was probably better
313	explained by differences in wave-exposure to ocean swell between locations (Underwood
314	1984). This was expected since different wave-exposure is known to affect the accumulation
315	of sediment (Prathep et al. 2003; e.g. Motta et al. 2003) and micro-algal growth (e.g.
316	Thompson et al. 2005) in intertidal habitats. Furthermore, the variance of these
317	environmental variables was only correlated with the numbers of species in particular
318	combinations of habitat and matrix (i.e. long turfs on emergent-rock), which indicates that the
319	importance of environmental variables may not be the same across all habitats in this system.
320	Thus, these results are further evidence of the importance of determining the appropriate
321	scales at which benthic assemblages respond to habitat structure and other environmental
322	variables (e.g. food availability). Future studies could investigate these responses at finer
323	spatial scales to further advance our understanding of the patterns of distribution of benthic
324	assemblages in relation to environmental variability.

325 Another potential source of variability between assemblages in different habitats might 326 be attributed to changes in biotic interaction (e.g. predation, Hughes and Grabowski 2006; 327 inter-specific competition, Spooner and Vaughn 2006; Matias et al. 2012) depending on the 328 matrix in which habitats were deployed. Generally, habitats with longer turfs had greater 329 numbers of species. In rockpools, however, there were no differences in numbers of species 330 between types of habitats. Common species Lasaea australis and Amphithalamus incidatus 331 did not occur in similar numbers inside or outside of rockpools; other common species 332 Austrocochlea porcata and Eatoniella atropurpurea, occurred in similar numbers in either 333 matrix (Fig. 3). These observations might be explained by previous evidence that competition between species of gastropods might be dependent on the quality of the habitat (e.g. "habitat suitability", Firth and Crowe 2010) possibly due to differential competitive ability of species depending on the habitat in which they are found (Keough et al. 1997). Furthermore, several species of gastropods show habitat-associated survival as a result of variability in structural components of the habitat (e.g. amount of sediment, Olabarria and Chapman 2001). Future research on these assemblages should investigate whether the structure of patches of habitat affect competitive interactions.

341 These results may have additional implications for our understanding of the 342 distribution and abundance of species in intertidal rocky shores. Many common grazers in 343 intertidal rocky shores (e.g. gastropods Austrocochlea porcata, Bembicium nanum, Nerita 344 atramentosa, and limpet Patelloida sp.) recruit in large numbers to coralline turfs – artificial 345 or natural – and then disperse to the surrounding emergent-rock. Experiments in different 346 regions (e.g. Australia, Chile and Ireland; Kelaher et al. 2004) showed that assemblages in 347 coralline habitats may vary depending on the pool of species of each region, which is possibly 348 explained by different matrices in which coralline habitats were embedded in those different 349 regions. On many Australian shores, coralline turfs occur predominantly in low-shore areas; 350 on rocky shores in other parts of the world, coralline turfs occur almost exclusively in 351 rockpools (e.g. UK, Bussell et al. 2007), with low-shore areas often dominated by other 352 macro-algal beds (e.g. fucoids). Understanding the consequences of the spatial structure of 353 these habitats complements our knowledge on patterns of abundance and distributions of 354 functionally important species and ultimately the structure of intertidal assemblages.

355

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

356	This work was supported by funds from the Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia
357	(FCT) SFRH/BD/27506/2006 to MGM with additional support from the EICC (The
358	university of Sydney). Tony Underwood, Ross Coleman, Dieter Hochuli, Mariana Mayer-
359	Pinto, Ezequiel Marzinelli and Gustavo Martins provided helpful comments on earlier
360	versions of the manuscript. Emily Callahan, Francesca van den Berg and Rodrigo Roman
361	provided valuable assistance with field and laboratory work.
362	REFERENCES
363	Akioka H, Baba M, Masaki T, Johansen HW (1999) Rocky shore turfs dominated by
364	Corallina (Corallinales, Rhodophyta) in northern Japan. Phycol Res 47 (3):199–206
365	Anderson MJ (2001) A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance.
366	Aust Ecol 26 (1):32-46
367	Andren H (1994) Effects of habitat fragmentation on birds and mammals in landscapes with
368	different proportions of suitable habitat - a review. Oikos 71 (3):355-366
369	Beesley PL, Ross GJB, Wells A (1998) Mollusca: the southern synthesis. Fauna of Australia,
370	vol 5. CSIRO, Melbourne
371	Bussell JA, Lucas IAN, Seed R (2007) Patterns in the invertebrate assemblage associated with
372	Corallina officinalis in tide pools. J Mar Biol Assoc UK 87 (2):383-388
373	Cole VJ (2009) Densities of polychaetes in habitat fragments depend on the surrounding
374	matrix but not the complexity of the remaining fragment. Aust Ecol 34 (4):469-477
375	Collinge SK, Prudic KL, Oliver JC (2003) Effects of local habitat characteristics and
376	landscape context on grassland butterfly diversity. Conserv Biol 17 (1):178-187

377	Crowe TP (1996) Different effects of microhabitat fragmentation patterns of dispersal on
378	intertidal gastropod in two habitats. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 206 (1-2):83-107
379	Debinski DM (2006) Forest fragmentation and matrix effects: the matrix does matter. J
380	Biogeogr 33 (10):1791-1792
381	Downes BJ, Lake PS, Schreiber ESG, Glaister A (2000) Habitat structure, resources and
382	diversity: the separate effects of surface roughness and macroalgae on stream
383	invertebrates. Oecologia 123 (4):569-581
384	Driscoll MJL, Donovan TM (2004) Landscape context moderates edge effects: Nesting
385	success of wood thrushes in central New York. Conserv Biol 18 (5):1330-1338
386	Ewers RM, Didham RK (2006) Confounding factors in the detection of species responses to
387	habitat fragmentation. Biol Rev 81 (1):117-142
388	Fagan WE, Cantrell RS, Cosner C (1999) How habitat edges change species interactions. Am
389	Nat 153 (2):165-182
390	Firth LB, Crowe TP (2010) Competition and habitat suitability: small-scale segregation
391	underpins large-scale coexistence of key species on temperate rocky shores. Oecologia
392	162 (1):163-174
393	Goodsell PJ, Connell SD (2008) Complexity in the relationship between matrix composition
394	and inter-patch distance in fragmented habitats. Mar Biol 154 (1):117-125
395	Gullstrom M, Bodin M, Nilsson PG, Ohman MC (2008) Seagrass structural complexity and
396	landscape configuration as determinants of tropical fish assemblage composition. Mar
397	Ecol Prog Series 363:241-255

398	Hicks GRF (1980) Structure of phytal harpacticoid copepod assemblages and the influence of
399	habitat complexity and turbidity. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 44 (2-3):157-192
400	Hovel KA, Fonseca MS (2005) Influence of seagrass landscape structure on the juvenile blue
401	crab habitat-survival function. Mar Ecol Prog Series 300:179-191
402	Hovel KA, Lipcius RN (2001) Habitat fragmentation in a seagrass landscape: Patch size and
403	complexity control blue crab survival. Ecology 82 (7):1814-1829
404	Huggett J, Griffiths CL (1986) Some relationships between elevation, physicochemical
405	variables and biota of intertidal rock pools. Mar Ecol Prog Series 29 (2):189-197
406	Hughes AR, Grabowski JH (2006) Habitat context influences predator interference
407	interactions and the strength of resource partitioning. Oecologia 149 (2):256-264
408	Hull SL (1999) Comparison of tidepool phytal ostracod abundance and assemblage structure
409	on three spatial scales. Mar Ecol Prog Series 182:201-208
410	Johnson AR, Wiens JA, Milne BT, Crist TO (1992) Animal movements and population
411	dynamics in heterogenous landscapes. Landsc Ecol 7 (1):63-75
412	Karlson RH, Cornell HV (2002) Species richness of coral assemblages: Detecting regional
413	influences at local spatial scales. Ecology 83 (2):452-463
414	Kelaher BP (2003a) Changes in habitat complexity negatively affect diverse gastropod
415	assemblages in coralline algal turf. Oecologia 135:431-441
416	Kelaher BP (2003b) Effects of frond length on diverse gastropod assemblages in coralline
417	turf. J Mar Biol Assoc UK 83 (1):159-163

- 418 Kelaher BP (2005) Does colonization contribute to spatial patterns of common invertebrates
- 419 in coralline algal turf? Aust Ecol 30 (1):40-48
- 420 Kelaher BP, Castilla JC, Seed R (2004) Intercontinental test of the generality of spatial
- 421 patterns of diverse molluscan assemblages in coralline algal turf. Mar Ecol Prog Series
 422 271:221-231
- Kelaher BP, Chapman MG, Underwood AJ (2001) Spatial patterns of diverse macrofaunal
 assemblages in coralline turf and their association with environmental variables. J Mar
 Biol Assoc UK 382 (1):1-14
- Keough MJ, Quinn GP, Bathgate R (1997) Geographic variation in interactions between size
 classes of the limpet *Cellana tramoserica*. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 215 (1):19-34
- Kotliar NB, Wiens JA (1990) Multiple scales of patchiness and patch structure a hierarchical
 framework for the study of heterogeneity. Oikos 59 (2):253-260
- 430 Lawton JH (1999) Are there general laws in ecology? Oikos 84 (2):177-192
- 431 Loreau M, Mouquet N (1999) Immigration and the maintenance of local species diversity.
 432 Am Nat 154 (4):427-440
- 433 MacArthur RH (1964) Environmental factors affecting bird species diversity. Am Nat 98
 434 (903):387-397
- 435 MacArthur RH, MacArthur JW (1961) On bird species diversity. Ecology 42:594–598
- 436 MacArthur RH, Wilson EO (1967) The theory of island biogeography. Princeton University
 437 Press, Princeton, NJ

438	Macreadie PI, Hindell JS, Jenkins GP, Connolly RM, Keough MJ (2009) Fish responses to
439	experimental fragmentation of seagrass habitat. Conserv Biol 23 (3):644-652
440	Macreadie PI, Hindell JS, Keough MJ, Jenkins GP, Connolly RM (2010) Resource
441	distribution influences positive edge effects in a seagrass fish. Ecology 91 (7):2013-
442	2021
443	Martins GM, Hawkins SJ, Thompson RC, Jenkins SR (2007) Community structure and
444	functioning in intertidal rock pools: effects of pool size and shore height at different
445	successional stages. Mar Ecol Prog Series 329:43-55
446	Matias MG, Chapman MG, Underwood AJ, O'Connor NE (2012) Increasing density of rare
447	species of intertidal gastropods: tests of competitive ability compared with common
448	species. Marine Ecology Progress Series 453:107-116
449	Matias MG, Underwood AJ, Coleman RA (2007) Interactions of components of habitat alter
450	composition and variability of assemblages. J Anim Ecol 76:986–994
451	Matias MG, Underwood AJ, Hochuli DF, Coleman RA (2010) Independent effects of patch-
452	size and structural complexity on the diversity of benthic assemblages. Ecology
453	91:1908–1915
454	Matias MG, Underwood AJ, Hochuli DF, Coleman RA (2011) Habitat identity influences
455	species-area relationships in heterogeneous habitats. Mar Ecol Prog Series 437:135-
456	145
457	Mazerolle MJ, Villard M-A (1999) Patch characteristics and landscape context as predictors
458	of species presence and abundance: A review. Ecoscience 6 (1):117-124

459	Metaxas A, Scheibling RE (1994) Spatial and temporal variability of tidepool hyperbenthos
460	on a rocky shore in Nova-Scotia, Canada. Mar Ecol Prog Series 108 (1-2):175-184
461	Motta JJC, Underwood AJ, Chapman MG, Rossi F (2003) Benthic assemblages in sediments
462	associated with intertidal boulder-fields. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 285:383-401
463	Murphy HT, Lovett-Doust J (2004) Context and connectivity in plant metapopulations and
464	landscape mosaics: does the matrix matter? Oikos 105 (1):3-14
465	Murphy RJ, Tolhurst TJ, Chapman MG, Underwood AJ (2005) Remote-sensing of benthic
466	chlorophyll: should ground-truth data be expressed in units of area or mass? J Exp
467	Mar Biol Ecol 316 (1):69-77
468	Olabarria C (2002) Role of colonization in spatio-temporal patchiness of microgastropods in
469	coralline turf habitat. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 274:121–140
470	Olabarria C, Chapman MG (2001) Habitat-associated variability in survival and growth of
471	three species of microgastropods. J Mar Biol Assoc UK 81 (6):961-966
472	Pacala SW, Silander JA (1990) Field-tests of neighborhood population-dynamic models of 2
473	annual weed species. Ecol Monogr 60 (1):113-134
474	Pianka ER (1966) Convexity desert lizards and spatial heterogeneity. Ecology 47 (6):1055-
475	1059
476	Porra RJ, Thompson WA, Kriedemann PE (1989) Determination of accurate extinction
477	coefficients and simultaneous-equations for assaying chlorophyll-a and chlorophyll-B
478	extracted with 4 different solvents - verification of the concentration of chlorophyll
479	standards by atomic-absorption spectroscopy. Biochim Biophys Acta 975 (3):384-394

- 480 Prathep A, Marrs RH, Norton TA (2003) Spatial and temporal variations in sediment
- 481 accumulation in an algal turf and their impact on associated fauna. Mar Biol 142:381-482 390
- 483 Ricketts TH (2001) The matrix matters: effective isolation in fragmented landscapes. Am Nat
 484 158 (1):87-99
- 485 Ries L, Sisk TD (2004) A predictive model of edge effects. Ecology 85 (11):2917-2926
- 486 Roberts DA, Poore AGB (2006) Habitat configuration affects colonisation of epifauna in a
 487 marine algal bed. Biol Conserv 127 (1):18-26
- 488 Scheltema RS (1974) Biological interactions determining larval settlement of marine
- 489 invertebrates. Thalassia jugosl 10 (1-2):263-296
- 490 Skilleter GA, Olds A, Loneragan NR, Zharikov Y (2005) The value of patches of intertidal
 491 seagrass to prawns depends on their proximity to mangroves. Mar Biol 147 (2):353492 365
- 493 Spooner DE, Vaughn CC (2006) Context-dependent effects of freshwater mussels on stream
 494 benthic communities. Freshwater Biology 51 (6):1016-1024
- 495 Steffan-Dewenter I, Munzenberg U, Burger C, Thies C, Tscharntke T (2002) Scale-dependent
 496 effects of landscape context on three pollinator guilds. Ecology 83 (5):1421-1432
- 497 Tanner JE (2006) Landscape ecology of interactions between seagrass and mobile epifauna:
 498 the matrix matters. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 68 (3-4):404-412
- 499 Taylor PD, Fahrig L, Henein K, Merriam G (1993) Connectivity Is a Vital Element of
- 500 Landscape Structure. Oikos 68 (3):571-573

501	terHorst CP, Dudgeon SR (2009) Beyond the patch: Disturbance affects species abundances
502	in the surrounding community. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 370 (1):120-126
503	Thompson RC, Moschella PS, Jenkins SR, Norton TA, Hawkins SJ (2005) Differences in
504	photosynthetic marine biofilms between sheltered and moderately exposed rocky
505	shores. Mar Ecol Prog Series 296:53-63
506	Thompson RC, Tobin ML, Hawkins SJ, Norton TA (1999) Problems in extraction and
507	spectrophotometric determination of chlorophyll from epilithic microbial biofilms:
508	towards a standard method. J Mar Biol Assoc UK 79 (3):551-558
509	Tilman D (1994) Competition and biodiversity in spatially structured habitats. Ecology 75
510	(1):2-16
511	Underwood AJ (1984) Microalgal food and the growth of the intertidal gastropods Nerita
512	Atramentosa Reeve and Bembicium nanum (Lamarck) at four heights on a shore. J
513	Exp Mar Biol Ecol 79:277–291
514	Underwood AJ (1997) Experiments in ecology: their logical design and interpretation using
515	analysis of variance. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
516	Underwood AJ, Chapman MG (2006) Early development of subtidal macrofaunal
517	assemblages: relationships to period and timing of colonization. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol
518	330 (1):221-233
519	Underwood AJ, Skilleter GA (1996) Effects of patch-size on the structure of assemblages in
520	rock pools. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 197 (1):63-90

521	Van Elven BR, Lavery PS, Kendrick GA (2004) Reefs as contributors to diversity of
522	epiphytic macroalgae assemblages in seagrass meadows. Mar Ecol Prog Series
523	276:71-83
524	Wiens JA (2002) Riverine landscapes: taking landscape ecology into the water. Freshwater
525	Biology 47 (4):501-515
526	Worthington DG, Fairweather PG (1989) Shelter and food: interactions between Turbo
527	undulatum (Archaeogastropoda: Turbinidae) and coralline algae on rocky seashores in
528	New South Wales. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 129:61-79
529	
530	

FIGURE CAPTIONS

533	Figure 1. Multivariate nMDS ordination of Bray-Curtis distances between assemblages
534	colonizing different type of habitats and matrix. Each symbol represents a centroid calculated
535	for each combination of Type, Matrix and Location (using the averaged abundances of each
536	species across replicates; $n = 3$). Different symbols and colours indicate different type of
537	habitats and matrix: turfs with long fronds in rockpools (\bullet), emergent-rock (\blacksquare); turfs with
538	short fronds inside rockpools (\bigcirc) and emergent-rock (\Box); Data were Log(X+1) transformed.
539	Figure 2 . Diversity of assemblages in different type of habitats and matrix. Mean (\pm SE, <i>n</i> =
540	15) numbers of species in different type of habitats and matrix; white bars indicate rockpools;
541	shaded bars indicate emergent-rock surfaces.
542	Figure 3. Densities of most abundant species in different type of habitats and matrix. Mean
543	(\pm SE, $n = 15$) densities of most abundant species <i>Lasaea australis</i> , <i>Austrocochlea porcata</i> ,
544	Amphithalamus Incidata, and Eatoniella atropurpurea in different types of habitats and
545	matrix; 'white bars' indicate rockpools; shaded bars indicate emergent-rock surfaces.
546	Figure 4. Relationships between numbers of species and environmental variables (sediment
547	or chlorophyll- <i>a</i>). Environmental variables were measured in different types of habitats (i.e.
548	short vs long) under different matrix [i.e. rockpools: a) and b); emergent-rock: c) and d)].
549	Different symbols indicate the types of habitats (short: white circles; long: black circles).
550	Solid lines indicate regression lines for significant correlations; coefficients of correlation and
551	significance values in <i>Results</i> section.

552	Table 1. (a) PERMANOVA and pair-wise comparisons of assemblages in different type of
553	habitats (2 levels: long vs short); matrix (2 levels: rockpool (RP) vs emergent-rock (ER))
554	using Bray-Curtis distances calculated on Log(X+1) transformed abundances; Location is a
555	random factor nested in Matrix. Pair-wise significance tests were done for significant
556	comparisons (b, c and d). Multivariate patterns (nMDS) are in Fig. 1. Numbers in the bottom
557	part of the table indicate average Bray-Curtis dissimilarity between levels of each significant
558	comparison. Levels of significance: $* = P < 0.05$, $** = P < 0.01$ and $*** = P < 0.001$.

559	Source		DF	MS	5	P	seudo-	F
560	Type = T			1229	7.0	6.7	**	
561	Matrix = N	Л	1	727	6.7	3.1	**	
562	Location ($\mathbf{M}) = \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{M})$	8	235	3.5	2.1	***	
563	T x M		1	7351.1		4.0	4.0*	
564	T x L(M)		8	184	8.4	1.6	**	
565	Residual		40	114	5.0			
566	Pair-wise comparisons:							
567	Average Bray-Curtis dissimilarity between groups T x M							М
568	(a) Sh	ort vs Long		(b) RP	vs EF	Ł	
569	RP	63**	S	hort	4′	7		
570	ER	60*	L	ong	74	1**		
571	(c) Averag	e Bray-Curtis	dissim	nilarity	v betw	een gr	oups T	x L(M)
572	Location		1	2	3	4	5	
573	RP		60	63	41	65	64	
574	ER		67	62	48	62	72	
575								

577	Table 2. (a) ANOVA of numbers of species in different types of habitats (2 levels: long vs
578	short) and matrix (2 levels: rockpool (RP) vs emergent-rock (ER)); Location was a random
579	factor nested in Matrix. SNKs for the comparisons (b) Type (Matrix) and (c) Matrix (Type).
580	Means, standard errors and SNK tests are also indicated in Fig. 2. Levels of significance: * =
581	P < 0.05, ** = $P < 0.01$ and *** = $P < 0.001$.

582	(a) Source	DF	MS	F			
583	Type = T	1	1.4^{\dagger}	0.2			
584	Matrix = M	1	50.4	5.9*			
585	Location $(M) = L(M)$	8	8.5^{\dagger}	1.2			
586	ТхМ	1	98.8^{\dagger}	13.5***			
587	T x L(M)	8	9.8				
588	Residual	40	6.8				
589	Transform: none						
590	SNK:						
591	(b) Matrix (Type): Short Long						
592		RP = ER	RP	< ER			
593	(c) Type (Matrix)	RP	ER				
594		Short > Long	Short	< Long			
595	[†] Tested against pooled Residual + T x L(M)						

Table 3. ANOVA of most abundant species: bivalve Lasaea australis (a), and gastropods Austrocochlea porcata (b), Amphithalamus incidatus (c), and 596 Eatoniella atropurpurea (d) in different types of habitats (2 levels: long vs short) and matrix (2 levels: rockpool (RP) vs emergent-rock (ER)); and 597 Location was a random factor nested in Matrix; means and standard errors are in Fig. 3. Levels of significance: * = P < 0.05, ** = P < 0.01 and *** = P < 0.01598 599 0.001.

600			(8	a)	(b)		(c)		(d))
601	Source	DF	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F
602	Type = T	1	67.8 [†]	69.5**	** 14.7	6.7*	4.3 [†]	5.2*	25.0	21.7**
603	Matrix = M	1	0.5	0.3	4.8	1.5	3.2	2.4	1.1	1.3
604	Location (M) =	L(M) 8	1.6 [†]	1.7	3.2	3.1**	1.3†	1.6	0.8	1.3
605	T x M	1	1.2	1.2	1.1	0.5	2.2^{\dagger}	2.6	0.3	0.3
606	T x L(M)	8	1.3†		2.2	2.1	0.5		1.2	1.8
607	Residual	40	0.9		1.0		0.8		0.6	
608	Transform:		Ln(X	K+1)	Ln(X+	-1)	Ln(X+	-1)	Ln(X	+1)
609	SNK:		Short >	> Long	Short > I	Long	Short > I	Long	Short >	Long

[†]Tested against pooled Residual + T x L(M)610

611 **Table 4.** ANOVA of (a) weight of sediment and (b) concentration of chlorophyll-a in different type 612 of habitats (2 levels: long vs short) and matrix (2 levels: rockpool (RP) vs emergent-rock (ER)); 613 Location was a random factor nested in Matrix. Levels of significance: * = P < 0.05, ** = P < 0.01614 and *** = P < 0.001.

615			(a)		(b)		
616	Source	DF	MS	F	MS	F	
617	Type = T	1	0.5^{\dagger}	9.2**	15206.4	3.7	
618	Matrix = M	1	0.4	1.3	427.6	0.1	
619	Location $(M) = L(M)$	M) 8	0.3†	5.3***	7442.4	13.2***	
620	T x M	1	0.0^{\dagger}	0.0	0.8	0.0	
621	T x L(M)	8	0.1		4124.3	7.3***	
622	Residual	40	0.1		562.2		
623	Transform:		Ln(X+	+1)	non	ie	
624	SNK:		Short > I	Long			

625 [†]Tested against pooled Residual + T x L(M)





631 **Figure 1.** Multivariate nMDS ordination of Bray-Curtis distances between assemblages colonizing

ΟП

632 different type of habitats and matrix. Each symbol represents a centroid calculated for each

633 combination of Type, Matrix and Location (using the averaged abundances of each species across

- 634 replicates; n = 3). Different symbols and colours indicate different type of habitats and matrix: turfs
- 635 with long fronds in rockpools (\bullet), emergent-rock (\blacksquare); turfs with short fronds inside rockpools (\bigcirc)
- 636 and emergent-rock (\Box); Data were Log(X+1) transformed.



640 **Figure 2**. Diversity of assemblages in different type of habitats and matrix. Mean (\pm SE, *n* = 15) 641 numbers of species in different type of habitats and matrix; white bars indicate rockpools; shaded

642 bars indicate emergent-rock surfaces.



647 Figure 3. Densities of most abundant species in different type of habitats and matrix. Mean (±SE,

n = 15) densities of most abundant species Lasaea australis, Austrocochlea porcata, 648

- 649 Amphithalamus Incidata, and Eatoniella atropurpurea in different types of habitats and matrix;
- 'white bars' indicate rockpools; shaded bars indicate emergent-rock surfaces. 650







Figure 4. Relationships between numbers of species and environmental variables (sediment or
chlorophyll-*a*). Environmental variables were measured in different types of habitats (i.e. short vs
long) under different matrix [i.e. rockpools: a) and b); emergent-rock: c) and d)]. Different symbols
indicate the types of habitats (short: white circles; long: black circles). The coefficients of
correlation and the significance values in *Results* section.