

**The role of bioturbators in seagrass blue carbon dynamics**

**Alexandra Clare Goudie Thomson**

**PhD by Research**

**Climate Change Cluster (C3)**

**Faculty of Science**

**University of Technology Sydney**

**2017**

## **Certificate of Original Authorship**

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged.

In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student:

Alexandra Thomson

Date: 27/02/2017

## **Acknowledgements**

Thank you to my supervisors, Peter Ralph, Peter Macreadie, and Daniel Nielsen. A very special thank-you must go to my co-authors (and mentors/teachers) in Denmark, Erik Kristensen, Thomas Valdemarsen and Cintia Quintana.

Thank you to the many other co-authors, Paul York, Jeff Baldock, Damien Maher, Isaac Santos and Jon Sandeman, for the time, patience, guidance and help with the chapters within this thesis. A very special thank you to another co-author, mentor, and friend, the amazing Stacey Trevathan-Tackett, who without her tireless effort and guidance, this thesis would not be anywhere near what it is today.

Thank you to my field and lab volunteers, especially Melanie Purdy, Simon Zantis and Bojana Manojlovic. For technical assistance, I would like to thank Mahrita Harahap, Jeff Kelleway and Will Cohen. Another thank you goes to Sabina Belli, for all her time reading and commenting on the chapters in this thesis.

A big thank you also goes to the UTS tech staff, especially Paul Brooks and Graeme Poleweski, for putting up with the endless trail of mud and yabbies throughout the lab. Thank you to my PhD cohort who kept me sane throughout the past 4 years.

Lastly, a huge thank you goes to my friends and my extremely supportive parents and family who supported me through this absolute beast of a project.

## **Preface**

This thesis has been prepared in publication format, whereby each chapter represents a manuscript ready for submission to a scientific peer-reviewed journal. Due to this preparation, there will be a degree of repetition across chapter introductions and methodologies. All data chapters are prepared as research articles. As of yet, no individual chapter has been accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal.

Two papers (both submitted to journals, not yet in publication) were produced in association with this PhD, but do not form a part of this thesis. These two papers (one review paper, one research article) are attached in the appendix of the thesis. These are both formatted in the style of the particular journal they have been submitted to.

# Table of Contents

The role of bioturbators in seagrass blue carbon dynamics .....	i
Certificate of Original Authorship.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Preface .....	iv
Table of Figure and Table Captions .....	vii
Abstract .....	1
Introduction .....	3
Carbon sequestration in blue carbon habitats .....	3
Seagrass carbon cycles.....	4
The role of bioturbators in seagrass blue carbon cycles .....	6
Bioturbation alters the chemical and physical properties of the sediment .....	9
Chapter 1: Fiddler crab gender affects carbon sequestration of a seagrass ecosystem	16
Abstract.....	16
Introduction.....	17
Methods .....	19
Results.....	23
Discussion.....	31
Chapter 2: The impact of Callianassid bioturbation on recent versus ancient seagrass carbon stocks .....	34
Abstract.....	34
Introduction.....	35
Methods .....	38
Results.....	46
Discussion.....	58
Chapter 3: Stability of estuarine carbon sinks: How does bioturbation affect the degradation of seagrass meadow carbon sources? .....	61
Abstract.....	61

Introduction.....	63
Methods .....	65
Results.....	70
Discussion.....	80
Chapter 4: The effect of estuarine lugworm <i>Arenicola marina</i> on sediment reworking and anaerobic microbial degradation of carbon .....	86
Abstract.....	86
Introduction.....	87
Methods .....	90
Results.....	96
Discussion.....	108
Chapter 5: Bioturbator-stimulated loss of seagrass carbon stocks <i>via</i> microbial priming .....	112
Abstract.....	112
Introduction.....	113
Methods .....	116
Results.....	122
Discussion.....	132
Synthesis, Conclusion and Outlook.....	136
Global bioturbation and <i>Zostera</i> meadows.....	138
Bioturbation and burial of sources of carbon.....	140
Bioturbation and the microbial community .....	143
Calculation of seagrass carbon loss over time .....	145
Concluding remarks and research outlook.....	147
Literature Cited.....	152
Appendix – Manuscripts submitted for publication.....	164

## Table of Figure and Table Captions

- Fig. 1.1: Conceptual diagram of C cycling within seagrass and mangrove ecosystems. Diagram is not to scale. Image created by A.Thomson using the Integration and Application Network, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science ([ian.umces.edu/symbols/](http://ian.umces.edu/symbols/))..... 5
- Fig. 1.2: Conceptual diagram highlighting the processes within the sediment that bioturbators are known to influence. Diagram is not to scale. Image created by A. Thomson using the Integration and Application Network, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science ([ian.umces.edu/symbols/](http://ian.umces.edu/symbols/)). ..... 8
- Fig. 1.1: (a) Mean down-core variations ( $\pm$  SE) in organic carbon ( $\%C_{org}$ ), comparing burrows constructed by male and female crabs, to control (undisturbed) sediment ( $n = 5$ ). Down-core variation in OM content (%) of (b) labile (mass lost between 200–400°C) and (c) refractory and recalcitrant OM (mass lost between 400–550 and 550–650 °C respectively), among male and female burrows, and control (undisturbed) sediment. Depths at 6–10 cm ( $n = 5$ ) are mean  $\pm$  SE. An “\*” indicated where significant differences lie..... 24
- Fig. 1.2: Non-metric Multi-Dimensional Scaling (MDS) ordination plot of sediment OM composition (thermogravimetric analysis) of all depths within a subset of female and male constructed burrows, and control (undisturbed) sediment. Plot is based on a Euclidean Distance Matrix of similarity among treatments. Kruskal’s 2D stress value of 0.2 indicates that the configuration is a sufficient representation of dissimilarity among the three treatments. Dashed lines indicate where treatment types are approximately clustered, and do not indicate statistical grouping..... 26
- Fig. 1.3: Composition of burrow sediment (6–10 cm depth) from burrows constructed by male and female crabs, and control (undisturbed) sediment. (a) Stable isotope plot of  $\delta^{15}N$  against  $\delta^{13}C$  values ( $n = 4$ ) of the sediments compared with reference values (hashed boxes) from potential sources (Andersen et al. 2005); and (b) sediment C:N ratios against  $\delta^{13}C$  values compared ( $n = 4$ ) to reference values (hashed boxes) from potential sources (Andersen et al. 2005, Carter et al. 2015). Only reference values within the range of the analysed samples are shown. .... 28
- Fig. 1.4: Nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectral molecular mixing model data displaying the predicted macromolecule content (carbohydrate, lignin, lipid,

protein, carbonyl and charcoal) of the sediment (6–10 cm depth) of burrows constructed by male and female crabs, and control sediment (n = 1). .....	30
Fig. 2.1: Relative (a) organic carbon (C <sub>org</sub> %) content and (b) age (constant rate of supply; CRS Age) of sediment at Fagan's Bay, respective to depth from sediment surface. Dashed lines indicate the surface (red) and deep (blue) sediment depths that sediment was collected from. Due to the pooling of collected sediment in this study from 1–10 cm and 50–70 cm depths, we assume an age range similar to that estimated from depths 0–7 and 50–82 cm. Symbols represent means ± 1 SE (n = 3). In some places, error bars are too small to be visible. ....	46
Fig. 2.2: Non-linear regression of seagrass density to density of active Callianassid burrow openings, at two sites (proximal to Sydney, AUS), showing an approximate 95-percent confidence envelope (dashed line) and predictor variable envelope (dotted line). The 3-factor equation of the regression line is given. ....	47
Fig. 2.3: Mean changes ±SE in (a) “surface” sediment; and (b) “deep” sediment C <sub>org</sub> in faunated (+Callianassid) and defaunated sediment treatments between initial (T0) and final (T1) sampling. An “*” indicates where significant differences among treatments lie. Bars represent means ± 1 SE (n = 5). ....	49
Fig 2.4: Mean changes ±SE in (a) “surface” sediment; and (b) “deep” sediment organic matter (OM) composition in faunated (+Callianassid) and defaunated sediment treatments between initial (T0) and final (T1) sampling. Lighter portion of graph indicates sediment composed of labile OM, while the darker portion indicates sediment composed of both recalcitrant and refractory OM. Bars represent means ± 1 SE (n = 5). ....	51
Fig. 2.5: Mean high-density DNA (HD-DNA) bacterial cell counts ±SE in “surface” sediment of faunated (+Callianassid) and defaunated treatments. Bars represent means ± 1 SE (n = 5). ....	52
Fig. 2.6: Identities of bacterial communities across time and sediment treatment. Community assemblages are represented as average (n = 5) relative abundance of the top 10 most dominant bacterial classes in faunated (+Callianassid) and control (defaunated) sediments. The category designated ‘other’ cumulatively represents less abundant taxa (i.e. less than 2%). Bars represent means ± 1 SE (n = 5). ....	53
Figure 2.7: (a) Vertical display of a Callianassids burrow (outlined by dotted line) in a sediment core, displaying (red) surface and (blue) deep sediment. Approximate microprofile locations in burrow walls (α and γ) and ambient sediment (β and δ)	



are shown. The dashed line indicates the approximate interface of surface and deep sediment. Corresponding oxygen microprofiles ( $n = 2-5$ ) of (b) surface and (c) deep sediment in sediment cores, with  $\pm$ SD (where applicable) in +Fauna (+Callianassid) and defaunated sediments. Measurements within faunated treatments were taken from within the burrow wall (BW), and from the surrounding ambient sediment approximately 2 cm from the burrow wall ambient). The dotted line (through Y-axis at 0) designates the sediment surface ..... 55

Fig. 2.8: Mean net sediment respiration (calculated as diffusive oxygen exchange)  $\pm$ SE of surface and deep sediment, in defaunated and faunated (+Callianassids) treatments. .... 56

Fig. 2.9: Predicted loss of surface sedimentary  $C_{org}$  due to Callianassids bioturbation, at different burrow densities, compared to the Australian seagrass annual rates of C sequestration. Australian seagrass sequestration calculated from published data (Lavery et al. 2013). Average loss reflects the average calculated loss of  $C_{org}$  that 1 burrow would lose annually, as seen in this study. Low-range and high-range loss values are calculated based on the lowest and highest (respectively) loss per burrow of  $C_{org}$  seen in this study. All loss values are scaled up according to densities per  $m^2$ . .... 57

Fig. 3.1: Vertical profiles of macrophyte recovery of coarse POC ( $> 0.5$  mm) in sediment cores enriched with seagrass (+SG), macroalgae (+MA), and mixed (+MIX) macrophyte material. Left panels: defaunated cores. Right panels: faunated cores (+W). Percentages indicate the portion (%) of the original material that was recovered post-experiment. The straight reference line (0 cm depth) indicates the original sediment surface depth. Original burial depth of macrophyte material was 3–4 cm. Error bars: SE ( $n = 3$ ). .... 72

Fig. 3.2: Total dissolved organic C (DOC), oxygen ( $O_2$ ) and carbon dioxide ( $TCO_2$ ) effluxes over time in sediment cores enriched with seagrass (+SG), macroalgae (+MA), and mixed macrophyte material (+MIX); and without (control) enrichment. The two curves in each graph show efflux profiles in sediment cores with (+*Arenicola*; white symbols) and without (Defaunated; black symbols) fauna. Error bars: SE ( $n = 3$ ). .... 74

Fig. 3.3: Content of total organic carbon ( $C_{org}$ ) in core sediments with seagrass (+SG), macroalgae (+MA), and mixed macrophyte material (+MIX); and without (control) enrichment. The two curves in each graph show sediment cores with (+*Arenicola*;

white symbols) and without (Defaunated; black symbols) fauna. The dashed line (4 cm depth) indicates the initial depth of macrophyte enrichment. The straight reference line (0 cm depth) indicates the original sediment surface. Error bars: SE (n = 3)..... 76

Fig. 3.4: Vertical porewater profiles of total carbon dioxide (TCO<sub>2</sub>), sulfate (SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>), and dissolved organic C (DOC) in sediment cores with seagrass (+SG), macroalgae (+MA), and mixed macrophyte material (+MIX); and without (control) enrichment. The two curves in each graph show profiles in sediment cores with (+*Arenicola*; white symbols) and without fauna (Defaunated; black symbols). The dashed line (4 cm depth) represents the initial burial depth of macrophyte material. The straight reference line (0 cm depth) represents the original sediment surface. Error bars: SE (n = 3)..... 78

Table 3.1: Details of *Arenicola marina* biomass added to each treatment, predicted end biomass, and calculated metabolism contributions to TCO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> fluxes..... 79

Table 3.2: Calculated budget of carbon (C) mineralisation in faunated (+*Arenicola*) and defaunated core sediments, with seagrass (+SG), macroalgae (+MA), mixed (+MIX) macrophyte material, and without (control) enrichment. Porewater accumulation (± SE) was calculated using depth integrated TCO<sub>2</sub> and TDOC concentrations at the beginning and at the end of the experiment. Time integrated TCO<sub>2</sub> flux rates (± SE) were calculated using average fluxes from day 7 onwards (post initial sediment flushing), and all data is presented for the total experimental period of 28 days..... 84

Fig. 4.1: Vertical porewater profiles of bromide (Br<sup>-</sup>; mmol) in faunated (+*Arenicola*) and defaunated sediment cores with +SG (seagrass), +MA (macroalgae), and +MIX (seagrass and macroalgae) and without (Control) enrichment. The dashed line (4 cm depth) indicates the initial depth of macrophyte enrichment. The straight reference line (0 cm depth) indicates the original sediment surface. Numerical values in each graph represent calculated bioirrigation rates ±SE within faunated sediments (L m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>). Error bars: SE (n = 3). ..... 97

Fig. 4.2: Core profiles of sediment water content, in faunated (+ W) and defaunated sediment. Sediment was amended with +SG (seagrass), +MA (macroalgae), and +MIX (seagrass and macroalgae) and without (Control) enrichment. The straight reference line (0 cm depth) indicates the original sediment surface, while the dashed line (4 cm) indicates the initial depth of macrophyte enrichment. Bar width

is indicative of the sediment portion sampled. Symbols represent means $\pm$ SE (n = 3).....	99
Fig. 4.3: Calculated recovery of detritus derived C, and sediment C <sub>org</sub> , in sediment cores with +SG (seagrass), +MA (macroalgae), and +MIX (seagrass and macroalgae) and without (Control) enrichment. Original enrichment depth was 3–4 cm. The straight reference line (0 cm depth) indicates the original sediment surface depth. Bar width is indicative of the sediment portion sampled. Error bars: SE (n = 3).	101
Fig. 4.5: Vertical porewater profiles of total carbon dioxide (TCO <sub>2</sub> ), sulfate (SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> ), and dissolved organic carbon (DOC) microbial reaction rates (nmol cm <sup>-3</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> ) in faunated (+ <i>Arenicola</i> ) and defaunated sediment cores with +SG (seagrass), +MA (macroalgae), and +MIX (seagrass and macroalgae) and without (Control) enrichment. Error bars: SE (n = 10).....	104
Table 4.1: Total production of porewater solutes (mmol m <sup>-2</sup> ), based on calculated anaerobic microbial reaction rates in incubated jars with sediment collected from -2–0, 0–2, 3–6, 8–10 and 18–20 cm depths, with calculated values representing depth-integrated reaction rates. Sediment was collected from faunated (+ <i>Arenicola</i> ) and defaunated cores, with +SG (seagrass), +MA (macroalgae), and +MIX (seagrass and macroalgae); and without (Control) macrophyte enrichment. ....	105
Fig. 4.6: Stable carbon ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ ) and nitrogen ( $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ) isotope values for <i>Arenicola</i> tissue, taken from animals removed from macrophyte-enriched (+ SG (seagrass), +MA (macroalgae), and +MIX (seagrass and macroalgae)) and non-enriched (Control) sediment. The labelled symbols $\pm$ SD bars indicate reference samples taken from <i>Fucus</i> and <i>Zostera</i> tissue, sediment and non-exposed <i>Arenicola</i> tissue. For reference and treatment samples, n = 3.....	107
Fig. 5.1: Vertical profiles of seagrass detritus recovery in (a) Control (defaunated) sediment cores, and cores with the presence of Callianassid (b) + Bioturbation. Column bar width is indicative of the size of the sediment portion sampled. The dashed reference line (2.5 cm depth) indicates the original burial depth of seagrass detritus. Error bars: SE (n = 3–5).....	122
Fig. 5.2: Organic matter composition of seagrass ( <i>Zostera muelleri</i> ) leaf detritus, determined <i>via</i> thermogravimetric analysis. Specifically proportion of labile OM (mass lost between 200–400 °C), refractory, and recalcitrant OM (mass lost between 400–550 and 550–650 °C respectively), in seagrass leaves fresh from the	

field (initial), recovered from control sediment, and sediment populated with Callianassid (+ Bioturbation). Proportions of labile, refractory and recalcitrant OM are presented as a percent of total OM, Bars represent means $\pm$ 1 SE (n = 3). In some places error bars are too small to be visible.....	123
Fig. 5.3: Sediment organic carbon (%C <sub>org</sub> ) content in core sediments amended (a) with (+ Seagrass) and (b) without (Bare sediment) seagrass. The two curves on each graph show sediment cores populated with (+ Bioturbation; white symbols) and without (Control; dark symbols) bioturbating fauna. The dashed line (2.5 cm depth) indicates the approximate initial depth of seagrass burial. Values represent means $\pm$ 1 SE (n = 3–5).....	125
Fig. 5.4: Total oxygen (O <sub>2</sub> ; Fig. 5.4a, b) and carbon dioxide (CO <sub>2</sub> ; Fig. 5.4c, d) effluxes over time in sediment cores with (+ seagrass) and without (bare sediment) seagrass detritus (mmol <sup>-2</sup> d <sup>-1</sup> ). The two curves in each graph show efflux profiles in sediment cores with (+ Bioturbation) and without (Control) Callianassid bioturbation. Values represent means $\pm$ SE (n = 3–5). ....	127
Fig. 5.5: Total calculated (a) seagrass and (b) sediment remineralisation rate in sediment cores containing seagrass (+ Seagrass), and without seagrass. The curves in the top graph (a) show seagrass remineralisation calculated from $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ concentrations measured in respective sediment cores with (+ Bioturbation; white symbols) and without (Control; dark symbols) Callianassid bioturbation. Curves in graph (b) reflect sediment remineralisation measured in all treatments. Values represent means $\pm$ SE (n = 3–5).....	129
Fig. 5.6: Estimated contributions of labile organic matter (LOM; seagrass) and recalcitrant organic matter (ROM; sediment C) sources to respiration. The contribution of (a) Bioturbation and (b) Seagrass (LOM amendment) to microbial priming (PE) is compared. The fraction of sediment C (ROM) and added C (seagrass; LOM) contribution to the total CO <sub>2</sub> flux was calculated from stable isotope signatures using a 2-end member mixing model. Values represent means (n = 3–5). Error bars are absent due to the calculated nature of the values. ....	131
Fig. C.1: Non-linear regression of <i>Zostera muelleri</i> seagrass cover to density of active site-dominant bioturbator burrow openings, at two locations (Sydney region, NSW and Gladstone, QLD), showing an approximate 95% confidence envelope (blue dotted line) and predictor variable envelope (red dashed line). The 3-factor equation of the regression line is given.....	139

Fig. C.2: Projected loss of sediment  $C_{org}$  (as  $CO_2$ ) stimulated by the microbial priming effect (PE), corresponding to bioturbator burrow densities from the Sydney region. Dotted horizontal reference lines indicate the range of annual sequestration rates for seagrass meadows in Australia (Lavery et al. 2013, Serrano et al. 2016). The cross-hashed reference box indicates the range of projected densities most likely to be sustainable (in terms of C flux) for the meadows tested in this thesis. The mean density of burrows in sites (with moderate to high seagrass density; see Fig. C.1) within the Sydney region (Chapter 2) was  $36\ m^{-2}$ . The range of projected PE stimulated C-loss values were calculated based on the (high, average and low) rates of observed sediment remineralisation (Chapter 5). The intensity of the range fill colour is indicative of the projected loss of sediment C due to PE. .... 147

Fig. C.3: Conceptual diagram of the processes affecting seagrass detrital burial and C sequestration in seagrass meadows in (a) undisturbed sediment and (b) sediment populated with a bioturbator. Image created by A. Thomson using the Integration and Application Network, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science ([ian.umces.edu/symbols/](http://ian.umces.edu/symbols/)). .... 149

## Abstract

The ability of vegetated coastal habitats to enhance carbon (C) sequestration and sustain C stocks plays an important role in the global cycling of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. These blue carbon ecosystems (encompassing seagrass meadows, mangroves, and saltmarshes) are among the most efficient and productive environments for C storage worldwide. In fact, seagrass meadows transfer C into the sediment more efficiently than any terrestrial ecosystem. There is therefore a huge potential to capitalise on these C sinks, and understanding processes that affect the sequestration and storage of C within seagrass ecosystems is essential. There is however a major deficit in our understanding of the factors affecting C cycling in seagrass sediments, and this is how burrowing macrofauna within seagrass sediments affect the flux of C.

Benthic macrofauna (“bioturbators”) are a natural component of seagrass environments. Their activity within the sediment potentially has major impacts on seagrass C sequestration, given their influence on organic matter, and relationship with sediment microbes. It is generally accepted that the effects of bioturbators are a poorly studied component of blue C ecosystems. Quantifying the effect of bioturbation on C sequestration is essential in understanding the continuing C sequestration capacity of these systems.

The overarching objectives for this thesis were two-fold; (1) to determine whether bioturbation has a net overall positive or negative effect on seagrass C sequestration; and (2) to evaluate the mechanisms behind these processes in relation to a meadows C flux. To address these objectives, this thesis took a holistic approach, following the burial and decomposition of organic matter (detritus), and investigating the extent of sediment oxygenation and microbial activity. Finally, we were able to quantify the flux of both sediment and detrital-C from the sediment. A number of species were investigated, including globally-distributed Thalassinidean shrimp (“Callianassid”), and the lugworm *Arenicola marina*. The overall findings of this thesis encompass a “scaled-up” approach to the potential impacts of bioturbators on seagrass sediment C stocks.

The results uncovered in this thesis revealed that bioturbation can have varying impacts on both seagrass C stocks, as well as C sequestration. It was shown that not only do bioturbators influence the burial of organic matter (i.e. detritus), bioturbation also

affects the degradation rate of organic matter. The results in this thesis also brought to light that bioturbation stimulated microbial degradation of sediment-bound C stocks, a process known as “microbial priming”. The results of this thesis outline that bioturbation ultimately results in favourable sediment conditions for microbial degradation of both detrital and sediment-C. The culmination of these processes may result in “hot-spots” of C loss. However, it is also evident that bioturbation has a larger scale impact on seagrass as a whole ecosystem. We conclude that bioturbation is likely to have ecologically-meaningful impacts on both Australian and global seagrass C sequestration.