Patterns of spatial variability between contrasting substrata: a boulder-field study

Jean-Charles Leclerc^{1,2,*}

¹Sorbonne Universités, UPMC, Univ Paris 06, CNRS, UMR 7144 AD2M, Station Biologique de Roscoff, Place Georges Teissier, 29680 Roscoff, France

²Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción, Departamento de Ecología, Facultad de Ciencias, Centro de Investigación en Biodiversidad y Ambientes Sustentables (CIBAS), Casilla 297, Concepción, Chile

ABSTRACT: Boulder fields are complex habitats in which many species coexist and are important contributors to coastal biodiversity. These habitats experience important natural disturbances due to wave action, over which anthropogenic stressors, such as hand-fishing and urban sprawl, can be added. Despite their particularity and vulnerability, there have been few attempts to disentangle the processes that actually structure boulder-field communities at different scales. In order to help direct future research in boulder-field systems, diversity and community structure, as well as associated variability patterns, were compared between boulder and bedrock habitats at a hierarchy of spatial scales (from 100s of cm to 10s of km) along approximately 100 km of shoreline in NW Brittany. Specifically, it was hypothesised that (1) differences in physical structure would produce greater variability on boulder than on bedrock substrate at small scales and (2) contrasting patterns of variability would emerge with increasing scales, as the processes operating at a large scale on the bedrock would be dampened on boulders undergoing physical disturbance. Overall, both hypotheses were rejected with regards to variability patterns in diversity, community structure and abundances of most functional groups, except for ephemerals in both mid- and low-shore heights and limpets in the low-shore. Variability was generally concentrated at the smallest spatial scale, but bedrock showed greater patchiness than boulders for most of the response variables. With increasing spatial scales, the variability patterns were consistent overall between habitats. Among potential mechanisms, the interplay between grazing and physical disturbance over several spatial scales deserves further experimental scrutiny.

KEY WORDS: Disturbance \cdot Hierarchical design \cdot Spatial scale \cdot Diversity \cdot Intertidal \cdot Seaweeds \cdot Marine invertebrates \cdot Community assembly \cdot NW Brittany \cdot NE Atlantic

- Resale or republication not permitted without written consent of the publisher

INTRODUCTION

Analyzing multi-scale patterns of variability in diversity, abundance and assemblage structure has been proven efficient to highlight the processes likely responsible for observable patterns in population and assemblage structures (Underwood & Chapman 1996, Benedetti-Cecchi 2001). On rocky shores, and more specifically on bedrock substrates, such approaches have enabled researchers to infer the significance of small-scale processes, such as biotic interactions (especially competition, facilitation and predation, including grazing) and those associated with substratum heterogeneity (e.g. Dayton 1971, McGuinness & Underwood 1986, Guichard & Bourget 1998, Blanchard & Bourget 1999, Coleman et al. 2006, Smale et al. 2010), generally resulting in larger variability at small scales (10s to 100s of cm). In contrast to small-scale patterns, the spatial variability at larger scales is generally lower, though processes acting across these scales can result in important differences in population and community structure (Broitman et al. 2001, Puente et al. 2017, Robuchon et al. 2017). These patterns can result from variation in coastal topography, wave exposure, upwelling, dispersal and recruitment, generally acting at the mesoscale (i.e. from a few to 100s of km), as well as climatic gradients, oceanography and geomorphology, which usually act at a broader scale (i.e. from 100s to 1000s of km) (see Fraschetti et al. 2005, Benedetti-Cecchi & Trussell 2014 for reviews). Since all these forces can overlap across spatial scales and interact among each other, identifying a characteristic scale of variation is a robust preliminary approach to determine which processes should be further investigated with thorough experiments. While consistent patterns of spatial variability emerged from general reviews on the topic or cross-system comparisons (e.g. Fraschetti et al. 2005, Dal Bello et al. 2017), there have been few attempts to compare these patterns between microhabitats shared by rocky shores across several spatial scales. Both the nature and strength of the forces experienced by these habitats (e.g. bedrock more or less inclined, rock pools, and boulders) may, however, differ (e.g. Benedetti-Cecchi et al. 2000, Firth & Crowe 2010) and lead to contrasting patterns across spatial scales.

Boulder fields have long been a useful framework to study ecological theories (e.g. Sousa 1979a, McGuinness 1984), and yet studies examining multiscale patterns in these habitats are rare (McKindsey & Bourget 2001, Chapman 2005). It has long been suggested that physical disturbance is one of the major forces influencing community structure in boulder fields (Osman 1977, Sousa 1979a, Littler & Littler 1984, but see McGuinness 1987b). By overturning boulders at different rates (turnover), physical disturbance may create a mosaic of patches undergoing different stages of community development. Though the probability of overturning an individual boulder could be estimated by its size (McGuinness 1984, 1987a), it does not necessarily reflect the intensity of disturbance actually operating on such heterogeneous habitats (Blanchard & Bourget 1999). In addition, the rate of boulder overturning may be locally increased by anthropogenic impacts such as seaweed and seafood harvesting (Le Hir & Hily 2005, Stagnol et al. 2013, Hily & Bernard 2014). While a huge boulder is unlikely to be overturned by wave action, a smaller boulder may experience an intermediate level of disturbance. When a boulder is overturned for a long period (several months), most of its sessile biota may be killed, and a new sequence of succession will start on the open space created upon its top surface (Sousa 1979b). Depending on its duration, the period of overturning will affect the ongoing succession sequence differently, as some biota remaining in place may either persist as reproductive or vegetative stages. By favouring the coexistence of a mosaic of successional stages and preventing dominance, an intermediate level of disturbance can thus be assumed to be associated with a greater species diversity (Osman 1977, Connell 1978, Sousa 1979b, 1980). Under heterogeneous disturbance, communities on boulder fields may therefore be naturally more variable at the patch scale than on more temporally constant surrounding bedrock. Further processes interacting with physical disturbance (e.g. grazing) may, however, make such model more complicated, and its outcomes may vary according to life form strategies and specific stress resistance (Sousa 1980, Littler & Littler 1984).

The rare studies performed at a hierarchy of spatial scales in boulder fields suggest that less and less variability is explained by increasing spatial scale (e.g. McKindsey & Bourget 2001, Chapman 2005, Liversage & Kotta 2015). Though not jointly performed, similar studies conducted on the bedrock generally captured processes operating at larger scales, such as among shores (Benedetti-Cecchi 2001, Valdivia et al. 2011) or among regions (Dal Bello et al. 2017). If the disturbances acting upon boulders are sustained across several spatial scales, they may overwhelm processes coming into play with increasing spatial scales (e.g. wave exposure, recruitment) on the bedrock, and contrasting patterns of variability may thus be expected between habitats. However, processes operating at larger spatial scales may interact with these disturbances, and the local influences (e.g. species pool) may change the outcomes of this model (Chapman & Underwood 1998); for example, boulder communities may tend to converge with bedrock in some place but not in others.

The present study aimed to compare boulder and bedrock substrata across different spatial scales and tidal heights in NW Brittany. In order to make both multivariate and univariate comparisons possible between habitats, bedrock was compared with the top of the boulders. Many fewer exclusive species occur in this stratum compared to habitats underneath boulders, therefore differences in multivariate variability would mainly result from differences in abundance of a common set of species rather than differences in identity. Beyond pattern descriptions, the following hypotheses were tested: (1) it was expected that small-scale variability in richness, abundance of most taxa and community structure would be lower on the bedrock than on boulders, which experience higher level of disturbance. (2) It



Fig. 1. Sampling design and maps indicating shores, sites (same symbols used in Fig. 3 and Supplement 3) and patches on the NW coast of Brittany where boulders and stable bedrock were sampled for the study. Intertidal areas appear in pale grey

was expected that contrasting patterns of variability between habitats would emerge from 10s of m to 10s of km, as processes operating on the bedrock over increasing spatial scales are overwhelmed by the disturbance presumably undergone by boulders at the small scale.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sampling design and data collection

The study was performed during November 2015 'spring' tides along approximately 100 km of shoreline in NW Brittany, France (Fig. 1, see Supplement 1 at www.int-res.com/articles/suppl/m597p023_supp.pdf). In this mega-tidal region, the tidal range may reach 8.5 to 10 m (increasing along a W to E gradient). This portion of coastline is part of the same well-mixed water body and experiences relatively cold (mean about 12°C) and stable (yearly amplitude of 6 to 8°C) sea surface temperatures throughout the year (Birrien et al. 1991, Gallon et al. 2014). The dominant rock formation is granite, though mixed with mica-schist at the westernmost part (Fig. 1, locality A), gneiss at northernmost (B) and gabbro (with pegmatite patches) at easternmost (D). The study region is generally exposed to WNW swell, varying on average from approximately 1.5 m in summer to 3.3 m in winter (with maxima up to 10.5 m), and showing a slight decrease

along a W to E gradient (Supplement 1). According to the coastline conformation and to the wave energy gradients, coastal boulder fields can be encountered either along headlands or embedded within rocky inlets (Le Duff & Hily 2001). All boulder-field sites were selected according to the presence of both natural boulders densely clustered and stable bedrock along at least 300 m of shoreline, extending at least from the top fringe of the mid-shore (about 6 m above chart datum) and the infra-littoral fringe (chart datum ± 1 m approximately). In addition, an operational criterion was adopted: the sampled boulders had to be large enough to be covered by a flexible 0.1 m² quadrat on their top part and light enough to be overturned manually by the observer. These individual boulders were thus assumed to experience an intermediate level of disturbance due to wave action (Sousa 1979a) as well as potential disturbance from recreational fishing (Hily & Bernard 2014). Both habitats (boulders and bedrock) were sampled at 2 tide levels (mid- and lowshore), adopting a hierarchical design comprising 3 random factors (locality, site and patch). Localities were haphazardly selected, 20 to 30 km apart within the region (Fig. 1). Within each locality, 2 study sites (the so-called boulder fields) were haphazardly selected 2 to 5 km apart. Finally, 2 patches (20 to 50 m wide) were placed 200 to 300 m apart within each site. While boulders tend to accumulate along the bedrock according to wave energy-gradients at the scale of a site, it was possible to find—generally on site edgespatches presenting a scattered arrangement of both habitats, hence avoiding confounding effects in habitat comparisons. Within a patch, the wave exposure experienced by these habitats was expected to be the same. Nonetheless, comparisons between patches or tidal heights may involve differences in wave exposure (see Supplement 1 for further details) owing to the site features (headland, island and inlets), and hence contrasting frequency and intensity of disturbance (McGuinness 1987a). Tidal heights were defined using a tide table: 2.0 ± 0.50 m above chart datum for the low-shore and 4.5 ± 0.50 m for the mid-shore. These heights were considered for both the upper side of boulder and the bedrock (i.e. sampled surface) to avoid confounding effects due to emersion period (McGuinness & Underwood 1986). Within each patch and at each tidal height, the stable bedrock (n = 16) and the top of the boulders (n = 16)were sampled using a flexible (plastic mesh) 0.1 m² quadrat.

Abundances were assessed for sessile organisms (seaweeds, sessile fauna) and mobile invertebrates (>2 mm) using percentage covers and counts, respectively. Seaweed and sessile fauna percentage cover was assessed by summing over 25 sub-quadrats, within each an abundance score from 1 to 4 was given to each taxon (after Dethier et al. 1993). In order to take into account species layering, percentage cover was assessed for epiphytic, canopy and understorey species (after moving the canopy aside); therefore the total frequently exceeded 100%. All quadrats were photographed entirely and a series of close-ups (above and beneath canopy) were taken to double check in the laboratory. Given the important diversity and layering of low-shore assemblages, their diversity and assemblage structure were directly assessed on the field. As for mid-shore, their assemblages were visually assessed based on photographs later in the laboratory using the same method described above. Most specimens were visually (non-destructively) identified at the lowest taxonomic level possible (generally species). A few specimens were brought to the laboratory and preserved at -20°C before further identification under a dissecting microscope. Notably, it was operationally unmanageable to remove all limpets, from the genus Patella (a total of 10866 ind.), from their substrate to allow identification based on foot and tentacle patterns; only the blue-rayed limpet Patella (formerly Helcion) pellucida L. could be identified based on superficial (shell) criteria. P. vulgata L., P. depressa Pennant and P. ulyssiponensis Gmelin were thus pooled into a single limpet group: Patella spp. Given the inefficiency involved with counting the cryptic periwinkle *Melarhaphe neritoides* L. from photographs (mid-shore bedrock), this species was not included in analyses.

Statistical analyses

General patterns in species diversity and distributions

Patterns in species richness, community structure (all taxa) and abundance of functional groups of algae (sheet-like, filamentous, coarsely branched, thick leathery canopy, jointed calcareous and crustose; Littler & Littler 1984), key faunal taxa (barnacles, limpets) and bare space—shared by both habitats and tidal levels—were examined with a 5-way design (Fig. 1) using permutational multivariate (or univariate) analyses of variance (PERMANOVA; Anderson 2001), with 4999 permutations. Factors were 'habitat' (fixed, 2 levels: boulders and bedrock), 'level' (fixed, 2 levels: mid- and low-shore), 'locality' (random, 4 levels), 'site' (random, 2 levels nested within locality) and 'patch' (random, 2 levels, nested within site and locality). Univariate analyses were based on Euclidian distance matrices whereas multivariate analyses were based on Bray-Curtis similarity matrices generated from either raw or transformed data. In order to down-weigh the importance of the most abundant species (and homogenize multivariate dispersion), multivariate data were square-root transformed. No transformation allowed homoscedasticity to be achieved in univariate data (PERM-DISP analyses; data not shown). Given the balance of the design and the large number of samples (n = 16), univariate PERMANOVAs (analogous to ANOVAs) were considered robust enough to cope with this issue, and were run on untransformed data (Underwood 1997). When appropriate, PERMANOVAs were followed by pairwise comparisons and p-values were estimated using Monte Carlo procedure. In order to examine the general patterns in habitat, vertical and horizontal distribution, a principal coordinate (PCO) analysis and a cluster analysis were jointly performed on centroid values computed from each combinations of habitat × level × patch (site [locality]), i.e. from 16 replicates (see Supplement 2). Subsequently, additional PCO analyses were performed on all samples and correlations of the variable to the axes were analysed in order to better explain these patterns. Since multivariate and most univariate PERMANOVAs showed a 3-way interaction, separate graphics were presented for mid- and low-shore assemblages, respectively.

Patterns of spatial variability across horizontal scales, habitats and levels

Degrees of variability were independently estimated for all combinations of habitat (boulder and bedrock) × level (mid- and low-shore) × horizontal scale (patch, site, locality and region). To this end, community structure, richness and abundances of functional groups of algae, barnacles, limpets and bare space in mid-shore boulders, mid-shore bedrock, low-shore boulders and low-shore bedrock were all examined separately using a fully nested 3way PERMANOVA, with patch nested in site and site nested in locality. For each response variable, these analyses were repeated on 8 independent matrices, yielded from the random selection of 2 quadrats patch⁻¹. Untransformed data were used for all multivariate and univariate analyses, respectively calculating Bray-Curtis dissimilarities and Euclidean distances. Pseudo-variance components (or variance in the case univariate analyses) were extracted for each source of variation (within region: 10s of km; within locality: 1000s of m; within site: 10s of m; and within patch: 100s of cm) by setting equal the observed mean square to their expectations (Anderson et al. 2008). When occurring, any negative estimate was set to zero and the model was adjusted-by excluding the corresponding factor-to re-calculate the remaining estimates (Fletcher & Underwood 2002, Fraschetti et al. 2005). For each response variable, a total of 128 estimates of horizontal variability were thus obtained and examined using a balanced 3-way ANOVA. Factors (all fixed and orthogonal) were habitat (boulder and bedrock), level (mid- and lowshore) and scale (patch, site, locality and region). Although pseudo-variance estimates were systematically log transformed to reduce heterogeneity (Benedetti-Cecchi 2001), the homogeneity of variances could not be achieved (Levene's test). As such, a conservative level of significance ($\alpha = 0.01$) was applied (Underwood 1997, Fraschetti et al. 2005). Provided that components of variation in residualsassociated with large degrees of freedom-are generally more accurately estimated than other terms in nested ANOVAs, obtaining heterogeneous variances was not surprising. It should be noted that other procedures herein employed (1-way ANOVAs for each scale, variance or dissimilarity calculations for pairs of samples) led to similar results, and therefore are

not presented. When appropriate, ANOVAs were followed by Student-Newman-Keuls (SNK) tests for multiple comparisons (with $\alpha = 0.05$). ANOVAs were performed using SigmaPlot, while PERMANOVAs, PCOs and PERMDISPs were performed using PRIMER 7 (Clarke & Warwick 2001).

RESULTS

During this study, a total of 114 taxa were identified (2 lichens, 49 seaweeds and 63 animals). Complete lists and species authorities are provided in Supplement 3 at www.int-res.com/articles/suppl/ m597p023_supp.pdf. Cumulated richness was more than twice as high in the low-shore (104 taxa) than in the mid-shore (43 taxa). Average abundances (site⁻¹) within the mid-shore and the low-shore are given for both habitats in Supplements 4 & 5, respectively. Across horizontal scales, the preliminary principal component analysis based on centroids suggested differences in assemblage structure among habitats and shore levels, with habitat discrimination seemingly level-dependent (Supplement 2).

Dissimilarities in diversity and assemblage structure between boulders and bedrock

Overall, boulders and bedrock were different, with some inconsistencies across scales and levels depending on the response variable considered (Supplement 6, Fig. 2). According to the PERMANOVAs and pairwise tests (Supplement 6), the more consistent result was regarding richness (interaction of habitat × level), being about twice as high (average ± SD) on the bedrock than on boulders in the midshore $(6.2 \pm 2.3 \text{ vs. } 3.4 \pm 1.4, \text{ respectively; Fig. 2A})$ and in the low-shore $(13.2 \pm 3.5 \text{ vs. } 7.2 \pm 2.7, \text{ respec-}$ tively; Fig. 2A). Although contrasting between tidal levels, almost consistent results were observed for the abundance of Patella spp. (interaction of habitat × level; Fig. 2B), which was caused by abundances being similar between habitats in the mid-shore (overall 8.0 ± 6.7) but lower on the bedrock (6.9 ± 8.4) than on boulders (19.1 ± 12.5) in the low-shore. Contrasting and patch-dependent results were observed for the cover of barnacles: covers were lower on boulders than on the bedrock in 11 patches out of 16 in the mid-shore (Supplement 6, Fig. 2C) and greater on boulders than on the bedrock in 3 patches in the low-shore (Fig. 2C). A 3 way-interaction (habitat × level × patch (site [locality]); Supplement 6) was



Fig. 2. Univariate patterns in richness and abundances of various groups in mid-shore (left panels) and low-shore (right panels). Mean (±SE) values (n = 16) for (A) richness, (B) numerical abundance of *Patella* spp., (C) covers of barnacles, (D) bare space, (E) ephemeral, (F) filamentous, (G) coarsely branched, (H) canopy, (I) jointed calcareous and (J) crustose algae are indicated for each habitat with patch

observed for the bare space cover, but pairwise tests revealed relatively consistent results: bare space was lower on bedrock than on boulders within 13 patches out of 16 in the mid-shore (on average 74.6 \pm 24.4 vs. 91.0 \pm 14.3; Fig. 2D) and within 15 patches in the low-shore $(9.8 \pm 16.0 \text{ vs. } 54.4 \pm 31.0;$ Fig. 2D). In contrast, despite a 3 wayinteraction (habitat × level × site [locality]); Supplement 6), no significant differences could be observed regarding the cover of sheet-like seaweeds (here represented by ephemerals such as Ulva and Porphyra spp.; Supplement 4) between habitats in the mid- and lowshore at any site. This group seemed, however, to be more representedthough not very abundant and highly variable (up to $25.1 \pm 24.2\%$ cover)—on boulders than on the bedrock (Fig. 2E). The percentage cover of filamentous algae tended to be greater on rock than boulders (habitat \times level \times patch) in the low-shore (13 patches out of 16; Fig. 2F), but less clearly in the mid-shore (4 patches; Fig. 2F). Similarly, coarsely branched algae displayed greater cover on bedrock than on boulders (habitat × level \times patch) within 3 patches in the mid-shore (Fig. 2G) and within 14 patches in the low-shore (Fig. 2G). Less abundant than other groups, jointed calcareous algae displayed greater cover on bedrock than on boulders (habitat \times level \times patch) in only 1 patch in the mid-shore and 8 in the low-shore (Fig. 2I). No difference could be detected regarding the crustose group between habitats (Fig. 2J). In contrast, canopy cover (i.e. thick-leathery seaweeds; Fig. 2H) was greater on bedrock than on boulders (habitat \times level \times patch) within 12 patches out of 16 in the mid-shore $(12.0 \pm 19.4 \% \text{ vs. } 2.2 \pm 5.6 \%)$ and within 13 patches in the low-shore $(36.7 \pm$ 31.1% vs. 3.8 ± 10.7%).

As for community structure, differences between habitats appeared patchdependent (3-way interaction; Supplement 6, Fig. 3), although pairwise tests indicated significant differences between habitats in all patches, both in the



Fig. 3. Principal coordinate (PCO) analyses describing (A,B) mid-shore and (C,D) low-shore assemblage structure. Vector plots of variables correlated with the PCO axes are indicated on right panels (r > 0.4); font size varyies with r values (see legend)

mid- and low-shore (Supplement 6). In the mid-shore, habitat appeared mainly discriminated by the first axis of PCO (30.9% of variation; Fig. 3A,B), and was highly correlated with the cover of bare space (r = 0.8), tending to be greater on boulders than on the bedrock. In the low-shore, samples appeared more scattered on the PCO and, in spite of some overlap, habitats were mostly discriminated by the first axis (41.0% of variation; Fig. 3C). Boulders tended to display greater cover of bare space and abundances of *Patella* spp. in comparison to the stable bedrock, characterized by greater canopy (especially *Fucus serratus*) cover and diverse associated species (Fig. 3D).

Horizontal patterns in diversity and assemblage structure within habitats

Important similarities in community structure were observed all along the studied area and no clear patterns in richness or abundances could be identified among localities (Fig. 2, Supplement 6). Some subtle differences could, however, be observed on the stable bedrock, but not on boulders. For instance, a 3way interaction of habitat \times level \times locality was revealed for community structure and discriminated the western locality A from the others on the stable bedrock at both shore heights, and the eastern locality D from the others in the midshore (Supplement 6). These differences are well illustrated on the PCOs, though explain a limited amount of variation (Fig. 3), as marked differences are also observed within sites (i.e. among patches; Supplement 6). In the midshore, the second axis (23.9%)tends to depict a balance between barnacles and/or limpets (possibly mussels) and fucoids, respectively more abundant in localities A,D and B,C (Fig. 3A,B, Supplement 4). Further variation (14.7% on axis 3; data not shown) discriminated patches partially covered by Fucus vesiculosus var. li*nearis* to patches sheltering some Ascophyllum nodosum and accompanying species. Finally, dissimilarities among localities were also suggested from community structure of the stable bedrock in the low shore. The second PCO axis (9.8% of variation; Fig. 3C,D) tended to differentiate sites with F. serratus canopy to sites dominated by diverse red turf-forming seaweeds (e.g. Osmundea pinnatifida, Chondracanthus acicularis) and alternative canopy (e.g. Himanthalia elongata) (especially at locality A).

As for pooled morpho-functional groups, horizontal patterns were less evident from univariate analyses and the variability between patches was important within most of the sites, with contrasting patterns depending on the habitat as well as on the shore height considered (Fig. 2, Supplement 6). Habitat × level × locality interactions were ob-



Fig. 4. Pseudo-variance estimates (mean \pm SE, n = 8, logarithmic scale) in various multivariate and univariate descriptors of the assemblages depending on habitats and shore levels within 4 spatial scales (patch, site, locality and region)

served for the abundances of coarsely branched and crustose seaweeds as well as barnacles, but pairwise tests solely revealed logical groupings for the latter. Locality-to-locality differences in barnacle covers (Fig. 2C) were limited to the bedrock in the low-shore (A > B = C = D), in the mid-shore (A = [B = C < D]) and to boulders in the mid-shore (A = B = C < D).

Patterns of spatial variability across horizontal scales, habitats and levels

Patterns of horizontal variability across scales appeared relatively consistent between habitats and shore levels—generally higher at the scale of patch—although this depended on the response variable considered (Tables 1 & 2, Fig. 4). While multivariate components of variability (community structure) displayed greater values on the bedrock than on boulders, it was consistently higher at the scale of the patch. Variability was equally distributed between site and locality, though it increased within region. While these patterns seem to be driven by values observed on the bedrock (Fig. 4), no interaction (e.g. scale \times habitat \times level) was significant at the level adopted ($\alpha <$ 0.01; Table 1). Such interactions were significant for the abundance of Patella spp., the covers of bare space, barnacles and jointed calcareous algae (Tables 1 & 2). Nonetheless, the only consistent logical grouping was greater variance values at the scale of patch at both shore levels, with the exception of bare surface in mid-shore bedrock. In only a few cases, within-site variability appeared higher than within locality, namely for jointed calcareous and crustose algae in the low-shore bedrock, and barnacles in the mid-shore. Patterns of increasing variability between the scales of locality and region-revealed with overall community structure-were also observed with the cover of barnacles in the midand low-shore and with the cover of crustose algae in the low-shore.

Finally, greater values of horizontal variability were generally observed on the bedrock compared to boulders (Fig. 4, Tables 1 & 2), most likely due to difference in mean values (e.g. richness and abundance of most functional groups of seaweeds; Fig. 2). Greater variability on boulders compared to bedrock was only revealed with the cover of sheet-like ephemeral algae within the scales of patch, site and locality, along with the cover of bare surface at the scale of locality in the mid-shore and limpet abundances in the low-shore (Fig. 4, Tables 1 & 2).

DISCUSSION

Across the majority of sampling sites, boulders appeared to be devoid of most functional groups of seaweeds, found in

Source of variation	df	Communi	ity structure	Rich	mess	Patelli	a spp.	Barnê	acles	Bare ro	ock	
		MS	F	MS	F	MS	Ц	MS	F	MS	F	
Scale (Sca)	с С	90.56	30.53***	12.02	48.93***	52.87	38,11 ***	56.03	44.89***	96.16	37.59***	
Habitat (Hab)	1	59.39	20.02***	5.25	21.37***	2.14	$1.54^{ m ns}$	18.82	15.08^{***}	3.89	$1.52^{ m ns}$	
Level (Lev)	1	3.42	$1.15^{ m ns}$	5.48	22.30***	0.04	$0.03^{ m ns}$	61.30	49.12***	7.29	$2.85^{ m ns}$	
$Sca \times Hab$	3	0.90	3.34^{a}	0.08	$0.32^{\rm ns}$	1.34	0.96^{ns}	1.47	$1.17^{ m ns}$	9.69	3.79^{a}	
$Sca \times Lev$	3	10.05	3.39^{a}	0.65	2.66^{ns}	11.83	8.53***	5.90	4.73**	22.23	8.69***	
$Hab \times Lev$	1	1.16	$0.39^{ m ns}$	0.27	$1.11^{ m ns}$	6.24	4.50^{a}	22.88	18.33***	16.42	6.42^{a}	
Sca × Hab × Lev	3	8.91	3.00^{a}	0.38	$1.53^{ m ns}$	5.64	4.07**	0.83	$0.67^{ m ns}$	17.34	6.78***	
Res	112	2.97		0.25		1.39		1.25		2.56		
Pairwise tests		Scale:		Scale:		Sca × Hal	b × Lev:	Sca × Lev:		Sca × Hab × I	ev:	
		Pa > ((S)	i = Lo) < Re	Pa > {	Si = Lo = Re	Mid: (S	ica × Hab) ^{ns}	Mid:		Mid: (Sca >	< Hab)***	
						Pa > Si	= Lo = Re	(Pa > Si :	> Lo < Re)	B: Pa > Si =	= Lo = Re	
		Habitat:		Habitat:				Low:		R: Pa = Si [> Lo] = Re	
		B < R		B < R		Low: (S	sca × Hab) ^{ns}	Pa > (Si :	= Lo < Re	Pa: B = R	1	
						Pa > Si	= Lo = Re	$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{R}$		Si: B < R		
				Level:		B > R				Lo: $B > R$		
				> Mid <	< Low			Hab × Lev: Mid: B <	R	Re B = R		
								Low: B =	= R	Low: (Scae	$(\times Hab)^{ns}$	
										Pa > Si = L D _ D	o = Re	
										D=R		

***p < 0.001; ^{ns}: term

not significant at $\alpha = 0.05$; ^a: term significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, but not significant at $\alpha = 0.01$, level adopted given the heteroscedasticity of the data. Scale: Patch (Pa), Site (Si)

Locality (Lo), Region (Re); Habitat: Boulders (B), Bedrock (R); Level: Mid-shore (Mid), Low-shore (Low)

Table 1. ANOVA tests for differences in multivariate and univariate pseudo-variance estimates across habitats, levels and spatial scales. ** p < 0.01,

abundance on the stable bedrock. In addition, the variability in abundance of most of these groups was lower on boulders than on bedrock, irrespective of the horizontal and vertical scales considered, except for jointed calcareous and sheet-like seaweeds. The latter group, dominated by ephemerals, actually experienced larger variability in abundance on boulders than on the bedrock across 3 horizontal scales (from metres to kilometres). While these results could suggest that most replicate boulders were more disturbed than the surrounding bedrock, these differences did not translate to greater patchiness in algal abundances on boulders than on the bedrock. The opposite pattern was actually observed for all groups, except early successional species at both tidal heights and limpets in the lowshore. First, this suggests that boulder patches do not necessarily represent a mosaic of successional stages, but could rather be dominated by individual boulders presenting assemblages at an early stage of development. Second, this indicates that small-scale variability is pervasive within the studied communities, including on the comparatively 'stable' bedrock. While physical disturbance may contribute to the observed patterns, further processes (e.g. grazing pressure, habitat selection) are likely to operate at both tidal heights studied.

Small-scale patterns and variability

At both tidal heights, important variability occurred at the scale of the patch and was generally greater than any other spatial scale considered. This finding aligns with reviews on the topic (e.g. Fraschetti et al. 2005), regardless of the substrate type (boulder versus bedrock).

Contrary to expectations, however, patchiness was generally greater on the bedrock than on boulders, except for ephemerals in both shore heights p < 0.001; ^{ns}: term not significant at $\alpha = 0.05$; ^a: term significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, but not significant at $\alpha = 0.01$, level adopted given the heteroscedasticity of the data. Scale: Patch (Pa), Site (Si) $^{**}p < 0.01$, Table 2. ANOVA tests for differences in multivariate and univariate pseudo-variance estimates across habitats, levels and spatial scales. (Low) (B), Bedrock (R); Level: Mid-shore (Mid), Low-shore Boulders Locality (Lo), Region (Re); Habitat:

tose F	*** 00 86	17 74 ***	52.19***	0.70^{ns}	5.84 ***	0.09^{ns}	$2.43^{\rm ns}$				= Lo = Re		> Lo < Re)							
Crus	21.08	04.00 75.08	73.77	0.99	8.25	0.13	3.44	1.41	Sca × Lev	Mid:	Pa = Si	Low:	Pa > (Si		Habitat:	B < R				
calcareous E	***ZC 0C	70.25***	140.66***	10.37***	25.24 ***	65.92***	9.27***		lab × Lev:	$Sca \times Hab)^{ns}$	i = Lo = Re			(Sca × Hab)***	> Si = Lo = Re	> Si > Lo > Re	< R	< R	< R	= R
Jointed	20 2	15.03	29.22	2.15	5.24	13.69	1.93	0.21	Sca × F	Mid: (Pa > S	B < R		Low:	B: Pa	R: Pa	Pa: B	Si: B <	Lo: B	Re B =
eathery r	75 08***	62 50***	9.00.	$0.30^{\rm ns}$	$0.37^{ m ns}$	$1.15^{ m ns}$	1.20^{ns}			Si = Lo) > Re)						Low				
Thick l	72 10	178 77	25.34	0.84	1.03	3.22	3.39	2.81	Scale:	Pa > ((Habitat	B = R		Level:	Mid <				
branched π	40 51 ***	10.05**	79.35***	2.25^{ns}	19.58***	0.38^{ns}	$1.84^{\rm ns}$				= Lo = Re		= (Lo > Re)							
Coarsely	66.93	17 78	133.81	3.80	33.02	0.64	3.10	1.69	Sca × Le	Mid:	Pa > Si	Low:	Pa > Si		Habitat:	B < R				
nentous E	*** 10 50	61 57 ***	38.97***	$2.41^{ m ns}$	3.60^{a}	6.26^{a}	$2.15^{ m ns}$			Si = Lo = Re		at:	~			< Low				
Filan	20 20	77 16	45.68	2.82	4.22	7.34	2.52	1.17	Scale:	Pa >		Habité	B < I		Level:	Mid				
Sheet-like ephemerals MS F	40 OK ***	44.00	0.13^{ns}	17.02***	5.66**	1.83^{ns}	3.51^{a}		:VE	a > Si	=Re		lab:	> (Si = Lo) > Re	= Si $=$ Lo $=$ Re	> R	۰R	► R	R	
	26.94	10.05 00.66	0.12	15.66	5.21	1.69	3.23	0.92	Sca × Le	Mid: P	(= Lo)		$Sca \times H$	B: Pa >	R: Pa =	Pa: B >	Si: B >	Lo: B >	Re B =	
df	~	o ←		ŝ	e	1	с	112												
Source of variation	Cralo (Cra)	Habitat (Hab)	Level (Lev)	Sca × Hab	$Sca \times Lev$	Hab × Lev	$Sca \times Hab \times Lev$	Res	Pairwise tests											

and limpets in the low-shore. In parallel, boulders presented lower covers of barnacles, leathery fucoids and associated species—but higher densities of limpets in the low-shore—and were comparatively less biodiverse at the patch scale. This result may thus partially be explained by the mean–variance relationship (Taylor 1961, Benedetti-Cecchi 2003), although further mechanisms could be involved.

Small-scale variability is a common feature of rocky shore communities from moderately to highly exposed conditions, and can be influenced by various interplaying processes such as substratum heterogeneity, species behaviour and biotic interactions (Dayton 1971, Connell 1972, Raffaelli & Hawkins 1996, Underwood & Chapman 1996, Guichard & Bourget 1998, Raimondi et al. 2000, Fraschetti et al. 2005). NW European mid-shores are generally characterized by clumps of either Ascophyllum, Fucus or Mytilus (all observed in the present study), whose formation depends on hydrodynamic forces acting at the scale of 100s of m and biotic interactions at the patch scale. For instance, in moderately exposed conditions, Fucus vesiculosus may establish within dense clusters of barnacles, which provide substratum and refuge from grazing by limpets. Adult plants may reduce further settlement of barnacles through sweeping while favouring aggregations of limpets and barnacle predators under the canopy, and in turn limit additional plants and barnacles from establishing in the vicinity (Hawkins & Hartnoll 1983, Hartnoll & Hawkins 1985). Through habitat formation (Jenkins et al. 1999, Moore et al. 2007), both richness and species interactions are promoted at the patch scale, hence increasing small-scale variability in richness and overall community structure on the bedrock. In the lowshore, diverse assemblages of seaweeds and associated invertebrates were observed. The abundance of canopy species varied among shores, and some differences in community structure were detected on the bedrock. Nonetheless, there was no dominance of a single canopy species (thick leathery cover varied from 4 to 76% cover patch⁻¹), nor exclusion of understorey seaweeds. The variability in abundance of thick leathery groups was greater at the scale of patch, and this pattern was tracked by all seaweed functional groups, except sheet-like ephemerals. While dominant and monospecific canopy stands could eventually exclude most understorey species owing to shading, whiplash and scouring (Wernberg et al. 2005), such negative interactions may be dampened as environmental factors-such as substratum heterogeneity (topography, sediments) and hydrodynamics-come into play (Connell 2003, Toohey &

Kendrick 2008). A patchily distributed and/or multispecies canopy would be more likely to create a mosaic of environmental conditions (light gaps, protection from physical stress) and to promote diverse assemblages within which multiple interactions (either direct or indirect; positive, neutral and negative) take place (Bertness et al. 1999, Irving & Connell 2006, Smale et al. 2011, Bulleri et al. 2012). As in the mid-shore, the greater patchiness observed on the bedrock compared to boulders could thus simply be explained by greater strengths of biological interactions, as well as higher species diversity and abundances of almost all successional groups of seaweeds. In addition, substratum complexity and the presence of dense boulders surrounding the bedrock may also affect the incident light and hydrodynamics (current velocity and turbulence) from centimetres to metres (Guichard & Bourget 1998, Guichard et al. 2001, McKindsey & Bourget 2001). Even more likely, given the close proximity of bedrock and boulders at the scale of patch, disturbance may also contribute to small-scale variability on the bedrock (Shanks & Wright 1986, Povey & Keough 1991). Bare space may be opened through boulders hitting bedrock, sand scouring and recreational fishing (seaweed and shellfish removal, stamping), hence providing settlement substrate and refuge from grazers to various seaweeds, regardless of their expected successional stages (Sousa 1980).

Seminal works on boulder fields supported the intermediate disturbance hypothesis (e.g. Osman 1977, Sousa 1979a) as greater diversity and patchiness (mosaic of successional stages) were observed on moderately disturbed boulders, while stable (or stabilized) boulders tended to be dominated by competitive dominants, such as Gigartina sp. (Sousa 1979a, 1980) excluding other species through competition for resources (light, substratum) and whiplash securing the open space. However, this model does not hold for all boulder fields, systems within which physical disturbance alone is unlikely to explain community dynamics (McGuinness & Underwood 1986, McGuinness 1987a,b). In the mid-shore, limpet abundances were statistically similar between habitats (see Supplement 6). Since boulder overturning has not been thoroughly inferred in the present study, it could be hypothesised that physical disturbance is locally unimportant (Bishop & Hughes 1989), or alternatively, that limpets are highly resistant to such disturbance, perhaps due to their anchoring capacity and mobility (Raffaelli & Hawkins 1996) and to boulder substratum heterogeneity (McGuinness & Underwood 1986). With limited substratum facilitation and refuges from grazing

(typically due to barnacles, which preferentially settle towards adult clumps; e.g. Jenkins 2005), seaweeds may thus be less likely to establish on boulders. Though not statistically significant, the pattern observed in the western Site 'Ab' may support this hypothesis (Fig. 2), which could be easily tested through limpet removals: likely due to extreme wave exposure in this site (Le Duff & Hily 2001, Robuchon et al. 2017, Supplement 1), limpets were virtually absent from most boulders, presenting a featureless/smooth aspect, and upon which ephemerals and young Fucus were observed in abundance. In the NE Atlantic, it is often considered that the grazing pressure of limpets decreases lower on the shore (Raffaelli & Hawkins 1996), as the ability of seaweeds to settle and grow (under decreasing stresses) becomes higher than limpet foraging. Indeed, the bedrock herein presented similar limpet densities between tidal heights, but the bare space was about 7-fold lower in the low-shore, where diverse assemblages of seaweeds and associated invertebrates were observed. In contrast, lowshore boulders were generally dominated by bare surface, and only limpets and sheet-like ephemerals presented higher variability on boulders than on the bedrock at the scale of patch. Limpet abundance was up to 15-fold higher (on average 3.9 times patch⁻¹) on boulders than on the bedrock (and generally higher than on the mid-shore). Although this remains to be thoroughly tested, limpets, when present, may thus limit the establishment of a patchy seaweed assemblage, similar to surrounding bedrock. Interestingly, among the possible mechanisms regulating limpet abundance on boulders, habitat selection for substrate and food (e.g. biofilm growing on the apparent bare surface), survival due to lower predation and movement facilitated by bare surface (Underwood & Jernakoff 1981) may all be promoted by disturbance. While physical disturbance (e.g. boulders knocking together, overturning) likely contributes to the contrasting patchiness observed between habitats, it may occur either directly (by creating bare space) or indirectly (by modulating important processes, such as grazing).

Patterns and variability at increasing spatial scales

Beyond patches, variability patterns were generally consistent between boulder and bedrock with increasing spatial scales, i.e. from 10s of m to 10s of km. As an exception, the abundance of ephemerals varied equally among all spatial scales examined on the bedrock, but showed a trend towards decreasing variability on boulders as the horizontal span increased. This pattern tends to support the initial hypothesis that disturbance operating at small scales will lessen other processes, visible on the bedrock, at larger scales. Comparable trends were, however, observed irrespective of the substrate for several groups (thick leathery, crustose) or solely on the bedrock (jointed calcareous) in the low-shore.

The within-site variability (10s of m) was generally similar to within-locality variability (1000s of m), but a few contrasting patterns were observed in the low-shore (e.g. jointed calcareous algae on the bedrock, barnacles and crustose algae on both substrata). Although contrasting between habitats and shore heights, some patch-to-patch differences were observed for the community structure, richness and abundance of all groups, except sheet-like and crustose seaweeds (which displayed some site-to-site differences). Given the coastal features of the study sites (distributed along headlands or within inlets), hydrodynamics are likely to interact with substratum heterogeneity at these intermediate scales, hence influencing many aspects of recruitment and postrecruitment processes (Blanchard & Bourget 1999).

Between the scales of locality and region (1 to 10s of km), an increase in variability was observed for barnacle cover and community structure. These variables displayed differences, generally more pronounced on bedrock than on boulders, between localities. On bedrock, mid-shore communities ranged from fucoid- to suspension feeder-dominated, which could be due to gradients in wave exposure (Hartnoll & Hawkins 1985, Raffaelli & Hawkins 1996). In the low shore, the splash and spray resulting from waves may allow the development of communities uplifted from the infralittoral fringe (Raffaelli & Hawkins 1996, Schaal et al. 2016), as was observed at westernmost locality A (Fig. 3) probably undergoing greater swell than the others (Supplement 1). Should wave exposure be important in influencing bedrock communities among localities, it may also influence boulder communities, hence contributing to the similar variability patterns observed between habitats at this scale ($\alpha = 0.01$). In addition, within a single patch and at a given tidal height, both boulders and bedrock could be expected to experience a similar propagule supply, either originating from local or remote sources. It could be hypothesised that the number of species likely to settle, colonize and eventually establish would tend to be similar between the bedrock and virtually non-disturbed boulders at the local scale (Sousa 1979b, 1980, Chapman & Underwood 1998), although post-settlement survival may be influenced by a series of habitat- and site-specific processes.

Any discrepancy between biodiversity patterns of natural boulders and bedrock may thus emerge if the influence of these specific processes (e.g. physical and biotic disturbance) prevails over those operating at a larger scale. Across all studied patches, a positive correlation between boulders and bedrock richness was found on the low-shore, but not on the midshore (Fig. 5), and this may align with McGuinness (1987a), who found that the frequency and intensity of boulder overturning was generally higher on the shore. Although further work would be needed to disentangle putative mechanisms, disturbance is thus likely to prevail over a series of processes in influencing mid-shore boulders. Nonetheless, since boulder limpets may locally be excluded in favour of ephemerals' development (e.g. locality Ab), the interaction between physical disturbance and biotic interactions may contribute to variability at large scales on boulders. In the low-shore, biodiversity patterns were generally more pronounced and involved a greater number of species than in the mid-shore. Through 'sampling effect', these patterns are more likely to co-vary between habitats, regardless of the disturbance (including grazing) seemingly being stronger on boulders than on bedrock. As on the surrounding bedrock, all hydrodynamics, dispersal and recruitment processes may therefore contribute to large-scale variability on boulders.

Beyond observations: implications and limitations

Overall, the present results suggest that several abiotic and biotic processes interact and may influence patterns at multiple spatial scales (Levin 1992,



Fig. 5. Observed combined richness on boulder versus on the bedrock per patch in the mid- and low-shore (i.e. total number of species identified within a total of 16 quadrats). Only the significant regression (within low-shore) is depicted

Benedetti-Cecchi & Trussell 2014, Dal Bello et al. 2017), even within 2 distinct microhabitats. While habitat properties may locally affect diversity and assemblages, such relationships are generally mediated, over a range of spatial and temporal scales, by biological and environmental contexts (Tews et al. 2004, Matias 2013, Leclerc & Viard 2018). In the studied system, wave action and limpet grazing may have conspicuous influence on boulder-field communities. Nonetheless, experimental manipulations would be needed to infer these processes and to define the spatial scales at which they operate (e.g. Benedetti-Cecchi et al. 2000). While the present study helps direct future research in boulder fields, its outcomes may depend on the specific temporal frame at which it was conducted (Benedetti-Cecchi 2001, Maggi et al. 2017). (1) The intensity and spatial extent of physical and biotic processes may vary over time (Osman 1977). The present study was performed in late fall, when tourism and associated recreational fishing are reduced compared to spring or summer holiday periods. Furthermore, the intensity of recreational fishing is unlikely to be even from site to site (Addessi 1994). As such, the balance between small- and intermediate-scale variability may be time-dependent. Strong storms—operating at the scale of the region, though probably interacting with habitat heterogeneity at small scale-may contribute to physical disturbance, though they are less likely to occur during summer. (2) The nature and abundance of species interacting with these processes also likely change over time. For instance, most fleshy red algae grow and reproduce during the winter-spring period (Sousa 1979b), i.e. a few months after sampling was performed. Unlike ephemeral algae (that reproduce all year), these middle and late successional species could have displayed very different patterns of variability later in the year. (3) Finally, since all natural and anthropogenic disturbances may vary throughout the year, incorporating a temporal level of variability would have been even more valuable than simply replicating the survey (Smale 2013, Leclerc et al. 2016). Given the spatially patchy nature of both boulders and bedrock, such direction may be promising to define indices of anthropogenic disturbance on the basis of variability (Warwick & Clarke 1993, Fraschetti et al. 2001, Chapman 2002)-an approach which has so far yielded conflicting results (e.g. Chapman et al. 1995). Nonetheless, variance analyses generally rely on independence, and such temporal replication would be challenged by the limited number of boulders available per sampling units, thus risks of repetition should be taken into account.

CONCLUSIONS

Important patchiness was revealed on both boulders and 'stable' bedrock, though it was generally higher on the bedrock than boulders, except regarding the abundance of ephemeral algae. While the degree of spatial variability in this group could be useful to characterize physical disturbance on boulders, it is unlikely to disentangle between natural and anthropogenic causes from one shore to another, and even more likely to interact with additional sources of disturbance such as grazing, especially by limpets. Like within most rocky shores worldwide, the intertidal communities of NW Brittany-regardless of substrate type—experience important sources of variability across multiple spatial scales (100s of cm, 10s of m, 1000s of m and 10s of km) which should be considered in sampling designs for both experimental and monitoring purposes.

Acknowledgements. I thank D. Davoult, G. Schaal and S. Huchette for suggesting potential boulder fields in the region, and L. Lévêque for sharing corresponding maps. I am grateful to M. Dal Bello, A. Brante and M. Robuchon for their insightful feedback on an earlier draft as well as 3 anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments that helped to improve the manuscript. This work was funded by 'Pôle Emploi' and a postdoctoral fellowship CONICYT FONDECYT/POSTDOCTORADO/3160172.

LITERATURE CITED

- Addessi L (1994) Human disturbance and long term changes on a rocky intertidal community. Ecol Appl 4:786–797
- Anderson MJ (2001) A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance. Austral Ecol 26:32–46
 - Anderson MJ, Gorley RN, Clarke KR (2008) PERMANOVA+ for PRIMER: guide to software and statistical methods. PRIMER-E, Plymouth
- Benedetti-Cecchi L (2001) Variability in abundance of algae and invertebrates at different spatial scales on rocky sea shores. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 215:79–92
- Benedetti-Cecchi L (2003) The importance of the variance around the mean effect size of ecological processes. Ecology 84:2335–2346
 - Benedetti-Cecchi L, Trussell G (2014) Rocky intertidal communities. In: Bertness MD, Bruno JF, Silliman BR, Stachowicz JJ (eds) Marine community ecology and conservation. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA, p 203–225
- Benedetti-Cecchi L, Bulleri F, Cinelli F (2000) The interplay of physical and biological factors in maintaining midshore and low-shore assemblages on rocky coasts in the north-west Mediterranean. Oecologia 123:406–417
- Bertness MD, Leonard GH, Levine JM, Schmidt PR, Ingraham AO (1999) Testing the relative contribution of positive and negative interactions in rocky intertidal communities. Ecology 80:2711–2726
- Birrien JL, Wafar MVM, Corre PL, Riso R (1991) Nutrients and primary production in a shallow stratified ecosystem

in the Iroise Sea. J Plankton Res 13:721-742

- Bishop P, Hughes M (1989) Imbricate and fitted fabrics in coastal boulder deposits on the Australian east coast. Geology 17:544–547
- Blanchard D, Bourget E (1999) Scales of coastal heterogeneity: influence on intertidal community structure. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 179:163–173
- Broitman BR, Navarrete SA, Smith F, Gaines SD (2001) Geographic variation of southeastern Pacific intertidal communities. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 224:21–34
- Bulleri F, Benedetti-Cecchi L, Cusson M, Maggi E and others (2012) Temporal stability of European rocky shore assemblages: variation across a latitudinal gradient and the role of habitat-formers. Oikos 121:1801–1809
- Chapman MG (2002) Patterns of spatial and temporal variation of macrofauna under boulders in a sheltered boulder field. Austral Ecol 27:211–228
- Chapman MG (2005) Molluscs and echinoderms under boulders: tests of generality of patterns of occurrence. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 325:65–83
- Chapman M, Underwood A (1998) Inconsistency and variation in the development of rocky intertidal algal assemblages. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 224:265–289
- Chapman M, Underwood A, Skilleter G (1995) Variability at different spatial scales between a subtidal assemblage exposed to the discharge of sewage and two control assemblages. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 189:103–122
 - Clarke KR, Warwick RM (2001) Change in marine communities: an approach to statistical analysis and interpretation, 2nd edn. PRIMER-E, Plymouth
- Coleman RA, Underwood AJ, Benedetti-Cecchi L, Aberg P and others (2006) A continental scale evaluation of the role of limpet grazing on rocky shores. Oecologia 147: 556–564
- Connell JH (1972) Community interactions on marine rocky intertidal shores. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst 3:169–192
- Connell JH (1978) Diversity in tropical rain forests and coral reefs. Science 199:1302–1310
- Connell SD (2003) Negative effects overpower the positive of kelp to exclude invertebrates from the understorey community. Oecologia 137:97–103
- Dal Bello M, Leclerc JC, Benedetti-Cecchi L, Andrea De Lucia G and others (2017) Consistent patterns of spatial variability between NE Atlantic and Mediterranean rocky shores. J Mar Biol Assoc UK 97:539–547
- Dayton PK (1971) Competition, disturbance, and community organization: the provision and subsequent utilization of space in a rocky intertidal community. Ecol Monogr 41: 351–389
 - Dethier MN, Graham ES, Cohen S, Tear LM (1993) Visual versus random-point percent cover estimations: 'objective' is not always better. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 96:93–100
- Firth LB, Crowe TP (2010) Competition and habitat suitability: small-scale segregation underpins large-scale coexistence of key species on temperate rocky shores. Oecologia 162:163–174
- Fletcher D, Underwood A (2002) How to cope with negative estimates of components of variance in ecological field studies. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 273:89–95
- Fraschetti S, Bianchi CN, Terlizzi A, Fanelli G, Morri C, Boero F (2001) Spatial variability and human disturbance in shallow subtidal hard substrate assemblages: a regional approach. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 212:1–12
- Fraschetti S, Terlizzi A, Benedetti-Cecchi L (2005) Patterns of distribution of marine assemblages from rocky shores:

evidence of relevant scales of variation. Mar Ecol Prog $\operatorname{Ser}296{:}13{-}29$

- Gallon RK, Robuchon M, Leroy B, Le Gall L, Valero M, Feunteun E (2014) Twenty years of observed and predicted changes in subtidal red seaweed assemblages along a biogeographical transition zone: inferring potential causes from environmental data. J Biogeogr 41: 2293–2306
- Guichard F, Bourget E (1998) Topographic heterogeneity, hydrodynamics, and benthic community structure: a scale-dependent cascade. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 171:59–70
- Guichard F, Bourget E, Robert JL (2001) Scaling the influence of topographic heterogeneity on intertidal benthic communities: alternate trajectories mediated by hydrodynamics and shading. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 217:27–41
- Hartnoll RG, Hawkins SJ (1985) Patchiness and fluctuations on moderately exposed rocky shores. Ophelia 24:53–63
 - Hawkins SJ, Hartnoll RG (1983) Grazing of intertidal algae by marine invertebrates. Oceanogr Mar Biol Annu Rev 21:195–282
 - Hily C, Bernard M (2014) Can we use a landscape approach to assess natural and anthropogenic perturbations of the rocky shore ecosystems? In: Musard O, Le Dû-Blayo L, Francour P, Beurier JP, Feunteun E, Talassinos L (eds) Underwater seascapes: from geographical to ecological perspectives. Springer International Publishing, Cham
- Irving AD, Connell SD (2006) Physical disturbance by kelp abrades erect algae from the understorey. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 324:127–137
- Jenkins SR (2005) Larval habitat selection, not larval supply, determines settlement patterns and adult distribution in two chthamalid barnacles. J Anim Ecol 74:893–904
- Jenkins SR, Hawkins SJ, Norton TA (1999) Direct and indirect effects of a macroalgal canopy and limpet grazing in structuring a sheltered inter-tidal community. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 188:81–92
 - Le Duff M, Hily C (2001) Les zones Natura 2000 de Corsen et Tréompan, Vol 1: les habitats de l'estran de la zone de Corsen. Institut Universitaire Européen de la Mer, Brest
- Le Hir M, Hily C (2005) Macrofaunal diversity and habitat structure in intertidal boulder fields. Biodivers Conserv 14:233–250
- Leclerc JC, Viard F (2018) Habitat formation prevails over predation in influencing fouling communities. Ecol Evol 8:477–492
- Leclerc JC, Riera P, Lévêque L, Davoult D (2016) Contrasting temporal variation in habitat complexity and species abundance distributions in four kelp forest strata. Hydrobiologia 777:33–54
- Levin SA (1992) The problem of pattern and scale in ecology. Ecology 73:1943–1967
- Littler MM, Littler DS (1984) Relationships between macroalgal functional form groups and substrata stability in a subtropical rocky-intertidal system. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 74:13–34
- Liversage K, Kotta J (2015) Disturbance-related patterns in unstable rocky benthic habitats of the north-eastern Baltic coast. Proc Est Acad Sci 64:53–61
- Maggi E, Rindi L, Dal Bello M, Fontanini D, Capocchi A, Bongiorni L, Benedetti-Cecchi L (2017) Spatio-temporal variability in Mediterranean rocky shore microphytobenthos. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 575:17–29
- Matias MG (2013) Macrofaunal responses to structural complexity are mediated by environmental variability and surrounding habitats. Mar Biol 160:493–502

- McGuinness KA (1984) Species-area relations of communities on intertidal boulders: testing the null hypothesis. J Biogeogr 11:439–456
- McGuinness KA (1987a) Disturbance and organisms on boulders. I. Patterns in the environment and the community. Oecologia 71:409–419
- McGuinness KA (1987b) Disturbance and organisms on boulders. II. Causes of patterns in diversity and abundance. Oecologia 71:420–430
- McGuinness KA, Underwood AJ (1986) Habitat structure and the nature of communities on intertidal boulders. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 104:97–123
- McKindsey CW, Bourget E (2001) Body size and spatial variation of community structure in subarctic intertidal boulder fields. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 216:17–30
- Moore P, Hawkins SJ, Thompson RC (2007) Role of biological habitat amelioration in altering the relative responses of congeneric species to climate change. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 334:11–19
- Osman RW (1977) The establishment and development of a marine epifaunal community. Ecol Monogr 47:37–63
- Povey A, Keough MJ (1991) Effects of trampling on plant and animal populations on rocky shores. Oikos 61: 355–368
- Puente A, Guinda X, Juanes JA, Ramos E and others (2017) The role of physical variables in biodiversity patterns of intertidal macroalgae along European coasts. J Mar Biol Assoc UK 97:549–560
 - Raffaelli D, Hawkins SJ (1996) Intertidal ecology. Chapman & Hall, London
- Raimondi PT, Forde SE, Delph LF, Lively CM (2000) Processes structuring communities: evidence for trait mediated indirect effects through induced polymorphisms. Oikos 91:353–361
- Robuchon M, Valero M, Thiébaut E, Le Gall L (2017) Multi scale drivers of community diversity and composition across tidal heights: an example on temperate seaweed communities. J Ecol 105:1791–1805
- Schaal G, Leclerc JC, Droual G, Leroux C, Riera P (2016) Biodiversity and trophic structure of invertebrate assemblages associated with understory red algae in a Laminaria digitata bed. Mar Biol Res 12:513–523
- Shanks AL, Wright WG (1986) Adding teeth to wave action: the destructive effects of wave-borne rocks on intertidal organisms. Oecologia 69:420–428
- Smale DA (2013) Multi-scale patterns of spatial variability in sessile assemblage structure do not alter predictably with development time. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 482:29–41
- Smale DA, Kendrick GA, Wernberg T (2010) Assemblage turnover and taxonomic sufficiency of subtidal macroalgae at multiple spatial scales. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 384: 76–86
- Smale DA, Kendrick GA, Wernberg T (2011) Subtidal macroalgal richness, diversity and turnover, at multiple spatial scales, along the southwestern Australian coastline. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 91:224–231
- Sousa WP (1979a) Disturbance in marine intertidal boulder fields: the nonequilibrium maintenance of species diversity. Ecology 60:1225–1239
- Sousa WP (1979b) Experimental investigations of disturbance and ecological succession in a rocky intertidal algal community. Ecol Monogr 49:227–254
- Sousa WP (1980) The responses of a community to disturbance: the importance of successional age and species' life histories. Oecologia 45:72–81

- Stagnol D, Michel R, Davoult D (2013) Effects of commercial harvesting of intertidal macroalgae on ecosystem biodiversity and functioning. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 130: 99–110
- Taylor L (1961) Aggregation, variance and the mean. Nature 189:732–735
- Tews J, Brose U, Grimm V, Tielbörger K, Wichmann M, Schwager M, Jeltsch F (2004) Animal species diversity driven by habitat heterogeneity/diversity: the importance of keystone structures. J Biogeogr 31:79–92
- Toohey BD, Kendrick GA (2008) Canopy-understorey relationships are mediated by reef topography in *Ecklonia radiata* kelp beds. Eur J Phycol 43:133–142
 - Underwood AJ (1997) Experiments in ecology: their logical design and interpretation using analysis of variance. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Underwood AJ, Chapman MG (1996) Scales of spatial pat-

Editorial responsibility: Lisandro Benedetti-Cecchi, Pisa, Italy

terns of distribution of intertidal invertebrates. Oecologia 107:212–224

- Underwood AJ, Jernakoff P (1981) Effects of interactions between algae and grazing gastropods on the structure of a low-shore intertidal algal community. Oecologia 48: 221–233
- Valdivia N, Scrosati RA, Molis M, Knox AS (2011) Variation in community structure across vertical intertidal stress gradients: How does it compare with horizontal variation at different scales? PLOS ONE 6:e24062
- Warwick RM, Clarke KR (1993) Increased variability as a symptom of stress in marine communities. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 172:215–226
- Wernberg T, Kendrick G, Toohey B (2005) Modification of the physical environment by an *Ecklonia radiata* (Laminariales) canopy and implications for associated foliose algae. Aquat Ecol 39:419–430

Submitted: December 1, 2017; Accepted: March 30, 2018 Proofs received from author(s): May 30, 2018