
Plasticity of trophic interactions in fish assemblages results in temporal stability of benthic-pelagic couplings

Timmerman Charles-André ^{1,*}, Giraldo Carolina ¹, Cresson Pierre ^{1,*}, Ernande Bruno ^{2,3}, Travers-Trolet Morgane ⁴, Rouquette Manuel ⁵, Denamiel Margaux ¹, Lefebvre Sebastien ⁶

¹ Ifremer, HMMN, Centre Manche - Mer du Nord, BP 669, F-62 321, Boulogne-sur-Mer, France

² MARBEC, Univ. Montpellier, IFREMER, CNRS, IRD, F-34 090, Montpellier, France

³ IIASA, Evolution and Ecology Program, Schloßplatz 1, A-2361, Laxenburg, Austria

⁴ Ifremer, EMH, Centre Atlantique, BP 21105, F-44 300, Nantes, France

⁵ Ifremer, LERBN, Station Ifremer de Dinard, BP 70134, F-35 801, Dinard, France

⁶ Univ. Lille, CNRS, Univ. Littoral Côte d'Opale, UMR 8187, LOG, Laboratoire d'Océanologie et de Géosciences, station marine de Wimereux, F-59000, Lille, France

* Corresponding authors : email address : Charles-André Timmerman, email address : charles.a.timmerman@gmail.com ; Pierre Cresson, email address : pierre.cresson@ifremer.fr

Abstract :

This study addresses the temporal variability of couplings between pelagic and benthic habitats for fish assemblages at five periods in a shallow epicontinental sea, the Eastern English Channel (EEC). Organic matter fluxes fueling fish assemblages and the relative contribution of their different sources were assessed using stable isotope analysis and associated isotopic functional metrics. Couplings between benthic and pelagic realms appeared to be a permanent feature in the EEC, potentially favored by shallow depth and driven by the combination of two trophic processes. First, trophic interactions exhibited plasticity and revealed resource partitioning. Second, changes in the composition of fish assemblages did not impact benthic-pelagic couplings, as most dominant species were generalists during at least one time period, allowing complete use of available resources. Examining both unweighted and biomass-weighted indices was complementary and permitted a better understanding of trophic interactions and energy fluxes.

Highlights

► Most fish species displayed trophic plasticity over time. ► Trophic resources were used optimally through complementarity. ► When considering biomass, dominant species were trophic generalists. ► Couplings between benthic and pelagic habitats are a permanent feature of the EEC.

Keywords : Food webs, Stable isotopes, Biomass, Isotopic functional indices, Flux

44 1. Introduction

1
2
3 45 Identifying and quantifying trophic interactions between organisms is crucial to
4
5 46 understand the structure and functioning of food webs (Ings et al., 2009; McCann, 2000).
6
7
8 47 Ecosystems with numerous trophic links are considered more stable and resilient to
9
10 48 perturbations (McCann, 2000; Rooney et al., 2006; Rooney and McCann, 2012) and trophic
11
12 49 interactions have been proposed as mediators between biodiversity and ecosystem functioning
13
14
15 50 (Hooper et al., 2005; Lynam et al., 2017; Rooney and McCann, 2012; Thompson et al., 2012).
16
17 51 Particularly, characterizing spatio-temporal variability of interactions in trophic networks is
18
19
20 52 considered a promising avenue for improving our understanding of the link between
21
22 53 biodiversity and ecosystem functioning (Ings et al., 2009; McMeans et al., 2015). However,
23
24
25 54 how this variability is impacted by environmental gradients and anthropogenic pressures has
26
27 55 been overlooked so far (Pellissier et al., 2018). Finally, the assessment of trophic interactions
28
29
30 56 and their spatio-temporal dynamics is also essential to sustainably manage marine ecosystems
31
32 57 (Seibold et al., 2018), notably for the implementation of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries
33
34
35 58 Management (Cresson et al., 2020; Garcia et al., 2003) or for aiming at good environmental
36
37 59 status such as recommended in the Marine Strategy Framework Directive in Europe.
38
39

40 60 Couplings between habitats, defined here as transfers of energy and organic matter
41
42 61 between them, have been widely studied both within and between aquatic and terrestrial
43
44
45 62 ecosystems (Darnaude et al., 2004). The existence, strength and variability of coupling fluxes
46
47 63 drive food web structure (Post et al., 2000), and functioning and resilience to perturbations
48
49
50 64 (Blanchard et al., 2011; Woodland and Secor, 2013). In particular, couplings can be mediated
51
52 65 by foraging when occurring across different habitats (Baustian et al., 2014; McMeans et al.,
53
54
55 66 2015; Quevedo et al., 2009). In marine ecosystems, a major coupling occurs between pelagic
56
57 67 and benthic realms, through a bidirectional process: on the one hand, sinking or vertically
58
59
60 68 migrating pelagic organic matter reaches the sea floor (pelagic-benthic coupling (Griffiths et

69 al., 2017)), while on the other hand, benthic organic matter can be feed upon by pelagic
70 species (benthic-pelagic coupling (Gaudron et al., 2016)). Most investigations have focused
71 on pelagic to benthic organic matter fluxes, as plankton sedimentation is considered to be the
72 main source of organic matter for most benthic ecosystems worldwide (Grebmeier and Barry,
73 1991; Polunin et al., 2001; Stasko et al., 2018; Tecchio et al., 2013). On the contrary, few
74 studies have investigated how benthic organic matter can be integrated in pelagic food webs.
75 Numerous chemical, biological and physical factors can affect couplings between benthic and
76 pelagic habitats (Baustian et al., 2014; Griffiths et al., 2017). These include primary
77 production intensity (Docmac et al., 2017; McMeans et al., 2015; Stasko et al., 2018; Udy et
78 al., 2019; Ying et al., 2020), filtering activity of suspension feeders (Cresson et al., 2016; Gili
79 and Coma, 1998), fish feeding activity (Snickars et al., 2015) or depth (Cresson et al., 2016;
80 Giraldo et al., 2017; Kopp et al., 2015). Despite the potential magnitude of spatial and/or
81 temporal variation of these factors, and of their effects on organic matter fluxes, most studies
82 performed one-off analyses of benthic-pelagic coupling, *i.e.* in one environment or at one
83 season (but see (Cresson et al., 2020; Hayden et al., 2019; McMeans et al., 2015; Silberberger
84 et al., 2018). In shallow waters, the physical proximity between pelagic and benthic habitats
85 and the absence of physical barriers, such as a thermocline, may allow for a strong coupling
86 between these habitats (Duffill Telsnig et al., 2018; Kopp et al., 2015; Woodland and Secor,
87 2013). Shallow marine ecosystems are thus good case studies to explore benthic-pelagic
88 coupling, its dynamics and its link with ecosystem functioning.

89 Multiple approaches are available for unraveling spatio-temporal variability in
90 benthic-pelagic coupling, particularly stable isotope analysis and functional diversity. On the
91 one hand, stable isotope analysis is an insightful tool in trophic ecology (Fry, 2006; Layman
92 et al., 2012), suited to quantify contributions of organic matter sources within an ecosystem
93 and to determine factors shaping communities. For instance, community-wide metrics based

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

94 on stable isotopes were developed by Layman et al. (2007) and by Jackson et al. (2011) and
95 have been widely used to study the isotopic structure of fish assemblages (*e.g.*, Abrantes et
96 al., 2014; Cresson et al., 2016; Hill et al., 2015; Jabot et al., 2017). On the other hand,
97 measuring functional diversity allows for a better understanding of ecosystem functioning and
98 trophic fluxes within biological communities (Cresson et al., 2019). According to Villéger et
99 al. (2008), the functional diversity of a community is the layout of its organisms and of their
100 relative importance (abundance or biomass) in a multi-dimensional functional space.
101 Functional diversity can be split into three components, functional richness (space occupied
102 by species in the functional space), functional divergence or dispersion (variance or degree of
103 clustering of species distribution in the occupied space) and functional evenness (regularity of
104 species distribution in the occupied space). Recently, functional diversity metrics have been
105 merged with stable isotope analysis, where isotopes are used as species traits (Cucherousset
106 and Villéger, 2015; Rigolet et al., 2015), to describe the isotopic diversity of a community.
107 One of the advantages of these new metrics is to deal with the heterogeneous distribution of
108 biomass among species of an assemblage. Accordingly, species with the highest biomass
109 should have the largest contribution to diversity metrics to reflect their expected highest
110 impact on ecosystem functioning (Rigolet et al., 2015). Accounting for species biomass
111 underlines the strength of trophic interactions, energy distributions and fluxes (Rigolet et al.,
112 2015) while ignoring species biomass assumes equitability between species (Cucherousset
113 and Villéger, 2015). Still, isotopic community metrics have drawbacks (Hoeinghaus and
114 Zeug, 2008) and do not necessarily grasp subtle details of food web structure when the
115 number of basal sources is high (Jabot et al., 2017). In particular, two key issues are the
116 failure to account for basal food sources (*i.e.*, the isotopic baseline) and the standardization of
117 isotopic values (Hoeinghaus and Zeug, 2008). One solution is to transform the isotopic niche
118 (in the δ -space, *i.e.*, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ versus $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ plot) into a trophic niche (expressed as dietary

119 proportions, i.e., in the p-space) through mixing models (Newsome et al., 2007), but using
120 few basal sources before calculating isotopic metrics to encompass changes both in isotopic
121 baselines and in diet proportions.

122 According to previous studies conducted in the Eastern English Channel (EEC), a shallow
123 epicontinental temperate sea, benthic-pelagic coupling intensity varies with depth and
124 predators' habitat preferences (Giraldo et al., 2017; Kopp et al., 2015). The present work aims
125 to build upon these initial results to study how benthic-pelagic coupling varies over time,
126 through the determination of the predominant organic matter sources (i.e. benthic vs pelagic)
127 fueling fish assemblages in the EEC and how these variations depend on (1) changes in the
128 trophic ecology of species over time and (2) changes in the species composition of the fish
129 assemblage. For this purpose, inferences from isotopic mixing models and functional indices
130 were used at five periods: autumn 2009, 2014, and 2015 and winter 2015 and 2016 to study
131 the topology of energy fluxes (Cucherousset and Villéger, 2015; Rigolet et al., 2015). We
132 used unweighted and biomass-weighted isotopic metrics as a complementary approach to
133 explore trophic interactions and energy fluxes (respectively) within the fish assemblage. We
134 hypothesize that variations in the three complementary facets (i.e. richness, dispersion, and
135 evenness) of trophic and functional diversity occur between periods for fish assemblages
136 because species respond differently to environmental conditions. We also hypothesize that
137 due to the strong benthic-pelagic coupling in this shallow ecosystem (Cresson et al., 2020;
138 Giraldo et al., 2017; Kopp et al., 2015), many species are generalists and can partition their
139 resources through complementarity. The inclusion of biomass will provide more information
140 about the trophic behavior of dominant fish species in the assemblage.

141

142

143 **2. Materials and methods**

144 **2.1 Study area and sampling**

145 Fish assemblages were sampled during five bottom trawl surveys conducted in the
146 EEC (49.3°N to 51.2°N, 2°W to 2°E, Fig. 1, Table 1). Additionally to providing information
147 on species composition and opportunities to collect fish individuals for further analysis, these
148 surveys also sample or observe most components of the ecosystem, from the abiotic
149 environment to top-predators (Travers-Trolet and Verin, 2014). The CGFS (Channel Ground
150 Fish Survey) occurred on board of R/V Gwen Drez in autumn 2009 (Le Roy, 2009) and on
151 board of the R/V Thalassa in autumn 2015 (Travers-Trolet, 2015). The CAMANOC
152 (“CAMpagne écosystémique en MANche OCCidentale”- Oct. 2014) and the IBTS surveys
153 (International Bottom Trawl Survey; Jan-Feb 2015 and 2016) were operated on board of the
154 R/V Thalassa (Travers-Trolet and Vérin, 2014; Vérin and Lazard, 2015; Vérin, 2016). A joint
155 dataset between the surveys was generated on the basis of common spatial boundaries, i.e.
156 filtering out data not located in the EEC to avoid any confusion between temporal and spatial
157 variability of the different surveys. The data used for autumn 2009 and winter 2015 were
158 reanalyzed from a previously published dataset (Cresson et al., 2020; Giraldo et al., 2017;
159 Kopp et al., 2015). The complete dataset was published at the following URL address:
160 <https://doi.org/10.17882/76378>.

161 Following the standard IBTS protocol (ICES, 2004), fish sampling was performed
162 using a Grande Ouverture Verticale (GOV) bottom trawl towed for 30 minutes during
163 daylight at a constant speed of 4 knots. The sampling scheme is spatially stratified by
164 subdividing the EEC into 1° longitude × 0.5° latitude rectangles. Immediately after trawling,
165 all fish were sorted, identified, weighed, and a subsample was measured for length. At each
166 station, when possible, a minimum of five individuals per species were collected in the modal
167 size-class and frozen onboard. The whole dataset comprises 35 fish species and 1419

168 individuals (Table S1). Sample size was then reduced to five individuals for each species by
1
2 169 random sampling, to limit the influence of some overrepresented species (see afterwards).
3
4 170 More than 35 species were encountered during the surveys but only these 35 were collected
5
6
7 171 for further trophic analysis. Therefore, we refer only to these 35 species hereafter when using
8
9
10 172 “fish assemblage”.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

173 **Table 1**

174 Details of sampling. For each survey: number (n) and depth (mean ± sd, min – max) of sampling stations used for laboratory analysis. Benthic
175 and pelagic baselines correspond to isotopic values of benthic (*A. opercularis*) and pelagic (copepods) sources used in the mixing model for the
176 five studied periods. Values for baselines were collected concomitantly with fish, with the exception of *A. opercularis* in autumn 2014 (S.
177 Dubois, Ifremer/DYNECO, unpubl. data). Biomass representativeness corresponds to the sum of the biomass of the species sampled for stable
178 isotopes analyses divided by the total biomass of the fish community.

Survey	Period	n station	Depth (m)		Benthic baseline (‰)		Pelagic baseline (‰)		Biomass representativeness (%)
			mean ± sd	min - max	Carbon	Nitrogen	Carbon	Nitrogen	
CGFS 2009	Autumn 2009	48	37 ± 13	20 - 79	-17.39 ± 0.47	8.74 ± 0.86	-21.07 ± 0.89	10.28 ± 1.70	98
CAMANOC	Autumn 2014	14	46 ± 19	20 - 78	-17.58 ± 0.24	6.93 ± 0.30	-20.95 ± 1.55	7.32 ± 0.94	86
IBTS 2015	Winter 2015	12	43 ± 7	30 - 54	-17.68 ± 0.58	7.30 ± 0.45	-19.77 ± 0.46	6.42 ± 0.89	95
CGFS 2015	Autumn 2015	15	28 ± 9	23 - 53	-17.65 ± 1.00	7.77 ± 1.00	-20.73 ± 0.83	7.77 ± 1.00	92
IBTS 2016	Winter 2016	12	46 ± 11	29 - 61	-17.58 ± 0.69	7.81 ± 0.68	-19.77 ± 0.46	6.42 ± 0.89	82

179 A suspension feeding bivalve (the queen scallop *Aequipecten opercularis*) and
180 zooplankton (copepods of the calanoid order) were collected to be used as proxies of benthic
181 and pelagic trophic baselines, respectively. *A. opercularis* feeds on a mix of phytoplankton
182 and associated bacterial and detrital material that supports benthic production (Barnes et al.
183 2009), and displays a $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ signature similar to deposit feeders and distinct from zooplankton
184 (Kürten et al., 2013). Following other papers on benthic-pelagic coupling (Cresson et al.,
185 2020; Hayden et al., 2019; Kopp et al., 2015), the use of zooplankton as proxy of pelagic
186 production pathway and bivalves as proxy of benthic production pathway is satisfactory.
187 Without any knowledge about fish diet, the use of these proxies will help determine the
188 relative importance of benthic or pelagic production in the food web to which the different
189 fish species belong (Kiljunen et al., 2020). Bivalves were sampled together with fish with the
190 GOV bottom trawl whereas zooplankton were collected with a WP2 net (200 μm mesh size)
191 and frozen for stable isotope analysis. As no copepods were collected in winter 2015, the
192 same isotopic values were used for the pelagic baseline in winter 2016 and 2015. Using
193 primary consumers rather than producers as trophic baselines is advocated (Jennings and van
194 der Molen, 2015; Jennings and Warr, 2003). Isotopic ratios of primary producers are highly
195 variable through time and thus should not be used as isotopic baseline for studies based on
196 muscle tissues, as muscles integrate isotopic signature of individuals' diet over several
197 months. In contrast, primary consumers' tissues integrate primary producers' isotopic
198 signatures on a time scale comparable to that of higher trophic level organisms' muscle,
199 providing a more relevant trophic baseline (Jennings and van der Molen, 2015). In the
200 laboratory, fish were thawed and measured (total length, to the nearest mm), then fish and
201 bivalves were dissected. One sample per individual of white dorsal muscle without skin (fish)
202 or adductor muscle (bivalves) (~ 2g wet mass) was dissected, stored frozen and then freeze-
203 dried for at least 24h. For zooplankton, several individuals were identified to the order or

204 genus level and sorted under a binocular microscope and pooled by sampling station in order
205 to have enough biological material for isotopic ratio analysis. All samples (fish muscle, *A.*
206 *opercularis* and copepods) were ground into a homogeneous powder (~ 1g dry mass) with a
207 mixer mill for stable isotope analysis.

208

209 ***2.2. Stable isotope analysis***

210 Stable isotopes are largely used as a tool to trace the trophic structure of marine food
211 webs, as they give an integrated view of trophic interactions and organic matter fluxes.
212 Nitrogen isotopic ratios ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$) are used to estimate the trophic level of consumers, because
213 consumers are enriched in ^{15}N relative to their prey (Peterson and Fry, 1987; Post, 2002). In
214 contrast, carbon isotopic ratios ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$) are used to identify the sources of organic matter
215 fueling trophic pathways since there are little changes of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values (commonly 1‰) at each
216 trophic level (DeNiro and Epstein, 1978). More specifically, it is an appropriate tracer of
217 couplings, since organic matter of different origin (*e.g.*, benthic or pelagic) exhibit markedly
218 different $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values, and can be followed along food webs.

219 Isotopic ratios were measured with a Thermo Delta V isotope mass ratio spectrometer,
220 coupled with a Carlo Erba NC 2500 elemental analyzer. Ratios were expressed with the
221 classical δ notation,

$$222 \quad \delta X = \left(\frac{R_{\text{sample}}}{R_{\text{standard}}} - 1 \right) \times 10^3, \quad (1)$$

223 where X is ^{13}C or ^{15}N respectively, and R the ratio $^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$ or $^{15}\text{N}/^{14}\text{N}$ respectively. Accuracy
224 of the analyses was checked with different standards for the five surveys, mink (autumn 2014,
225 2015, winter 2016), acetanilide (winter 2016) and sea bass muscle coupled with bovine liver
226 (autumn 2009). The analytical precision of measures was always ± 0.2 ‰ for both elements.

227 Since lipids tend to be depleted in ^{13}C compared to proteins, high lipid concentrations
 1
 2 228 in tissues can bias $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values (Logan et al., 2008). Using elemental carbon to nitrogen ratios
 3
 4 229 (C:N) as a proxy of lipid content, the mathematical correction for lipids proposed by Post et
 5
 6
 7 230 al. (2007) was applied to all samples with C:N ratios higher than 3.5:

$$231 \quad \delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{corrected}} = \delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{uncorrected}} - 3.32 + 0.99 \times C:N \quad (2)$$

232 233 **2.3. Trophic level and benthic contribution calculations**

234 For each consumer, the relative trophic contribution of pelagic (copepods) and benthic
 19 235 organic matter (*A. opercularis*) was estimated with a mixing model taking into account the
 22 236 calculation of the benthic contribution and trophic level jointly. Combining the Post equation
 24 237 (Post, 2002) for the trophic level and a two-sources mixing model (Phillips and Gregg, 2003)
 25 238 by correcting for fractionation of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, the following system of equations was
 26 239 obtained:

$$240 \quad \begin{cases} TL_C = TL_{base} + (\delta^{15} N_C - (\alpha \delta^{15} N_B + (1 - \alpha) \delta^{15} N_P)) / \Delta^{15} N \\ \alpha = (\delta^{13} C_C - (TL_C - TL_{base}) \Delta^{13} C - \delta^{13} C_P) / (\delta^{13} C_B - \delta^{13} C_P) \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

241 where TL_C is the trophic level of the consumer C (fish), TL_{base} is the trophic level of the
 39 242 source ($TL_{base} = 2$ as the sources are primary consumers), α the fraction of the benthic source
 42 243 in fish diet, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ the nitrogen and carbon isotopic signature respectively, $\Delta^{15}\text{N}$ and
 44 244 $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ the nitrogen (3.4‰) and carbon (1‰) trophic discrimination factor at each trophic level
 47 245 respectively, and C , B and P corresponds to the consumer, the benthic (*A. opercularis*) and
 49 246 pelagic (copepods) organisms respectively.

54 247 The following equation was obtained for α by solving the system of equations:

$$248 \quad \alpha = \frac{\Delta^{15} N (\delta^{13} C_P - \delta^{13} C_C) + \Delta^{13} C (\delta^{15} N_C - \delta^{15} N_P)}{\Delta^{15} N (\delta^{13} C_P - \delta^{13} C_B) + \Delta^{13} C (\delta^{15} N_B - \delta^{15} N_P)} \quad (4)$$

249 and TL_C was obtained replacing α with its value in (3).

250 For some individuals, values of benthic contributions lower than zero and higher than one
251 were obtained due to approximations regarding trophic discrimination factors. Trophic
252 discrimination factors values were set to 1‰ and 3.4‰ as suggested by Post (2002). but these
253 values can vary, according to several parameters, such as the species considered (Caut et al.,
254 2009). Furthermore, temporal differences between turnover rates of trophic baselines and fish
255 muscle or other sources of bias potentially unknown can affect values of benthic
256 contributions. Finally, contributions were scaled in order to obtain values strictly between 0
257 and 1.

$$\%B = \frac{(\alpha - \min(\alpha))}{(\max(\alpha) - \min(\alpha))} \quad (5)$$

259 Hence, each individual position in the isotopic or δ -space, with coordinates ($\delta^{13}\text{C}, \delta^{15}\text{N}$), was
260 projected in the trophic or p-space, with coordinates ($\%B, TL_C$), while accounting for benthic
261 and pelagic isotopic baselines.

262 ***2.4. Trophic interactions and energy fluxes***

263 Assessing fish assemblage functioning from stable isotope analysis classically does
264 not take into account the species unevenness observed in the field, as simultaneous sampling
265 of quantitative (biomass) and qualitative (stable isotopes) data requires a considerable amount
266 of work. However, trophic fluxes in marine ecosystems depend on species relative
267 dominance. Considering species biomass when analyzing stable isotopes might improve our
268 understanding of assemblage functioning particularly in regard to energy fluxes. Thus, for
269 each species, the benthic contribution $\%B$ in its diet was combined with its relative biomass
270 in the fish assemblage, as sampled by the trawl. Trophic structure was partly depicted by
271 isotopic functional indices (IFI), but also by violin plots representing the distribution of

272 consumer biomass across the fraction of contribution of benthic sources for the fish
273 assemblage. We propose to use both unweighted and biomass-weighted IFI and violin plots in
274 an attempt to consider trophic interactions and energy flux within the fish assemblage.

275 For each survey, species biomass density (B_i , expressed in $\text{kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$) was calculated
276 according to the following formula:

$$B_i = \frac{\sum_j B_{i,j} S_j}{\sum_{j'} S_{j'}} \quad (6)$$

277 with $B_{i,j}$ the average biomass density of species i across stations in stratum j , S_j the surface of
278 stratum j and $\sum_{j'} S_{j'}$ the sum of the stratum surfaces sampled during the survey. Relative
279 species biomass b_i among all fish species captured was then calculated as $b_i = B_i / \sum_{i'=1}^{S_T} B_{i'}$
280 where S_T is the total number of species captured during the survey. Relative species biomass
281 in the assemblage of 35 species used for isotopic analyses was calculated as $\beta_i =$
282 $B_i / \sum_{i'=1}^{S_S} B_{i'}$ with $S_S = 35$ the number of species used for isotopic analyses.

283 In order to account for the fluxes at the assemblage scale, the average benthic
284 contribution weighted by the relative biomasses of the species in the assemblage was
285 calculated as follows:

$$\%B_w = \sum_{i=1}^{S_S} \beta_i \times \%B \quad (7)$$

286 Since the number of individuals sampled differed between species, a bootstrap
287 procedure was applied to avoid a possible bias in estimates of $\%B_w$ due to unequal
288 representation. Five individuals per species were sampled with replacement for all species
289 with $n > 5$. Resampling was based on a 100 000 iteration bootstrap procedure, to ensure that
290 the isotopic values for the pseudo individuals are representative of the isotopic variability of
291 the larger initial dataset. Scaled benthic contributions were then computed for each pseudo-

294 individual and their averages across pseudo-individuals are presented as results. After this
1
2
3 295 correction, all individuals had the same importance when biomass is not considered. To keep
4
5 296 inter-individual variability in violin plots, pseudo-individual benthic contribution was
6
7 297 considered rather than average contribution calculated for species, and one fifth of the
8
9
10 298 species' biomass was applied to each pseudo individual.

11
12
13 299 The Shannon-Weaver index (Shannon and Weaver, 1963) was used to measure the
14
15 300 diversity of the fish assemblage for each survey.

16
17
18 301
$$H' = - \sum_{i=1}^{S_T} b_i \log_2(b_i), \quad (8)$$

19
20
21

22 302 where b_i is the relative biomass of the species i across the S_T species collected in the trawl. H'
23
24 303 is low when S_T is low and diversity is low (when one species dominate in the assemblage for
25
26 304 example). For a given S_T , the maximum diversity (*i.e.* all species are equally common), H_{max} ,
27
28
29 305 then equal $\log_2(S_T)$. The ratio between the measured diversity and the maximum theoretical
30
31
32 306 diversity for a given number of species is the Pielou Equitability Index (Pielou, 1976, J'),
33
34 307 which tends to zero when a species strongly dominates the assemblage or to one when species
35
36
37 308 are evenly distributed.

38
39
40 309
$$J' = \frac{H'}{H_{max}} \quad (9)$$

41
42
43

44 310 ***2.5. Description of functional indices***

45
46
47
48 311 Each component of functional diversity (isotopic richness, isotopic dispersion and
49
50 312 isotopic evenness) was characterized using one index. These components must be quantified
51
52 313 independently to describe functional diversity (Mason et al., 2005; Villéger et al., 2008). As
53
54
55 314 trophic baselines might differ temporally, we followed Quevedo et al. (2009) or Kiljunen et
56
57
58 315 al. (2020) by calculating functional diversity indices in p-space, *i.e.* using (% B, TLC), rather
59
60 316 than in δ -space (Cucherousset and Villéger, 2015). Average values of (% B, TLC) per species,
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

317 i.e. across the five sampled individuals or pseudo-individuals depending on species, were
318 used for these calculations. Both an unweighted and biomass-weighted version of the
319 dispersion and evenness index were calculated for each of the five time-periods, whereas
320 richness can only be unweighted. by definition

321 *2.5.1. Isotopic Richness*

322 Isotopic Functional Richness (IFRic) is similar to the Total Area index developed by
323 Layman et al. (2007) and to the Functional Richness index (FRic) developed by Villéger et al.
324 (2008) but adapted for isotopic data. It represents the trophic diversity of the assemblage.
325 IFRic is the convex hull volume (or surface in a two dimensional space) surrounding species
326 in the trophic space, thus its value is not impacted by biomass consideration. For comparison
327 between time periods, IFRic was standardized by the IFRic value calculated when merging
328 the values of the five time periods (IFRic_{max} hereafter), so that its values were constrained
329 between zero and one (Rigolet et al., 2015). IFRic_{max} represents all values taken by
330 individuals whatever the time-period. By extension, we assume it corresponds to total
331 available trophic space for the assemblage. Then, IFRic represents the trophic resources used
332 at a given period, *i.e.* a subset of the total available trophic resources. When close to one,
333 available resources are efficiently used and/or resource availability is high. When close to
334 zero, resources potentially available to the assemblage are unused and/or resource availability
335 is unusually low.

336 *2.5.2. Isotopic dispersion*

337 Isotopic dispersion is an index of isotopic divergence, *i.e.* the variation in the position
338 or the dispersion of species in the isotopic space occupied. Isotopic Functional Dispersion
339 (IFDis) is based on FDis, developed by Laliberté and Legendre (2010). IFDis ranges from

340 zero, when all organisms have the same %B and trophic level, to one, when all organisms are
 341 far from the center of gravity.

$$IFDis = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{S_S} w_i \sqrt{\sum_k (x_{i,k} - c_k)^2}}{\max_i (w_i \sqrt{\sum_k (x_{i',k} - c_k)^2})} \quad (9)$$

343 where w_i is the relative weight of species i , with $\sum_{i=1}^{S_S} w_i = 1$ and x_{ik} is the coordinate of
 344 species i for trait k , here %B or TL_C . IFDis is thus the weighted mean distance to the weighted
 345 center of gravity $\mathbf{c} = (c_k)$ with

$$c_k = \sum_{i=1}^{S_S} w_i x_{i,k}. \quad (10)$$

347 The unweighted version of this index, denoted IFDis hereafter, assumes an evenly
 348 distributed weight across species, i.e. $w_i = \frac{1}{S_S}$, whereas the biomass-weighted version,
 349 denoted IFDis_{biom} hereafter, takes species relative biomasses as weight, i.e. $w_i = \beta_i$. When
 350 IFDis_{biom} is close to zero, the assemblage is dominated by generalist species, whereas when it
 351 is close to one, it reveals trophic specialization.

352 2.5.3. Isotopic evenness

353 Isotopic Functional Evenness (IFEve), based on FEve, developed by Villéger et al.
 354 (2008) quantifies the uniformity in biomass distribution along the shortest tree that links all
 355 species in the trophic space (minimum spanning tree - MST).

$$IFEve = \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{S_S-1} \min \left[\frac{\text{dist}_l(i,j)/(w_i+w_j)}{\sum_{l=1}^{S_S-1} \text{dist}_l(i,j)/(w_i+w_j)}, \frac{1}{S_S-1} \right] \frac{1}{S_S-1}}{1 - \frac{1}{S_S-1}} \quad (11)$$

357 where $\text{dist}_l(i,j)$ is the Euclidean distance between species i and j involved in branch l
 358 of the MST. As for IFDis, the unweighted version of this index, denoted IFEve hereafter,

359 considers evenly distributed weights w_i across species and the biomass-weighted version,
1
2 360 denoted $IFE_{ve_{biom}}$ hereafter, uses relative biomass as weight. An $IFE_{ve_{biom}}$ close to zero
3
4
5 361 reveals trophic redundancy and potential competition among species, whereas a value close to
6
7 362 one reveals optimal resource use through species complementarity.
8
9

10
11 363 All the indices used in this study and their significance were summarized in the Table
12
13 364 S2. All analyses and plots were produced using the R software and ggplot2 package (R Core
14
15 365 Team, 2019; Wickham, 2016); R scripts developed by Cucherousset and Villéger (2015) and
16
17
18 366 Mouillot et al. (2013) were used for computing isotopic functional indices (see supplementary
19
20 367 material in Cucherousset and Villéger (2015) and Mouillot et al. (2013)).
21
22
23

24 368

26 369 3. Results

28 370 3.1. Description of the fish assemblages of the different time periods

30
31 371 The Shannon's index (H') results from a combination of two components, species
32
33 372 richness and the equitability of biomass between species. Among the five sampling periods,
34
35 373 the H' value in autumn 2009 was the highest ($H'= 2.64$), resulting from a high number of
36
37
38 374 harvested fish species and a moderate equitability ($J'= 0.44$, Table 2). The high biomass of *T.*
39
40 375 *trachurus* in autumn 2014 and 2015 (Relative biomass, $b_{T. trachurus} = 81$ and 70% respectively)
41
42
43 376 and the high biomass of *M. merlangus* in winter 2015 and 2016 ($b_{M. merlangus} = 69.5$ and 66%
44
45 377 respectively) led to a low diversity (H' between 1.39 and 1.78) and equitability (J' between
46
47
48 378 0.24 and 0.34). The lowest values of H_{max} were recorded in winter due to the lowest species
49
50 379 richness (S_T).
51
52

53 380
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

382 **Table 2**

383 Diversity and isotopic functional (unweighted and biomass-weighted) indices. For diversity
 384 indices, S_T corresponds to the species richness, H' to the Shannon-Weaver index, H_{max} to the
 385 theoretical maximum of diversity and J' to Pielou's equitability index (see Material and
 386 methods section for details). For functional indices, S_s corresponds to the number of species
 387 subsampled of species for stable isotope analysis, $IFRic$ to the isotopic richness, $IFEve$, to the
 388 isotopic evenness (unweighted, $IFEve$, and biomass-weighted, $IFEve_{biom}$, respectively), and
 389 $IFDis$ to the isotopic dispersion (unweighted, $IFDis$, and biomass-weighted, $IFDis_{biom}$,
 390 respectively).

Periods	Diversity indices				Isotopic functional indices					
	S_T	H'	H_{max}	J'	S_s	$IFRic$	$IFEve$	$IFEve_{biom}$	$IFDis$	$IFDis_{biom}$
Autumn 2009	62	2.64	5.95	0.44	28	0.34	0.71	0.41	0.38	0.27
Autumn 2014	67	1.45	6.07	0.24	11	0.21	0.79	0.57	0.58	0.23
Winter 2015	42	1.39	5.39	0.26	13	0.34	0.73	0.39	0.45	0.40
Autumn 2015	65	1.57	6.02	0.26	26	0.30	0.81	0.39	0.38	0.22
Winter 2016	39	1.78	5.29	0.34	25	0.37	0.73	0.30	0.38	0.24

391

392 The set of species used for isotopic analyses represented between 82% and 98% of the
 393 sampled biomass across all periods (Table 1). This subsample of species can thus be
 394 considered representative of the fish assemblage captured by the demersal trawl. The
 395 assemblage structure differed temporally because species with highest relative biomass b_i
 396 differed in time. In autumn 2009, the dominant fish species were *Scyliorhinus canicula*,
 397 *Trisopterus luscus* and *Mustelus asterias*, representing 18.5%, 13.5% and 12% of the relative
 398 biomass, respectively (Table 3). For the other periods, one species was largely dominant in
 399 the assemblage. In autumn 2014 and 2015, *T. trachurus* was clearly the most dominant
 400 species ($b_i = 81$ and 70%, respectively) while in winter 2015 and 2016, the dominant species
 401 was *Merlangius merlangus* ($b_i = 69.5$ and 66%, respectively).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

402 **Table 3**

403 The three species with the highest relative biomasses in the ecosystem for each time period, their biomass density (kg.km⁻²), benthic contribution
404 (%B) and associated trophic level (TL_C).

Periods	Dominant species in the ecosystem	Relative biomass (%)	Biomass (× 10³ kg.km⁻²)	Benthic contribution (mean ± sd)	Trophic level (mean ± sd)
Autumn 2009	<i>Scyliorhinus canicula</i>	18.5	0.63	0.56 ± 0.20	3.75 ± 0.58
	<i>Trisopterus luscus</i>	13.5	0.46	0.57 ± 0.27	3.71 ± 0.21
	<i>Mustelus asterias</i>	12	0.39	0.65 ± 0.09	3.29 ± 0.33
Autumn 2014	<i>Trachurus trachurus</i>	81	3.47	0.24 ± 0.11	3.56 ± 0.24
	<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>	6	0.24	0.56 ± 0.05	4.29 ± 0.10
	<i>Scyliorhinus canicula</i>	4	0.16	0.83 ± 0.08	3.41 ± 0.06
Winter 2015	<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>	69.5	4.05	0.56 ± 0.10	5.07 ± 0.13
	<i>Scyliorhinus canicula</i>	10	0.59	0.88 ± 0.08	4.02 ± 0.15
	<i>Limanda limanda</i>	9	0.53	0.78 ± 0.17	4.25 ± 0.16
Autumn 2015	<i>Trachurus trachurus</i>	70	8.75	0.14 ± 0.07	3.31 ± 0.19
	<i>Scomber scombrus</i>	9	1.18	0.07 ± 0.07	3.22 ± 0.35
	<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>	4	0.60	0.42 ± 0.07	4.40 ± 0.12
Winter 2016	<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>	66	6.03	0.51 ± 0.06	4.27 ± 0.13
	<i>Trachurus trachurus</i>	7	0.63	0.28 ± 0.18	4.73 ± 0.33
	<i>Mustelus asterias</i>	6	0.55	0.78 ± 0.07	3.60 ± 0.35

405 3.2. Contributions of benthic and pelagic sources

406 3.2.1. Species scale

407 Species with pelagic lifestyles had lower %B than benthic ones (Table 4). Both
408 *Scomber scombrus* and *T. trachurus* exhibited mean values lower than 30% regardless of the
409 studied period while mean %B values were always higher than 82% for benthic species (e.g.
410 *Raja clavata* (Fig. 2A)).

411 Among the species sampled at least twice, some of them (*Pleuronectes platessa*, *R.*
412 *clavata*, *M. asterias* or *Microstomus kitt*) always had a stronger benthic contribution (%B \geq
413 $55 \pm 5\%$), whereas others (*T. trachurus*, *Sprattus sprattus*, *Engraulis encrasicolus*, *C.*
414 *lucerna*) always had a stronger pelagic contribution (%B $\leq 45 \pm 5\%$ Fig. 2A). Despite some
415 variation and occasional high %B values, well-known pelagic species (e.g. *S. scombrus*, *C.*
416 *harengus*, *Spondyliosoma cantharus* or *S. pilchardus*) generally exhibited low %B values.
417 However, many species displayed high trophic plasticity, i.e. shifted from a stronger benthic
418 to a stronger pelagic contribution depending on the period (Fig. 2A, Table S1). These species
419 were mainly benthic or demersal species (*Callionymus lyra*, *Chelidonichthys cuculus*,
420 *Dicentrarchus labrax*, *M. merlangus*, *Mullus surmuletus*, *Trisopterus* spp.)

421 The trophic level of most species sampled at least twice also varied among periods
422 (Fig. 2B). For most species sampled in autumn and winter (e.g. *C. lucerna*, *Gadus morhua*, *T.*
423 *trachurus*, *Trisopterus minutus*, *Eutrigla gurnardus*, *Limanda limanda*), their trophic level
424 was generally higher in winter than in autumn. Upper trophic level (>4) species (e.g. *D.*
425 *labrax*, *G. morhua*, *Zeus faber*, *M. merlangus*) generally displayed trophic plasticity (i.e.
426 differed in resource use over time) and generalism (i.e. predated on several trophic levels
427 and/or several food sources within a given period) and exhibited comparable contributions of
428 both benthic and pelagic sources.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 4

Results from the mixing model showing the mean contribution of the benthic organic matter source (*A. opercularis*; %B) to the community, whether weighing by species biomass or not. Values are reported as quantiles (25% - 50% and 75). The second and third column are expressed at specific scales and represented species with the lowest and highest benthic contribution. For these species, their mean and standard deviation (\pm sd) but also their minimum and maximum of benthic contribution are reported (See Table S1 for more details).

	Species with the min benthic contribution mean \pm sd. [min ; max]	Species with the max benthic contribution mean \pm sd. [min ; max]	Mean benthic contribution unweighted %B mean \pm sd. quantiles (25% - 50% - 75%)	Mean benthic contribution biomass-weighted %B_w mean \pm sd. quantiles (25% - 50% - 75%)
Autumn 2009	<i>S. scombrus</i> 0.18 \pm 0.10 [0.05 ; 0.32]	<i>R. clavata</i> 0.85 \pm 0.10 [0.71 ; 1.00]	0.46 \pm 0.20 (0.34 - 0.49 - 0.59)	0.50 \pm 0.20 (0.49 - 0.59 - 0.69)
Autumn 2014	<i>T. trachurus</i> 0.24 \pm 0.11 [0.14 ; 0.42]	<i>S. canicula</i> 0.83 \pm 0.07 [0.71 ; 0.93]	0.59 \pm 0.22 (0.48 - 0.62 - 0.73)	0.31 \pm 0.20 (0.22 - 0.25 - 0.42)
Winter 2015	<i>T. trachurus</i> 0.21 \pm 0.13 [0.00 ; 0.35]	<i>S. canicula</i> 0.88 \pm 0.08 [0.78 ; 0.98]	0.57 \pm 0.23 (0.38 - 0.59 - 0.72)	0.62 \pm 0.17 (0.57 - 0.62 - 0.75)
Autumn 2015	<i>S. scombrus</i> 0.07 \pm 0.07 [0.00 ; 0.19]	<i>S. stellaris</i> 0.82 \pm 0.16 [0.63 ; 1.00]	0.46 \pm 0.21 (0.35 - 0.46 - 0.58)	0.20 \pm 0.18 (0.17 - 0.17 - 0.25)
Winter 2016	<i>T. trachurus</i> 0.28 \pm 0.18 [0.00 ; 0.47]	<i>R. clavata</i> 0.89 \pm 0.07 [0.81 ; 1.00]	0.53 \pm 0.19 (0.40 - 0.53 - 0.67)	0.51 \pm 0.14 (0.49 - 0.53 - 0.59)

3.2.2. Assemblage scale and energy fluxes

The distribution of %B values in the fish assemblages differed between periods and when species relative biomasses were or were not taken into account (Fig. 3).

Regarding trophic interactions (unweighted %B), the EEC was fueled by both benthic and pelagic production at around 50% for all periods (mean %B values varied from $46 \pm 20\%$ in autumn 2009 and 2015 to $59 \pm 22\%$ in autumn 2014, Table 4). Regarding energy fluxes (biomass-weighted %B_w), the picture was slightly different. The average benthic contribution in the assemblage dropped by 50% when relative biomasses were included in autumn 2014 and 2015 (e.g., autumn 2014, mean %B = 59% and mean %B_w = 31%, Table 4, Fig. 3). At these periods, the fish assemblages were strongly dominated by pelagic species (e.g., *T. trachurus*) characterized by low %B values ($24 \pm 11\%$ and $14 \pm 7\%$ in autumn 2014 and 2015, respectively; Table 3). In contrast, a slight increase of benthic contribution was observed in autumn 2009 and winter 2015 when relative biomasses were included due to the dominance of benthic or demersal species.

3.3. Functional indices

IFR_{ic} relies on the subset of total available trophic resources actually used that varies according to the studied periods. IFR_{ic} values varied between 0.21 in autumn 2014 to 0.37 in winter 2016 (Fig.4, Table 2). Trophic levels ranged from 2.69 ± 0.61 for *Micromesistius poutassou* to 4.00 ± 0.21 for *M. merlangus* in autumn 2009; from 3.82 ± 0.20 for *C. harengus* to 5.07 ± 0.13 for *M. merlangus* in winter 2015 and from 3.08 ± 0.17 for *R. clavata* to 4.93 ± 0.36 for *C. lucerna* in winter 2016. Autumn 2009, winter 2015 and 2016 were periods with the highest IFR_{ic} when the assemblages were composed of species of both low and high trophic level but also of both low and high %B values. The assemblages thus exploited a wide range of resources.

458 In autumn 2009, the polygon was mainly located at the bottom of the whole trophic
1
2 459 space. Trophic levels of species were estimated to be lower at this period. On the contrary, in
3
4 460 winter 2015 the polygon was mainly located at the top of the whole trophic space, mainly
5
6
7 461 reflecting the highest estimated trophic levels at this period. Lowest ranges of both %B and
8
9 462 trophic levels were found in autumn 2014, leading to the lowest value of IFRic. At this
10
11 463 period, the polygon was located at the center of the whole trophic space. The assemblage was
12
13 464 composed of intermediate trophic level species, mainly belonging to both pelagic and benthic-
14
15 465 based trophic pathways. Intermediate IFRic values were found in autumn 2015. At this
16
17 466 period, the range of %B was the highest: from 0.07 ± 0.07 for *S. scombrus* to 0.82 ± 0.16 for
18
19 467 *Scyliorhinus stellaris*. This variability reflected that species within the assemblage depended
20
21
22 468 on both benthic and pelagic trophic pathways.
23
24
25
26

27 469 Considering the trophic interactions, despite slight variation between periods, the
28
29 470 assemblages' values of the isotopic functional indices were close and no clear seasonal
30
31 471 pattern was evidenced. IFDis was moderate and always lower than 0.58, meaning that the
32
33 472 assemblages were composed of a mix of generalist and specialist species. IF Eve was always
34
35 473 high and ranged between 0.71-0.81 (Table 2). Species were evenly distributed in the trophic
36
37 474 space and exploited the resources equitably. Considering the energy fluxes, IFDis_{biom} and
38
39 475 IF Eve_{biom} were lower than IFDis and IF Eve, respectively (Table 2). Thus, the dominant
40
41 476 species were rather generalists suggesting a higher trophic redundancy and potential
42
43 477 competition between species. However, it should be noted that despite a decrease, IF Eve_{biom}
44
45 478 remained high in autumn 2014 (0.57), while IFDis_{biom} (0.23) was low, suggesting resource
46
47
48
49 479 partitioning.
50
51
52
53
54

55 480

58 481 4. Discussion

59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

482 Our results indicate a high temporal plasticity in trophic interactions within fish
483 assemblages resulting in variable strengths of benthic-pelagic interactions and energy fluxes
484 in a temperate shallow epicontinental sea. Many species displayed trophic plasticity (*i.e.* may
485 differ in resource use over time) and were generalists (*i.e.* can predate on several trophic
486 levels and/or several food sources within a given period), supporting strong benthic-pelagic
487 couplings in the EEC. Trophic interactions differed among studied periods but assemblages
488 were always fueled by a mix of benthic and pelagic food sources. Energy fluxes revealed that
489 the contribution of benthic food sources to the assemblages differs according to the relative
490 importance of the different species at each season. Consequently, dominant species usually
491 drove overall fluxes. The shallowness of this ecosystem may allow for these trophic features.

4.1. *Fish assemblages differed among studied periods*

493 A number of top-down or bottom-up forces (*e.g.*, resource availability, temperature,
494 fishing pressure) may affect the structure and diversity of fish assemblages (Auber et al.,
495 2017; Lynam et al., 2017; McLean et al., 2018; Thompson et al., 2020). Several studies have
496 demonstrated a positive relationship between diversity and ecosystem functioning (Hooper et
497 al., 2005; Tilman et al., 2014). In our study, autumn 2009 was the period with the highest
498 diversity indices (H' and J') which can be explained by the equitability of species biomass in
499 the assemblage. Autumn 2009 and winter 2016 periods were characterized by longer food
500 chains and a greater exploitation of resources. The addition of high trophic level species (*e.g.*,
501 winter 2016) or of intermediate consumers (*e.g.*, autumn 2009) may have lengthened food
502 chains at these periods (Post and Takimoto, 2007).

503 Higher trophic levels in winter may result from environmental variables such as
504 resource availability. In the EEC, there is an autumnal phytoplanktonic bloom (Breton, 2000).
505 Since phytoplankton is consumed by primary consumers, it results in a higher abundance of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

506 zooplankton in autumn than in winter (Eloire et al., 2010). Due to the lower abundance of
507 zooplankton in winter, we can hypothesize that fish feed on higher trophic level preys during
508 this period, which results in the highest overall trophic levels in the fish assemblages.

509 The composition of fish assemblages varies seasonally with species migration cycles.
510 This is particularly the case for pelagic species such as *T. trachurus*, which is very abundant
511 in the EEC in summer and autumn as observed in autumn 2014 and 2015. During these
512 periods, it migrates from the North Sea to the EEC, probably due to changes in water
513 temperature (Macer, 1977). This is also the case for whiting in winter. During this period,
514 temperature has an strong influence of its spatial distribution (Loots et al., 2011; Zheng et al.,
515 2001), which explains its high biomass in winter 2015.

516 ***4.2. Trophic plasticity and trophic resource partitioning strengthen benthic-pelagic*** 517 ***couplings***

518 When considering unweighted measures, the average contribution of benthic food
519 sources %B to the fish assemblages ranged between 46% and 59% (Table 4). Species were
520 thus always feeding on both benthic and pelagic production as demonstrated for other shallow
521 marine coastal or estuarine ecosystems (Christianen et al., 2017; Griffiths et al., 2017;
522 Kiljunen et al., 2020; Ying et al., 2020). Due to the shallow depth, species can rely on both
523 benthic and pelagic sources due to physical (*e.g.*, resuspension, sedimentation) and/or
524 biological processes (*e.g.*, fish predation) (Baustian et al., 2014; Griffiths et al., 2017).

525 Many fish species displayed trophic plasticity, relying on benthic or pelagic
526 production depending on the studied period. Such plasticity may originate from changes
527 either in direct predation in relation to environmental variation such as changes in prey
528 abundance or species competition, or in indirect predation such as changes in the diet or
529 trophic level of their prey. This result confirms the hypothesis of Kopp et al. (2015) that

1 species could adapt their foraging strategy in relation to variation of the availability of their
2 trophic subsidies (*i.e.*, changes in prey abundance or prey specific composition). These
3 variations may also be due to the variation of organic matter fluxes. An increase of pelagic
4
5 532 variations may also be due to the variation of organic matter fluxes. An increase of pelagic
6
7 533 productivity may result in an increase in pelagic-benthic coupling, whereby benthic species
8
9
10 534 are fueled by pelagic organic matter (Docmac et al., 2017; Hayden et al., 2019). This coupling
11
12 535 may be even more pronounced in the EEC due to the shallow depth.
13
14

15 536 Considering trophic interactions, functional indices (IFRic, IFEve, IFDis) revealed that
16
17 537 assemblages were composed of a mix of specialist and generalist species (IFDis between 0.38
18
19
20 538 and 0.58, Table 2) with little variation over time. In addition, there was low functional
21
22 539 redundancy and resources were used optimally through complementarity (IFEve \geq 0.71, Table
23
24
25 540 2) between species, thus evidencing niche partitioning. Complementarity between species
26
27 541 could result in reduced interspecific competition (Hooper et al., 2005). Following the niche
28
29
30 542 variation hypothesis, species may expand their niches due to a release of interspecific
31
32 543 competition (Costa-Pereira et al., 2019; Gajdzik et al., 2018; Van Valen, 1965). Species can
33
34
35 544 partition their resources through a combination of differences in trophic patterns and habitat
36
37 545 use. Many species may depend on both benthic and pelagic sources, but can also predate on
38
39
40 546 several trophic levels (*i.e.*, omnivory; Cury et al., 2003, Thompson et al., 2007; Vandermeer,
41
42 547 2006). A shallow depth allows pelagic species to migrate vertically and consume benthic
43
44 548 preys (Baustian et al., 2014; Griffiths et al., 2017). Stomach content analyses performed on
45
46
47 549 fish species of the EEC have shown that some benthic preys were found in the diet of some
48
49
50 550 pelagic species. For example, benthic amphipods were found in the stomach contents of
51
52 551 clupeidae and benthic fish (*e.g.* callionymidae) in the diet of *S. scombrus* (Cachera, 2013). In
53
54 552 this ecosystem, high $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values were recorded for pelagic species probably as a result of the
55
56
57 553 consumption of benthic invertebrates. This behavior was observed in other shallow
58
59 554 ecosystems like the Seto Sea (mean depth of 37m, (Takai et al., 2002) or the Baltic sea mean
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(depth of 42m, (Kiljunen et al., 2020)). Similarly, in lakes, pelagic species can derive up to 50-90% of their energy from benthic sources (Schindler et al., 1996; Vander Zanden and Vadeboncoeur, 2002). For benthic species, the shallow depth allows them to adopt an opportunistic behavior by integrating benthic production but also taking advantage of the pelagic production sedimentation via the pelagic-benthic coupling (van Denderen et al., 2018). Thus, depth is one of the main drivers for pelagic-benthic temporal variation in shallow ecosystems, including the EEC (Cresson et al., 2020; Giraldo et al., 2017; Kopp et al., 2015).

4.3. Temporal variation of benthic-pelagic couplings and energy fluxes

When focusing on energy fluxes, the most dominant fish species were generalists ($IFD_{\text{Sbiom}} \leq 0.40$, Table 2). Trophic generalism is common in marine ecosystems (Thompson et al., 2007) and, in our study, it was particularly marked at all periods. In winter, the dominant species was whiting, a high trophic level demersal piscivorous fish. Upper trophic level species are considered as ultimate couplers. Their predatory nature allows them to forage on both benthic and pelagic preys, and to stabilize food webs (Cury et al., 2003, McCann, 2000; Rooney et al., 2006; Rooney and McCann, 2012; Udy et al., 2019).

In autumn 2014, even though the dispersion was similar to other periods (low $IFD_{\text{Sbiom}} \leq 0.40$), evenness was the highest ($IFE_{\text{vebiom}} = 0.57$, Table 2) suggesting higher optimal resource use in autumn 2014 compared to other periods. According to the resource diversity hypothesis (i.e. ecological opportunity), the diversity of available resources promotes niche expansion and divergence among species of consumers (Araújo et al., 2011; Costa-Pereira et al., 2019). Thus, we can hypothesize that at this period, resources were sufficient to support assemblages leading to niche segregation to reduce competition whereas,

578 for other periods, resources were insufficient leading to some trophic redundancy ($IFE_{ve_{biom}} \leq$
1
2 579 0.41, Table 2).

580 In a similar study on a shallow ecosystem, Ying et al. (2020) suggested that high
7
8 581 functional redundancy was caused by the abundance of pelagic fish with similar traits. Our
9
10 582 results show that trophic plasticity goes beyond a replacement of dominant species by others
11
12
13 583 with similar traits, and that similar assemblages (in terms of species composition) can respond
14
15 584 differently depending on other biotic or abiotic factors (*e.g.*, productivity, competition, niche
16
17 585 overlap).

21 586 The generalist behavior of dominant species ($IFD_{is_{biom}} \leq 0.40$) may be a way to avoid
22
23 587 competition or may also reveal the high abundance of one food source (Lefebvre et al.,
24
25 588 2009a). The broadening of resource use may improve ecosystem functioning by allowing a
26
27
28 589 more complete use of all available resources and promote species coexistence (Leduc et al.,
29
30
31 590 2015; Petchey, 2003). However, it should be noted that a generalist species can be either
32
33 591 composed of a sum of generalist individuals or a sum of specialist individuals (Bearhop et al.,
34
35 592 2004). Additional analyses at the individual level would provide a better understanding of the
36
37
38 593 structure and functioning of this ecosystem (Bolnick et al., 2011, 2003; Clegg et al., 2018;
39
40 594 Ingram et al., 2018).

44 595 **4.4.Strengths and limitations of the study**

47 596 This study relies on a large temporal sampling plan of a fish assemblage to decipher
48
49 597 variability in benthic-pelagic couplings at five different periods. To be comparable and
50
51
52 598 interpretable, isotopic values were standardized to account for the variability of the isotopic
53
54 599 baselines (Hoeinghaus and Zeug, 2008) by calculating for each period the benthic
55
56
57 600 contribution ($\%B$) and the trophic level (TL_C) using the same two source mixing model for
58
59 601 both metrics. A similar standardization was used by Quevedo et al. (2009) or Kiljunen et al.

602 (2020) but the originality of our study stands both in the use of the p-space for the
1
2 603 determination of the functional isotopic metrics and the use of a common mixing model for
3
4 604 both metrics. Another strength is the use of unweighted/biomass-weighted metrics that assess
5
6
7 605 two complementary facets of the trophic relationships in the fish assemblage. However, our
8
9 606 approach still relies on strong assumptions regarding isotope mixing models. First, the
10
11 607 isotopic values of the sources should reflect the time periods over which the consumer tissues
12
13 608 are synthesized (Phillips et al., 2014). Fortunately, isotopic values of the baseline sources in
14
15 609 our study stayed quite stable over time with the exception of higher $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values for both
16
17 610 zooplankton and *A. opercularis* in autumn 2009 that could lead to an underestimation of fish
18
19 611 trophic levels at this period. However, we are quite confident in our results since the three
20
21 612 autumn periods displayed similar patterns in p-space. Pelagic (zooplankton) and benthic
22
23 613 (molluscs such as bivalves or gastropods) baselines are often used in marine studies (e.g.
24
25 614 Kiljunen et al., 2020; Kopp et al., 2015). *A. opercularis* is a suspension feeder and the
26
27 615 suspended particulate matter it assimilates in the deep layer originates from a mix of
28
29 616 reprocessed settling organic matter from the surface and resuspended organic matter from the
30
31 617 sediment (Rodil et al., 2020). This explains why isotopic ratios of benthic suspension feeders
32
33 618 differ significantly from zooplankton. An alternative to using primary consumers as isotopic
34
35 619 baselines would have been to use indicator fish species that rely exclusively on pelagic or
36
37 620 benthic subsidies (Duffill Telsnig et al., 2018). In our study, *S. scombrus* and *R. clavata*
38
39 621 would be the best candidates. But this approach requires isotopic values at each period and
40
41 622 invariable diet of the two fish species, both of which were not the case (Table S2). Second the
42
43 623 trophic discrimination factors should be known for each taxon, tissue and diet under study
44
45 624 (Phillips et al., 2014). Mixing models are sensitive to the values of trophic discrimination
46
47 625 factors for carbon and nitrogen (Bond and Diamond, 2011). However, changing their values
48
49 626 identically would have changed the absolute outputs of the mixing model but not their general
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 trend (Lefebvre et al., 2009b). Here, a problem arises if one considers that trophic
2 628 discrimination factors vary over time. Several studies showed that the trophic discrimination
3
4 629 factor of nitrogen in consumer tissues decreased when growth rate increased, both in fish
5
6
7 630 (Gaye-Siessegger et al., 2004) and in invertebrates (Gorokhova, 2018; Lefebvre and Dubois,
8
9
10 631 2016). More recently, Jacobi et al. (2020) showed that consumer length and season were
11
12 632 factors explaining the trophic level of a large river fish beyond $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values of its prey.
13
14 633 Finally, a starvation period would increase the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values in consumer tissues (Doi et al.,
15
16
17 634 2017). Trophic level values of two fish species stretched the p-space polygons towards higher
18
19 635 trophic levels by a value of 0.5 in winter 2015 and 2016. Further, trophic level values of the
20
21
22 636 fish assemblage in winter 2015 were on average higher than for the other periods but still the
23
24 637 vast majority of trophic level values remained between 3 and 4.5 whatever the season.
25
26
27 638 Unfortunately, we do not have any evidence to support food and/or growth limitation
28
29 639 hypotheses for our fish assemblage and therefore estimations of variable trophic
30
31
32 640 discrimination factors are not possible. In this regard, further developments are obviously
33
34 641 needed but in the meantime, we have formulated similar assumptions as previous studies in
35
36 642 the field.

43 644 **Conclusion**

46 645 Couplings between benthic and pelagic realms are persistent in the EEC where most
47
48
49 646 species display trophic plasticity and can therefore change their food source over time
50
51 647 depending on their availability or on potential competition with other species. In addition,
52
53
54 648 dominant species are rather generalist: they can predate on several food sources but also on
55
56 649 prey from different trophic levels. These behaviors are permitted by the shallowness of this
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

650 ecosystem. Finally, accounting for fish biomass in trophic and isotopic functional metrics was
1
2 651 complementary and allowed the consideration of energy fluxes within the ecosystem.
3
4

652 **List of figures**

5
6
7
8
9 653

10
11
12 654 **Fig. 1:** Location of sampling stations in the Eastern English Channel (EEC) during the five
13
14 655 surveys: CGFS 2009 (green squares), CAMANOC 2014 (orange squares), IBTS 2015 (purple
15
16 656 circles), CGFS 2015 (blue squares) and IBTS 2016 (pink circles). Autumn and winter periods
17
18
19 657 were represented by squares and circles, respectively.
20
21

22 658
23
24
25 659 **Fig. 2:** Variation of benthic contributions $%B$ (A) and trophic level TLC (B). Green squares:
26
27 660 autumn 2009 (CGFS 2009); orange squares: autumn 2014 (CAMANOC); purple circles:
28
29
30 661 winter 2015 (IBTS 2015); blue squares: autumn 2015 (CGFS 2015); pink circles: winter 2016
31
32 662 (IBTS 2016).
33
34
35

36 663
37
38
39 664 **Fig. 3:** Comparison of violin plots of the scaled benthic contribution unweighted ($%B$) or
40
41 665 weighted by biomass ($%B_w$). The bottom and top edges of the boxplots represent the first and
42
43
44 666 third quartiles. The horizontal line is the median value. The whiskers' extremities represent
45
46 667 1.5 times the interquartile space (the distance between the first and third quartile). Larger
47
48
49 668 zones of each violin plot represent the benthic contribution values supporting most of the
50
51 669 biomass.
52
53

54 670
55
56
57 671 **Fig 4:** Comparison of IFRic among the five studied periods. Each point corresponds to the
58
59
60 672 mean trophic level (TLC) and benthic contribution ($%B$) of each species. The black polygon
61
62
63
64
65

673 corresponds to the largest IFRic space calculated for the meta-assemblage gathering the 5
674 studied periods, while the red polygon corresponds to the IFRic of each studied period. The
675 silhouettes represent the three species with the highest relative biomasses in the ecosystem for
676 each studied period. 1: *Scyliorhinus canicula*; 2: *Trisopterus luscus*; 3: *Mustelus asterias*; 4:
677 *Trachurus trachurus*; 5: *Merlangius merlangus*; 6: *Limanda limanda*; 7: *Scomber scombrus*.

678

679

680 **Acknowledgments**

681 The authors thank all scientists who contributed through previous works, especially
682 Marie Cachera, Dorothée Kopp and Arnaud Auber, crews of the R/V Gwen-Drez and
683 Thalassa for their help during CGFS, CAMANOC and IBTS surveys, Khalef Rhabi for
684 technical support during fish dissections and Stanislas F. Dubois (Ifremer/DYNECO) for
685 providing some queen scallop isotopic ratios and R codes and Matthew McLean for
686 proofreading the paper.

687

688 **Funding**

689 This work is a synthesis of data collected during several projects: the Channel
690 integrated Approach for marine Resource Management (CHARM) Phase 3 project, funded by
691 the INTERREG IV A France (Channel) – England cross-border European cooperation
692 programme, co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund; RETROGRAD,
693 funded by Ifremer Scientific Direction through a “Politique de Site” incitative grant, the
694 Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) monitoring protocol calibration phase funded
695 by the French Ministry for Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy (MEDDE); the
696 “Effets de la pêche et du CLImat sur la biodiversité de PoiSsons en Manche et MER du Nord

697 (ECLIPSE), funded by the French Region Hauts-de-France and the Foundation for Research
698 on Biodiversity (contract no. astre 2014-10824); the Recherche Marine en Côte d'Opale
699 (CPER MARCO 2015-2020), funded by the European Union (ERDF), the French
700 Government, the French Region Hauts-de-France and Ifremer. S.L. was supported through the
701 ISIT-U project by the French government through the Programme Investissement d'Avenir (I-
702 SITE ULNE /ANR-16-IDEX-0004 ULNE) managed by the Agence Nationale de la
703 Recherche and by the métropole Européenne de Lille. C.A.T. received a PhD grant through a
704 project funded by European Marine Fisheries Fund and France Filière Pêche (2017-2020
705 VARITROPH project; PI: PC)

706

707 **CRedit author statement**

708 **Charles-André Timmerman:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis,
709 Investigation, Methodology, Validation, Writing – original draft

710 **Sébastien Lefebvre:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology,
711 Validation, Writing – original draft, Supervision, Project administration

712 **Pierre Cresson:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation,
713 Methodology, Validation, Writing – original draft, Supervision, Funding acquisition, Project
714 administration

715 **Bruno Ernande:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation,
716 Methodology, Validation, Writing – original draft, Funding acquisition

717 **Morgane Travers-Trolet:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation,
718 Methodology, Validation, Writing – original draft

719 **Manuel Rouquette:** Investigation, Resources

720 **Margaux Denamiel:** Investigation, Resources

721 **Carolina Giraldo:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology,

722 Validation, Writing – original draft, Supervision, Project administration

723

724 **Bibliography**

725

726 Abrantes, K.G., Barnett, A., Bouillon, S., 2014. Stable isotope-based community metrics as a

727 tool to identify patterns in food web structure in east African estuaries. *Funct Ecol* 28,

728 270–282. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12155>

729 Araújo, M.S., Bolnick, D.I., Layman, C.A., 2011. The ecological causes of individual

730 specialisation. *Ecology Letters* 14, 948–958. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461->

731 0248.2011.01662.x

732 Auber, A., Gohin, F., Goascoz, N., Schlaich, I., 2017. Decline of cold-water fish species in

733 the Bay of Somme (English Channel, France) in response to ocean warming.

734 *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 189, 189–202.

735 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2017.03.010>

736 Barnes, C., Jennings, S., Barry, Jon.T., 2009. Environmental correlates of large-scale spatial

737 variation in the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ of marine animals. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* 81, 368–374.

738 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2008.11.011>

739 Baustian, M.M., Hansen, G.J.A., de Kluijver, A., Robinson, K., Henry, E.N., Knoll, L.B.,

740 Rose, K.C., Carey, C.C., 2014. Linking the bottom to the top in aquatic ecosystems:

741 mechanisms and stressors of benthic-pelagic coupling *ECO-DAS X* 4, 38–60.

742 <http://doi.org/10.4319/ecodas.2014.978-0-9845591-4-5.38>.

- 743 Bearhop, S., Adams, C.E., Waldron, S., Fuller, R.A., Macleod, H., 2004. Determining trophic
1
2 744 niche width: a novel approach using stable isotope analysis. *Journal of Animal*
3
4 745 *Ecology* 73, 1007–1012. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-8790.2004.00861.x>
5
6
7 746 Blanchard, J.L., Law, R., Castle, M.D., Jennings, S., 2011. Coupled energy pathways and the
8
9 747 resilience of size-structured food webs. *Theoretical Ecology* 4, 289–300.
10
11 748 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12080-010-0078-9>
12
13
14 749 Bolnick, D.I., Amarasekare, P., Araújo, M.S., Bürger, R., Levine, J.M., Novak, M., Rudolf,
15
16 750 V.H.W., Schreiber, S.J., Urban, M.C., Vasseur, D.A., 2011. Why intraspecific trait
17
18 751 variation matters in community ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 26, 183–192.
19
20 752 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.01.009>
21
22
23
24 753 Bolnick, D.I., Svanbäck, R., Fordyce, J.A., Yang, L.H., Davis, J.M., Hulsey, C.D., Forister,
25
26 754 M.L., McPeck, A.E.M.A., 2003. The Ecology of Individuals: Incidence and
27
28 755 Implications of Individual Specialization. *The American Naturalist* 161, 1–28.
29
30 756 <https://doi.org/10.1086/343878>
31
32
33
34 757 Bond A.L., Diamond A.W., 2011 Recent Bayesian stable-isotope mixing models are highly
35
36 758 sensitive to variation in discrimination factors. *Ecological Applications* 21,1017-1023.
37
38 759 <https://doi.org/10.1890/09-2409.1>
39
40
41 760 Breton, E., 2000. Annual variations of phytoplankton biomass in the Eastern English Channel:
42
43 761 comparison by pigment signatures and microscopic counts. *Journal of Plankton*
44
45 762 *Research* 22, 1423–1440. <https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/22.8.1423>
46
47
48
49 763 Cachera, M., 2013. Implications of morphological and functional traits for trophic
50
51 764 relationships within fish communities and marine trophic network architecture. PhD
52
53 765 thesis, 249p.
54
55
56 766 Caut, S., Angulo, E., Courchamp, F., 2009. Variation in discrimination factors ($\Delta^{15}\text{N}$ and
57
58 767 $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$): the effect of diet isotopic values and applications for diet reconstruction.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

768 Journal of Applied Ecology 46, 443–453. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365->
1
2 769 2664.2009.01620.x
3
4
5 770 Christianen, M.J.A., Middelburg, J.J., Holthuijsen, S.J., Jouta, J., Compton, T.J., van der
6
7 771 Heide, T., Piersma, T., Sinninghe Damsté, J.S., van der Veer, H.W., Schouten, S.,
8
9
10 772 Olf, H., 2017. Benthic primary producers are key to sustain the Wadden Sea food
11
12 773 web: stable carbon isotope analysis at landscape scale. *Ecology*. 98, 1498-1512
13
14 774 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.1837>
15
16
17 775 Clegg, T., Ali, M., Beckerman, A.P., 2018. The impact of intraspecific variation on food web
18
19 776 structure. *Ecology* 99, 2712–2720. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2523>
20
21
22 777 Costa-Pereira, R., Araújo, M.S., Souza, F.L., Ingram, T., 2019. Competition and resource
23
24 778 breadth shape niche variation and overlap in multiple trophic dimensions. *Proc. R.*
25
26
27 779 *Soc. B.* 286, 20190369. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.0369>
28
29 780 Cresson, P., Chauvelon, T., Bustamante, P., Bănar, D., Baudrier, J., Le Loc'h, F., Mauffret,
30
31 781 A., Mialet, B., Spitz, J., Wessel, N., Briand, M.J., Denamiel, M., Doray, M., Guillou,
32
33
34 782 G., Jadaud, A., Lazard, C., Prieur, S., Rouquette, M., Saraux, C., Serre, S.,
35
36 783 Timmerman, C.-A., Verin, Y., Harmelin-Vivien, M., 2020. Primary production and
37
38
39 784 depth drive different trophic structure and functioning of fish assemblages in French
40
41 785 marine ecosystems. *Progress in Oceanography* 186, 102343.
42
43 786 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2020.102343>
44
45
46 787 Cresson, P., Le Direach, L., Rouanet, E., Goberville, E., Astruch, P., Ourgaud, M., Harmelin-
47
48 788 Vivien, M., 2019. Functional traits unravel temporal changes in fish biomass
49
50
51 789 production on artificial reefs. *Marine Environmental Research* 145, 137–146.
52
53 790 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2019.02.018>
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 791 Cresson, P., Ruitton, S., Harmelin-Vivien, M., 2016. Feeding strategies of co-occurring
1
2 792 suspension feeders in an oligotrophic environment. *Food Webs* 6, 19–28.
3
4 793 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fooweb.2015.12.002>
5
6
7 794 Cucherousset, J., Villéger, S., 2015. Quantifying the multiple facets of isotopic diversity: New
8
9 795 metrics for stable isotope ecology. *Ecological Indicators* 56, 152–160.
10
11 796 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.03.032>
12
13
14 797 Cury, P., Shannon, L., Shin, Y., 2003. The functioning of marine ecosystems: a fisheries
15
16 798 perspective., in: Sinclair, M., Valdimarsson, G. (Eds.), *Responsible Fisheries in the*
17
18 799 *Marine Ecosystem*. Wallingford, 103–123.
19
20 800 <https://doi.org/10.1079/9780851996332.0103>
21
22
23
24 801 Darnaude, A.M., Salen-Picard, C., Polunin, N.V.C., Harmelin-Vivien, M.L., 2004.
25
26 802 Trophodynamic linkage between river runoff and coastal fishery yield elucidated by
27
28 803 stable isotope data in the Gulf of Lions (NW Mediterranean). *Oecologia* 138, 325–
29
30 804 332. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-003-1457-3>
31
32
33
34 805 DeNiro, M.J., Epstein, S., 1978. Influence of diet on the distribution of carbon isotopes in
35
36 806 animals. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 42, 495–506.
37
38 807 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037\(78\)90199-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037(78)90199-0)
39
40
41 808 Docmac, F., Araya, M., Hinojosa, I.A., Dorador, C., Harrod, C., 2017. Habitat coupling writ
42
43 809 large: pelagic-derived materials fuel benthivorous macroalgal reef fishes in an
44
45 810 upwelling zone. *Ecology* 98, 2267–2272. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.1936>
46
47
48 811 Doi, H., Akamatsu, F., González, A., 2017. Starvation effects on nitrogen and carbon stable
49
50 812 isotopes of animals: An insight from meta-analysis of fasting experiments. *R. Soc.*
51
52 813 *Open Sci.* 4, 170633. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.170633>
53
54
55 814 Duffill Telsnig, J.I., Jennings, S., Mill, A.C., Walker, N.D., Parnell, A.C., Polunin, N.V.C.,
56
57 815 2018. Estimating contributions of pelagic and benthic pathways to consumer
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

816 production in coupled marine food webs. *J Anim Ecol* 1365-2656.12929.
1
2 817 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12929>
3
4 818 Eloire, D., Somerfield, P.J., Conway, D.V.P., Halsband-Lenk, C., Harris, R., Bonnet, D.,
5
6
7 819 2010. Temporal variability and community composition of zooplankton at station L4
8
9 820 in the Western Channel: 20 years of sampling. *J. Plankton Res.* 32, 657–679.
10
11 821 <https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/fbq009>
12
13 822
14
15
16
17 823 Fry, B., 2006. *Stable Isotope Ecology*. Springer New York. 308p. <https://doi.org/10.1007/0->
18
19 387-33745-8
20 824
21
22 825 Gajdzik, L., Parmentier, E., Michel, L.N., Sturaro, N., Soong, K., Lepoint, G., Frédérick, B.,
23
24
25 826 2018. Similar levels of trophic and functional diversity within damselfish assemblages
26
27 827 across Indo- Pacific coral reefs. *Funct Ecol* 32, 1358–1369.
28
29 828 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13076>
30
31 829 Garcia, S.M., Zerbi, A., Aliaume, C., Do Chi, T., Lasserre, G., 2003. The ecosystem approach
32
33 830 to fisheries. Issues, terminology, principles, institutional foundations, implementation
34
35 831 and outlook., *FAO Fisheries Technical Paper*. 71p.
36
37 832 Gaudron, S.M., Grangeré, K., Lefebvre, S., 2016. The Comparison of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ Values of a
38
39 833 Deposit- and a Suspension-Feeder Bio-Indicates Benthic vs. Pelagic Couplings and
40
41 834 Trophic Status in Contrasted Coastal Ecosystems. *Estuaries and Coasts* 39, 731–741.
42
43 835 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-015-0020-x>
44
45 836 Gaye-Siessegger J., Focken U., Muetzel S., Abel H., Becker K., 2004 Feeding level and
46
47 837 individual metabolic rate affect $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values in carp: implications for food
48
49 838 web studies. *Oecologia* 138, 175-183. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-003-1429-7>
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 839 Gili, J.-M., Coma, R., 1998. Benthic suspension feeders: their paramount role in littoral
1
2 840 marine food webs. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 13, 316–321.
3
4 841 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(98\)01365-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(98)01365-2)
5
6
7 842 Giraldo, C., Ernande, B., Cresson, P., Kopp, D., Cachera, M., Travers-Trolet, M., Lefebvre,
8
9 843 S., 2017. Depth gradient in the resource use of a fish community from a semi-enclosed
10
11 844 sea: Benthic-pelagic coupling in fish diet. *Limnology and Oceanography* 6, 2213–
12
13 845 2226. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.10561>
14
15
16 846 Gorokhova E., 2018 Individual growth as a non-dietary determinant of the isotopic niche
17
18 847 metrics. *Methods Ecol Evol* 9, 269-277. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210x.12887>
19
20
21 848 Grebmeier, J.M., Barry, J.P., 1991. The influence of oceanographic processes on pelagic-
22
23 849 benthic coupling in polar regions: A benthic perspective. *Journal of Marine Systems* 2,
24
25 850 495–518. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0924-7963\(91\)90049-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/0924-7963(91)90049-Z)
26
27
28 851 Griffiths, J.R., Kadin, M., Nascimento, F.J.A., Tamelander, T., Törnroos, A., Bonaglia, S.,
29
30 852 Bonsdorff, E., Brüchert, V., Gårdmark, A., Järnström, M., Kotta, J., Lindegren, M.,
31
32 853 Nordström, M.C., Norkko, A., Olsson, J., Weigel, B., Žydelis, R., Blenckner, T.,
33
34 854 Niiranen, S., Winder, M., 2017. The importance of benthic-pelagic coupling for
35
36 855 marine ecosystem functioning in a changing world. *Glob Change Biol* 23, 2179–2196.
37
38
39 856 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13642>
40
41
42 857 Hayden, B., Harrod, C., Thomas, S.M., Eloranta, A.P., Myllykangas, J.-P., Siwertsson, A.,
43
44 858 Praebel, K., Knudsen, R., Amundsen, P.-A., Kahilainen, K.K., 2019. From clear lakes
45
46 859 to murky waters - tracing the functional response of high-latitude lake communities to
47
48
49 860 concurrent ‘greening’ and ‘browning.’ *Ecology Letters*. 22, 807-816
50
51
52 861 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13238>
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- 862 Hill, J.M., Jones, R.W., Hill, M.P., Weyl, O.L.F., 2015. Comparisons of isotopic niche widths
863 of some invasive and indigenous fauna in a South African river. *Freshw Biol* 60, 893–
864 902. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12542>
- 865 Hoeninghaus, D.J., Zeug, S.C., 2008. Can Stable Isotope Ratios Provide for Community-Wide
866 Measures of Trophic Structure? *Comment. Ecology* 89, 2353–2357.
- 867 Hooper, D.U., Chapin, F.S., Ewel, J.J., Hector, A., Inchausti, P., Lavorel, S., Lawton, J.H.,
868 Lodge, D.M., Loreau, M., Naeem, S., Schmid, B., Setälä, H., Symstad, A.J.,
869 Vandermeer, J., Wardle, D.A., 2005. Effect of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning:
870 a consensus of current knowledge. *Ecological Monographs* 75, 3–35.
871 <https://doi.org/10.1890/04-0922>
- 872 ICES - International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, 2004. Manual for the
873 international bottom trawl surveys. Revision VII. 51p.
874 <https://archimer.ifremer.fr/doc/00036/14709/>
- 875 Ingram, T., Costa-Pereira, R., Araújo, M.S., 2018. The dimensionality of individual niche
876 variation. *Ecology* 99, 536–549. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2129>
- 877 Ings, T.C., Montoya, J.M., Bascompte, J., Blüthgen, N., Brown, L., Dormann, C.F., Edwards,
878 F., Figueroa, D., Jacob, U., Jones, J.I., Lauridsen, R.B., Ledger, M.E., Lewis, H.M.,
879 Olesen, J.M., van Veen, F.J.F., Warren, P.H., Woodward, G., 2009. Review:
880 Ecological networks - beyond food webs. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 78, 253–269.
881 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01460.x>
- 882 Jabot, F., Giraldo, C., Lefebvre, S., Dubois, S., 2017. Are food web structures well
883 represented in isotopic spaces? *Funct Ecol* 31, 1975–1984.
884 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12895>
- 885 Jackson, A.L., Inger, R., Parnell, A.C., Bearhop, S., 2011. Comparing isotopic niche widths
886 among and within communities: SIBER - Stable Isotope Bayesian Ellipses in R:

887 Bayesian isotopic niche metrics. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 80, 595–602.
1
2 888 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01806.x>
3
4 889 Jacobi C.M., Villamarín F., Jardine T.D., Magnusson W.E., 2020 Uncertainties associated
5
6
7 890 with trophic discrimination factor and body size complicate calculation of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ -
8
9
10 891 derived trophic positions in *Arapaima* sp. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish* 29 ,779-789.
11
12 892 <https://doi.org/10.1111/eff.12553>
13
14 893 Jennings, S., van der Molen, J., 2015. Trophic levels of marine consumers from nitrogen
15
16 894 stable isotope analysis: estimation and uncertainty. *ICES Journal of Marine Science:*
17
18
19 895 *Journal du Conseil* 72, 2289–2300. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsv120>
20
21
22 896 Jennings, S., Warr, K.J., 2003. Environmental correlates of large-scale spatial variation in the
23
24 897 $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ of marine animals. *Marine Biology* 142, 1131–1140.
25
26 898 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-003-1020-0>
27
28
29 899 Kiljunen, M., Peltonen, H., Lehtiniemi, M., Uusitalo, L., Sinisalo, T., Norkko, J.,
30
31 900 Kunnasranta, M., Torniainen, J., Rissanen, A.J., Karjalainen, J., 2020. Benthic-
32
33
34 901 pelagic coupling and trophic relationships in northern Baltic Sea food webs. *Limnol*
35
36 902 *Oceanogr* 65, 1706–1722. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.11413>
37
38
39 903 Kopp, D., Lefebvre, S., Cachera, M., Villanueva, M.C., Ernande, B., 2015. Reorganization of
40
41 904 a marine trophic network along an inshore–offshore gradient due to stronger pelagic–
42
43
44 905 benthic coupling in coastal areas. *Progress in Oceanography* 130, 157–171.
45
46 906 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2014.11.001>
47
48
49 907 Kürten, B., Frutos, I., Struck, U., Painting, S.J., Polunin, N.V.C., Middelburg, J.J., 2013.
50
51 908 Trophodynamics and functional feeding groups of North Sea fauna: a combined stable
52
53 909 isotope and fatty acid approach. *Biogeochemistry* 113, 189–212.
54
55 910 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10533-012-9701-8>
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- 911 Laliberté, E and Legendre P. 2010., A distance-based framework for measuring functional
912 diversity from multiple traits. *Ecology* 91,299-305
- 913 Layman, C.A., Araujo, M.S., Boucek, R., Hammerschlag-Peyer, C.M., Harrison, E., Jud,
914 Z.R., Matich, P., Rosenblatt, A.E., Vaudo, J.J., Yeager, L.A., Post, D.M., Bearhop, S.,
915 2012. Applying stable isotopes to examine food-web structure: an overview of
916 analytical tools. *Biological Reviews* 87, 545–562. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2011.00208.x>
- 917
- 918 Layman, C.A., Arrington, D.A., Montaña, C.G., Post, D.M., 2007. Can stable isotope ratios
919 provide for community-wide measures of trophic structure? *Ecology* 88, 42–48.
920 [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658\(2007\)88\[42:CSIRPF\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2007)88[42:CSIRPF]2.0.CO;2)
- 921
- 922 Le Roy D., 2009. CGFS2009 cruise, Gwen Drez R/V. <https://doi.org/10.17600/9050090>
- 923
- 924 Leduc, A.O.H.C., da Silva, E.M., Rosenfeld, J.S., 2015. Effects of species vs. functional
925 diversity: Understanding the roles of complementarity and competition on ecosystem
926 function in a tropical stream fish assemblage. *Ecological Indicators* 48, 627–635.
927 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.09.027>.
- 928
- 929 Lefebvre S., Dubois S.F., 2016 The stony road to understand isotopic enrichment and
930 turnover rates: insight into the metabolic part. *Vie Milieu* 66, 305-314
- 931
- 932 Lefebvre S., Harma C., Blin J.L., 2009a Trophic typology of coastal ecosystems based on
933 $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ratios in an opportunistic suspension feeder. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 390,
934 27-37. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08187>
- 935
- 936 Lefebvre, S., Marín Leal, J.C., Dubois, S., Orvain, F., Blin, J.-L., Bataillé, M.-P., Ourry, A.,
937 Galois, R., 2009b. Seasonal dynamics of trophic relationships among co-occurring
938 suspension-feeders in two shellfish culture dominated ecosystems. *Estuarine, Coastal
939 and Shelf Science* 82, 415–425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2009.02.002>

- 935 Logan, J.M., Jardine, T.D., Miller, T.J., Bunn, S.E., Cunjak, R.A., Lutcavage, M.E., 2008.
1
2 936 Lipid corrections in carbon and nitrogen stable isotope analyses: comparison of
3
4 937 chemical extraction and modelling methods. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 77, 838–846.
5
6
7 938 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01394.x>
8
9
10 939 Loots, C., Vaz, S., Planque, B., Koubbi, P., 2011. Understanding what controls the spawning
11
12 940 distribution of North Sea whiting (*Merlangius merlangus*) using a multi-model
13
14 941 approach. *Fisheries Oceanography* 20, 18–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365->
15
16 942 [2419.2010.00564.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2419.2010.00564.x)
17
18
19 943 Lynam, C.P., Llope, M., Möllmann, C., Helaouët, P., Bayliss-Brown, G.A., Stenseth, N.C.,
20
21
22 944 2017. Interaction between top-down and bottom-up control in marine food webs. *Proc*
23
24 945 *Natl Acad Sci USA* 114, 1952–1957. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1621037114>
25
26
27 946 Macer, C.T., 1977. Some aspects of the biology of the horse mackerel [*Trachurus trachurus*
28
29 947 (L.)] in waters around Britain. *J Fish Biology* 10, 51–62.
30
31 948 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8649.1977.tb04041.x>
32
33
34 949 Mason, N.W.H., Mouillot, D., Lee, W.G., Wilson, J.B., 2005. Functional richness, functional
35
36 950 evenness and functional divergence: the primary components of functional diversity.
37
38
39 951 *Oikos* 111, 112–118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0030-1299.2005.13886.x>
40
41 952 McCann, K.S., 2000. The diversity–stability debate. *Nature* 405, 228–233.
42
43
44 953 <https://doi.org/10.1038/35012234>
45
46 954 McLean, M., Mouillot, D., Lindegren, M., Engelhard, G., Villéger, S., Marchal, P.,
47
48
49 955 Brind’Amour, A., Auber, A., 2018. A Climate-Driven Functional Inversion of
50
51 956 Connected Marine Ecosystems. *Current Biology* 28, 3654-3660.e3.
52
53 957 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2018.09.050>
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- 958 McMeans, B.C., McCann, K.S., Humphries, M., Rooney, N., Fisk, A.T., 2015. Food Web
959 Structure in Temporally-Forced Ecosystems. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 30, 662–
960 672. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.09.001>
- 961 Mouillot, D., Graham, N.A.J., Villéger, S., Mason, N.W.H., Bellwood, D.R., 2013. A
962 functional approach reveals community responses to disturbances. *Trends in Ecology
& Evolution* 28, 167–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2012.10.004>
- 964 Newsome, S.D., Martinez del Rio, C., Bearhop, S., Phillips, D.L., 2007. A niche for isotopic
965 ecology. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 5, 429–436.
966 <https://doi.org/10.1890/060150.1>
- 967 Pellissier, L., Albouy, C., Bascompte, J., Farwig, N., Graham, C., Loreau, M., Maglianesi,
968 M.A., Melián, C.J., Pitteloud, C., Roslin, T., Rohr, R., Saavedra, S., Thuiller, W.,
969 Woodward, G., Zimmermann, N.E., Gravel, D., 2018. Comparing species interaction
970 networks along environmental gradients: Networks along environmental gradients.
971 *Biol Rev* 93, 785–800. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12366>
- 972 Petchey, O.L., 2003. Integrating methods that investigate how complementarity influences
973 ecosystem functioning. *Oikos* 101, 323–330. [https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-
0706.2003.11828.x](https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0706.2003.11828.x)
- 975 Peterson, B.J., Fry, B., 1987. Stable Isotopes in Ecosystem Studies. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*
976 18, 293–320. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.18.110187.001453>
- 977 Phillips, D.L., Gregg, J.W., 2003. Source partitioning using stable isotopes: coping with too
978 many sources. *Oecologia* 136, 261–269. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-003-1218-3>
- 979 Phillips, D.L., Inger, R., Bearhop, S., Jackson, A.L., Moore, J.W., Parnell, A.C., Semmens,
980 B.X., Ward, E.J., 2014. Best practices for use of stable isotope mixing models in food-
981 web studies. *Can. J. Zool.* 92, 823–835. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjz-2014-0127>
- 982 Pielou, E.C., 1976. *Ecological Diversity*. John Wiley & Sons Inc, New York.176p.

- 983 Polunin, N., Morales-Nin, B., Pawsey, W., Cartes, J., Pinnegar, J., Moranta, J., 2001. Feeding
1
2 984 relationships in Mediterranean bathyal assemblages elucidated by carbon and nitrogen
3
4 985 stable-isotope data. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 220, 13–23.
5
6
7 986 <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps220013>
8
9
10 987 Post, D.M., 2002. Using Stable Isotopes to Estimate Trophic Position: Models, Methods, and
11
12 988 Assumptions. *Ecology* 83, 703–718. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3071875>
13
14 989 Post, D.M., Conners, M.E., Goldberg, D.S., 2000. Prey Preference by a Top Predator and the
15
16 990 Stability of Linked Food Chains. *Ecology* 81, 8–14. <https://doi.org/10.2307/177129>
17
18
19 991 Post, D.M., Layman, C.A., Arrington, D.A., Takimoto, G., Quattrochi, J., Montaña, C.G.,
20
21 992 2007. Getting to the fat of the matter: models, methods and assumptions for dealing
22
23 993 with lipids in stable isotope analyses. *Oecologia* 152, 179–189.
24
25 994 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-006-0630-x>
26
27
28 995 Quevedo, M., Svanbäck, R., Eklöv, P., 2009. Intrapopulation niche partitioning in a generalist
29
30 996 predator limits food web connectivity. *Ecology* 90, 2263–2274.
31
32 997 <https://doi.org/10.1890/07-1580.1>
33
34
35 998 R Core Team, 2019. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, R
36
37 999 Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria.
38
39
40 1000 Rigolet, C., Thiébaud, E., Brind'Amour, A., Dubois, S.F., 2015. Investigating isotopic
41
42 1001 functional indices to reveal changes in the structure and functioning of benthic
43
44 1002 communities. *Funct Ecol* 29, 1350–1360. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12444>
45
46
47 1003 Rodil I.F., Lucena-Moya P., Tamelander T., Norkko J., Norkko A., 2020 Seasonal Variability
48
49 1004 in Benthic–Pelagic Coupling: Quantifying Organic Matter Inputs to the Seafloor and
50
51 1005 Benthic Macrofauna Using a Multi-Marker Approach. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 7,
52
53 1006 404. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.00404>
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1007 Rooney, N., McCann, K., Gellner, G., Moore, J.C., 2006. Structural asymmetry and the
1 stability of diverse food webs. *Nature* 442, 265–269.
2
3
4
51009 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04887>
6
- 71010 Rooney, N., McCann, K.S., 2012. Integrating food web diversity, structure and stability.
8
9
101011 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 27, 40–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.09.001>
11
- 121012 Schindler, D.E., Carpenter, S.R., Cottingham, K.L., He, X., Hodgson, J.R., Kitchell, J.F.,
13
14
151013 Soranno, P.A., 1996. Food Web Structure and Littoral Zone Coupling to Pelagic
16
171014 Trophic Cascades, in: Polis, G.A., Winemiller, K.O. (Eds.), *Food Webs*. Springer US,
18
191015 Boston, MA. 96–105. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-7007-3_9
20
- 21
221016 Seibold, S., Cadotte, M.W., MacIvor, J.S., Thorn, S., Müller, J., 2018. The Necessity of
23
241017 Multitrophic Approaches in Community Ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 33,
25
26
271018 754–764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2018.07.001>
28
- 291019 Shannon, C.E., Weaver, W., 1963. *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. University
30
311020 of Illinois Press.144p.
32
- 33
341021 Silberberger, M.J., Renaud, P.E., Kröncke, I., Reiss, H., 2018. Food-Web Structure in Four
35
361022 Locations Along the European Shelf Indicates Spatial Differences in Ecosystem
37
38
391023 Functioning. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 5, 119. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2018.00119>
40
- 411024 Snickars, M., Weigel, B., Bonsdorff, E., 2015. Impact of eutrophication and climate change
42
43
441025 on fish and zoobenthos in coastal waters of the Baltic Sea. *Mar Biol* 162, 141–151.
45
461026 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-014-2579-3>
47
- 48
491027 Stasko, A., Bluhm, B., Michel, C., Archambault, P., Majewski, A., Reist, J., Swanson, H.,
50
511028 Power, M., 2018. Benthic-pelagic trophic coupling in an Arctic marine food web
52
53
541029 along vertical water mass and organic matter gradients. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 594, 1–
55
561030 19. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps12582>
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1031 Takai, N., Mishima, Y., Yorozu, A., Hoshika, A., 2002. Carbon sources for demersal fish in
1
21032 the western Seto Inland Sea, Japan, examined by $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ analyses. *Limnol.*
3
4
51033 *Oceanogr.* 47, 730–741. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2002.47.3.0730>
6
- 71034 Tecchio, S., van Oevelen, D., Soetaert, K., Navarro, J., Ramírez-Llodra, E., 2013. Trophic
8
9
101035 Dynamics of Deep-Sea Megabenthos Are Mediated by Surface Productivity. *PLoS*
11
121036 *ONE* 8, e63796. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0063796>
13
- 141037 Thompson, M.S.A., Pontalier, H., Spence, M.A., Pinnegar, J.K., Greenstreet, S., Moriarty,
15
16
171038 M., Hélaouët, P., Lynam, C.P., 2020. A feeding guild indicator to assess
18
191039 environmental change impacts on marine ecosystem structure and functioning. *J Appl*
20
21
221040 *Ecol* 1365-2664.13662. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13662>
23
- 241041 Thompson, R.M., Brose, U., Dunne, J.A., Hall, R.O., Hladyz, S., Kitching, R.L., Martinez,
25
26
271042 N.D., Rantala, H., Romanuk, T.N., Stouffer, D.B., Tylianakis, J.M., 2012. Food webs:
28
291043 reconciling the structure and function of biodiversity. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*
30
31
321044 27, 689–697. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2012.08.005>
33
- 341045 Thompson, R.M., Hemberg, M., Starzomski, B.M., Shurin, J.B., 2007. Trophic levels and
35
361046 trophic tangles: the prevalence of omnivory in real food webs. *Ecology* 88, 612–617.
37
38
391047 <https://doi.org/10.1890/05-1454>
40
- 411048 Tilman, D., Isbell, F., Cowles, J.M., 2014. Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning. *Annu.*
42
43
441049 *Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 45, 471–493. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-120213->
45
461050 091917
47
- 481051 Travers-Trolet, M., Verin, Y., 2014. Camanoc Survey Report.
49
50
511052 <https://doi.org/10.17600/14001900>
52
- 531053 Travers-Trolet M., 2015. CGFS2015 cruise, Thalassa R/V. <https://doi.org/10.17600/15002100>
54
55
- 561054 Udy, J., Wing, S., O’Connell-Milne, S., Durante, L., McMullin, R., Kolodzey, S., Frew, R.,
57
581055 2019. Regional differences in supply of organic matter from kelp forests drive
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1056 trophodynamics of temperate reef fish. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 621, 19–32.
1
21057 <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps12974>
3
4
51058 van Denderen, P.D., Lindegren, M., MacKenzie, B.R., Watson, R.A., Andersen, K.H., 2018.
6
71059 Global patterns in marine predatory fish. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 2, 65–70.
8
9
101060 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0388-z>
11
121061 Van Valen, L., 1965. Morphological Variation and Width of Ecological Niche. *The American*
13
141062 *Naturalist* 99, 377–390.
15
16
171063 Vander Zanden, M.J., Vadeboncoeur, Y., 2002. Fishes as integrators of benthic and pelagic
18
191064 food webs in Lakes. *Ecology* 83, 2152–2161. <https://doi.org/10.1890/0012->
20
21
221065 [9658\(2002\)083\[2152:FAIOBA\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2002)083[2152:FAIOBA]2.0.CO;2)
23
241066 Vandermeer, J., 2006. Omnivory and the stability of food webs. *Journal of Theoretical*
25
261067 *Biology* 238, 497–504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2005.06.006>
27
28
291068 Verin, Y., Lazard, C., 2015. IBTS 2015 cruise, Thalassa R/V.
30
311069 <https://doi.org/10.17600/15001500>.
32
33
341070 Verin Y., 2016. IBTS 2016 cruise, Thalassa R/V. <https://doi.org/10.17600/16002100>
35
361071 Villéger, S., Mason, N.W.H., Mouillot, D., 2008. New multidimensional functional diversity
37
381072 indices for a multifaceted framework in functional ecology. *Ecology* 89, 2290–2301.
39
40
411073 <https://doi.org/10.1890/07-1206.1>
42
43
441074 Wickham, H., 2016. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*, Springer-Verlag New
45
461075 York. 221p.
47
48
491076 Woodland, R.J., Secor, D.H., 2013. Benthic-pelagic coupling in a temperate inner continental
50
511077 shelf fish assemblage. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 58, 966–976.
52
531078 <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2013.58.3.0966>
54
55
561079 Ying, R., Cao, Y., Yin, F., Guo, J., Huang, J., Wang, Y., Zheng, L., Wang, J., Liang, H., Li,
57
581080 Z., Feng, J., 2020. Trophic structure and functional diversity reveal pelagic-benthic
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1081 coupling dynamic in the coastal ecosystem of Daya Bay, China. *Ecological Indicators*
1
21082 113, 106241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2020.106241>
3
4
51083 Zheng, X., Pierce, G.J., Reid, D.G., 2001. Spatial patterns of whiting abundance in Scottish
6
71084 waters and relationships with environmental variables. *Fisheries Research* 50, 259–
8
9
101085 270. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-7836\(00\)00219-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-7836(00)00219-8)
11
121086
13
141087
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

List of figures

Fig. 1: Location of sampling stations in the Eastern English Channel (EEC) during the five surveys: CGFS 2009 (green squares), CAMANOC 2014 (orange squares), IBTS 2015 (purple circles), CGFS 2015 (blue squares) and IBTS 2016 (pink circles). Autumn and winter periods were represented by squares and circles, respectively.




Fig. 2: Variation of benthic contributions %B (A) and trophic level *TLC* (B). Green squares: autumn 2009 (CGFS 2009); orange squares: autumn 2014 (CAMANOC); purple circles: winter 2015 (IBTS 2015); blue squares: autumn 2015 (CGFS 2015); pink circles: winter 2016 (IBTS 2016).




Fig. 3: Comparison of violin plots of the scaled benthic contribution unweighted ($\%B$) or weighted by biomass ($\%B_w$). The bottom and top edges of the boxplots represent the first and third quartiles. The horizontal line is the median value. The whiskers' extremities represent 1.5 times the interquartile space (the distance between the first and third quartile). Larger zones of each violin plot represent the benthic contribution values supporting most of the biomass.





Fig 4: Comparison of IFRic among the five studied periods. Each point corresponds to the mean trophic level (*TLC*) and benthic contribution (*%B*) of each species. The black polygon corresponds to the largest IFRic space calculated for the meta-assemblage gathering the 5 studied periods, while the red polygon corresponds to the IFRic of each studied period. The silhouettes represent the three species with the highest relative biomasses in the ecosystem for each studied period. 1: *Scyliorhinus canicula*; 2: *Trisopterus luscus*; 3: *Mustelus asterias*; 4: *Trachurus trachurus*; 5: *Merlangius merlangus*; 6: *Limanda limanda*; 7: *Scomber scombrus*.



Supplementary material

Table S1. Synthesis of the dataset used for isotopic analysis. n: number of fish for each species collected at each period before bootstrapping. After bootstrapping, all species were set at five consumers by species.

Species	n	Periods	Biomass (kg.km ⁻²)	Total length (mm)	$\delta^{13}\text{C}$ (‰) before bootstrap	$\delta^{13}\text{C}$ (‰) after bootstrap	$\delta^{15}\text{N}$ (‰) before bootstrap	$\delta^{15}\text{N}$ (‰) after bootstrap	Benthic contribution scaled	Trophic level
				min - max	mean \pm sd	mean \pm sd	mean \pm sd	mean \pm sd		
<i>Ammodytes tobianus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Lesser sand eel	5	Winter 2016	54.41	192 - 198	-17.49 \pm 0.16	-17.49 \pm 0.16	12.67 \pm 0.30	12.67 \pm 0.30	0.49 \pm 0.02	3.74 \pm 0.08
<i>Buglossidium luteum</i> (Risso, 1810) Yellow sole	6	Autumn 2009	0.38	70 - 100	-17.01 \pm 0.18	-17.01 \pm 0.20	13.81 \pm 0.53	13.79 \pm 0.59	0.53 \pm 0.02	3.36 \pm 0.17
	5	Autumn 2015	0.22	80 - 120	-16.50 \pm 0.50	-16.50 \pm 0.50	14.17 \pm 0.45	14.17 \pm 0.45	0.46 \pm 0.09	3.77 \pm 0.16
<i>Callionymus lyra</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Common dragonet	11	Autumn 2009	17.92	150 - 230	-17.66 \pm 0.86	-17.87 \pm 0.98	13.45 \pm 0.31	13.45 \pm 0.43	0.37 \pm 0.21	3.18 \pm 0.16
	5	Autumn 2015	3.32	130 - 156	-16.64 \pm 0.47	-16.64 \pm 0.47	13.94 \pm 0.48	13.94 \pm 0.48	0.45 \pm 0.09	3.69 \pm 0.15
	5	Winter 2016	1.92	154 - 187	-16.53 \pm 0.33	-16.53 \pm 0.33	12.24 \pm 0.47	12.24 \pm 0.47	0.69 \pm 0.06	3.36 \pm 0.16
<i>Chelidonichthys cuculus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Red gurnard	12	Autumn 2009	90.64	200 - 260	-17.23 \pm 0.25	-17.10 \pm 0.31	14.13 \pm 0.61	14.41 \pm 0.68	0.47 \pm 0.05	3.52 \pm 0.20
	24	Autumn 2014	16.26	123 - 364	-16.79 \pm 0.63	-16.71 \pm 0.88	13.65 \pm 0.85	13.71 \pm 0.75	0.70 \pm 0.22	3.86 \pm 0.27
	5	Autumn 2015	22.57	111 - 192	-17.05 \pm 0.73	-17.05 \pm 0.73	13.39 \pm 0.99	13.39 \pm 0.99	0.40 \pm 0.10	3.49 \pm 0.36
	5	Winter 2016	10.81	207 - 301	-16.54 \pm 0.33	-16.54 \pm 0.33	13.35 \pm 0.24	13.35 \pm 0.24	0.63 \pm 0.06	3.77 \pm 0.13
<i>Chelidonichthys lucerna</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	6	Autumn 2009	14.26	100 - 400	-17.11 \pm 0.68	-17.04 \pm 0.75	15.43 \pm 0.88	15.32 \pm 0.92	0.43 \pm 0.18	3.76 \pm 0.23

Tub gurnard	5	Winter 2016	357.96	195 – 641	-17.39 ± 0.90	-17.39 ± 0.90	16.04 ± 1.12	16.04 ± 1.12	0.33 ± 0.15	4.93 ± 0.36
<i>Clupea harengus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Atlantic herring	5	Autumn 2009	0.56	127 – 290	-18.43 ± 0.68	-18.43 ± 0.68	14.00 ± 2.67	14.00 ± 2.67	0.21 ± 0.23	3.26 ± 0.69
	11	Winter 2015	39.20	237 – 268	-18.55 ± 0.34	-18.47 ± 0.38	12.44 ± 0.46	12.37 ± 0.47	0.42 ± 0.15	3.82 ± 0.20
	5	Autumn 2015	17.97	196 – 221	-16.64 ± 0.96	-16.64 ± 0.96	13.10 ± 0.88	13.10 ± 0.88	0.50 ± 0.22	3.48 ± 0.22
	5	Winter 2016	712.42	153 – 251	-18.77 ± 0.73	-18.76 ± 0.73	10.57 ± 0.93	10.57 ± 0.93	0.37 ± 0.10	3.27 ± 0.24
<i>Dicentrarchus labrax</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) European bass	24	Autumn 2009	74.29	350 – 450	-16.77 ± 0.84	-16.93 ± 0.48	15.91 ± 1.08	15.52 ± 1.01	0.44 ± 0.16	3.82 ± 0.22
	5	Autumn 2015	22.49	253 – 288	-15.85 ± 0.54	-15.85 ± 0.54	14.70 ± 0.49	14.70 ± 0.49	0.57 ± 0.14	4.00 ± 0.08
<i>Echiichthys vipera</i> (Cuvier, 1829) Lesser weever	5	Autumn 2015	1.05	77 – 101	-17.55 ± 0.33	-17.55 ± 0.33	13.53 ± 0.35	13.53 ± 0.35	0.29 ± 0.06	3.44 ± 0.11
<i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) European anchovy	12	Winter 2015	4.89	114 – 149	-18.18 ± 0.39	-18.27 ± 0.56	14.11 ± 0.75	13.82 ± 0.82	0.35 ± 0.12	4.27 ± 0.21
	5	Winter 2016	1.45	94 – 140	-17.53 ± 0.71	-17.53 ± 0.71	14.49 ± 0.29	14.49 ± 0.29	0.39 ± 0.12	4.40 ± 0.13
<i>Eutrigla gurnardus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Grey gurnard	8	Autumn 2009	0.92	232 – 302	-16.76 ± 0.56	-16.42 ± 0.25	14.92 ± 0.52	14.91 ± 0.22	0.58 ± 0.06	3.72 ± 0.06
	19	Winter 2015	5.05	173 – 305	-16.67 ± 0.49	-16.70 ± 0.59	14.84 ± 1.09	15.21 ± 1.21	0.72 ± 0.14	4.52 ± 0.36
	6	Autumn 2015	1.33	187 – 199	-16.49 ± 0.23	-16.49 ± 0.23	13.48 ± 0.42	13.48 ± 0.42	0.51 ± 0.07	3.60 ± 0.09
	6	Winter 2016	18.93	131 – 185	-16.66 ± 0.39	-16.60 ± 0.39	13.85 ± 0.63	13.66 ± 0.46	0.60 ± 0.07	3.89 ± 0.15
<i>Gadus morhua</i>	28	Autumn	384.52	570 – 730	-16.71 ±	-16.56 ±	15.28 ±	15.30 ± 0.63	0.53 ± 0.09	3.81 ±

(Linnaeus, 1758) Atlantic cod		2009			0.45	0.28	0.74			0.15
	20	Winter 2015	178.92	420 - 900	-16.77 ± 0.55	-17.01 ± 0.80	15.18 ± 0.97	14.43 ± 0.46	0.69 ± 0.24	4.30 ± 0.14
	5	Autumn 2015	41.73	332 - 444	-15.72 ± 0.36	-15.72 ± 0.36	15.38 ± 0.26	15.38 ± 0.26	0.55 ± 0.09	4.19 ± 0.03
<i>Galeorhinus galeus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) School shark	5	Autumn 2015	28.12	710 - 960	-16.61 ± 0.14	-16.61 ± 0.14	14.76 ± 0.37	14.76 ± 0.37	0.41 ± 0.04	3.90 ± 0.09
<i>Hyperoplus lanceolatus</i> (Le Sauvage, 1824) Great sand eel	7	Winter 2016	1.39	184 - 228	-17.81 ± 0.33	-17.87 ± 0.19	13.06 ± 0.53	13.18 ± 0.58	0.40 ± 0.03	4.01 ± 0.19
<i>Limanda limanda</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Common dab	15	Autumn 2009	59.05	80 – 290	-16.82 ± 0.79	-17.28 ± 1.03	12.98 ± 0.54	13.13 ± 0.62	0.51 ± 0.24	3.16 ± 0.14
	13	Winter 2015	530.99	195 – 261	-16.63 ± 0.42	-16.72 ± 0.50	14.14 ± 0.97	14.39 ± 0.40	0.78 ± 0.17	4.25 ± 0.16
	5	Autumn 2015	40.51	154 – 201	-16.05 ± 0.45	-16.05 ± 0.45	13.55 ± 0.34	13.55 ± 0.34	0.59 ± 0.09	3.68 ± 0.12
	5	Winter 2016	93.18	158 – 229	-16.67 ± 0.33	-16.67 ± 0.33	13.61 ± 1.11	13.61 ± 1.11	0.59 ± 0.03	3.89 ± 0.34
<i>Merlangius merlangus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Whiting	34	Autumn 2009	258.30	150 – 410	-16.92 ± 0.40	-17.14 ± 0.58	16.27 ± 0.48	16.26 ± 0.60	0.34 ± 0.09	4.00 ± 0.21
	26	Autumn 2014	237.87	241 – 282	-16.86 ± 0.37	-16.71 ± 0.13	15.33 ± 0.72	15.38 ± 0.38	0.56 ± 0.05	4.29 ± 0.10
	44	Winter 2015	4051.80	257 – 347	-16.78 ± 0.35	-16.72 ± 0.26	16.52 ± 0.58	16.85 ± 0.32	0.56 ± 0.10	5.07 ± 0.13
	5	Autumn 2015	595.75	229 - 258	-16.04 ± 0.27	-16.04 ± 0.27	16.41 ± 0.48	16.41 ± 0.48	0.42 ± 0.07	4.40 ± 0.12
	5	Winter 2016	26.52	350 - 364	-16.83 ± 0.30	-16.83 ± 0.30	14.58 ± 0.32	14.58 ± 0.32	0.51 ± 0.06	4.27 ± 0.13

<i>Micromesistius poutassou</i> (Risso, 1827) Blue whiting	12	Autumn 2009	9.69	120 – 160	-18.14 ± 0.68	-18.05 ± 0.99	11.04 ± 1.39	11.65 ± 1.92	0.44 ± 0.09	2.69 ± 0.61
<i>Microstomus kitt</i> (Walbaum, 1758) Lemon sole	15	Autumn 2009	22.70	100 – 310	-16.87 ± 0.54	-16.93 ± 0.35	13.66 ± 0.52	13.66 ± 0.37	0.55 ± 0.09	3.34 ± 0.09
	5	Autumn 2015	4.77	147 – 216	-16.01 ± 0.31	-16.01 ± 0.31	13.31 ± 0.22	13.31 ± 0.22	0.62 ± 0.06	3.63 ± 0.08
	6	Winter 2016	0.47	197 – 219	-16.05 ± 0.19	-16.04 ± 0.22	12.19 ± 0.75	12.36 ± 0.71	0.77 ± 0.04	3.29 ± 0.23
<i>Microchirus variegatus</i> (Donovan, 1808) Thickback sole	10	Autumn 2014	0.22	106 - 172	-16.93 ± 0.18	-16.91 ± 0.14	13.25 ± 0.21	13.27 ± 0.21	0.68 ± 0.05	3.72 ± 0.05
<i>Mullus surmuletus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Striped red mullet	54	Autumn 2009	36.58	100 - 240	-17.38 ± 0.43	-16.93 ± 0.48	14.87 ± 0.66	14.39 ± 0.54	0.50 ± 0.12	3.53 ± 0.13
	10	Winter 2015	10.70	196 – 219	-17.19 ± 0.53	-16.89 ± 0.24	15.15 ± 0.43	15.42 ± 0.36	0.64 ± 0.07	4.62 ± 0.12
	5	Autumn 2015	47.27	162 – 181	-16.69 ± 0.20	-16.69 ± 0.20	14.82 ± 0.24	14.82 ± 0.24	0.39 ± 0.05	3.90 ± 0.07
	5	Winter 2016	3.18	150 – 196	-17.70 ± 0.63	-17.70 ± 0.63	14.18 ± 0.56	14.18 ± 0.56	0.37 ± 0.14	4.33 ± 0.31
<i>Mustelus asterias</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Starry smooth-hound	14	Autumn 2009	392.77	330 - 800	-16.41 ± 0.66	-16.56 ± 0.57	13.63 ± 1.37	13.32 ± 1.09	0.65 ± 0.09	3.29 ± 0.33
	5	Autumn 2015	333.93	475 - 765	-15.42 ± 0.68	-15.42 ± 0.68	13.38 ± 0.75	13.38 ± 0.75	0.73 ± 0.15	3.74 ± 0.21
	5	Winter 2016	0.40	474 - 754	-15.67 ± 0.37	-15.67 ± 0.37	13.45 ± 1.02	13.45 ± 1.02	0.78 ± 0.07	3.60 ± 0.35
<i>Platichthys flesus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) European flounder	5	Autumn 2015	4.73	243 - 302	-15.92 ± 0.82	-15.92 ± 0.82	12.52 ± 1.63	12.52 ± 1.63	0.68 ± 0.25	3.45 ± 0.33
	5	Winter 2016	185.36	218 - 282	-17.47 ±	-17.47 ±	12.66 ±	12.66 ± 0.49	0.50 ± 0.30	3.73 ±

					1.55	1.55	0.49			0.48
<i>Pleuronectes platessa</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) European plaice	24	Autumn 2009	133.64	210 - 340	-16.64 ± 0.81	-16.88 ± 0.90	13.05 ± 1.07	12.84 ± 1.11	0.61 ± 0.20	3.13 ± 0.32
	18	Autumn 2014	13.61	332 - 417	-16.39 ± 0.39	-16.69 ± 0.55	13.19 ± 0.80	13.81 ± 0.63	0.70 ± 0.17	3.89 ± 0.17
	42	Winter 2015	272.22	259 - 350	-17.08 ± 0.84	-17.19 ± 0.91	13.55 ± 0.94	13.69 ± 1.68	0.70 ± 0.26	4.08 ± 0.52
	5	Autumn 2015	122.59	179 - 215	-15.66 ± 0.32	-15.66 ± 0.32	13.16 ± 0.41	13.16 ± 0.41	0.70 ± 0.05	3.65 ± 0.14
	5	Winter 2016	166.27	210 - 250	-16.33 ± 1.03	-16.33 ± 1.03	12.98 ± 0.45	12.98 ± 0.45	0.69 ± 0.20	3.58 ± 0.33
<i>Raja clavata</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Thornback ray	19	Autumn 2009	116.22	180 - 330	-15.80 ± 0.48	-15.60 ± 0.70	13.17 ± 0.97	13.42 ± 1.02	0.85 ± 0.10	3.42 ± 0.33
	10	Winter 2016	5.57	334 - 429	-15.21 ± 0.45	-15.44 ± 0.31	12.22 ± 0.43	12.17 ± 0.33	0.89 ± 0.07	3.08 ± 0.17
<i>Sardina pilchardus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) European pilchard	6	Autumn 2009	2.39	120 - 272	-17.67 ± 1.10	-17.52 ± 1.16	13.19 ± 0.75	13.03 ± 0.71	0.47 ± 0.28	3.11 ± 0.11
	5	Winter 2016	944.37	140 - 150	-18.31 ± 0.40	-18.31 ± 0.40	11.52 ± 0.47	11.52 ± 0.47	0.40 ± 0.06	3.51 ± 0.14
<i>Scomber scombrus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Atlantic mackerel	13	Autumn 2009	14.84	220 - 310	-18.56 ± 0.68	-18.66 ± 0.62	13.91 ± 0.99	13.83 ± 0.87	0.18 ± 0.10	3.19 ± 0.28
	74	Autumn 2014	92.89	298 - 386	-17.62 ± 1.02	-18.09 ± 1.04	13.91 ± 1.07	13.25 ± 0.73	0.35 ± 0.33	3.57 ± 0.18
	24	Winter 2015	23.62	298 - 375	-17.86 ± 0.63	-17.58 ± 0.46	14.69 ± 1.19	14.62 ± 0.94	0.49 ± 0.13	4.44 ± 0.29
	5	Autumn 2015	1178.44	243 - 289	-18.68 ± 0.51	-18.68 ± 0.51	13.33 ± 1.16	13.33 ± 1.16	0.07 ± 0.07	3.22 ± 0.35
	5	Winter 2016	199.99	260 - 280	-17.61 ± 0.63	-17.61 ± 0.63	14.33 ± 0.68	14.33 ± 0.68	0.38 ± 0.13	4.36 ± 0.33
<i>Scyliorhinus canicula</i>	36	Autumn	628.45	130 - 520	-16.46 ±	-16.48 ±	14.37 ±	15.05 ± 2.25	0.56 ± 0.20	3.75 ±

(Linnaeus, 1758) Small-spotted catshark		2009			0.44	0.51	1.17			0.58
	6	Autumn 2014	162.78	552 – 620	-16.72 ± 0.27	-16.75 ± 0.28	12.06 ± 0.25	11.98 ± 0.17	0.83 ± 0.08	3.41 ± 0.06
	18	Winter 2015	587.12	389 – 621	-16.51 ± 0.34	-16.62 ± 0.32	13.81 ± 0.68	13.78 ± 0.53	0.88 ± 0.08	4.02 ± 0.15
	5	Autumn 2015	467.08	560 - 650	-16.28 ± 0.18	-16.28 ± 0.18	14.11 ± 0.37	14.11 ± 0.37	0.51 ± 0.05	3.79 ± 0.09
	5	Winter 2016	4.02	505 - 598	-16.43 ± 0.21	-16.43 ± 0.21	12.52 ± 0.32	12.52 ± 0.32	0.69 ± 0.03	3.44 ± 0.10
<i>Scyliorhinus stellaris</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Nursehound	10	Autumn 2009	47.12	290 – 1140	-16.83 ± 0.32	-16.86 ± 0.46	12.83 ± 1.25	13.38 ± 1.52	0.58 ± 0.08	3.27 ± 0.43
	10	Autumn 2015	77.36	188 - 410	-15.31 ± 0.82	-15.12 ± 0.86	13.04 ± 1.40	13.04 ± 1.48	0.82 ± 0.16	3.70 ± 0.45
<i>Solea solea</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Common sole	35	Autumn 2009	22.85	180 – 230	-16.85 ± 0.70	-17.10 ± 0.84	14.06 ± 1.22	13.83 ± 1.43	0.51 ± 0.25	3.36 ± 0.31
	5	Autumn 2015	3.98	171 – 204	-16.04 ± 0.59	-16.04 ± 0.59	14.18 ± 1.19	14.18 ± 1.19	0.56 ± 0.16	3.84 ± 0.28
<i>Spondyliosoma cantharus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Black seabream	10	Autumn 2009	130.58	165 – 420	-17.97 ± 0.45	-17.82 ± 0.31	14.31 ± 0.26	14.34 ± 0.35	0.32 ± 0.06	3.42 ± 0.10
	59	Autumn 2014	123.27	107 – 291	-17.65 ± 0.94	-17.26 ± 0.68	14.06 ± 1.04	14.20 ± 0.35	0.51 ± 0.19	3.92 ± 0.13
	5	Autumn 2015	173.63	96 - 185	-17.77 ± 0.49	-17.77 ± 0.49	13.83 ± 0.65	13.83 ± 0.65	0.22 ± 0.11	3.48 ± 0.17
<i>Sprattus sprattus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) ³ European sprat	9	Autumn 2009	29.17	75 - 135	-18.28 ± 0.46	-18.26 ± 0.53	13.53 ± 0.45	13.67 ± 0.53	0.27 ± 0.13	3.20 ± 0.12
	10	Winter 2015	86.46	107 – 121	-17.78 ± 0.65	-18.02 ± 0.82	14.23 ± 0.90	14.04 ± 1.09	0.41 ± 0.19	4.31 ± 0.28
	5	Autumn 2015	286.60	89 – 100	-18.32 ± 0.46	-18.32 ± 0.46	13.24 ± 0.59	13.24 ± 0.59	0.15 ± 0.10	3.25 ± 0.17
	5	Winter 2016	15.00	100 - 110	-18.27 ±	-18.27 ±	13.11 ±	13.11 ± 0.81	0.33 ± 0.07	4.08 ±

					0.33	0.33	0.81			0.29
<i>Trachurus trachurus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Atlantic horse mackerel	49	Autumn 2009	350.37	210 – 310	-17.86 ± 0.83	-17.90 ± 0.67	15.70 ± 1.18	15.45 ± 1.67	0.24 ± 0.04	3.70 ± 0.51
	65	Autumn 2014	3473.94	216 – 289	-18.21 ± 0.67	-18.43 ± 0.53	13.56 ± 0.78	13.38 ± 0.72	0.24 ± 0.11	3.56 ± 0.24
	7	Winter 2015	12.30	101 – 134	-18.23 ± 0.44	-18.23 ± 0.46	15.34 ± 0.30	15.43 ± 0.30	0.21 ± 0.13	4.81 ± 0.08
	10	Autumn 2015	8754.10	186 – 192	-17.87 ± 0.57	-18.26 ± 0.49	14.03 ± 0.71	13.45 ± 0.45	0.14 ± 0.07	3.31 ± 0.19
	20	Winter 2016	2.00	104 - 160	-18.03 ± 0.65	-17.89 ± 0.87	14.59 ± 1.30	15.18 ± 0.43	0.28 ± 0.18	4.73 ± 0.33
<i>Trigloporus lastoviza</i> (Bonnaterre, 1788) Streaked gurnard	10	Autumn 2009	2.48	220 – 272	-17.40 ± 0.40	-17.32 ± 0.44	13.51 ± 0.55	13.62 ± 0.50	0.47 ± 0.06	3.29 ± 0.18
	5	Autumn 2015	1.82	110 - 217	-16.92 ± 0.32	-16.92 ± 0.32	12.85 ± 0.42	12.85 ± 0.42	0.46 ± 0.04	3.38 ± 0.15
	6	Winter 2016	65.99	155 - 247	-16.68 ± 0.34	-16.64 ± 0.37	13.07 ± 0.84	12.82 ± 0.65	0.64 ± 0.06	3.60 ± 0.22
<i>Trisopterus luscus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Pouting	19	Autumn 2009	460.68	90 – 260	-17.12 ± 1.13	-16.49 ± 1.34	14.67 ± 0.44	14.91 ± 0.32	0.57 ± 0.27	3.71 ± 0.21
	34	Autumn 2014	55.30	152 – 277	-16.56 ± 0.59	-16.36 ± 0.35	14.66 ± 0.89	14.95 ± 0.93	0.69 ± 0.12	4.22 ± 0.24
	5	Autumn 2015	166.57	123 - 153	-16.80 ± 0.53	-16.80 ± 0.53	14.40 ± 0.53	14.40 ± 0.53	0.39 ± 0.11	3.78 ± 0.17
	9	Winter 2016	53.34	119 – 185	-16.60 ± 0.42	-16.60 ± 0.33	14.74 ± 0.94	14.32 ± 0.61	0.57 ± 0.06	4.13 ± 0.21
<i>Trisopterus minutus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) Poor cod	11	Autumn 2009	57.30	106 – 180	-17.85 ± 1.12	-17.56 ± 0.98	14.34 ± 0.57	14.20 ± 0.80	0.38 ± 0.18	3.41 ± 0.29
	34	Autumn 2014	68.22	139 – 165	-17.38 ± 0.20	-17.40 ± 0.25	13.13 ± 0.31	13.22 ± 0.48	0.55 ± 0.05	3.65 ± 0.15
	24	Winter 2015	33.99	107 – 191	-17.67 ± 0.38	-17.62 ± 0.49	14.04 ± 0.48	14.23 ± 0.35	0.52 ± 0.13	4.32 ± 0.06

	5	Autumn 2015	60.80	93 – 156	-16.98 ± 0.72	-16.98 ± 0.72	14.47 ± 0.49	14.47 ± 0.49	0.35 ± 0.17	3.77 ± 0.07
	5	Winter 2016	0.51	129 - 143	-17.42 ± 0.13	-17.42 ± 0.13	13.59 ± 0.28	13.59 ± 0.28	0.45 ± 0.02	4.06 ± 0.09
<i>Zeus faber</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) John Dory	6	Autumn 2009	13.64	95 – 450	-16.91 ± 0.63	-16.80 ± 0.47	14.85 ± 0.70	15.25 ± 0.45	0.48 ± 0.09	3.77 ± 0.15
	24	Autumn 2014	29.94	112 - 416	-16.82 ± 0.51	-16.53 ± 0.53	14.58 ± 0.59	14.64 ± 0.55	0.67 ± 0.18	4.12 ± 0.11
	5	Winter 2016	0.51	240 - 402	-16.77 ± 0.39	-16.77 ± 0.39	14.28 ± 0.26	14.28 ± 0.26	0.54 ± 0.08	4.15 ± 0.15

Fig S1. Relationship between isotopic values (carbon on the left, and nitrogen on the right) before and after bootstrapping for each individual





Table S2: Summary of metrics and indices used to compared fish assemblages and structure among the 5 studied periods

Diversity Indices	Symbol	Measurement/Definition	Tendency	Ecological processes
Shannon-Weaver index	H'	Diversity of the fish assemblage	H low	Low number of species and low diversity (presence of dominant species)
			H high	High number of species evenly distributed
			H max	Theoretical value of H' if all species are equally distributed
Pielou Equitability Index	J'	Ratio between the measured diversity and the maximum theoretical diversity	→ 0	Assemblage in which there is a dominant species
			→ 1	Assemblage in which species are evenly distributed
Functional indices				
Isotopic Functional Richness	IFRic	Relative isotopic trophic diversity of the community (isotopic niche space as estimated by convex hull)	→ 0	Resources potentially available to the assemblage are unused /or resource availability are unusually low
			→ 1	All available resources are used by the community
Isotopic Functional Dispersion	IFDis	Biomasses evenly distributed. Variance in the position or the dispersion of species in the isotopic space occupied	→ 0	Minimal distance to the center of gravity observed in the species pool, all organisms had the same benthic contribution and trophic level
			→ 1	Maximal distance to the center of gravity observed in the species pool, all organisms are far from the centroid and from each other
	IFDi _{sbiom}	Biomasses not evenly distributed. Variance in the position or the dispersion of species in the isotopic space occupied	→ 0	Biomasses are dominated by more generalist species (i.e. species closer to the center of gravity)
			→ 1	Biomass-dominant species occupy the trophic space are far from the centroid, revealing a trophic specialization
Isotopic Functional Evenness	IFEve	Biomasses evenly distributed. Uniformity in distribution along the shortest tree that links all species in the trophic space	→ 0	Species are unevenly distributed in the trophic space
			→ 1	Species are evenly distributed along the shortest tree

	IFE _{ve} _{biom}	Biomasses not evenly distributed Uniformity in distributions weighted by its biomass along the shortest tree that links all species in the trophic space	→ 0	Trophic redundancy and potential competition among species
			→ 1	Optimal resource use through species complementarity