
Implication of size fraction on benthic foraminiferal-based paleo-reconstructions: A case study from the Bay of Biscay (NE Atlantic)

Depuydt Pauline ^{1,*}, Barras Christine ¹, Toucanne Samuel ², Fossile Eleonora ¹, Mojtahid Meryem ¹

¹ Univ Angers, Nantes Université, Le Mans Université, CNRS, UMR 6112, Laboratoire de Planétologie et Géosciences, F-49000 Angers, France

² Univ Brest, CNRS, Ifremer, Geo-Ocean, F-29280 Plouzané, France

* Corresponding author : Pauline Depuydt, email address : pauline.depuydt@univ-angers.fr

Abstract :

Many paleoenvironmental studies based on benthic foraminiferal assemblages use different protocols for sample analysis. A standardized protocol has been recently established for biomonitoring applications, but for paleostudies, the influence of size fraction on benthic foraminiferal composition and biodiversity is poorly documented. We studied fossil foraminiferal assemblages along two paleorecords (BOBGEO-CS05 and SU81–44) from the Bay of Biscay covering the last ~35 ka cal BP. We investigated diversity and community composition to compare the impact of each size fraction (63-150 μm , >150 μm , >63 μm) on environmental interpretations. Foraminiferal diversity was affected by the accumulation of small opportunistic species. In terms of faunal composition, both paleorecords displayed a different pattern depending on the size fraction selected. While in both cores, the 63-150 μm fraction blurred the signal of some rare indicator species, our results show that i) in BOBGEO-CS05, it yielded no extra ecological information compared to the large fraction whereas ii) in SU81–44, it contained small opportunistic species that were not present in the >150 μm , impacting therefore paleoenvironmental interpretations. According to these findings, we recommend: i) to focus on the large fraction for a thorough taxonomic determination and a detailed analysis of benthic assemblages, and ii) to analyse the small fraction separately after a taxonomical identification of major species and strategic selection of studied samples. Although the 125 μm size limit was not tackled in this study, we recommend to use it for the limit between the small and large fractions instead of 150 μm for harmonization with the previously published standardized protocol for living faunas.

Highlights

► We assess the influence of benthic foraminiferal size fraction (>63 μm and > 150 μm) in two paleorecords from the Bay of Biscay. ► Paleo-interpretations differ according to the choice of size fraction in the southern record. ► The >150 μm is sufficient for accurate paleo-interpretations in the northern record. ► In both records the small fraction (63–150 μm) blurred the signal of some rare indicator species

from the >150 μm . ► We propose a preliminary protocol for size fraction standardization in foraminiferal-based paleostudies.

Keywords : Benthic foraminifera, Fossil faunas, Size fractions, Paleo-records, Holocene/deglacial, Last glacial period

1. Introduction

Benthic foraminiferal assemblages are widely studied to characterize modern marine environmental conditions (*e.g.*, Buzas, 1969; Alve, 1995; Jorissen, 1999; Murray, 2006; Bouchet et al., 2012; Pati and Patra, 2012) and to reconstruct past environments (*e.g.*, Alve, 1999; Gooday and Rathburn, 1999; Van der Zwaan et al., 1999; Gooday, 2003; Jorissen et al., 2007), from estuaries to abyssal realms. For ecological studies, the analysis of benthic foraminiferal faunas implies some sieving procedures to remove clays and fine silts from the sample and extract foraminifera of a given size fraction from the sediment. Specimens smaller than the chosen threshold (*i.e.* size fraction) are ignored. The smaller the foraminifera, the more difficult it is to identify the species (Bé, 1959, 1960), or even impossible for juvenile benthic foraminifera <32 μm or propagules (*i.e.* dormant stages consisting of a proloculus or few chambers; Alve and Goldstein, 2002, 2003, 2010). Different size fractions may be chosen depending on sampling regions, environmental characteristics, authors, and institutions *e.g.*, >32 μm in Ohkawara et al., 2009; >63 μm in Thomas et al., 1995; Pascual et al., 2020; >100 μm in Seidenkrantz et al., 2007; Ivanova et al., 2002; >125 μm in Milker et al., 2009; Diz et al., 2020; >150 μm in Gupta et al., 2004; Milker et al., 2017; >250 μm in Schönfeld and Zahn, 2000; >500 μm in Renema, 2008) (see Fig. 1 for other examples). According to the review of Schönfeld (2012), the most frequently used fractions are >63 μm , >125 μm and >150 μm . The variety of used size fractions in paleo-studies implies that different proportions of the total foraminiferal assemblage are considered and therefore it is challenging to compare data between publications. Several studies based on modern samples discuss the influence of foraminiferal size fraction on the environmental interpretations (Jennings and Helgadottir, 1994; Schroder-Adams et al., 1987; Bouchet et al., 2012; Lo Giudice Cappelli and Austin, 2019; Fossile et al., 2022; Klootwijk and Alve, 2022). For example, Bouchet et al. (2012) and Klootwijk and Alve (2022) focused on the differences in diversity indices between the >63 μm and >125 μm fractions in samples from Skagerrak basin (northeast North Sea) and Norwegian fjords, respectively. They show that although the >125 μm size fraction describes the general trends in biodiversity and it is therefore enough for an overview of environmental changes, the smaller size fraction provides a less biased estimate of this diversity. Lo Giudice Cappelli and Austin (2019) reached similar conclusions while comparing the 63-150 μm and >150 μm fractions in samples from Shetland Island (Scotland). They specified that a certain number of species were exclusively present in one of the two size fractions. Therefore, they proposed to combine the two fractions to obtain a statistically more robust reconstruction. Recently, Fossile

et al. (2020) showed that similar foraminiferal-based biozones were identified in Storfjorden (Svalbard) whatever the considered size fraction (*i.e.* 63-150, >63 or >150 μm), although the 63-150 μm fraction provides a more precise estimation of diversity. The authors recommended to neglect the 63-150 μm fraction for future studies in this area considering the time-consuming character inherent to its analysis unless it is studied with the aim of answering some very specific questions. In the same logic, the standardized protocol proposed by the FOBIMO group for biomonitoring studies based on living benthic foraminifera recommended the use of the >125 μm fraction as the best compromise between processing time and precision in ecological interpretations (Schönfeld et al., 2012).

In paleoceanography, the choice of the most relevant size fraction is still debated. Initially, and for standardization purposes, the CLIMAP group recommended to use the >149 μm fraction to study planktonic foraminifera (CLIMAP Project Members, 1981, 1984; Kellogg, 1984), a limit that was probably adopted for benthic studies afterwards. This may explain why the >150 μm fraction is commonly used in paleo-records (*e.g.*, Rohling et al., 1997; Jian et al., 2000; Huang et al., 2003; Gupta et al., 2004; Müller et al., 2017) although several studies are also based on the total >63 μm fraction (*e.g.*, Thomas et al., 1995; Hayward et al., 2004, 2006; Kang et al., 2010; de Almeida et al., 2015). Few studies discuss the influence of size fraction on paleo-records interpretations and, to our knowledge, only Weinkauf and Milker (2018) precisely compared fossil assemblages and diversity data from two size fractions (*i.e.* >125 and >150 μm). These authors conclude that the difference in term of biodiversity is small, and the reduction of the limit by 25 μm only improves the representation of the total assemblage but the choice of the size fraction can have an influence on assemblage composition. To our knowledge, no statistical comparison exists between the most commonly used fractions in paleo-records (>63 μm vs >150 μm).

The aim of this work is to contribute to filling this gap by comparing benthic fossil foraminiferal assemblages between the >63 μm and >150 μm size fractions, and as such, to highlight the potential implications on environmental interpretations. These two size limits are commonly used by paleoceanographers in the Bay of Biscay, northeast (NE) Atlantic (Thomas et al., 1995; Mojtahid et al., 2013, 2017; Rodriguez-Lazaro et al., 2017; Pascual et al., 2020; Depuydt et al., 2022; see Fig. S1). We believe that the obtained results are the first stepping-stones towards the building of a standardized protocol for future palaeoceanographic studies. To this end, we studied biodiversity and assemblage composition from two sedimentary cores collected from the Bay of Biscay, at similar water depths (*i.e.* ~1000 m) (Fig. 1) and covering

comparable time periods. Data from BOBGEO-CS05 core, located in the north of the Bay of Biscay and covering the 32-14 ka cal BP time interval, have been published in Depuydt et al. (2022). Core SU81-44 (original data) is located in the south part and covers the last 35 kyr. The objectives of this study are therefore: 1) to identify differences in major species assemblages depending on the size fraction by using multivariate statistical analyses, 2) to evaluate the *plus* value of including the smaller size fraction, 3) to compare the findings between the two different geographical sites and 4) to determine whether the choice of size fractions could effectively have an impact on environmental reconstructions. The results highlight that the discrepancy in the choice of size fraction may hamper the possibility of comparing paleo-records between published studies and call for a standardization of protocols in the field.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Core locations, sampling and foraminiferal analyses

Two marine sediment cores from the Bay of Biscay (NE Atlantic) were investigated: core BOBGEO-CS05 (46°18.850'N, 5°56.988' W, 1473 cm length, 1015 m water depth) retrieved during the BOBGEO cruise in 2009 (doi.org/10.17600/9030060; R/V Pourquoi pas?; Bourillet, 2009) and core SU81-44 (44° 15.4'N, 2° 41.7'W, 436 cm length, 1173 m water depth) retrieved during the CEPAG cruise in 1981. Cores BOBGEO-CS05 and SU81-44 are located on the upper slope at about 200 km and 100 km from the French Atlantic coast, respectively (Fig. 1). A total of 56 and 65 samples were studied for core BOBGEO-CS05 (Depuydt et al., 2022) and SU81-44, respectively. These samples were washed with tap water through 63 µm and 150 µm mesh sieves, dried, and each fraction was analyzed separately (63-150 µm and >150 µm). Note that no disaggregating agents were used for samples' processing. Due to high foraminiferal abundances from the >150 µm size fraction, the dry samples were split with an Otto microsplitter reaching, at least ~250 specimens from a single split. All sorted foraminifera were stored in Plummer cell slides. Wherever possible, we identified specimens to species level (cf. taxonomical list of major species in Fig. S2). For the 63-150 µm fraction, 16 out of the 56 samples in core BOBGEO-CS05 and 15 out of the 65 samples in core SU81-44 were investigated. The depths of these samples were selected based on major changes of the foraminiferal assemblages observed in the >150 µm fraction. Dry samples were split with a dry Otto microsplitter to reach a minimum of ~250 specimens in the analyzed split. In three samples out of 16 and four samples out of 15 (cores BOBGEO-CS05 and SU81-44, respectively),

foraminifera were picked out from the entire split, stored in Plummer cell slides and each specimen of the total assemblage was identified (Fig. S2). For this small fraction, in a few cases we combined species under their genus to avoid misrepresentation and/or misidentification of species. This is for example the case for *Globobulimina* spp. (gathering *G. affinis* and *G. pacifica*) or *Quinqueloculina* spp. where species level was not reached. Major species from the 63-150 μm fraction (>5 % of the assemblage) were identified from these samples. For the rest of the 63-150 μm samples, no foraminifera were picked or stored in Plummer cell slides but the total assemblage was counted from the entire split. Moreover, major species were identified and counted separately whereas minor species (<5 %) were counted altogether and gathered as ‘others’. The same operator performed all sample analyses and identification to avoid any operator bias. The complete raw data sets for SU81-44 are available as supplementary material in Table S1 and in the SEANOE data repository (<https://doi.org/10.17882/91758> for SU81-44). Raw data for BOBGEO-CS05 have been published in Depuydt et al. (2022) and are available in the SEANOE data repository (<https://doi.org/10.17882/88029>).

The diversity indices (Shannon and equitability) were determined for each size fraction using PAST software (Paleontological Statistics; Version 2.14; Hammer et al., 2001). For the small fraction, diversity indices were only calculated for the 3-4 samples per core that were picked and identified. The Shannon diversity index (H' ; Shannon, 1948) allows to characterize the structure of a community and the distribution of these individuals within this community. It is calculated according to the following formula:

$$H' = - \sum_{i=1}^S p_i \ln p_i$$

Where S is the total number of species (also called species richness) and p_i is the proportion of each species i in the community. It is important to note that the higher the H' value is, the higher is the diversity. The modern H' values for benthic communities in the Atlantic are often between ~1.1 and ~3.8 (Murray, 2006). The equitability index (J ; Pielou, 1966) indicates how similar are the proportion of the species of an assemblage and it is calculated according to:

$$J = \frac{H'}{\ln S}$$

J index varies between 0 and 1 where the maximum represents the most equal distribution of taxa in a given assemblage. As such, it was necessary to apply these diversity indices on fully

picked samples (*i.e.* 3 samples and 4 samples for cores BOBGEO-CS05 and SU81-44, respectively).

The relative abundances of benthic species were calculated for each size fraction (*i.e.* 63-150 μm , >150 μm and their sum, *i.e.* >63 μm) and for all samples in both cores. We computed a binomial standard error according to the following formula (Buzas, 1990; Fatela and Taborda, 2002):

$$\text{Binomial standard error} = \frac{\sqrt{p * (1 - p)}}{n}$$

Where p is the species proportion estimate (number of counted individuals for a given species/ n) and n the total number of specimens counted. Several ecological groups that may indicate particular environmental conditions established in Depuydt et al. (2022) for core BOBGEO-CS05 were applied to core SU81-44 for comparison (Table 1).

2.2. Stratigraphic framework

The chronostratigraphic framework of core BOBGEO-CS05 is based on the synchronization of XRF-elements with those of the well dated nearby core MD95-2002 (Toucanne et al., 2021). The counts of the polar planktonic taxon *Neogloboquadrina pachyderma* are published in Depuydt et al. (2022). For core SU81-44 and BOBGEO-CS05, *N. pachyderma* was used to identify the Deglacial/Holocene and the last glacial periods, as well as some remarkable events such as the Heinrich Stadials (HSs) (Fig. 2) (Eynaud et al., 2009). A minimum of ~300 specimens of planktonic foraminiferal tests were counted in the >150 μm fraction from a single sample split.

2.3. Multivariate analyses

In order to get a visual comparison of the differences in major species compositions (*i.e.* relative abundance >5 %) between size fractions (>63 μm and >150 μm) for each core, a non-metric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) analysis (Taguchi and Oono, 2005) based on Bray-Curtis dissimilarity (Bray and Curtis, 1957) was performed using PAST software (Hammer et al., 2001). The species per sample matrix used for this analysis was based on the relative abundance of major species (>5 %) of the 16 and 15 samples analyzed for both size fractions for cores

BOBGEO-CS05 and SU81-44, respectively. The different species belonging to the genus *Globobulimina*, *Elphidium*, *Bolivina* and *Bulimina* were lumped together as “spp.” for comparison between both fractions of both cores. We chose to compare the results of $>63\ \mu\text{m}$ and $>150\ \mu\text{m}$ fractions because the 63-150 μm fraction is rarely used for paleo-record interpretations on its own (supplementary information about the comparison between 63-150 μm and $>150\ \mu\text{m}$ are available in Fig. S3 and Table S2). The quality of our nMDS is assessed according to a) stress values (Kruskal, and Wish, 1978) that consider ordination as suspect (>0.2), correct (0.1-0.2), good (0.05-0.1) or excellent (<0.05), and b) Shepard's diagram (actual distances vs. ordination distances between samples) that shows a linear trend with little spread (Fig. S4). This visualization for each of the cores is accompanied by an ANOSIM statistical test to discuss the dissimilarity matrices (Clarke, 1993). This was done with 999 permutations on the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrices in each core using the *anosim()* function in the R package *vegan* (Oksanen et al., 2020), with the aim of comparing both size fractions to detect differences in major species composition. The ANOSIM test give an R value: if R is close to 1, the test suggests a strong dissimilarity between the fractions whereas an R close to 0 suggests that the distribution is equal between the fractions.

A similarity percentages breakdown (SIMPER) procedure (Clarke, 1993) was also applied to our species-by-sample matrix to identify the main contributing species to the Bray-Curtis dissimilarities detected between the samples of the two fractions studied. This analysis was performed using the *simper()* function of the R package *vegan* (Oksanen et al., 2020) giving an average contribution which was transformed into a percentage. Only the major species with the most influence on the dissimilarities between samples of the two fractions studied (*i.e.* representing ~90 % cumulative contribution) were extracted and displayed on the nMDS biplot.

3. Results

3.1. Core SU81-44

Considering the four fully analyzed samples (*i.e.* assemblages picked out and identified in both fractions) from core SU81-44, the 63-150 μm and $>150\ \mu\text{m}$ fractions show similar values of species richness varying between 15 and 25 species (Fig. 3a). Nevertheless, these fractions contain partly different species since the $>63\ \mu\text{m}$ fraction (*i.e.* $>150\ \mu\text{m}$ + 63-150 μm) exhibits a higher number of species varying between 25 and ~40. The Shannon (H') and equitability (J) indices exhibit different trends through time between the $>150\ \mu\text{m}$ fraction on one side and 63-

150 μm and $>63 \mu\text{m}$ fractions on the other side, with a greater difference during the last glacial period at 350 cm depth. Indeed, this sample shows a higher diversity index values when considering only the $>150 \mu\text{m}$ fraction.

In core SU81-44, foraminiferal fauna is characterized by a total of 22 major species ($>5\%$ of the total fauna): 8 species out of 22 species are present with $>5\%$ whatever the size fraction considered (*Bolivina* spp., *Cassidulina carinata*, *Cibicidoides pachyderma*, *Cibicides lobatulus*, *Elphidium* spp., *Gavelinopsis praegeri*, *Melonis affinis*, *Osangularia umbonifera*). Ten species out of 22 species are present with $>5\%$ when considering only the $>150 \mu\text{m}$ size fraction (*Bulimina* spp., *Cibicidoides robertsonianus*, *Cibicides wuellerstorfi*, *Globobulimina* spp., *Gyroidina orbicularis*, *Quinqueloculina* spp., *Sigmoilopsis schlumbergeri*, *Spiroloculina tenuiseptata*, *Uvigerina mediterranea*, *Uvigerina peregrina*). Four species are present only in the 63-150 μm size fraction (*Alabaminella weddellensis*, *Fristominella exigua*, *Nonionella turgida* and *Trifarina angulosa*).

The nMDS of core SU81-44 shows a good ordination with a Shepard plot having a linear trend without strong propagations and a stress value = 0.119 (Fig. S4a). The ordinations of this analysis are therefore representative and can be considered as reliable. The nMDS ordination in core SU81-44 (Fig. 4a) shows that the first dimension (NMDS1) separates the $>63 \mu\text{m}$ fraction from the $>150 \mu\text{m}$ fraction while NMDS 2 clearly differentiates between deglacial/Holocene and the last glacial period (with HSs and without HSs). The polygonal areas of each convex hull of the size fractions do not overlap. This shows a significant difference between the two fractions, tested statistically by ANOSIM with an $R = 0.966$ ($p = 0.0001$). SIMPER analysis identified eight species contributing significantly ($p < 0.01$) to this observed difference: *Cibicidoides pachyderma*, *C. wuellerstorfi*, *Bulimina* spp., *Gyroidina orbicularis*, *Sigmoilopsis schlumbergeri* correlated positively with NMDS1, and *Cassidulina carinata*, *Elphidium* spp., *Trifarina angulosa* correlated negatively with NMDS1. Despite their $p > 0.01$, *U. mediterranea*, *U. peregrina* and *M. affinis* correlate negatively with NMDS 2 and positively with NMDS1, and *A. weddellensis* correlates negatively with NMDS 1 and 2 (Fig. 4a, Table S3a).

The relative densities of major species show that the large fraction (*i.e.* $>150 \mu\text{m}$) is largely dominated by *C. pachyderma* with high values between 20 and 80 % of the fauna during the last glacial period (Fig. 5b). This species was replaced by *U. peregrina* and *U. mediterranea* (about 20 and 40 %, respectively) during the deglacial/Holocene period (Fig. 5c & d). In the small fraction, *C. carinata* dominated the faunas at $\sim 65\%$ during the last glacial period (Fig.

5a), and it was replaced by *A. weddellensis* and *E. exigua* varying around 35 % together during the deglacial/Holocene period (Fig. 5e & f). *Alabaminella weddellensis*, *E. exigua* and *T. angulosa* (Fig. 5g) are the only species exclusively present in the 63-150 μm fraction.

The ecological groups based on indicator species (Fig. 6a) show that the meso-oligotrophic group dominates the large fraction whereas the high organic matter flux indicator group dominates the small fraction. Moreover, the low oxygen indicator group occurring during the HSs in the $>150 \mu\text{m}$ are completely minimized in the $>63 \mu\text{m}$ since they are almost absent in the 63-150 μm .

3.2. Core BOBGEO-CS05

In the three analyzed samples of core BOBGEO-CS05 (Fig. 3d), the species richness shows lower values in the 63-150 μm fraction (~30 species) than in the $>150 \mu\text{m}$ fraction (~40 species). Overall, the values of Shannon and Equitability indices in both fractions are similar for two out of three samples, varying respectively around 2.2 and 0.65 (Fig. 3e-f). When considering only the $>150 \mu\text{m}$, the sample at 1000 cm sediment depth is different with a higher diversity fraction.

Foraminiferal fauna is characterized by a total of fifteen major species (*i.e.* contributing with $>5\%$ to the total fauna): five species are found whatever the size fraction considered (*Bolivina* spp., *Cassidulina carinata*, *Cassidulina crassa*, *Cibicides lobatulus*, *Elphidium* spp.). Ten species are found only in the $>150 \mu\text{m}$ fraction (*Cibicidoides pachyderma*, *Chilostomella oolina*, *Gavelinopsis praegeri*, *Globobulimina* spp., *Hoeglundina elegans*, *Nonionella turgida*, *Planorbulina mediterraneensis*, *Pullenia quinqueloba*, *Trifarina angulosa*, *Textularia sagittula*). No species is classified as major only in the 63-150 μm fraction.

The nMDS analysis shows a good ordination with Shepard plot and a stress value of 0.130 (Fig. S4b). In general, the faunal assemblages between size fractions are less distinct for BOBGEO-CS05 than for SU81-44 (Fig. 4b). For core BOBGEO-CS05, the different size fractions (*i.e.* $>63 \mu\text{m}$ and $>150 \mu\text{m}$) are separated on the NMDS2 ordination. Figure 4b shows that the convex hulls identifying the two size fractions overlap. This result shows that, in core BOBGEO-CS05, dissimilarity between samples decreases when including the 63-150 μm fraction in addition to the $>150 \mu\text{m}$ and the dissimilarity is not as marked as in core SU81-44. The ANOSIM test for this core shows an R of around 0.514 ($p = 0.0001$), which is lower than

that of SU81-44. Moreover, the faunal assemblage variations between different sediment depths are enhanced when considering only the $>150\ \mu\text{m}$ fraction. Here, the SIMPER analysis identifies only four species contributing significantly ($p < 0.01$) to the difference between the two size fractions (Fig. 4b, Table S3b): *C. lobatulus*, *T. angulosa* and *C. pachyderma* correlates positively with NMDS2 (*i.e.* $>150\ \mu\text{m}$ fraction) and *C. crassa* correlates negatively with NMDS2, largely representing the 63-150 μm . Indeed, *C. crassa* dominated the faunal assemblage in the 63-150 μm fraction representing in average about 40 % while it represented about 15 % of the benthic composition in the large fraction (Fig. 5j). In contrast, *T. angulosa* is almost absent in the 63-150 μm fraction while it reaches about 10 % along the record in the $>150\ \mu\text{m}$ fraction (Fig. 5h). *Cassidulina carinata* occurred with high percentages during HS1 in both size fractions (Fig. 5i). This species together with *Globobulimina* and *Bolivina* species is negatively correlated with NMDS1 (p value > 0.01) showing a higher contribution to HS sample assemblages (Fig. 4b).

Finally, there is little change in the distribution of the ecological groups according to the size fraction (Fig. 6b). Indeed, the glacier-proximal indicator group, high organic matter flux indicator group and high energy indicator group are well represented regardless of the size fraction. However, the percentages of the low oxygen group and the epiphytic group, are becoming very low when the small fraction is considered.

4. Discussion

4.1. Size fraction effect on foraminiferal biodiversity

In the present study, 13 % of the total fossil foraminiferal abundance and 67 % of the species richness is recorded in the $>150\ \mu\text{m}$ fraction compared to the $>63\ \mu\text{m}$ fraction. So considering the small fraction allows taking into account more individuals and species (Fig. 3a and 3d). According to the review of Schönfeld et al. (2012), only 27 % of the living individuals in the deep-sea and 11 % in the shallow waters are captured when only the $>150\ \mu\text{m}$ size fraction is studied compared to the $>63\ \mu\text{m}$ fraction. Regarding the number of species, the ratio is 47 % in the deep-sea and 61 % in shallow waters. Our results are therefore in the same range as for living foraminifera.

In addition, biodiversity indices show the same trend through time when considering the small fraction 63-150 μm alone or the $>63\ \mu\text{m}$ fraction (Fig. 3b-c and 3e-f) but the observed

trend is different when considering the larger fraction alone. This indicates that the 63-150 μm does not co-evolve with the $>150 \mu\text{m}$ and the small fraction (63-150 μm) drives the trend observed for the total fraction (*i.e.* $>63 \mu\text{m}$). In the literature, the addition of the small size fraction to the large one usually results in higher diversity indices (*e.g.*, >30 vs $>125 \mu\text{m}$ in Kurbjewit et al., 2000; >63 vs $>125 \mu\text{m}$ in Alve, 2010; Klootwijk and Alve, 2022); >63 vs $>150 \mu\text{m}$ in Schönfeld et al., 2012, Gooday and Goineau, 2019; >125 vs $>150 \mu\text{m}$ in Weinkauff and Milker, 2018). This is not always the case in our dataset where the opposite is observed for half of the data points. Some authors report contrasted results in their study area as well. For instance, Fossile et al. (2020) recorded higher diversity and lower dominance in the $>150 \mu\text{m}$ compared to the $>63 \mu\text{m}$ in the deep basin of Storfjorden (Svalbard) and the opposite for the inner and outer fjord. Phipps et al. (2012) also show contrasting results along a bathymetric transect between stations at <1000 m water depths close to the Portuguese margin (*i.e.* higher diversity in the 63-150 μm fraction) and those at >1000 m water depths (*i.e.* higher diversity in $>150 \mu\text{m}$ fraction). In both cases, the authors suggest that the driving parameter could be the availability or quality of organic matter. In our study, the lower diversity (and higher dominance) observed in the $>63 \mu\text{m}$ fraction, driven by the 63-150 μm size fraction, is the result of high percentages of small opportunistic species (*e.g.*, *Cassidulina carinata*, *Epistominella exigua*), probably developing in response to fluctuations in organic matter fluxes. These species, due to high reproduction potential and turnover rate usually would accumulate in fossil records and lead to amplified effect on diversity and equitability indices. This potential accumulation effect in response to population dynamics was suggested by Duros et al. (2012) to explain the higher percentages of opportunistic species observed in the dead assemblages compare to the living one in the Whittard canyon, north of site BOBGEO-CS05. Taphonomic processes such as loss of some non-fossilizing species (*e.g.*, agglutinated species) or transport of tests could also influence the diversity indices. However, these taphonomic effects should affect both the small and large size fractions. More studies based on fossil fauna comparing biodiversity of different size fractions would allow verifying if this observation is systematic and understanding the effects of seasonal variability and taphonomic mechanisms on size fraction records. Indeed, if the accumulation/removal of indicator species affect paleoenvironmental interpretations, this would hamper the possibility to compare studies based on different size fractions.

4.2. Environmental interpretations driven from assemblages according to the analysed size fraction

4.2.1. Core SU81-44

In the southeastern Bay of Biscay foraminiferal record, the lower diversity and higher dominance driven by the small size fraction is mainly due to the high presence of *C. carinata* (more than 60 % of the total >63 μm assemblage) during the last glacial period (Fig. 5a) and *A. weddellensis* (about 30 %) during the Holocene (Fig. 5e). These species were present only in low proportions or even absent in the large size fraction. This is supported by the nMDS analysis showing a clear difference between the faunal composition of the >63 μm and the >150 μm size fractions considering the major species (Fig. 4a).

In the Bay of Biscay, *C. carinata* (including *C. laevigata*) is abundant in recent living faunas in the 63-150 μm size fraction (10-15 %; Fontanier et al., 2003). However, it reached up to 40 % of the large fraction (>150 μm) during the last glacial and deglacial/Holocene periods in paleo-records from the Bay of Biscay (Montañid et al., 2013, 2017). This species can dominate the deepest areas of continental shelves exposed to high organic matter input (e.g., Hayward et al., 2002; Fontanier et al., 2003; Hess and Jorissen, 2009). *Alabaminella weddellensis* is a small species restricted to the 63-150 μm size fraction in our study and also observed in the <125 μm fraction in the living fauna from the NE Atlantic (Gooday, 1988) and in fossil records in Antarctica (Thomas and Gooday, 1996). This species is usually found in association with *Epistominella exigua* responding to seasonal organic matter inputs (e.g., Thomas and Gooday, 1996; Gooday and Hughes, 2002; Sun et al., 2006; Smart, 2008; Smart et al., 2019). Opportunistic species, such as *Cassidulina* and *Epistominella* species are often found in small size fractions (Perez-Cruz and Machain-Castillo, 1990; Alve, 2003; Lo Giudice Cappelli and Austin, 2019). Some authors suggested that opportunistic species adopt a r-strategy lifestyle (e.g., Gooday et al., 1990; Gooday, 1993; Jorissen, 1988) responding to high organic matter inputs with fast growth and precocious reproductions to colonize rapidly their habitat (Phleger and Soutar, 1973; Gooday et al., 1990; Melki et al., 2010). Due to this strategy, opportunistic species are able to reach very high densities in the 63-150 μm fraction, influencing significantly the >63 μm assemblage.

Core SU81-44 is located on the Landes Plateau, influenced by important fluvial inputs from the Adour-Gironde river system (Koutsikopoulos and Le Cann, 1996), known for its strong seasonal variations (Coynel et al., 2005). Because river discharges bring a significant quantity

of nutrients, they trigger strong primary production in surface waters (*e.g.*, Nausch et al., 1999; Labry et al., 2001, 2002; Gohin et al., 2003; Guillaud et al., 2008). The benthic communities affected by these seasonal organic matter vertical fluxes may respond with a dominance of opportunistic species.

In the paleo-record of core SU81-44, interpretations in terms of environmental changes are definitely influenced by the size fraction considered. On one hand, when only the >150 μm fraction is considered, the faunal composition during the last glacial period is largely dominated by meso-oligotrophic species (*e.g.*, *C. pachyderma*) (Fig. 5b, 6a). The deglacial/Holocene period is characterised by the presence of *Uvigerina* species which are identified as species living in organic-matter rich environments (Jorissen et al., 2007) suggesting a potential shift in surface productivity between the last glacial and Holocene periods (Schönfeld and Altenbach, 2005) (Fig. 5c & d). Moreover, the group of low oxygen tolerant species exhibit higher percentages in the last glacial period (during HSs in particular) compared to deglacial/Holocene samples (Fig. 6a). On the other hand, when the total >63 μm assemblage is considered, the fauna is dominated by small opportunistic species indicative of high organic matter inputs throughout the record (Fig. 6a) whereas the meso-oligotrophic indicator species become poorly represented. Based on the total >63 μm assemblage, the study area can be considered as an environment receiving high organic matter fluxes. This is coherent with the nearby study of Pascual et al. (2020), based on the >63 μm fraction, that showed an overall dominance of species appreciating high organic matter environments. In our >63 μm dataset, the transition between the last glacial and deglacial/Holocene periods can still be highlighted by the shift in major species composition (*i.e.* *C. carinata* vs *A. weddellensis*) (Fig. 5a & e) and the increase in diversity indices (Fig. 5b). However, the low oxygen indicator species group is not anymore usable to distinguish low ventilation events when the >63 μm fraction is considered. Indeed, the proportion of opportunistic species completely "overwrite" the information that could be taken from "rare" species which may be excellent environmental indicators.

4.2.2. Core BOBGEO-CS05

The results of the multivariate analyses for core BOBGEO-CS05 data, which covers only the last glacial period, are very different from SU81-44 data. The convex hulls overlap of the two size fractions show that the faunal assemblages are proportionally more similar between fractions in BOBGEO-CS05 than in SU81-44. The dissimilarity between both fractions is

mainly driven by the presence of *Cassidulina crassa* in the small fraction. This species contributes in average to ~35 % of the total fauna in the >63 μm fraction and only 15 % in the >150 μm fraction. According to Depuydt et al. (2022), *C. crassa* responds to large amounts of organic material arriving to the study site during episodes of EIS melting.

The dominant ecological groups, previously determined by Depuydt et al. (2022) in the same core, remain the same regardless of the size fraction studied (>150 μm and >63 μm) (Fig. 6b), although the percentages are slightly changing. Indeed, whatever the size fraction considered, there is always a dominance of glacier-proximal indicator and high energy indicator species. Additionally, the addition of the small fraction (63-150 μm) dilutes the signal of the rare “large-size” species from the low oxygen indicator group (*i.e.* *Globobulimina* and *Chilostomella*) that are well represented by the >150 μm fraction during specific low ventilation events (*i.e.* HSs) (Mojtahid et al., 2017; Depuydt et al., 2022). This is also the case for the epiphytic group (Fig. 6b). This “dilution effect” is also highlighted by the rMDS results since the >150 μm fraction exhibits higher dissimilarity in the faunal community between samples, *i.e.* over time, than the >63 μm fraction (Fig. 4b).

4.3. Recommendations in the choice of the size fraction

Our results show that the impact of the used size fraction on paleo-environmental interpretations is not the same depending on the site location. This difference is probably due to the different environmental conditions (*e.g.*, trophic conditions, proximity to the ice sheet influence, bottom-current velocity, nature of sediments) between the two study sites. Core BOBGEO-CS05 is located on a topographically steep slope, relatively well ventilated during the last glacial period due to the influence of the strong North Atlantic Glacial Eastern Boundary current, as testified by sedimentological and geochemical proxies (Toucanne et al., 2021). Core SU81-44, however, is located on a gentle slope and is composed of homogeneous fine sediments. This indicates a lower current velocity than at site BOBGEO-CS05 allowing the settlement of organic-rich fine sediments. This seems to be confirmed by the lower proportion of the “high energy indicator group” in core SU81-44 compared to core BOBGEO-CS05. Benthic foraminiferal community seems to respond differently between the two sites, by exhibiting a higher proportion of small opportunistic specimens in the organic-rich fine sediments of core SU81-44. It is also interesting to note that *Cassidulina carinata*, *Trifarina angulosa* and *Nonionella turgida*, three species present in both records, have different sizes

depending on the location. These species are almost exclusively found in the 63-150 μm fraction in SU81-44 (99 % of the total individuals of each species is found in the 63-150 μm) whereas they are more present in the >150 μm fraction in BOBGEO-CS05 (respectively 82 %, 14 % and 29 % of the total individuals are found in the 63-150 μm). This behaviour may be explained by generally higher organic matter fluxes in the southern part of the Bay of Biscay which favour an opportunistic r-type strategy resulting in smaller individuals. Mojtahid et al. (2009) also observed a difference in size within the same species depending on the geographical location for *C. carinata*, *N. turgida*, *Rectuvigerina phlegeri* or *Nonion scaphum* in the Rhône prodelta. Smaller specimens of a given species were abundant in the area influenced by the river plume, whereas larger specimens were concentrated close to the river mouth. They suggested that it could be related to an earlier reproductive maturity in the ontogenetic stage in areas under strong organic matter influences. Several planktonic foraminiferal studies also showed a relationship between shell size and surrounding ecological conditions, where some species tend to be relatively larger under optimal conditions for reproduction (*e.g.*, Hecht, 1976; Schmidt et al., 2003; Iwasaki et al., 2017).

Our results show that, even in the same geographic area (*i.e.* Bay of Biscay) and a similar water depth (*i.e.* 1000 m), it is still complicated to draw straightforward conclusions about the choice of the size fraction for benthic foraminiferal-based paleoenvironmental reconstructions. For sure, the addition of the 63-150 μm size fraction allows to include a greater number of specimens and species that are absent from the large fraction, and therefore be more representative of the “real” diversity as it has been shown in modern ecological studies (*e.g.*, Schroder-Adams et al., 1987; Lo Giudice Cappelli and Austin, 2019; Klootwijk and Alve, 2022). However, paleoenvironmental interpretations cannot only be based on diversity indices because those are biased by taphonomic processes. Therefore, paleoenvironmental studies rely rather on distribution patterns of single species or groups of indicative species than on diversity indices. However, these patterns may be blurred by the dominance of small opportunistic species. For living foraminifera, Lo Giudice Cappelli and Austin (2019) recommended combining both fractions to achieve high-resolution environmental reconstructions. Our results based on fossil records highlight that the accumulation of opportunistic species shells may dilute the signal of other indicative taxa and therefore reduce the quality of the interpretations. We therefore suggest to systematically analyse both size fractions (63-150 μm and >150 μm) separately to account for the signal provided 1) by rare large species and 2) by small-sized opportunistic species. In addition, this approach allows a more relevant comparison between

studies using different size fractions. In fact, some studies on living assemblages had already considered to study the 63-150 μm fraction in a limited number of samples in addition to the $>150 \mu\text{m}$ fraction (*e.g.*, Rathburn et al., 2001; Fontanier et al., 2008; Mojtahid et al., 2009; Gooday and Goineau, 2019). To our opinion, the $>150 \mu\text{m}$ size fraction should be done systematically and thoroughly to reach high time resolution, because it is less time consuming and requires less taxonomic expertise than the study of the small fraction. The small fraction (here 63-150 μm) should be analysed following a strategic selection of samples depicting the environmental gradient encountered in the core (*e.g.*, glacial/Holocene periods, specific periods as HSs, Bølling-Allerød, etc.). These samples would not necessarily need to be fully sorted/picked, and sample processing could be simplified by only counting major species, once they have been identified for this fraction separately. Depending on the relevance of the small fraction fauna for the paleo-environmental interpretations, a more detailed analysis of the 63-150 μm may be essential.

These conclusions are based on a limit set at 150 μm for the large size fraction because this limit is traditionally used in the NE Atlantic and particularly in the Bay of Biscay for both living (*e.g.*, Fontanier et al., 2003; Mojtahid et al., 2013; Duros et al., 2012) and fossil faunal studies (cf. Fig. S1). However, in other areas, several paleostudies used the $>125 \mu\text{m}$ fraction to investigate fossil benthic foraminifera (*e.g.*, Hasegawa et al., 1990; Schmiedl and Mackensen, 1997; Hayward, 2002; Kaminski et al., 2002; Gupta and Thomas, 2003; Diz and Barker, 2016; Das et al., 2021; see Fig. S1). Additionally, this size limit was already chosen as the best compromise for biomonitoring studies (Schönfeld et al., 2012) and Weinkauf and Milker (2018) showed that the $>125 \mu\text{m}$ size fraction better represents the total assemblages in fossil records than the $>150 \mu\text{m}$ fraction. Therefore, we suggest that a step forward, towards a more general homogenization of protocols dealing with benthic foraminifera, would benefit from the choice of the $>125 \mu\text{m}$ instead of $>150 \mu\text{m}$ for the large size fraction. However, conversely to biomonitoring objectives, the separate investigation of the input of the smaller size fraction would be mandatory in the case of paleoceanographic purposes.

5. Conclusions

Our results show that it is complex to process a unique size fraction to reconstruct accurately paleoenvironments. The inclusion of the small fraction allows to be closer to the real diversity

when considering living fauna but the average image given by the fossil fauna, subject to taphonomic processes, may follow a different pattern. In terms of faunal assemblages, core BOBGEO-CS05 located in relatively well-dynamic environment, shows that the small fraction blurred the signal of rare indicator species from the $>150\ \mu\text{m}$ fraction and provides no additional information compared to the large fraction. Core SU81-44 however, located in a calmer environment and influenced by seasonal inputs of organic matter, shows that it is essential to study the 63-150 μm fraction since the faunal composition from each fraction provides different paleoenvironmental interpretations. Therefore, our research highlights the need to follow a harmonized protocol for paleoenvironmental studies based on benthic foraminifera as the one proposed by Schönfeld et al. (2012) for the biomonitoring studies. In view of our results in the NE Atlantic at 1000 m water depth and for harmonization of practices within the community working on living and fossil assemblages, our recommendations for the paleoenvironmental reconstructions are:

- 1) To separate the small fraction (preferentially 63-125 μm , or 63-150 μm) from the large fraction (preferentially $>125\ \mu\text{m}$, or $>150\ \mu\text{m}$) during sample preparation and treatment;
- 2) To focus systematically on the large fraction (preferentially $>125\ \mu\text{m}$, or $>150\ \mu\text{m}$) for high time resolution analysis of benthic assemblages;
- 3) To make a strategic choice in the selection of samples to study the small fraction (preferentially 63-125 μm , or 63-150 μm) for a complete analysis of foraminiferal faunas. This will highlight the relevance of this fraction and allow to identify major species;
- 4) Depending on the study purpose, a more detailed analysis of the small fraction might be essential, either by focusing on major species or on total fauna.

More studies comparing the difference between size fractions in other geographic areas, water depths and time intervals are necessary in order to validate or improve the above proposed procedure. Moreover, the systematic availability (in open databases) of distinct databases for each size fraction studied will definitely help to reach a standardized protocol for paleoenvironmental studies.

6. Acknowledgements

This study was sponsored by the CNRS-INSU-LEFE (IMAGO-CYBER) program (STING project), the ARTEMIS 14C AMS French INSU project, and the Region Pays de la Loire

programs (Rising Star project TANDEM). S.T. was funded by French National Research Agency (ANR) via the LabexMER program (ANR-10-LABX-19-01) and the PIA TANDEM project (ANR-11-RSNR-00023-01). Salary and research support for the PhD student (First author) were provided by the French Ministry of Higher Education and Research. We thank S. Le Houedec for core sampling, and F. Rihani, L. Dahhan (internship students) and S. Sanchez (University of Angers) for benthic foraminifera picking. Finally, the authors are thankful to Elisabeth Michel (LSCE) for providing the well-preserved core SU81-44 and J-F. Bourillet (Ifremer) for the recovery of core BOBGEO-CS05 during the BOBGEO cruise (doi.org/10.17600/9030060). The foraminiferal raw data sets are available as supplementary material S1 for SU81-44 and in the SEANOE data repository (<https://doi.org/10.17882/88029> for BOBGEO-CS05; <https://doi.org/10.17882/91758> for SU81-44).

7. References

- Aksu, A.E., Yaşar, D., Mudie, P.J., Gillespie, H., 1995. Late glacial-Holocene paleoclimatic and paleoceanographic evolution of the Aegean Sea: micropaleontological and stable isotopic evidence. *Mar. Micropaleontol.* 25, 1–28. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8398\(94\)00026-J](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8398(94)00026-J)
- Alve, E., 2010. Benthic foraminiferal responses to absence of fresh phytodetritus: A two-year experiment. *Marine Micropaleontology* 76, 67–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2010.05.003>
- Alve, E., 2003. A common opportunistic foraminiferal species as an indicator of rapidly changing conditions in a range of environments. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 57, 501–514. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7714\(02\)00383-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7714(02)00383-9)
- Alve, E., 1999. Colonization of new habitats by benthic foraminifera: a review. *Earth-Science Reviews* 46, 167–185. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-8252\(99\)00016-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-8252(99)00016-1)
- Alve, E., 1995. Benthic foraminiferal responses to estuarine pollution. *Journal of Foraminiferal Research - J FORAMIN RES* 25, 190–203. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gsjfr.25.3.190>
- Alve, E., Goldstein, S.T., 2010. Dispersal, survival and delayed growth of benthic foraminiferal propagules. *Journal of Sea Research* 63, 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seares.2009.09.003>
- Alve, E., Goldstein, S.T., 2003. Propagule transport as a key method of dispersal in benthic foraminifera (Protista). *Limnology and Oceanography* 48, 2163–2170. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2003.48.6.2163>
- Alve, E., Goldstein, S.T., 2002. Resting stage in benthic foraminiferal propagules: a key feature for dispersal? Evidence from two shallow-water species. *Journal of Micropalaeontology* 21, 95–96. <https://doi.org/10.1144/jm.21.1.95>
- Bé, A.W.H., 1960. Ecology of Recent planktonic foraminifera--Part 2, Bathymetric and seasonal distributions in the Sargasso Sea off Nermuda. *Micropaleontology* 6, 373–392.

- Bé, A.W.H., 1959. Ecology of Recent Planktonic Foraminifera: Part I: Areal Distribution in the Western North Atlantic. *Micropaleontology* 5, 77–100. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1484157>
- Bouchet, V.M.P., Alve, E., Rygg, B., Telford, R.J., 2012. Benthic foraminifera provide a promising tool for ecological quality assessment of marine waters. *Ecological Indicators* 23, 66–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.03.011>
- Bourillet, J.-F., 2009. BOBGEO cruise, Pourquoi pas ? R/V. <https://doi.org/10.17600/9030060>
- Bray, J.R., Curtis, J.T., 1957. An Ordination of the Upland Forest Communities of Southern Wisconsin. *Ecological Monographs* 27, 325–349. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1942268>
- Buzas, M.A., 1990. Another look at confidence limits for species proportions. *Journal of Paleontology* 64, 842–843. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002233600001903X>
- Buzas, M.A., 1969. Foraminiferal Species Densities and Environmental Variables in an Estuary. *Limnology and Oceanography* 14, 411–422. <https://doi.org/10.4319/limn.1969.14.3.0411>
- Caralp, M.-H., 1988. Late glacial to recent deep-sea benthic foraminifera from the northeastern Atlantic (Cadiz Gulf) and western Mediterranean (Alboran Sea). *Paleoceanographic results. Mar. Micropaleontol.* 13, 265–289. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8598\(88\)90006-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8598(88)90006-0)
- Clarke, K.R., 1993. Non-parametric multivariate analyses of changes in community structure. *Australian Journal of Ecology* 18, 117–143. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9993.1993.tb00438.x>
- CLIMAP Project Members, 1981. Seasonal reconstructions of the Earth's surface at the last glacial maximum. Geological Society of America.
- CLIMAP Project Members, J.D., 1984. The last interglacial Ocean. *Quaternary Research* 21, 123–224. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0033-5894\(84\)90098-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0033-5894(84)90098-X)
- Coynel, A., Etcheber, H., Abril, G., Maroux, F., Dumas, J., Hurtrez, J.-E., 2005. Contribution of small mountainous rivers to particulate organic carbon input in the Bay of Biscay. *Biogeochemistry* 74, 151–171. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10533-004-3562-1>
- Das, M., Singh, R.K., Holbourn, A., Farooq, S.H., Vats, N., Pandey, D.K., 2021. Paleoclimatographic evolution of the Japan Sea during the Pleistocene – A benthic foraminiferal perspective. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 566, 110238. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2021.110238>
- de Almeida, F.K., de Mello, R.M., Costa, K.B., Toledo, F.A.L., 2015. The response of deep-water benthic foraminiferal assemblages to changes in paleoproductivity during the Pleistocene (last 769.2kyr), western South Atlantic Ocean. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 440, 201–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2015.09.005>
- Depuydt, P., Mojtahid, M., Barras, C., Bouhdayad, F.Z., Toucanne, S., 2022. Intermediate ocean circulation and cryosphere dynamics in the northeast Atlantic during Heinrich Stadials: benthic foraminiferal assemblage response. *Journal of Quaternary Science* 37, 1207–1221. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jqs.3444>
- Diz, P., Barker, S., 2016. Approaches and constraints to the reconstruction of palaeoproductivity from Cape Basin abyssal benthic foraminifera (South Atlantic). *Journal of Micropaleontology* 35, 195–204. <https://doi.org/10.1144/jmpaleo2015-045>
- Diz, P., Peñalver-Clavel, I., Hernández-Almeida, I., Bernasconi, S.M., 2020. Environmental changes in the East Equatorial Pacific during the Mid Pleistocene Transition and implications for the Last Global

- Extinction of benthic foraminifera. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 539, 109487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2019.109487>
- Duros, P., Fontanier, C., de Stigter, H.C., Cesbron, F., Metzger, E., Jorissen, F.J., 2012. Live and dead benthic foraminiferal faunas from Whittard Canyon (NE Atlantic): Focus on taphonomic processes and paleo-environmental applications. *Marine Micropaleontology* 94–95, 25–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2012.05.004>
- Ferreira, F., Frontalini, F., Leão, C.J., Leipnitz, I.I., 2014. Changes in the water column structure and paleoproductivity in the western South Atlantic Ocean since the middle Pleistocene: Evidence from benthic and planktonic foraminifera. *Quat. Int., Quaternary Investigations from Antarctica across South America to the North Atlantic* 352, 111–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2014.07.061>
- Eynaud, F., Abreu, L. de, Voelker, A., Schönfeld, J., Salueiro, E., Turon, J.-L., Penaud, A., Toucanne, S., Naughton, F., Goñi, M.F.S., Malaizé, B., Cacho, I., 2009. Position of the Polar Front along the western Iberian margin during key cold episodes of the last 45 ka. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems* 10. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009GC002398>
- Eynaud, F., Malaizé, B., Zaragosi, S., Vernal, A. de, Scourse, J., Puñol, C., Cortijo, E., Grousset, F.E., Penaud, A., Toucanne, S., Turon, J.-L., Auffret, G., 2012. New constraints on European glacial freshwater releases to the North Atlantic Ocean. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 39. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GL052100>
- Fatela, F., Taborda, R., 2002. Confidence limits of species proportions in microfossil assemblages. *Marine Micropaleontology* 45, 169–174. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8398\(02\)00021-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8398(02)00021-X)
- Fontanier, C., Jorissen, F., Geslin, E., Zaragosi, S., Duchemin, G., Laversin, M., Gaultier, M., 2008. Live and dead foraminiferal faunas from Saint-Tropez Canyon (Bay of Frejus): Observations based on in situ and incubated cores. *Journal of Foraminiferal Research* 38, 137–156. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gsjfr.38.2.137>
- Fontanier, C., Jorissen, F.J., Chaillou, C., David, C., Anschutz, P., Lafon, V., 2003. Seasonal and interannual variability of benthic foraminiferal faunas at 550m depth in the Bay of Biscay. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers* 50, 457–494. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0637\(02\)00167-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0637(02)00167-X)
- Fossile, E., Nardelli, M.P., Howa, H., Baltzer, A., Poprawski, Y., Baneschi, I., Doveri, M., Mojtahid, M., 2022. Influence of modern environmental gradients on foraminiferal faunas in the inner Kongsfjorden (Svalbard). *Marine Micropaleontology* 102117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2022.102117>
- Fossile, E., Nardelli, M.P., Jouini, A., Lansard, B., Pusceddu, A., Moccia, D., Michel, E., Péron, O., Howa, H., Mojtahid, M., 2020. Benthic foraminifera as tracers of brine production in the Storfjorden “sea ice factory.” *Biogeosciences* 17, 1933–1953. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-17-1933-2020>
- Gohin, F., Lampert, L., Guillaud, J.-F., Herbland, A., Nézan, E., 2003. Satellite and in situ observations of a late winter phytoplankton bloom, in the northern Bay of Biscay. *Continental Shelf Research* 23, 1117–1141. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4343\(03\)00088-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4343(03)00088-8)
- Gooday, A.J., 2003. Benthic foraminifera (protista) as tools in deep-water palaeoceanography: Environmental influences on faunal characteristics, in: *Advances in Marine Biology*. Academic Press, pp. 1–90. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2881\(03\)46002-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2881(03)46002-1)
- Gooday, A.J., 1993. Deep-sea benthic foraminiferal species which exploit phytodetritus: Characteristic features and controls on distribution. *Marine Micropaleontology* 22, 187–205. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8398\(93\)90043-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8398(93)90043-W)

- Gooday, A.J., 1988. A response by benthic Foraminifera to the deposition of phytodetritus in the deep sea. *Nature* 332, 70–73. <https://doi.org/10.1038/332070a0>
- Gooday, A.J., Goineau, A., 2019. The Contribution of Fine Sieve Fractions (63–150 µm) to Foraminiferal Abundance and Diversity in an Area of the Eastern Pacific Ocean Licensed for Polymetallic Nodule Exploration. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 6.
- Gooday, A.J., Hughes, J.A., 2002. Foraminifera associated with phytodetritus deposits at a bathyal site in the northern Rockall Trough (NE Atlantic): seasonal contrasts and a comparison of stained and dead assemblages. *Marine Micropaleontology* 46, 83–110. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8398\(02\)00050-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8398(02)00050-6)
- Gooday, A.J., Rathburn, A.E., 1999. Temporal variability in living deep-sea benthic foraminifera: a review. *Earth-Science Reviews* 46, 187–212. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-8252\(99\)00010-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-8252(99)00010-0)
- Gooday, A.J., Turley, C.M., Allen, J.A., Charnock, H., Edmond, J.M., McCave, I.N., Rice, A.L., Wilson, T.R.S., 1990. Responses by benthic organisms to inputs of organic material to the ocean floor: a review. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences* 331, 119–138. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.1990.0060>
- Guichard, S., Jorissen, F., Peypouquet, J.-P., 1999. Late Quaternary benthic foraminiferal records testifying lateral variability of the Cape Blanc upwelling signal. *Comptes Rendus Académie Sci. - Ser. IIA - Earth Planet. Sci.* 329, 295–301. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1251-8050\(99\)80249-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1251-8050(99)80249-3)
- Guillaud, J.-F., Aminot, A., Delmas, D., Gohin, F., Lunven, M., Labry, C., Herbland, A., 2008. Seasonal variation of riverine nutrient inputs in the northern Bay of Biscay (France), and patterns of marine phytoplankton response. *Journal of Marine Systems, Oceanography of the Bay of Biscay* 72, 309–319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2007.03.010>
- Gupta, A.K., Singh, R.K., Joseph, S., Thomas, E., 2004. Indian Ocean high-productivity event (10–8 Ma): Linked to global cooling or to the initiation of the Indian monsoons? *Geology* 32, 753–756. <https://doi.org/10.1130/G20662.1>
- Gupta, A.K., Thomas, E., 2003. Initiation of Northern Hemisphere glaciation and strengthening of the northeast Indian monsoon: Ocean Drilling Program Site 758, eastern equatorial Indian Ocean. *Geology* 31, 47–50. [https://doi.org/10.1130/G091-7613\(2003\)031<0047:IONHGA>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/G091-7613(2003)031<0047:IONHGA>2.0.CO;2)
- Hammer, O., Harper, D.A.T., Ryan, P.D., 2001. PAST: Paleontological Statistics Software Package for Education and Data Analysis 9.
- Hasegawa, S., Sprovieri, R., Poluzzi, A., Kastens, K.A., Mascle, J., 1990. Quantitative analysis of benthic foraminiferal assemblages from Plio-Pleistocene sequences in the Tyrrhenian Sea, ODP Leg 107. *Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Scientific Results, Ocean Drilling Program. College Station, TX* 107, 17.
- Hayward, B.W., 2002. Late Pliocene to middle Pleistocene extinctions of deep-sea benthic foraminifera (“Stilosomella Extinction”) in the southwest Pacific. *Journal of Foraminiferal Research* 32, 274–307. <https://doi.org/10.2113/32.3.274>
- Hayward, B.W., Kawagata, S., Grenfell, H.R., Droxler, A.W., Shearer, M., 2006. Mid-Pleistocene extinction of bathyal benthic foraminifera in the Caribbean Sea. *Micropaleontology* 52, 245–266. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gsmicropal.52.3.245>
- Hayward, B.W., Neil, H., Carter, R., Grenfell, H.R., Hayward, J.J., 2002. Factors influencing the distribution patterns of Recent deep-sea benthic foraminifera, east of New Zealand, Southwest Pacific Ocean. *Marine Micropaleontology* 46, 139–176. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8398\(02\)00047-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8398(02)00047-6)

- Hayward, B.W., Sabaa, A., Grenfell, H.R., 2004. Benthic foraminifera and the late Quaternary (last 150 ka) paleoceanographic and sedimentary history of the Bounty Trough, east of New Zealand. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 211, 59–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2004.04.007>
- Hecht, A.D., 1976. Size Variations in Planktonic Foraminifera: Implications for Quantitative Paleoclimatic Analysis. *Science* 192, 1330–1332. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.192.4246.1330>
- Hess, S., 1998. Distribution patterns of recent benthic foraminifera in the South China Sea.
- Hess, S., Jorissen, F.J., 2009. Distribution patterns of living benthic foraminifera from Cap Breton canyon, Bay of Biscay: Faunal response to sediment instability. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers* 56, 1555–1578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2009.04.003>
- Huang, B., Jian, Z., Cheng, X., Wang, P., 2003. Foraminiferal responses to upwelling variations in the South China Sea over the last 220 000 years. *Marine Micropaleontology* 47, 1–15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8398\(02\)00045-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8398(02)00045-2)
- Ivanova, E.V., Ovsepyan, E.A., Risebrobakken, B., Vetrov, A.A., 2003. Downcore distribution of living calcareous foraminifera and stable isotopes in the western Barents Sea. *Journal of Foraminiferal Research* 38, 337–356. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gsjfr.38.4.337>
- Iwasaki, S., Kimoto, K., Kuroyanagi, A., Kawahata, H., 2017. Horizontal and vertical distributions of planktic foraminifera in the subarctic Pacific. *Marine Micropaleontology* 130, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2016.12.001>
- Jennings, A.E., Helgadottir, G., 1994. Foraminiferal assemblages from the fjords and shelf of eastern Greenland. *Journal of Foraminiferal Research* 24, 123–144. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gsjfr.24.2.123>
- Jian, Z., Wang, P., Chen, M.-P., Li, B., Zhao, Q., Bühring, C., Laj, C., Lin, H.-L., Pflaumann, U., Bian, Y., Wang, R., Cheng, X., 2000. Foraminiferal responses to major Pleistocene paleoceanographic changes in the southern South China Sea. *Paleoceanography* 15, 229–243. <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999PA000451>
- Jones, R., 1994. *The challenger foraminifera*, Oxford University Press, USA. Ed.
- Jorissen, F.J., 1987. The distribution of benthic foraminifera in the Adriatic Sea. *Mar. Micropaleontol.* 12, 21–48. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8398\(87\)90012-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8398(87)90012-0)
- Jorissen, F.J., 1999. Benthic foraminiferal microhabitats below the sediment-water interface, in: Sen Gupta, B.K. (Ed.), *Modern Foraminifera*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 161–179. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-48104-9_10
- Jorissen, F.J., 1988. Benthic foraminifera from the Adriatic Sea : principles of phenotypic variation. *Utrecht micropaleontological bulletins* 37.
- Jorissen, F.J., Fontanier, C., Thomas, E., 2007. Chapter Seven Paleoclimatological Proxies Based on Deep-Sea Benthic Foraminiferal Assemblage Characteristics, in: Hillaire-Marcel, C., De Vernal, A. (Eds.), *Developments in Marine Geology, Proxies in Late Cenozoic Paleoclimatology*. Elsevier, pp. 263–325. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1572-5480\(07\)01012-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1572-5480(07)01012-3)
- Kaminski, M.A., Aksu, A., Box, M., Hiscott, R.N., Filipescu, S., Al-Salameen, M., 2002. Late Glacial to Holocene benthic foraminifera in the Marmara Sea: implications for Black Sea–Mediterranean Sea connections following the last deglaciation. *Marine Geology* 190, 165–202. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-3227\(02\)00347-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-3227(02)00347-X)

- Kang, S., Lim, D., Kim, S.-Y., 2010. Benthic foraminiferal assemblage of Seogwipo Formation in Jeju Island, South Sea of Korea: Implication for late Pliocene to early Pleistocene cold episode in the northwestern Pacific margin. *Quaternary International, Palaeobotanical and Palynological Records from Italy* 225, 138–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2010.04.009>
- Kawagata, S., Hayward, B.W., Gupta, A.K., 2006. Benthic foraminiferal extinctions linked to late Pliocene–Pleistocene deep-sea circulation changes in the northern Indian Ocean (ODP Sites 722 and 758). *Mar. Micropaleontol.* 58, 219–242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2005.11.003>
- Kawagata, S., Hayward, B.W., Kuhnt, W., 2007. Extinction of deep-sea foraminifera as a result of Pliocene–Pleistocene deep-sea circulation changes in the South China Sea (ODP Sites 1143 and 1146). *Quat. Sci. Rev.* 26, 808–827. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quascirev.2006.10.011>
- Kellogg, T.B., 1984. Paleoclimatic significance of subpolar foraminifera in high-latitude marine sediments. *Can. J. Earth Sci.* 21, 189–193. <https://doi.org/10.1139/e84-020>
- King, S.C., Murray, J.W., Kemp, A.E.S., 1998. Palaeoenvironments of deposition of Neogene laminated diatom mat deposits from the eastern equatorial Pacific from studies of benthic foraminifera (sites 844, 849, 851). *Mar. Micropaleontol.* 35, 161–177. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8398\(98\)00020-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8398(98)00020-6)
- Klootwijk, A.T., Alve, E., 2022. Does the analysed size fraction of benthic foraminifera influence the ecological quality status and the interpretation of environmental conditions? Indications from two northern Norwegian fjords. *Ecological Indicators* 135, 108423. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.108423>
- Knudsen, K.L., Stabell, B., Seidenkrantz, M.-S., Eide, J., Blake Jr, W., 2008. Deglacial and Holocene conditions in northernmost Baffin Bay sediments, foraminifera, diatoms and stable isotopes. *Boreas* 37, 346–376. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1502-3885.2008.00035.x>
- Koutsikopoulos, C., Le Cann, B., 1996. Physical processes and hydrological structures related to the Bay of Biscay anchovy 11.
- Kruskal, J.B., Wish, M., 1978. *Multi-dimensional Scaling*. p. 93.
- Kurbjeweit, F., Schmiidl, G., Scheiber, R., Hemleben, C., Pfannkuche, O., Wallmann, K., Schäfer, P., 2000. Distribution, biomass and diversity of benthic foraminifera in relation to sediment geochemistry in the Arabian Sea. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography* 47, 2913–2955. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-6345\(00\)00053-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-6345(00)00053-9)
- Labry, C., Herbland, A., Delmas, D., 2002. The role of phosphorus on planktonic production of the Gironde plume waters in the Bay of Biscay. *Journal of Plankton Research* 24, 97–117. <https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/24.2.97>
- Labry, C., Herbland, A., Delmas, D., Laborde, P., Lazure, P., Froidefond, J.M., Jegou, A.M., Sautour, B., 2001. Initiation of winter phytoplankton blooms within the Gironde plume waters in the Bay of Biscay. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 212, 117–130. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps212117>
- Leeuwen, R.J.W. van, 1989. Sea-floor distribution and Late Quaternary faunal patterns of planktonic and benthic foraminifers in the Angola Basin. *Utrecht Micropaleontol. Bull.* 38.
- Lo Giudice Cappelli, E., Austin, W.E.N., 2019. Size Matters: Analyses of Benthic Foraminiferal Assemblages Across Differing Size Fractions. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 6.
- Mancin, N., Hayward, B.W., Trattenero, I., Cobianchi, M., Lupi, C., 2013. Can the morphology of deep-sea benthic foraminifera reveal what caused their extinction during the mid-Pleistocene Climate Transition? *Mar. Micropaleontol.* 104, 53–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2013.09.004>

- Melki, T., Kallel, N., Fontugne, M., 2010. The nature of transitions from dry to wet condition during sapropel events in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 291, 267–285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2010.02.039>
- Milker, Y., Schmiedl, G., 2012. A taxonomic guide to modern benthic shelf foraminifera of the western Mediterranean Sea. *Palaeontol. Electron.* 15, 1–134. <https://doi.org/10.26879/27>
- Milker, Y., Schmiedl, G., Betzler, C., Römer, M., Jaramillo-Vogel, D., Siccha, M., 2009. Distribution of recent benthic foraminifera in shelf carbonate environments of the Western Mediterranean Sea. *Marine Micropaleontology* 73, 207–225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2009.10.003>
- Milker, Y., Weinkauf, M.F.G., Titschack, J., Freiwald, A., Krüger, S., Jorissen, F.J., Schmiedl, G., 2017. Testing the applicability of a benthic foraminiferal-based transfer function for the reconstruction of paleowater depth changes in Rhodes (Greece) during the early Pleistocene. *PLOS ONE* 12, e0188447. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0188447>
- Mojtahid, M., Griveaud, C., Fontanier, C., Anschutz, P., Jorissen, F.J., 2010. Live benthic foraminiferal faunas along a bathymetrical transect (140–4800m) in the Bay of Biscay (NE Atlantic). *Rev. Micropaléontologie, Foraminiferal Geobiology* 53, 139–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.revmic.2010.01.002>
- Mojtahid, M., Jorissen, F., Lansard, B., Fontanier, C., Bonbled, B., Rabouille, C., 2009. Spatial distribution of live benthic foraminifera in the Rhône prodelta: Faunal response to a continental–marine organic matter gradient. *Marine Micropaleontology* 70, 177–200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2008.12.006>
- Mojtahid, M., Jorissen, F.J., Garcia, J., Schiegl, R., Michel, E., Eynaud, F., Gillet, H., Cremer, M., Diz Ferreiro, P., Siccha, M., Howa, H., 2013. High resolution Holocene record in the southeastern Bay of Biscay: Global versus regional climate signals. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 377, 28–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2013.03.004>
- Mojtahid, M., Toucanne, S., Fentimen, R., Barras, C., Le Houedec, S., Soulet, G., Bourillet, J.-F., Michel, E., 2017. Changes in northeast Atlantic hydrology during Termination 1: Insights from Celtic margin's benthic foraminifera. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 175, 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quascirev.2017.09.003>
- Murray, J.W., 2006. *Ecology and Applications of Benthic Foraminifera*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nausch, G., Nehring, D., Hertzberg, G., 1999. Anthropogenic nutrient load of the Baltic Sea. *Limnologia* 29, 233–241. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0075-9511\(99\)80007-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0075-9511(99)80007-3)
- Nolet, G.J., Corliss, B.H., 1990. Benthic foraminiferal evidence for reduced deep-water circulation during sapropel deposition in the eastern Mediterranean. *Mar. Geol.* 94, 109–130. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-3227\(90\)90106-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-3227(90)90106-T)
- Ohkawara, N., Kitazato, H., Uematsu, K., Gooday, A.J., 2009. A minute new species of *Saccammina* (monothalamous Foraminifera; Protista) from the abyssal Pacific. *Journal of Micropalaeontology* 28, 143–151. <https://doi.org/10.1144/jm.28.2.143>
- Ohkushi, K., Itaki, T., Nemoto, N., 2003. Last Glacial–Holocene change in intermediate-water ventilation in the Northwestern Pacific. *Quat. Sci. Rev.* 22, 1477–1484. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-3791\(03\)00082-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-3791(03)00082-9)
- Ohkushi, K., Kennett, J.P., Zeleski, C.M., Moffitt, S.E., Hill, T.M., Robert, C., Beaufort, L., Behl, R.J., 2013. Quantified intermediate water oxygenation history of the NE Pacific: A new benthic foraminiferal record from Santa Barbara basin. *Paleoceanography* 28, 453–467. <https://doi.org/10.1002/palo.20043>

- Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., Minchin, P.R., O'Hara, R.B., Simpson, G.L., Solymos, P., Stevens, M.H.H., Szoecs, E., Wagner, H., 2020. *vegan*: Community Ecology Package.
- O'Neill, T.A., Hayward, B.W., Kawagata, S., Sabaa, A.T., Grenfell, H.R., 2007. Pleistocene Extinctions of Deep-Sea Benthic Foraminifera: The South Atlantic Record. *Palaeontology* 50, 1073–1102. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4983.2007.00702.x>
- Pascual, A., Rodríguez-Lázaro, J., Martínez-García, B., Varela, Z., 2020. Palaeoceanographic and palaeoclimatic changes during the last 37,000 years detected in the SE Bay of Biscay based on benthic foraminifera. *Quaternary International, Quaternary Research in Spain: Environmental Changes and Human Footprint* 566–567, 323–336. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2020.03.043>
- Pati, P., Patra, P., 2012. Benthic foraminiferal responses to coastal pollution: a review. *Int. J. Geol., Earth Environ. Sci.* 2, 42–56.
- Perez-Cruz, L.L., Machain-Castillo, M.L., 1990. Benthic foraminifera of the oxygen minimum zone, continental shelf of the Gulf of Tehuantepec, Mexico. *Journal of Foraminiferal Research* 20, 312–325. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gsjfr.20.4.312>
- Phipps, M., Jorissen, F., Pusceddu, A., Bianchelli, S., De Stigter, H., 2012. Live benthic foraminiferal faunas along a bathymetrical transect (282–4987m) on the Portuguese margin (NE Atlantic). *Journal of Foraminiferal Research* 42, 66–81. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gsjfr.42.1.66>
- Phleger, F.B., Soutar, A., 1973. Production of Benthic Foraminifera in Three East Pacific Oxygen Minima. *Micropaleontology* 19, 110–115. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1484973>
- Phleger, F.B., Parker, F.L., Peirson, J.F., 1953. North Atlantic core foraminifera. *Rep. Swed. Deep-Sea Exped.* 7, 1–122.
- Pielou, E.C., 1966. The measurement of diversity in different types of biological collections. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 13, 131–144. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193\(66\)90013-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193(66)90013-0)
- Piva, A., Asioli, A., Trincardi, F., Schneider, R.R., Vigliotti, L., 2008. Late-Holocene climate variability in the Adriatic Sea (Central Mediterranean). *The Holocene* 18, 153–167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959683607035606>
- Rathburn, A.E., Perez, M.F., Lange, C.B., 2001. Benthic-pelagic coupling in the Southern California Bight: Relationships between sinking organic material, diatoms and benthic foraminifera. *Marine Micropaleontology* 43, 261–271. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8398\(01\)00028-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8398(01)00028-7)
- Renema, W., 2008. Habitat selective factors influencing the distribution of larger benthic foraminiferal assemblages over the Kepulauan Seribu. *Marine Micropaleontology* 68, 286–298. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2008.06.002>
- Rodrigues, A.R., Pivel, M.A.G., Schmitt, P., de Almeida, F.K., Bonetti, C., 2018. Infaunal and epifaunal benthic foraminifera species as proxies of organic matter paleofluxes in the Pelotas Basin, south-western Atlantic Ocean. *Mar. Micropaleontol.* 144, 38–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2018.05.007>
- Rodrigues, C.G., Hooper, K., 1982. The Ecological Significance of *Elphidium clavatum* in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada. *J. Paleontol.* 56, 410–422.
- Rodriguez-Lazaro, J., Pascual, A., Cacho, I., Varela, Z., Pena, L.D., 2017. Deep-sea benthic response to rapid climatic oscillations of the last glacial cycle in the SE Bay of Biscay. *Journal of Sea Research, Changing Ecosystems in the Bay of Biscay: Natural and Anthropogenic Effects* 130, 49–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seares.2017.06.002>

- Rohling, E.J., Jorissen, F.J., de Stigter, H.C., 1997. 200 Year interruption of Holocene sapropel formation in the Adriatic Sea. *Journal of Micropalaeontology* 16, 97–108. <https://doi.org/10.1144/jm.16.2.97>
- Santa-Rosa, L.C. de C., Disaró, S.T., Totah, V., Watanabe, S., Guimarães, A.T.B., 2021. Living Benthic Foraminifera from the Surface and Subsurface Sediment Layers Applied to the Environmental Characterization of the Brazilian Continental Slope (SW Atlantic). *Water* 13, 1863. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w13131863>
- Schmidt, D.N., Renaud, S., Bollmann, J., 2003. Response of planktic foraminiferal size to late Quaternary climate change. *Paleoceanography* 18. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002PA000831>
- Schmiedl, G., Mackensen, A., 1997. Late Quaternary paleoproductivity and deep water circulation in the eastern South Atlantic Ocean: Evidence from benthic foraminifera. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 130, 43–80. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-0182\(96\)00137-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-0182(96)00137-X)
- Schönfeld, J., 2012. History and development of methods in Recent benthic foraminiferal studies. *Journal of Micropalaeontology* 31, 53–72. <https://doi.org/10.1144/C262-321X11-008>
- Schönfeld, J., Altenbach, A.V., 2005. Late Glacial to Recent distribution pattern of deep-water *Uvigerina* species in the north-eastern Atlantic. *Marine Micropaleontology* 57, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2005.05.004>
- Schönfeld, J., Zahn, R., 2000. Late Glacial to Holocene history of the Mediterranean Outflow. Evidence from benthic foraminiferal assemblages and stable isotopes at the Portuguese margin. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 159, 85–111. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-0182\(00\)00035-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-0182(00)00035-3)
- Schönfeld, J., Alve, E., Geslin, E., Jorissen, F., Korsun, S., Spezzaferri, S., 2012. The FOBIMO (FOraminiferal BIO-MONitoring) initiative—Towards a standardised protocol for soft-bottom benthic foraminiferal monitoring studies. *Marine Micropaleontology* 94–95, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2012.05.001>
- Schroder-Adams, C., Scott, D.B., Mottoli, F.S., 1987. Can smaller benthic foraminifera be ignored in paleoenvironmental analyses? *Journal of Foraminiferal Research* 17, 101–105.
- Seidenkrantz, M.-S., Aagaard-Sørensen, S., Sulsbrück, H., Kuijpers, A., Jensen, K.G., Kunzendorf, H., 2007. Hydrography and climate of the last 4400 years in a SW Greenland fjord: implications for Labrador Sea palaeoceanography. *The Holocene* 17, 387–401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959573307075840>
- Shannon, C.E., 1948. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell System Technical Journal* 27, 379–423. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x>
- Singh, R.K., Gupta, A.K., 2005. Systematic decline in benthic foraminiferal species diversity linked to productivity increases over the last 26 Ma in the Indian Ocean. *J. Foraminif. Res.* 35, 219–227. <https://doi.org/10.2113/35.3.219>
- Singh, R.K., Gupta, A.K., Das, M., 2012. Paleooceanographic significance of deep-sea benthic foraminiferal species diversity at southeastern Indian Ocean Hole 752A during the Neogene. *Palaeogeogr. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol.* 361–362, 94–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2012.08.008>
- Smart, C.W., 2008. Abyssal NE Atlantic benthic foraminifera during the last 15 kyr: Relation to variations in seasonality of productivity. *Marine Micropaleontology* 69, 193–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2008.07.007>

- Smart, C.W., Thomas, E., Bracher, C.M., 2019. Holocene variations in North Atlantic export productivity as reflected in bathyal benthic foraminifera. *Marine Micropaleontology* 149, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2019.03.004>
- Sun, X., Corliss, B.H., Brown, C.W., Showers, W.J., 2006. The effect of primary productivity and seasonality on the distribution of deep-sea benthic foraminifera in the North Atlantic. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers* 53, 28–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2005.07.003>
- Taguchi, Y., Oono, Y., 2005. Relational patterns of gene expression via non-metric multidimensional scaling analysis. *Bioinformatics* 21, 730–740. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bti067>
- Thomas, E., Booth, L., Maslin, M., Shackleton, N.J., 1995. Northeastern Atlantic benthic foraminifera during the last 45,000 years: Changes in productivity seen from the bottom up. *Paleoceanography* 10, 545–562. <https://doi.org/10.1029/94PA03056>
- Thomas, E., Gooday, A.J., 1996. Cenozoic deep-sea benthic foraminifera: Tracers for changes in oceanic productivity? *Geology* 24, 355–358. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613\(1996\)024<0355:CDSBFT>2.3.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(1996)024<0355:CDSBFT>2.3.CO;2)
- Toucanne, S., Soulet, G., Riveiros, N.V., Boswell, S.M., Denielou, B., Waelbroeck, C., Bayon, G., Mojtahid, M., Bosq, M., Sabine, M., Zaragosi, S., Bourillet, J.-F., Mercier, H., 2021. The North Atlantic Glacial Eastern Boundary Current as a Key Driver for Ice-Sheet—Amoc Interactions and Climate Instability. *Paleoceanography and Paleoclimatology* 36, e2020PA004068. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020PA004068>
- Van der Zwaan, G.J., Jorissen, F.J., Verhallen, P.J.M., Daniels, C.H. von, 1986. Atlantic-European oligocene to recent uvigerina: taxonomy, paleoecology and paleobiogeography. *Utrecht Micropaleontol. Bull.* 35.
- Van der Zwaan, G.J., Duijnste, I.A.P., van Dulk, M., Ernst, S.R., Jannink, N.T., Kouwenhoven, T.J., 1999. Benthic foraminifera: proxies or problems?: A review of paleocological concepts. *Earth-Science Reviews* 46, 213–236. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-8252\(99\)00011-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-8252(99)00011-2)
- Weinkauf, M.F.G., Milker, Y., 2018. The Effect of Size Fraction in Analyses of Benthic Foraminiferal Assemblages: A Case Study Comparing Assemblages From the >125 and >150 μm Size Fractions. *Frontiers in Earth Science* 6.
- Xu, X., Ujiie, H., 1994. 973. Bathyal Benthic Foraminiferal Changes During the Past 210, 000 Years: Evidence from Piston Cores Taken from Seas South of Ishigaki Island, Southern Ryukyu Island Arc. *Trans. Proc. Paleontol. Soc. Jpn. New Ser.* 1994, 497–520. https://doi.org/10.14825/prpsj1951.1994.175_497

Table 1. Classification of major species from cores BOBGEO-CS05 and SU81-44 according to ecological indicators groups as proposed by Depuydt et al. (2022). (*) Species identified as major in core SU81-44 and added into the list published in Depuydt et al. (2022).

Ecological species groups	Major Species/Genera
Glacier-proximal indicator species	<i>Elphidium excavatum</i> f. <i>clavatum</i> <i>Cassidulina crassa</i> d'Orbigny, 1839
Low oxygen indicator species	<i>Globobulimina</i> spp. <i>Chilostomella oolina</i> Schwager, 1878
High organic flux indicator species	<i>Alabaminella weddellensis</i> Earland, 1936* <i>Bolivina</i> spp. <i>Cassidulina carinata</i> Silvestri, 1896 <i>Uvigerina mediterranea</i> Hofker, 1932* <i>Uvigerina peregrina</i> Cushman, 1923*
Epiphytic species	<i>Uvulinopsis praegeri</i> Heron-Allen & Earland, 1913 <i>Planorbulina mediterranensis</i> d'Orbigny, 1826
Meso-oligotrophic indicator species	<i>Cibicidoides pachyderma</i> Rzehak, 1886
High energy indicator species	<i>Cibicides lobatulus</i> Walker & Jacob, 1798 <i>Trifarina angulosa</i> Williamson, 1858

7. Figure captions

Figure 1. Bathymetric map modified from Depuydt et al. (2022) representing the paleogeographic and paleoceanographic configuration (i.e. EIS : European Ice Sheet; the Channel Paleoriver; GEBC : Glacial Eastern Boundary Current) of the Bay of Biscay during the Last Glacial Period and showing the location of our study cores: BOBGEO-CS05 (blue star; Toucanne et al., 2021; Depuydt et al. 2022) and SU81-44 (black star; this study) with a nearby core at 1000 m water depth (orange star) MD95-2002 (Ménot et al., 2006; Eynaud et al., 2012; Toucanne et al., 2015).

Figure 2. Percentages of the polar planktonic species *N. pachyderma* according to sediment depths for a) core SU81-44 (black line, this study) and b) core BOBGEO-CS05 (blue line, Depuydt et al., 2022). Blue color represents the Last glacial period and the orange color represents the deglacial/Holocene period. The dark blue bands show Heinrich Stadials.

Figure 3. Biodiversity indices based on benthic foraminiferal faunas calculated separately for the three size fractions: >150 μm (full black line), 63-150 μm (full red line) and >63 μm fraction (dashed grey line) in a-c) core SU81-44 and d-f) core BOBGEO-CS05. Blue color represents the Last glacial period and the orange color represents the Deglacial/Holocene period. The dark blue bands show Heinrich Stadials.

Figure 4. Non-metric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) analysis (Bray-Curtis dissimilarity) calculated on relative densities of major species (>5 %) considering two size fraction groups (>63 μm in green and >150 μm in pink) for a) core SU81-44 and b) core BOBGEO-CS05. Triangles correspond to samples from the Heinrich Stadials, squares represent samples from the Last glacial period out of Heinrich Stadials, and circles represent the Deglacial/Holocene period. The convex hulls enclosed each size fraction group. The displayed vectors are the species explaining 90 % of the dissimilarity between the groups based on SIMPER analysis, with $p < 0.01$ (black) and $p > 0.01$ (grey).

Figure 5. Relative abundances (%) of benthic foraminiferal faunas from a-g) core SU81-44 (this study) and h-j) core BOBGEO-CS05 (Depuydt et al., 2022). Full black lines, full red lines and dashed grey lines represent respectively the >150 μm , 63-150 μm and >63 μm . Blue color represents the Last glacial period and the orange color represents the Deglacial/Holocene period. The dark blue bands show Heinrich Stadials. To better highlight the variations of the different species, the scale of the ordinate axis is not constant. Error bars correspond to the binomial standard errors.

Figure 6. Relative abundances (%) of benthic foraminiferal indicator groups in each size fraction (>150 μm , 63-150 μm and >63 μm) for each sample from a) core SU81-44 and b) core

BOBGEO-CS05. Blue color represents the Last glacial period and the orange color represents the Deglacial/Holocene period. The dark blue bands show Heinrich Stadials.

8. Table captions

Table 1. Classification of major species from cores BOBGEO-CS05 and SU81-44 according to ecological indicators groups as proposed by Depuydt et al. (2022). (*) Species identified as major in core SU81-44 and added into the list published in Depuydt et al. (2022).

9. Supplementary materials

Figure S1. a) Map illustrating the variety of size fractions used worldwide in a non-exhaustive list of paleoceanographic studies based on fossil or authic foraminifera; b) list of the 45 studies presented in the map (Google Scholar research with key words: “benthic foraminifera”, “paleoenvironmental studies”, “assemblage”).

Figure S2. Taxonomic reference list of the dominant benthic species (>5 %) and publications where an image is available on which we based our determination.

Figure S3. Non-metric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) analysis (Bray-Curtis dissimilarity) calculated on relative densities of major species (>5 %) considering two size fraction groups (63-150 μm in orange and >150 μm in pink) for a) core SU81-44 and b) core BOBGEO-CS05. Triangles correspond to samples from the Heinrich Stadials, squares represent samples from the Last glacial period out of Heinrich Stadials, and circles represent the Deglacial/Holocene period. The convex hulls enclosed each size fraction group. The displayed vectors are the species explaining 90% of the dissimilarity between the groups based on SIMPER analysis, with $p < 0.01$ (black) and $p > 0.01$ (grey). Shepard's diagrams (actual distances vs. ordination distances between samples) and stress values are presented below.

Figure S4. Shepard's diagrams (actual distances vs. ordination distances between samples) and stress values of a) core SU81-44 and b) core BOBGEO-CS05 to observe the quality of each nMDS analysis.

Table S1. Raw foraminiferal count.

Table S2. Results of the SIMPER test of core a) SU81-44 and b) BOBGEO-CS05. Lines highlighted in grey correspond to species explaining 90 % of dissimilarity between 63-150 μm and $>150 \mu\text{m}$ size fractions. Green species have $p < 0.01$ and red species have $p > 0.01$.

Table S3. Results of the SIMPER test of core a) SU81-44 and b) BOBGEO-CS05. Lines highlighted in grey correspond to species explaining 90 % of dissimilarity between $>63 \mu\text{m}$ and $>150 \mu\text{m}$ size fractions. Green species have $p < 0.01$ and red species have $p > 0.01$.

Abstract

Many paleoenvironmental studies based on benthic foraminiferal assemblages use different protocols for sample analysis. A standardized protocol has been recently established for biomonitoring applications, but for paleostudies, the influence of size fraction on benthic foraminiferal composition and biodiversity is poorly documented. We studied fossil foraminiferal assemblages along two paleorecords (BOBGEO-CS05 and SU81-44) from the Bay of Biscay covering the last ~35 ka cal BP. We investigated diversity and community composition to compare the impact of each size fraction (63-150 μ m, >150 μ m, >63 μ m) on environmental interpretations. Foraminiferal diversity was affected by the accumulation of small opportunistic species. In terms of faunal composition, both paleorecords displayed a different pattern depending on the size fraction selected. While in both cores, the 63-150 μ m fraction blurred the signal of some rare indicator species, our results show that i) in BOBGEO-CS05, it yielded no extra ecological information compared to the large fraction whereas ii) in SU81-44, it contained small opportunistic species that were not present in the >150 μ m, impacting therefore paleoenvironmental interpretations. According to these findings, we recommend: i) to focus on the large fraction for a thorough taxonomic determination and a detailed analysis of benthic assemblages, and ii) to analyse the small fraction separately after a taxonomical identification of major species and strategic selection of studied samples. Although the 125 μ m size limit was not tackled in this study, we recommend to use it for the limit between the small and large fractions instead of 150 μ m for harmonisation with the previously published standardised protocol for living faunas.

Highlights

- We assess the influence of benthic foraminiferal size fraction ($>63\ \mu\text{m}$ and $>150\ \mu\text{m}$) in two paleorecords from the Bay of Biscay
- Paleo-interpretations differ according to the choice of size fraction in the southern record
- The $>150\ \mu\text{m}$ is sufficient for accurate paleo-interpretations in the northern record
- In both records the small fraction (63-150 μm) blurred the signal of some rare indicator species from the $>150\ \mu\text{m}$
- We propose a preliminary protocol for size fraction standardization in foraminiferal-based paleostudies

Journal Pre-proof




Figure 1





Figure 2





Figure 3

a)



b)




Figure 4





Figure 5





Figure 6