Distribution and spatial variation of hydrothermal faunal assemblages at Lucky Strike (Mid-Atlantic Ridge) revealed by high-resolution video image analysis
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Abstract:

Whilst the fauna inhabiting hydrothermal vent structures in the Atlantic Ocean is reasonably well known, less is understood about the spatial distributions of the fauna in relation to abiotic and biotic factors. In this study, a major active hydrothermal edifice (Eiffel Tower, at 1690 m depth) on the Lucky Strike vent field (Mid-Atlantic Ridge (MAR)) was investigated. Video transects were carried out by ROV Victor 6000 and complete image coverage was acquired. Four distinct assemblages, ranging from dense larger-sized \textit{Bathymodiolus} mussel beds to smaller-sized mussel clumps and alvinocaridid shrimps, and two types of substrata were defined based on high definition photographs and video imagery. To evaluate spatial variation, faunal distribution was mapped in three dimensions. A high degree of patchiness characterizes this 11 m high sulfide structure. The differences observed in assemblage and substratum distribution were related to habitat characteristics (fluid exits, depth and structure orientation). Gradients in community structure were observed, which coincided with an increasing distance from the fluid exits. A biological zonation model for the Eiffel Tower edifice was created in which faunal composition and distribution can be visually explained by the presence/absence of fluid exits.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Two decades of research on deep-sea hydrothermal vents in the Atlantic Ocean have led to a reasonably good knowledge of the mega- and macro-fauna inhabiting these chemosynthetic habitats. Rather less is known about the community structure and the spatial and temporal distributions of the fauna in relation to abiotic and biotic factors. In particular, small-scale and detailed spatial distribution studies for the Atlantic hydrothermal vents have been scarce. On the other hand, large-scale variations between Atlantic vent fields, have already been investigated (Desbruyères et al., 2000, 2001).

The most important structuring factor for the composition, distribution and dynamics of deep-sea hydrothermal vent assemblages appears to be the high spatial variability of biotic and abiotic factors related to hydrothermal vent activity and more specifically, the chemical composition and flow intensity of the vent fluids (Hessler et al., 1988; Tunnicliffe, 1991; Sarrazin et al., 1997; Shank et al., 1998; Desbruyères et al., 2001; Luther et al., 2001; Govenar et al., 2005). Consequently, alteration of fluid composition or cessation in fluid flow causes small-scale disturbances on short time-scales and can initiate significant faunal changes (Hessler et al., 1985, 1988; Fustec et al., 1987; Tunnicliffe, 1991; Sarrazin et al., 1997; Shank et al., 1998). Biological interactions are also thought to affect the hydrothermal vent community composition (Fustec et al., 1987; Hessler et al., 1988; Tunnicliffe, 1991; Johnson et al., 1994; Shank et al., 1998; Sarrazin et al., 1999; Mullineaux et al., 2003; Govenar et al.; 2005). Typical examples of biological interactions are predation and competition based, for instance, on trophic (e.g. access to hydrogen sulfide or other resources) and topographic (optimal positioning on the structure or limitation in available space) grounds (Hessler et al., 1985; Fustec et al., 1987; Comtet and Desbruyères, 1998). Food partitioning is likely to play a significant role (Levesque et al., 2006; Limen and Juniper, 2006).

For the Pacific Ocean, spatial distribution and high degrees of patchiness and
heterogeneity at hydrothermal vents have been described by many authors (e.g. Jollivet, 1993; Sarrazin et al., 1997; Tsurumi and Tunnicliffe, 2001, 2003; Govenar et al., 2005); these observations are quite often based on imagery data (e.g. Hessler et al., 1985, 1988; Chevaldonné and Jollivet, 1993; Jollivet, 1993; Grehan and Juniper, 1996; Sarrazin et al., 1997). To date, only a few studies have investigated spatial variation in fauna coverage through video imagery in the Atlantic. These studies took place at Broken Spur (3090m depth, Copley et al., 1997), Menez Gwen (850m depth, Colaço et al., 1998) and TAG (3650m depth, Copley et al., 2007).

The present study assesses spatial variation and distribution patterns of faunal assemblages of a large sulfide edifice located on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge (MAR). A continuous overview of Eiffel Tower, Lucky Strike vent field, is provided, including flow features, community composition and the scale of the geological structural features observed. The overall aim was to test the following hypothesis: the proximity to sources of visible fluid flow strongly influences faunal distribution, regardless of the orientation of the edifice. Using a new faunal mapping technique and high-resolution imagery, we aim to provide the first insights into small-scale heterogeneity and zonation patterns on a MAR vent edifice. This up-to-date approach will serve as a reference basis for future studies of temporal trends at dynamic and extreme deep-sea environments such as hydrothermal vents.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1. Study site

Lucky Strike vent field (37°17.5'N, 32°16’W) was discovered serendipitously in 1992, and has been visually observed since 1993. It is situated in the Azores Triple Junction area at a mean depth of 1700m (Fig. 1a). It is a basalt-hosted site (Langmuir et al., 1997; Fouquet et al., 1998; Desbruyères et al., 2000), consisting of a large lava lake (ca 300m
diameter) surrounded by numerous active vents located mainly in the north-western and south-eastern zones (Charlou et al., 2000; Humphris et al., 2002; Ondréas et al., 2009) (Fig. 1b). Eiffel Tower is a well-defined hydrothermal edifice and one of the most active at Lucky Strike (Fig. 1c), located in the south-eastern region of the vent field. Slabs are present in this area with cracks from which vent fluids originate (Langmuir et al., 1997; Ondréas et al., 1997, 2009). This irregular edifice hosts some intense black smokers (up to 324°C), active flanges and diffusion zones (<200°C), with shimmering water seeping through (Langmuir et al., 1997; Sarradin et al., 1999; Charlou et al., 2000). The fauna of Eiffel Tower is considered to be representative for the entire vent field (Desbruyères et al., 2001). Like other active hydrothermal structures at shallower depths in the Atlantic Ocean, it is covered with dense mussel beds of the mytilid *Bathymodiolus azoricus* (Van Dover, 1995; Langmuir et al., 1997; Comtet and Desbruyères, 1998; Desbruyères et al., 2000, 2001).

### 2.2. Image acquisition

During six (out of eleven) dives to the Eiffel Tower edifice (MoMARETO cruise 2006) video transects were carried out by the ROV Victor 6000 which was equipped with a 3-CCD camera, 2 piloting cameras and 5 additional colour cameras. A total of approximately 10 hours of video transects were dedicated to acquiring complete imagery coverage of this well-defined edifice. Two types of video transects were carried out. (1) Vertical video transects were executed from bottom to top and started at a distance of 4 to 5m from the structure, to allow reconstruction of the entire edifice, heading North, East, South, West and their intermediates (see Fig. 1d for terminology used to identify the different sides). (2) Transects were then repeated at a distance of 1m from the edifice. For each side the same heading was maintained and the pan and tilt of the principal camera was set to zero. Zoom levels were kept constant (wide open) during the video sampling, in order to generate similarly scaled and comparable...
images. Video transects were collected in colour imagery, which allowed a visual study of the assemblages and their distributional patterns. Screen-stills from video imagery had a resolution of 696 x 576 pixels. High definition photographs were taken with a digital still camera (Sony, Cybershot), which was mounted above the principal camera of the ROV and had a resolution of 2048 x 1536 pixels.

2.3. Video Analysis

Faunal assemblages and substrata were identified based on high definition photographs and video images (Fig. 2 and Table 1). Observations and identifications from on-screen individuals were ground-truthed with samples taken during the same cruise and with historical sample lists present in the BIOCEAN database (©Ifremer, Fabri et al., 2006). For each assemblage, mussels were measured to confirm the observed difference between larger- and smaller-sized individuals in order to allow a better distinction to be made between assemblage types.

Screen stills were taken from video transects with ‘Adelie video’ (version 1.8, ©Ifremer 2005) and were used to reconstruct the hydrothermal structure through mosaicing. Mosaics per edifice side and for zoomed-in regions were created manually in Adobe Photoshop Elements 2.2©; pixel lengths were measured and images adjusted one to another and superimposed. The mosaics were used as a template to map the different types of fluid exits (black smokers, active flanges and zones of diffusion) as well as the different assemblages. Visually recognizable geological features on the edifice were used as reference points to localize emissions or assemblages. Vertical transects were studied with different viewing angles (intermediate headings), to make sure no detail was missed and to minimize the distortion effects of protruding rocks, relief and uneven surfaces. Contours were drawn and video transects were watched repeatedly in order to map the fluid exits and the assemblages on the mosaic templates.
using colour coding, so they could be digitized. Visually interpretable maps were created for each side of the tower and the periphery. Sampling instruments present on the structure or visible parts of the ROV, when in the same focal plane, were used to scale the mosaics. The proximity (distance and direction) of the assemblages and substrata to fluid exits was measured, as well as the mean patch size for all assemblages and substrata. Patterns and gradients in assemblage distribution were analysed. Systematic transfer patterns between the different neighbouring assemblages were investigated. Counts were made of the number of times that a patch of assemblage X was bordered by a patch of another type of assemblage (Y). A patch was defined as an enclosed surface occupied by a certain type of assemblage or an uncolonised surface (substratum).

All image analysis operations, i.e. length/distance measurements and surface calculations, are pixel based and were carried out by the Image analysing program IP Lab Spectrum®. Each patch surface was measured 3 times to reduce error from online tracing (in analogy with Sarrazin et al., 1997).

2.4. Statistics

Statistical analyses of percentage cover and distances were carried out both in R (version 2.7, Multicore team 2008) and in Statistica 6 (StatSoft Inc 2001). Ordinations in R were performed with the Vegan package (Oksanen et al., 2008). Data used in the multivariate analyses were linearly distributed hence PCA (Principal Component Analysis) and RDA (Redundancy Analysis) were used. For the cluster analysis Ward’s method was used for Euclidean distances. The Friedman’s test is the non-parametric equivalent of a two-way ANOVA used to compare multiple dependent samples, in this case the size of the patches between the sides. Factorial ANOVA’s and the Tukey HSD post-hoc test were used to compare minimum and maximum distance to a fluid exit between the different assemblages.
and substrata. Correlations (Spearman Rank) were calculated between the number of visible black smokers, flanges and diffusion zones and between the assemblages and substrata, between all sides (n=7, degrees of freedom=5).

3. RESULTS

3.1. Eiffel Tower morphology and activity

The Eiffel Tower edifice extends 11m in height and at most 20m in width and was divided into two parts, a ‘tower’ structure consisting of the upper 8m (summit at 1681m of depth) and a ‘periphery’ including the lower 3-4m until the seafloor is reached at a depth of 1692m. The overall Eiffel Tower morphology did not change drastically during the MoMARETO cruise. However, several structural differences were noted between the dives; black chimneys of freshly precipitated minerals grew more than 0.5m per night (structures were sampled for certain experiments and grew back after one night, sometimes overgrowing sampling devices, D. Cuvelier, pers. obs.).

The number of black smokers and the number of diffusion zones were positively correlated (R²=0.944, p=0.001): their numbers increased proportionally one to another. Flanges were not correlated with either black smokers or diffusion zones. The hydrothermal activity spread out towards the periphery since highly-active black smoker chimneys were observed at the base of the edifice, on the southern periphery and on the structure between North and West sides (Fig. 1d). No activity was observed, however, on the eastern periphery, and no associated life was present. Therefore this part of the structure was not included in the analyses.

3.2. Faunal composition of the Eiffel Tower edifice

The taxonomic composition of the vent fauna inhabiting Eiffel Tower was determined through the use of both video imagery, still photography and past and ongoing faunal
sampling (Table 1). The resolution of video precludes the identification of smaller organisms; however, larger macro- and mega-fauna could be identified in most cases to species level. The main species associated with the vent were the mussel *Bathymodiolus azoricus*, and three species of alvinocaridid shrimp, namely *Mirocaris fortunata*, *Chorocaris chacei* and *Alvinocaris markensis*. Bytograeid crabs (*Segonzacia mesatlantica*) and many other less conspicuous species lived in association with these mussel beds (Desbruyères et al., 2006).

*Bathymodiolus azoricus* was the most abundant component of 2 out of the 4 assemblages, creating a microhabitat for other accompanying organisms (Table 1). Of the three species of shrimps present on Eiffel Tower, *A. markensis* was the most solitary, followed by *C. chacei*, which lived in small groups of low numbers. The smallest species, *M. fortunata*, was the most gregarious and abundant over the entire edifice; it co-occurred with *C. chacei*. *Alvinocaris markensis* was occasionally seen on top of or in between the larger-sized mussel beds. The mobility of all these alvinocaridids decreased when close by or in the actual warm water flow. If present in warm shimmering water, they were almost immobile, in contrast to the rapid movements when moving between and over mussels.

*Segonzacia mesatlantica* (Bytograeidae, Decapoda) is a typical vent species on the MAR and occurred anywhere on the edifice, in shimmering water, crawling in between and over mussel beds and clumps, hiding underneath them or crossing bare surfaces, etc. Sometimes they were observed traversing the microbial mats.

Towards the base and periphery of the edifice, ophiuroids were observed. Although difficult to identify from the video imagery, the species is most likely to be *Ophiocentella acies* (P. Tyler, pers. obs.), which seems to show an affinity for *Bathymodiolus* beds (Desbruyères et al., 2006). Gastropod grazers (Lepetodrilidae and other families) were observed on mussel shells and bare rocks, also mostly towards the base of the structure (Table 1). A diverse associated ichthyofauna was also associated with the edifice. These fish were
observed making regular predatory incursions (e.g. *Hydrolagus pallidus* (Chimaeridae), *Synaphobranchus* sp. (Synaphobranchidae), *Coryphaenoides armatus* (Macrouridae)) or living in cracks and crevices of the chimney (*Gaidropsarus* sp. (Moridae)). * Cataetyx laticeps* (Bythitidae) was observed almost every time a video transect was executed, lying immobile at the base of the edifice. This species often occurred in pairs.

### 3.3. Assemblages

To understand small-scale heterogeneity on the vent edifice, we identified and quantified distinct assemblages defined by the presence or absence of key taxa, their size and their coverage. Distinct substratum types were also identified based on the type of mineralization and, in some cases, microbial cover.

Four distinct assemblages and two substratum types were identified (Fig. 2) of which two assemblages and one substratum had two subordinate forms (“a” without and “b” with visible microbial coverage). Assemblage 1 consisted of dense mussel beds (the mussels are of the larger size class, in general >4cm) often with shrimps crawling over and between them. Some limpets were present on the mussel shells. Assemblage 1 mussel beds were found in the neighbourhood of fluid exits, but they were never present in the hot water flow (Fig. 2a).

Assemblage 2 comprised clusters of mussels (clumps) with bare surface visible between them (Fig. 2b and c, respectively without and with microbial cover). In this case, the mussels were almost always less than 4cm in length. Alvinocaridid shrimps were observed, but they were not as abundant as in Assemblage 1. Uncovered surfaces colonised by shrimps constituted Assemblage 3 (Fig. 2d). *Mirocaris fortunata* was always present, quite often accompanied by less numerous *Chorocaris chacei*. Assemblage 3 was found mostly in the direct proximity of the warm water flow from the fluid exits, or within the flow itself. Assemblage 4 was characterized by dispersed small mussels and/or new recruits on bare surface (the latter
Assemblage 4a had no microbial cover (Fig. 2e), and scattered hydroids and limpets were present next to the newly recruited mussels. Assemblages 4b, with microbial cover, lacked hydroids, but limpets were encountered (Fig. 2e). Assemblage 4 was often situated at the base of the tower (or in the periphery), often with large dead mussel shells below the base, possibly fallen from the wall of the structure.

In addition to the assemblages, two substratum types were detected. The main visual difference between these two substrata is their colour. Substratum 1a was a bare, brownish to reddish uncolonised surface (Fig. 2f) while Substratum 1b represented a similar surface covered by whitish filamentous bacteria (Fig. 2g). Occasionally decapods were present. Substratum 2 had a white-mottled surface due to anhydrite deposits; patchy microbial mats were sometimes also present (Fig. 2h). This substratum often occurred in very hot regions with the presence of black smokers, shimmering water and/or diffusion. Black chimneys composed of freshly deposited minerals were never colonised permanently, but were sometimes visited by shrimps and crabs from surrounding patches (Table 1).

### 3.4. Spatial distribution and size of the assemblages

The visually interpretable maps showing the spatial assemblage and substratum distribution are presented in Fig. 3. Assemblages 4a and 4b were considered as ‘uncolonised’ surface because bare surfaces largely predominate. Counts (number m²) of visible active features (black smokers, flanges and diffusion zones) showed variations between structure sides as well (Table 2).

The East and South sides, which were the least strongly colonised (Fig. 3e and g), had quite large proportions of Assemblages 1 and 3 and Substratum 2 (Fig. 3h) compared to the other sides, and also showed the highest level of visible hydrothermal activity (Table 2).

Conversely, the North and West sides, which were colonised most intensively (Fig. 3a and d),
were dominated by Assemblages 2a and 2b (Fig. 3h) and showed the lowest level of activity (Table 2). The peripheral zones (Fig. 3b, c and f) demonstrated similar trends of high activity, low degree of colonisation, and vice versa. The southern peripheral zone was the least colonised (Fig. 3f) and dominated by Assemblages 4a and 4b (Fig. 3h). It showed a large amount of activity, but this was limited to a few highly-active high-temperature exits (Table 2). The western periphery was the most active, with the highest number of active venting structures in proportion to its surface (Table 2), but the fluid flow was visibly less intense than that on the South side.

The number of patches (see description above in ‘2.3. Video Analysis’) occupied by the different assemblages differed between the sides. Assemblage 2a had always the highest number of patches, regardless of the side it occurred on. However, the total number of patches did not necessarily reflect the total surface covered by an assemblage since the sizes of the patches was variable. For example, while Assemblage 2a had 46 patches on the North side, the surface it covered was estimated to be 4.50 m² on this side of the edifice, while Assemblage 4b with only 16 patches covered 4.54 m².

In most cases, the mean size of a single patch varied between 0.002 and 1 m² for each assemblage across the sides. This must be interpreted with caution, since one big patch can significantly enlarge the mean patch size. The significance of these assumptions was tested with a Friedman’s test for all patch sizes across sides and periphery. For Assemblages 1, 2b, 4a and the substrata, there was no significant difference in patch size between the sides (p>0.05). Outliers were removed for Assemblages 3 and 4b, after which they did not show a significant difference. Assemblage 2a, however, showed significant differences between the sides (p<0.001). This was mainly due to the presence of very large patches on the West side and, to a lesser extent, to those present on the North side of the edifice.

Different correlations were observed between the percentage coverage of the
assemblages. Substratum 1a was negatively correlated with Assemblage 2b (R²=0.73, p=0.014). Substratum 2 was negatively correlated with Assemblage 2a (R²=0.67, p=0.023), but positively correlated with Assemblage 3 (R²=0.73, p=0.014). Assemblage 2a was positively correlated with Assemblage 2b (R²=0.67, p=0.023) and negatively correlated with Assemblage 3 (R²=0.73, p=0.014). The other correlations were not significant.

The ordinations (Fig. 4) showed the same trends as observed on the faunal distribution maps. The different sides were plotted based on the relative percentage coverage of the different assemblages and substrata. The constraints added in the canonical analysis were the number of visible active features per square meter. Major trends were maintained in both PCA and RDA analyses (therefore only RDA is shown, Fig. 4a). On the RDA, almost 62% of the variance was explained by the two axes, with axis 1 explaining 51.8% of the variance. The first axis was able to discriminate the more active (East side, southern periphery (S_periph)) from the less active (North side, northern periphery (N_periph) and West side) sides. The main separation in the ordination plot was caused by Assemblages 2a and 2b on the one hand and Assemblage 4a, 4b and Substratum 1a and 2 on the other. The activity features (black smokers, flanges and diffusion zones) also confirmed the separation of the active and less active sides (Fig. 4a). Two sides of the edifice appeared to be in the middle of the ordination plot, namely the South side and the western periphery (W_periph). The cluster analysis, based on Ward’s method, clarified this (Fig. 4b), showing that the western periphery is more similar to the North side, the northern periphery and the West side. The South side grouped with the East side and the southern periphery, although the similarity was quite low.

Analysis of video images revealed some preliminary trends regarding which assemblages thrive in or can tolerate warm water flows. Most of these trends were confirmed when the distance from a fluid exit to a patch was measured (Fig. 5). A selection of assemblages were found in close proximity (<1m) to the fluid exits. However, only
Assemblage 3 and Substratum 2 seemed to prevail in the warm water flow. Assemblage 1 was always present in the surroundings of fluid exits, but was rarely seen in the warm water flow itself. The minimum distances of these three assemblages to the closest fluid exit were significantly different from the other assemblages (ANOVA, $R^2=0.38$, $p=0.00$). Assemblages with smaller mussels (2a and 2b) were situated further away from the fluid exits. However, for all the sides of the edifice, the assemblage covered with microbial mats (2b) was closer to the fluid exits than the one without (2a). In general, larger patches had a greater probability that their borders are surrounded by different fluid exits.

If a division was made between the different types of fluid exits, black smokers (up to 324°C) and flanges and diffusion zones (<200°C) (Fig. 5 a-b respectively), it was clear that they showed the same trends. Assemblage 3 was found closest to all three types of fluid exits. Assemblage 1 and Substratum 2 showed a similar distribution. The minimum distance of these three assemblages in relation to black smokers was significantly different from that of the other assemblages, while for the flanges and diffusion zones the differences were less obvious. Overall, the minimum distance to flanges and diffuse emissions was half of that to black smokers.

3.5. Neighbouring patterns

Based on video observations, systematic patterns between different neighbouring assemblages appeared to be present. This was confirmed with the analysis of adjacent patches. For the “mussel-based” assemblages, a clear gradient from bare surface with new recruits and scattered mussels (Assemblages 4a and b) to mussel clumps (Assemblages 2a and b) and dense mussel beds (Assemblage 1) was noted. This coincided with an increase in temperature measured in these mussel-based assemblages, respectively ranging from 4.7°C to 12.5°C (Sarrazin et al. in prep).
Each assemblage had at least 2 “preferred” or dominant neighbours, accounting for the occupancy of ca. 50% and more of the adjacent patches (Table 3). The other ca. 50% was divided between the other assemblages and substratum types (n-2=7 with n=9 being the total number of assemblages and substrata). For example, newly formed surface (Substratum 2) was more often bordered by Assemblage 1 and 2a, while Assemblage 3 was more often bordered by Substratum 2 and Assemblage 1. For Assemblages 4a and b, Assemblages 2a and b are the most frequent neighbours.

4. DISCUSSION

In contrast to the diverse assemblages of tubeworms, clams and polychaetes found at hydrothermal vents on the East Pacific Rise (EPR), the shallower vents of the slow-spreading MAR (<2300m depth) are dominated visually, on macrofaunal scales, either by an assemblage of Bathymodiolin mussels (Van Dover, 1995; Turnipseed et al., 2003) or Alvinocaridid shrimps (Desbruyères et al., 2001). Due to the shallower depth of some of these Atlantic vents (e.g. Lucky Strike) and the associated phase separation (i.e. the local pressure-temperature characteristics determine the rate of precipitation of dissolved and particulate metals and sulfide), the hydrothermal fluids lose part of their toxicity, which allows non-vent bathyal fauna to make predatory incursions (Desbruyères et al., 2000). Fishes have been observed to feed on shrimps, crabs and mussels (Saldanha and Biscoito, 1997; Marques and Porteiro, 2000; Desbruyères et al., 2006).

Crucial to our understanding of global macro-ecological patterns are small-scale ecological forcing factors. In particular, the relationships between the substrata, vent activity, fluid flow, temperature and biological tolerances are important. Mid-Atlantic vents differ substantially from those on the EPR in the nature of their abiotic variables. Elucidating the influences of these variables on composition and zonation patterns is one of the main goals of
this study. Using a high-resolution video imaging technique, assemblages were identified and mapped on a typical MAR vent edifice, revealing the potential spatial patterns in relation to visible abiotic factors.

4.1. Spatial and zonation patterns

When the spatial patterns of the assemblages and substrata were analysed, a systematic lateral zonation between the patches was observed, transforming one assemblage into another over distance. Analyzing the occupancy of neighbouring patches was considered the most appropriate way to quantify the number of transfers. A zonation model, summarising the way that assemblages and substrata change across the edifice, is presented in Fig. 6a. The overall driver of this spatial shift in faunal composition is the decrease in fluid flow, i.e. the presence of high temperature fluid exits and proximity to fluid exits (Fig. 6b). Associated with this decrease in flow is the probable decrease in temperature, sulfide and other associated chemicals. Thermal conditions and associated factors like fluid flow play a role in habitat selection, spatial partitioning and distribution of vent animals (Sarrazin et al., 1999; Bates et al., 2005; Levesque et al., 2006; Mills et al., 2007). An idealized scenario of faunal distribution and zonation at Eiffel Tower is shown in Fig. 7.

Faunal assemblages can be divided into three groups (Fig. 6). Assemblages 3 and 1 are associated with the harshest environment. Assemblages 2a and 2b, the most abundant on the edifice, are associated with intermediate conditions and are found at moderate distances from fluid-flow exits. Assemblages 4a and 4b can be regarded as the “recolonisation pools” for the rest of the sulfide structure, hosting new recruits and small mytilids. This sequence of assemblages creates a gradient in mussel densities. Among the substrata, Substratum 2 is characterized by the co-occurrence of precipitated anhydrite and shimmering water suggesting the presence of a high permeability. Substratum 1b is colonised by microbial mats and is more
abundant at a greater distance from the fluid exits. A spatial segregation between different microbial communities (present in Assemblages 2b, 4b, Substratum 1b and 2) may be a response to a temperature gradient. In addition, the existence of intra-specific (between mussels) and inter-specific (bacteria and mussels, mussels and shrimp) competition for access to resources (e.g. sulfide) could play a role in structuring the spatial distribution of the different communities.

The main interacting factors likely to drive the observed assemblage and substratum distribution and zonation are thus twofold, namely abiotic constraints and biotic interactions. Based on experimental manipulations, abiotic gradients and biotic interactions are believed to act jointly to shape benthic vent communities (Micheli et al., 2002, Lenihan et al., 2008). Abiotic constraints include the geomorphology, porosity and composition of the substratum as well as the presence/absence and proximity of fluid exits. Although they were not tested in the present study, biotic interactions must exert an important control on the observed distribution of the fauna (Shank et al. 1998, Sarrazin et al. 2002, Mullineaux et al. 2003). They include the community induced changes in microhabitat, e.g. changes in sulfide concentrations resulting from biological uptake and dilution (Johnson et al., 1994), competition and predator-prey interactions (Micheli et al., 2002). Their exact role and importance, however, is difficult to asses based on imagery.

Mussels may out-compete other sessile chemosynthetic macrofauna for access to vent fluid (Lenihan et al., 2008). They have several advantages over other vent animals. For example, dense mussel beds are able to redirect the fluid flow horizontally (Johnson et al., 1994) explaining the existence of vast mussel beds. In addition, their motility enables them to escape from unfavourable environmental conditions or to colonise newly formed habitats. Species of *Bathymodiolus* have been observed moving 0.74cm per hour (Govenar et al., 2004). Temporal evolution studies and manipulative experiments are needed to test these hypotheses
and to enhance our knowledge with regard to assemblage dynamics.

4.2. Assemblages on the Eiffel Tower edifice

4.2.1. Mussel-based assemblages

The dominant megafaunal species, and the main constituent of Assemblages 1, 2a and 2b, is *Bathymodiolus azoricus*. *Bathymodiolus* is the most widespread genus in deep-sea chemosynthetic environments, present in both cold seeps and hydrothermal vents (Tyler and Young, 1999). The definition of the assemblages is partially based on a visible difference between big and small mussels that was confirmed by length measurements. In the case of Eiffel Tower, the mussels belonging to a larger size class form dense mussel beds (Assemblage 1) and are relatively more abundant, compared to Assemblages 2a and 2b (mussel clumps), on the more active sides. On all sides of the edifice, a spatial segregation of the assemblages based on their proximity to fluid exits is observed.

Larger mussels (Assemblage 1) are found in the close proximity of a fluid exit, suggesting that they may be able to survive a somewhat more hostile environment than the smaller-sized mussels (Desbruyères et al., 2001). The observations presented here support a spatial segregation of mytilid sizes at Eiffel Tower as described previously (Comtet and Desbruyères, 1998; Sarradin et al., 1999; Desbruyères et al., 2001). In contrast to the present observations, the mussels in the Lau Basin (SW Pacific) live further away from the fluid exits. Zonation studies show *Bathymodiolus brevior* to have a low thermal tolerance but a high autotrophic capacity. Like *B. azoricus*, *B. brevior* avoids direct contact with vent fluids, although it can stand high concentrations of sulfide (Henry et al., 2008; Waite et al. 2008).

Mytilids use their byssus threads to attach to the substratum, which allows them to grow almost everywhere on the edifice and to connect to other individuals, resulting in ‘stacking’ several layers deep (Johnson et al., 1994). In this regard, the permeability of the
substratum and the thermal tolerance of the animals appear to play a significant role in the faunal distribution observed. Shrimps (Assemblage 3) can get closest to the fluid exits. They are very mobile, are not attached to the substratum and have a temperature resistance up to 36°C (Shillito et al., 2006). Therefore they can survive on the highly permeable substrata close to the fluid exits (e.g. Substratum 2). This is supported by the positive correlation between Substratum 2 and Assemblage 3. Mussels, on the other hand, are not observed on newly formed surfaces, either because they have more difficulties attaching to this substratum or they are less tolerant of warm fluid flows.

The dependence of the mussel community on the lateral dispersion of vent fluids by the physical structure of the community makes individuals at the boundaries vulnerable to a disruption in reduced chemical supply. A limit to autotrophy would constrain the growth rates within the vent environment, enhancing the spatial segregation between large and small sizes and their proximity to fluid exits. We speculate that individuals living closer to fluid exits could have a faster growth rate, or are able to attain larger sizes because there is no limit to sulfide and methane (see Bergquist et al., 2004 on Bathymodiolus childressi at cold seeps).

In the Pacific hydrothermal vents Bathymodiolus species are regarded as the final survivors in waning vent fields. When the activity decreases they tend to out-compete the siboglinid tubeworms (Hessler at al., 1985). Mussel beds offer a complex secondary surface and interstitial microhabitats for associated species (Van Dover and Trask, 2000). The provision of complex physical structures by foundation species plays a role in the composition and diversity of vent communities. It contributes to altering the physico-chemical environment, and thus influences the physiology of the organisms (Bergquist et al., 2004; Govenar and Fisher, 2007). Although naturally high densities of mussels can directly or indirectly inhibit recruitment of invertebrates at deep-sea hydrothermal vents (Lenihan et al., 2008), gastropod grazers are found on the mussel shells, possibly feeding on the microbial
cover. In addition, some gastropod species at other vent sites have been observed to (re)position themselves along thermal gradients, looking for the ideal temperature regime (Bates et al., 2005; Mills et al., 2007).

New mytilid recruits occur on the mussel shells in the other assemblages and in larger numbers on bare substratum in Assemblage 4, which is present on all sides, tower and periphery, of the edifice, mostly at the base. Assemblage 4 can be either closer to lower temperature exits (e.g. flanges, diffuse flow) or further away from high temperature black smokers. Often dead mussel shells can be encountered in the immediate vicinity. A change in the porosity of the substratum or local (de)activation might explain this observation.

Decapod predators and scavengers (Segonzacia mesatlantica, Mirocaris fortunata, Chorocaris chacei and Alvinocaris markensis) are all very mobile and can occur anywhere on the edifice, but they are most abundant in the more hydrothermally-active zones. Segonzacia mesatlantica appears to require rougher vertical substrata onto which they can grip, or horizontal platforms from which they cannot slip off, or mussel beds that provide ample support.

4.2.2. Shrimp assemblage

The occurrence of shrimp (Assemblage 3) is an indication for the proximity of vent fluid exits since they are usually present in the warm water flow. The higher abundance of Alvinocarididae on the more active East and South sides and the peripheral zones can be explained by the higher hydrothermal activity observed there. At Eiffel Tower, the shrimps may be predators and/or scavengers, consuming free-living bacteria present in the hydrothermal solution flows or ingesting other small invertebrates (Gebruk et al., 2000; Colaço et al., 2002). Shrimps also exhibit a more opportunistic behaviour as they can be observed feeding on broken mussel shells. Segonzacia mesatlantica consumes shrimps and
other small invertebrates (Voight, 2000; Colaço et al., 2002) and were also abundantly present at broken mussel shell sites. *Mirocaris fortunata* is present in almost all samples taken at Eiffel Tower (Sarrazin et al., in prep.) suggesting that they live in the interstitial spaces between the mytilids or hidden in the cracks and crevices from which fluids enriched in micro-organisms can be emanating.

4.3. Comparison between the edifice sides

The hydrothermally most active sides of Eiffel Tower show a lower degree of colonisation and share a similar composition. Analogously the less active sides display a high degree of colonisation with a comparable composition. However, if there is no hydrothermal activity there is no visible vent-associated fauna. While carrying out video-transects, the temperature sensor on the ROV Victor registered up-welling clouds of hot fluids present at East and South sides and the highest temperature was reached at the top of the edifice. Similar patterns were observed for the North and West sides but the temperature differences were considerably smaller than on the more active sides (ca. 1.2°C for the North and West sides compared to 4°C for the East and South sides). The sides that were considered the most active showed the highest temperatures, linking temperature with flow vigour as already suggested by Sarrazin et al. (1997) for the Pacific.

The highest percentage of colonisation can be found on the West side of the edifice. The mussel shells are mostly of a smaller size range than on the other sides (dominance of Assemblages 2a and 2b; Fig. 3h). Many mussels on the West side were observed with their siphons opening upwards. This might be explained by the fact that *Bathymodiolus azoricus* is capable of filter feeding, in addition to supporting a nutritional relationship with the bacterial symbionts in its gill tissue (Tunnicliffe, 1991; Colaço et al., 2002). The limited supply of hydrothermal fluids and reduced chemicals on the West side might constrain their growth,
explaining the high abundance of smaller sized individuals on this side. According to a
carbon-flux model developed by Martins et al. (2008), small mussels depend more on filter
feeding than big mussels, which rely mostly on chemosynthesis.

The western periphery is fairly active compared to the tower. We suggest that the
West side tower is less permeable since there are almost no fluid exits. Fluids may have been
redirected towards the periphery because the main tower was partially clogged. The south
peripheral zone is very active and shows a low degree of colonisation. The percentage of
colonisation is equally divided between the different faunal assemblages (1, 2a, 2b and 3 –
Fig. 3(h)). Individuals of *B. azoricus* living in this zone are quite large (≥4cm). Most likely
these adults originate from the main tower 1 or 2m away.

4.4. Habitat and substrata

Hydrothermal vent fields and sites are very changeable environments. Unlike the high
frequency of eruptive events on fast-spreading ridges, drastic changes in the Atlantic Ocean
are rather rare (Van Dover, 1995), but a certain degree of (sulfide) accretion is responsible for
some structural changes (Haymon et al., 1983), providing additional substrata for fauna to
occupy (Copley et al., 1997; Sarrazin et al., 1997; Butler et al., 1998). Some of these rapid
accretions are responsible for certain over-night changes in the appearance of the Eiffel Tower
edifice.

The presence of shimmering water and even black smokers at the base and the
peripheral zones could be explained by the redirection of the fluids. During the life span of a
hydrothermal vent, the edifice can become clogged by mineral precipitation. Sulfide
deposition causes loss of pore connectivity in the sediment, thus drastically reducing the
substratum permeability and fluid flow rate (Zhu et al., 2007). The fluids may be redirected
towards the periphery, as observed on Juan de Fuca Ridge (Sarrazin et al., 1997).
The colour of the substratum can depend on the nature of the minerals precipitating from the vent fluids. Substratum 1a has no visible mineral precipitation and is unable to support vent-endemic fauna, probably because it is not permeable, i.e. no hot fluids can seep through. It can be present as small patches between the faunal assemblages or as larger patches further away from the fluid exits and nearly always at the base of the structure. In contrast, Substratum 2, which is characterised by obvious anhydrite precipitation, appears to be permeable, letting warm fluids flow through. It often seems to act as a buffer zone between the fluid exits and the faunal patches. Substratum 1b can be covered by thick microbial mats that can serve as a feeding ground for grazing organisms further away from the fluid exits.

The nature of the substratum (porosity, composition and instability) may play an important role in structuring vent assemblages and its importance should not be underestimated (Tunnicliffe, 1991; Grehan and Juniper, 1996; Copley et al., 1997; Shank et al., 1998; Sarrazin et al., 2002; Tsurumi and Tunnicliffe, 2003; Zhu et al., 2007).

5. CONCLUSION

Our study has revealed a patchy zonation of biological assemblages around fluid exits on the Eiffel Tower hydrothermal construct (Fig. 7). A fluid exit is always bordered by Substratum 2 that can be colonised by shrimps (transforming into Assemblage 3) followed by larger-sized mussels (Assemblage 1). Beyond this point, a decrease in mussel densities and sizes occurs with increasing distance from the fluid exits (Assemblages 2 to Assemblages 4) as well as an increase in the area of bare surface between the mussel clumps. A gradient is thus created by the presence or absence of fluid exits and the fluid flow dynamics. This implies a spatial segregation of assemblages based on proximity to fluid exits and correlated environmental factors. As a result, there is a greater similarity in the percentage coverage of faunal assemblages and substrata between the highly active sides of the hydrothermal edifice.
The same relationship applies to the less active sides. The influence of factors such as geomorphology and porosity of the substrata on assemblage distribution should not be underestimated. These can constrain the ability of fauna to colonise certain regions. Biological interactions are another likely factor influencing faunal distributions, although their importance is difficult to verify based on imagery.
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Figures

Fig. 1. (a) Hydrothermal vent fields of the northern Mid-Atlantic Ridge. The major transform faults are shown as well. Image modified from Desbruyères et al. (2001). (b) Bathymetric map of the Lucky Strike vent field area at a mean depth of 1700m (Flores 1998©Ifremer, resolution: 20m). The Lucky Strike vent field consists of 3 seamounts surrounding a lava lake. (c) Microbathymetric map of Eiffel Tower (MoMARETO 2006©Ifremer, resolution=20cm), which is situated in the south-eastern region, on the saddle between two seamounts. (d) Terminology of the different sides used in this study.

Fig. 2. Faunal assemblages identified at Eiffel Tower hydrothermal edifice. (a) Assemblage 1: Dense *Bathymodiolus azoricus* beds (the mussels are of the larger size class, in general > 4cm), occasionally patchy microbial mats can be present. (b) Assemblage 2a: *Bathymodiolus azoricus* clumps (in this case the mussels are almost always less than 4cm in length) separated by bare surface without visible microbial mats or (c) Assemblage 2b: with visible microbial mats. (d) Assemblage 3: Bare surface ‘colonised’ by Alvinocarididae (*Mirocaris fortunata* and/or *Chorocaris chacei*). (e) Bare surface with mussel “veins” and very small mussels (possibly new recruits) without visible microbial mats (Assemblage 4a) and with visible microbial mats (Assemblage 4b). (f) Substratum 1a represents bare dark brownish, sometimes slightly reddish surfaces (with on the image the fish *Gaidropsarus* sp. hiding in a crevice). (g) Substratum 1b represents bare surfaces with visible microbial mats. (h) Substratum 2 represents bare surfaces with clear mineral precipitation (whitish, greyish) and with possible
microbial presence as well (cf. Table 1). Predators and scavengers (*Segonzacia mesatlantica* (Bythograeidae), *Mirocaris fortunata*, *Chorocaris chacei* and *Alvinocaris markensis* and some fishes) can be present on top of these assemblages. Scales were not put on the individual pictures due to malfunctioning of the laser pointers during the 2006 cruise. The surface covered by each image depends on the zoom-level, proximity to the edifice and irregularity of the edifice.

Fig. 3. Spatial distribution of faunal assemblages and substrata on each side of the Eiffel Tower hydrothermal edifice (Lucky Strike vent field, MAR). (a) North side, (b) Northern periphery, (c) Western periphery, (d) West side, (e) South side, (f) Southern periphery, (g) East side and (h) stacked histogram representing the % of coverage per assemblage.

Fig. 4. Ordinations (canonical analyses) based on the relative percentage coverage of each assemblage and substratum on each side of the Eiffel Tower structure. PCA showed exactly the same tendencies as the RDA and is therefore not shown. (a) Redundancy Analysis (RDA), where the number of visible active features (n.m²) acted as constraints. The horizontal and vertical axes together take into account 61.9% of the variation between the sides, although the horizontal axis is clearly more important. (b) Ward’s cluster analysis. Clustering of the different sides of Eiffel Tower based on assemblage coverage. The agglomeration method used was Ward’s method which minimizes the Sum of Squares between two formed clusters (the most similar sides cluster together first). The patterns are similar to those revealed by the canonical analysis. The positioning of the South side and the western periphery, which were difficult to interpret in the RDA, are clarified in the cluster analysis (S_periph=southern periphery, N_periph=northern periphery, W_periph=western periphery).

Fig. 5. Minimum and maximum distances of the assemblages (n=6) and substrata (n=3) were measured to the different activity features and their associated temperature regimes; (a). black smokers (324°C) and (b). flanges and diffusion zones (<200°C).

Fig. 6. The neighbour transfer patterns between assemblages and substrata are presented in a zonation model (a). For each assemblage the adjacent patches were analysed. This resulted in 2 ‘favourite’ neighbours (2 arrows) accounting for more than 50% occupancy of the adjacent patches (cf. Table 3). The primary driving force (b) that coincides with this zonation pattern is shown as well.

Fig. 7. A conceptual model representing an idealized biological zonation of assemblages and substratum distribution at Eiffel Tower, taking into account all results presented this study. Patches occupied by assemblages and substrata are positioned on the structure in a way that
represents their relative size and positions relative to other assemblages and to the fluid exit. Mean patch sizes are in proportion as well as the relative distance to the fluid exit. Faunal assemblages (1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4a, 4b) are represented by a sketch, substrata are named on the patch itself (Sub 1a, Sub 1b, Sub 2). Some predators are represented as well; *Cataetyx laticeps* (Pisces) is lying at the bottom of the structure, and *Hydrolagus pallidus* (Pisces) is passing by left of the sulfide structure. The presence of the crab, *Segonzacia mesatlantica*, is mostly driven by the presence of a food source.

**Tables**
Table 1. Composition of the faunal assemblages and substrata as well as several physico-chemical and topographic characteristics, all based on visual observations. Since the identification of the assemblages was based on video imagery, only mega- and macro-faunal species are represented here. Ophiuroids and fish were not included because there was no discernable pattern to their occurrence ++ Abundant, + present, ( ) occasional, - absent. (Ass = Assemblage, Sub = Substratum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fauna</th>
<th>Ass 1</th>
<th>Ass 2a</th>
<th>Ass 2b</th>
<th>Ass 3</th>
<th>Ass 4a</th>
<th>Ass 4b</th>
<th>Sub 1a</th>
<th>Sub 1b</th>
<th>Sub2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bivalvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mytilidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathymodiolus azoricus (Larger sized)</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathymodiolus azoricus (Smaller sized)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathymodiolus azoricus (New recruits)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decapoda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvinocarididae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirocaris fortunata</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorocaris chacei</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvinocaris markensis</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bythograeidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segonzacia mesatlantica</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastropoda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpets (Lepetodrilus atlanticus, Pseudorimula midatlantica, Protolira valvatoide)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnidaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydroids</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-organisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible microbial mats</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Flow features                  |       |        |        |       |        |        |        |        |      |
| proximity of black smoker      | ++ | + | + | ++ | - | - | - | - | ++ |
| proximity of flange/diffusion zones | ++ | + | + | ++ | ++ | ++ | - | + | ++ |
| in flow                       | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat characteristics</th>
<th>possibly everywhere</th>
<th>possibly everywhere</th>
<th>possibly everywhere</th>
<th>possibly everywhere, rougher substrata</th>
<th>Mainly edifice base and periphery</th>
<th>Mainly edifice base and periphery</th>
<th>Mainly edifice base and periphery</th>
<th>possibly everywhere</th>
<th>possibly everywhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Percentage of the edifice that is colonised by fauna and the number of active features (n=black smokers, flanges and diffusion zones) per m² for each side. The least colonised side of the tower (upper 8m) is the most active one and vice versa. The peripheral zones (lower 3m until sea bottom is reached) show similar trends. Highest activity and degree of colonisation values are marked in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tower</th>
<th>% coverage/colonisation</th>
<th># active features (n/m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>28.11</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>82.82</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>58.85</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periphery</th>
<th>% coverage/colonisation</th>
<th># active features (n/m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East periphery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South periphery</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West periphery</td>
<td>54.10</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North periphery</td>
<td>64.54</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Representation of the dominant neighbouring patches (2 for each assemblage), responsible for an occupancy of ca. 50% of the adjacent patches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant neighbours</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assemblage 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substratum 2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblage 2a</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblage 2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblage 2b</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substratum 2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblage 2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblage 2a</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblage 1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assemblage 3        |     |     |
| Substratum 2        | 34.5| 64.1|
| Assemblage 1        | 29.6|     |

| Assemblage 4a       |     |     |
| Substratum 2        | 32.9| 55.9|
| Assemblage 2a       | 23.0|     |

| Assemblage 4b       |     |     |
| Assemblage 2a       | 34  | 60.4|
| Assemblage 2b       | 26.4|     |

| Substratum 1a       |     |     |
| Assemblage 2a       | 25.7| 45.1|
| Assemblage 4a       | 19.4|     |

| Substratum 1b       |     |     |
| Assemblage 2a       | 29.3| 55.8|
| Assemblage 2b       | 26.5|     |

| Substratum 2        |     |     |
| Assemblage 2a       | 29.2| 56.5|
| Assemblage 1        | 27.3|     |
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