

Faunal carbon flows in the abyssal plain food web of the Peru Basin have not recovered during 26 years from an experimental sediment disturbance

Tanja Stratmann^{1*}, Lidia Lins^{2†}, Autun Purser³, Yann Marcon^{3□}, Clara F. Rodrigues⁴, Ascensão Ravara⁴,
5 Marina R. Cunha⁴, Erik Simon-Lledó⁵, Daniel O. B. Jones⁵, Andrew K. Sweetman⁶, Kevin Köser⁷, Dick
van Oevelen¹

¹NIOZ Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research, Department of Estuarine and Delta Systems, and Utrecht University,
P.O. Box 140, 4400 AC Yerseke, The Netherlands.

²Marine Biology Research Group, Ghent University, Krijgslaan 281 S8, 9000 Ghent, Belgium.

10 [†]present address: Senckenberg Research Institute, Senckenberganlage 25, 60325 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

³Deep Sea Ecology and Technology, Alfred Wegener Institute, Am Handelshafen 12, 27570 Bremerhaven, Germany.

[□]MARUM-Center for Marine Environmental Sciences, General Geology - Marine Geology, University of Bremen, D-28359
Bremen, Germany

15 ⁴Departamento de Biologia & Centro de Estudos do Ambiente e do Mar (CESAM), Departamento de Biologia, Universidade
de Aveiro, Campus de Santiago, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal

⁵National Oceanography Centre, University of Southampton Waterfront Campus, European Way, Southampton SO14 3ZH,
UK.

⁶Marine Benthic Ecology, Biogeochemistry and In-situ Technology Research Group, The Lyell Centre for Earth and Marine
Science and Technology, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh EH14 4AS, UK.

20 ⁷GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research, FE Marine Geosystems, Wischhofstr 1-3, 24148 Kiel, Germany.

Correspondence to: Tanja Stratmann (tanja.stratmann@nioz.nl)

Abstract

Future deep-sea mining for polymetallic nodules in abyssal plains will impact the benthic ecosystem, but it is largely unclear
whether this ecosystem will be able to recover from mining disturbance and if so, at what time scale and to ~~which-what~~ extent.
In

25 1989, during the ‘DISturbance and reCOLonization’ (DISCOL) experiment, a total of 22% of the surface within a 10.8 km²
~~large~~-circular area of the nodule-rich seafloor in the Peru Basin (SE Pacific) was ploughed to bury nodules and mix the surface
sediment. This area was revisited 0.1, 0.5, 3, 7, and 26 ~~years-yr~~ after the disturbance to assess macrofauna, megafauna and
fish density and diversity. We used this unique abyssal faunal time series to develop carbon-based food web models for
disturbed (sediment inside the plough tracks) and undisturbed (sediment inside the experimental area, but outside the
plough tracks)

30 sites. We developed a linear inverse model (LIM) to resolve carbon flows ~~between-among~~ 7 different feeding types within
macrofauna, megafauna and fish. ~~The~~-total faunal biomass was always higher at the undisturbed sites compared ~~to-with~~ the
disturbed sites, and 26 ~~years-yr~~ post_-disturbance the biomass at the disturbed sites was only 54% of the biomass at
undisturbed sites. Fish and sub- surface deposit feeders experienced ~~a~~-particularly large temporal variability in biomass and
model-reconstructed respiration rates making it difficult to determine disturbance impacts. Deposit feeders were least
affected by the disturbance, with

35 respiration, external predation and excretion levels ~~only~~-reduced by ~~only~~ 2.6% in the sediments disturbed 26 ~~-years~~ ago
compared

with undisturbed areas. In contrast, the respiration rate of filter and suspension feeders was still 79.5% lower after 26 ~~years~~ ~~yr~~ ~~when comparing the same sites~~. The 'total system throughput' (T_{total}), i.e. the total sum of carbon flows in the food web, was always higher at undisturbed sites compared ~~to~~ ~~with~~ the corresponding disturbed sites and was lowest at disturbed sites directly after the disturbance ($8.63 \times 10^{-3} \pm 1.58 \times 10^{-5} \text{ mmol C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$). ~~Therefore, Even~~ 26 ~~years~~ ~~yr~~ after the DISCOL disturbance, the

5 throughput discrepancy between the undisturbed and the disturbed sediment was still 56%. From these results we conclude that C cycling within the faunal compartments of an abyssal plain ecosystem remains reduced 26 ~~years~~ ~~yr~~ after physical disturbance, and that a longer period of ~~time~~ is required for the system to recover from such a simulated small-scale, deep-sea mining, experimental disturbance.

1 Introduction

10 Abyssal plains cover approximately 50% of the world's surface and 75% of the seafloor (Ramirez-Llodra et al., 2010). The abyssal seafloor is primarily composed of soft sediments consisting of fine-grained erosional detritus and biogenic particles (Smith et al., 2008). Occasionally, hard substrate occurs ~~occasionally~~ in the form of clinkers from steam ships, glacial drop stones, outcrops of basaltic rock, whale carcasses, and marine litter (Amon et al., 2017; Kidd and Huggett, 1981; Radziejewska, 2014; Ramirez-Llodra et al., 2011; Ruhl et al., 2008). In some ~~soft-soft~~ sediment regions, islands of hard substrate are provided by

15 polymetallic nodules, authigenically formed deposits of metals, ~~which that~~ grow at approximate ~~rates~~ ~~ly~~ of 2 to 20 mm per million years (Guichard et al., 1978; Kuhn et al., 2017). These nodules have ~~the shapes~~ and sizes of cauliflower florets, cannon balls or potatoes, and are found on the sediment surface and in the sediment at depths between 4000 and 6000 m in areas of the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian Ocean (Devey et al., 2018; Kuhn et al., 2017).

20 Polymetallic nodules are rich in metals, such as nickel, copper, cobalt, molybdenum, zirconium, lithium, yttrium and ~~rare-rare~~ earth elements (Hein et al., 2013), and occur in sufficient densities for potential exploitation by ~~the~~ commercial mining ~~industry~~ in the Clarion-Clipperton Fracture Zone (CCFZ; equatorial Pacific), around the Cook Islands (equatorial Pacific), in the Peru Basin (E Pacific) and in the ~~Central-central~~ Indian Ocean ~~Basin-basin~~ (Kuhn et al., 2017). Extracting these polymetallic nodules during deep-sea mining operations will have severe impacts on the benthic ecosystem, such as the removal of hard substrate (i.e.

25 nodules) and the food-rich surface sediments from the seafloor, physically causing the mortality of organisms within the mining tracks and re-settlement of resuspended particles (Levin et al., 2016; Thiel and Tiefsee-Umweltschutz, 2001). ~~Defining~~ ~~Choosing appropriate~~ regulations on deep-sea mining requires knowledge ~~on~~ ~~of~~ ecosystem recovery from these activities, but to date information on these rates is not extensive (Gollner et al., 2017; Jones et al., 2017; Stratmann et al., 2018; Stratmann et al., in review; Vanreusel et al., 2016). Especially the recovery of ecosystem functions, such as ~~food-food~~-web structure and

carbon (C) cycling, from deep-
30 sea mining is understudied.

In the Peru Basin (SE Pacific), small-scale, deep-sea mining activities were simulated during the 'DISturbance and reCOLonization' experiment (DISCOL) in 1989. A 10.8 km² ~~large~~-circular area was ploughed diametrically 78 times with an 8 m ~~-~~wide plough-harrow to bury ~~the~~-surface nodules into the sediment (Thiel and Schriever, 1989). This experimental disturbance resulted in a heavily disturbed centre and a less affected periphery of the DISCOL area (Bluhm, 2001; Foell et al., 5 1990; Foell et al., 1992). Over 26 ~~years-yr~~ the region was re-visited five times to assess the ~~Postpost-Disturbance-disturbance~~ (PD) situation: directly after the disturbance event, March 1989: (hereafter referred to as 'PD_{0.1}'); half a year later, September 1989: 'PD_{0.5}'; three years later, January 1992: 'PD₃'; seven years later, February 1996: 'PD₇'; 26 years later, September 2015: 'PD₂₆'. Following the original definition by Bluhm (2001), we denote sites within the DEA (DISCOL Experimental Area), but not directly disturbed by the plough harrow as 'undisturbed sites' and sites that were directly impacted by the plough harrow as 10 'disturbed sites' (Bluhm, 2001). During subsequent visits, densities of macrofauna and megafauna were assessed, but data on meiofaunal and microbial communities were ~~only-sparsely~~-collected ~~only sparsely~~. Therefore, the ~~food-food~~-web models presented in this work cover ~~a-period-of~~ 1989 to 2015 and contain ~~only~~ macrofauna, megafauna and fish.

Linear inverse modelling (LIM) is an approach that has been developed to disentangle carbon flows between ~~food-food~~-web 15 compartments for data-sparse systems (Klepper and Van de Kamer, 1987; Vézina and Platt, 1988). It has been applied to assess differences in ~~carbon (C)~~ and nitrogen (N) cycling in various ecosystems, including the ~~abyssal-abyssal~~-plain food web at Station M (NE Pacific) under various particulate organic carbon (POC) flux regimes (Dunlop et al., 2016), and a comparison of ~~food-~~web flows between abyssal hills and plains at the Porcupine Abyssal Plain (PAP) in the north-eastern Atlantic (Durden et al., 2017). LIM is based on the principle of mass ~~balancing-balance and~~ various data sources (Vézina and Platt, 1988), i.e., faunal biomasses and 20 physiological constraints, that are implemented in the model, either as ~~equality-equalities~~ or ~~inequality-inequalities~~~~equations~~, and ~~these-they~~ are solved simultaneously (van Oevelen et al., 2010). A ~~food-~~web model almost always includes more inequalities than equalities, i.e., it is mathematically under-determined, which implies that an infinite number of solutions will solve the models. In this case, a likelihood approach can be used to generate a large data ~~set~~ of possible solutions for the model (van Oevelen et al., 2010), from which ~~the-means~~ and standard deviations for each flow ~~is-are~~ calculated. ~~Food-Food-~~web models from different sites and/or points in 25 time can be compared quantitatively by calculating network indices, such as the 'total system throughput' (T_{\cdot}) that sums all carbon flows in the food web (Kones et al., 2009). Hence, a decrease in the difference of T_{\cdot} between the food webs from undisturbed and corresponding disturbed sites (ΔT_{\cdot}) over time is taken as a sign of ecosystem recovery following disturbance.

In this study, benthic food-web models were developed for undisturbed ~~sites~~-and disturbed sites at DISCOL to assess whether 30 faunal biomass and trophic composition of the food webs varied and/or converged between the two sites over time. ~~M~~~~The~~ ~~m~~odel outcomes were compared with conceptual and qualitative predictions on benthic community recovery from

polymetallic nodule mining published by Jumars (1981). Additionally, it was investigated how ΔT developed over time to infer the recovery rate of C flows from experimental deep-sea disturbance in the Peru Basin.

2 Methods

2.1 Data availability

Macrofauna, megafauna and fish density data (mean \pm std; ind. m⁻²) for the first four cruises (PD_{0.1} to PD₇) were extracted from the original papers (Bluhm, 2001 annex 2.8; Borowski, 2001; Borowski and Thiel, 1998), and methodological details can be

- 5 found in those papers. In brief, macrofaunal samples (> 500 μ m size fraction) were collected with a 0.25 m² box-corer, and densities of megafauna and fish were assessed on still photos and videos taken with a towed “Ocean Floor Observation System” (OFOS) underwater camera system. During the PD₂₆ cruise (RV Sonne cruise SO242-2; Boetius, 2015), macrofauna were collected with a square 50 \times 50 \times 60 cm box-corer (disturbed sites: n = 3; undisturbed sites: n = 7), and the upper 5 cm of sediment ~~was-were~~ sieved on a 500 μ m sieve (Greinert, 2015). All organisms retained on the sieve were preserved in 96% un-
- 10 denaturated ethanol on board (Greinert, 2015) and were sorted and identified ashore under a stereomicroscope to the same taxonomic level as the previous cruises ~~under a stereomicroscope~~. Megafauna and fish density during the PD₂₆ cruise ~~was were~~ acquired by deploying the OFOS (Boetius, 2015). Every 20 s, the OFOS automatically took a picture ~~of the seafloor at an from~~ approximately ~~altitude of~~ 1.5 m above the seafloor (Boetius, 2015; Stratmann et al., in review), resulting in 1,740 images of plough marks (disturbed sites) and 6,624 images from undisturbed sites (Boetius, 2015). A subset of 300 pictures from the disturbed sites (surface area:
- 15 1,440.6 m²) and 300 pictures from the undisturbed sites (surface area: ~~1,420.4~~ m²) were randomly selected from the original set of pictures and annotated using the open-source annotation software PAPA(ZZ)I (Marcon and Purser, 2017). Megafauna were identified to the same taxonomic levels as for the previous megafauna studies conducted within the DEA (Bluhm, 2001), whereas fishes were identified to genus ~~level~~ using the CCZ-species atlas (www.ccfzatlas.com).
- 20 The above-mentioned density data collected for macrofauna, megafauna and fish were used to build ~~food-food~~-web models to resolve carbon fluxes; hence, all faunal density data ~~needed-required~~ conversion into carbon units before they ~~can-could~~ be used in the ~~food-food~~-web model. Converting density data to carbon biomass ~~values~~ was challenging in the current study, as few to no conversion factors for deep-sea faunas are available in the literature. Below, we describe the approach ~~that~~ we used to tackle this ~~hurdle-problem~~ for macrofauna, megafauna and fish.
- 25 ~~In case of a macrofaunal specimen, m~~Measuring the carbon content ~~of a macrofaunal specimen~~ requires its complete combustion, which means that the specimen cannot be kept as ~~a voucher-specimen in scientific collections~~. ~~M~~The ~~macrofaunal~~ samples collected for this study are part of the Biological Research Collection of Marine Invertebrates (Department of Biology & Centre for Environmental and Marine Studies, University of Aveiro, Portugal) and were therefore not sacrificed. Instead, we used the C conversion factors of macrofaunal specimens previously collected within the framework of a pulse-chase experiment in the Clarion-Clipperton

Comment [PA1]: I doubt that you can justify the 0.4.

Comment [PA2]: Tackling a hurdle is a mixed metaphor (U.S. football and track). Nobody intentionally tackles hurdles.

30 Zone (CCZ, NE Pacific), in which a deep-sea benthic lander (3 incubation chambers à 20 × 20 × 20 cm) was deployed at water depths between 4050 and 4200 m (Sweetman et al., in review). The upper 5 cm of the sediment of the incubation chambers ~~was-were~~ sieved on a 300 µm sieve and preserved in 4% buffered formaldehyde ~~-solution~~. Ashore, the samples were sorted and identified under a dissecting microscope, and the biomass of individual freeze-dried, acidified specimens was determined with

at Thermo Flash EA 1112 elemental analyser (EA; Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA) to give the individual carbon contents in mmol C ind⁻¹. The macrofauna density data (ind. m⁻²) from all cruises were converted to macrofauna biomass (mmol C m⁻²) by multiplying each taxon-specific density (ind. m⁻²) with the mean taxon-specific individual biomass value for macrofauna (mmol C ind⁻¹);

5

Table 1). Subsequently, the biomass data of all taxa with the same feeding type (




Table 1) were summed to calculate the biomass of each macrofaunal compartment (mmol C m^{-2} ; Supplement 1, Figure 1).

The megafaunal density data (ind. m^{-2}) of the time series was converted to biomass (mmol C m^{-2}) by multiplying the taxon-specific density with a taxon-specific mean biomass per megafaunal specimen (mmol C ind^{-1} ;

5

Table 1. To determine this taxon-specific biomass per megafaunal specimen, size measurements were used as follows. The ‘AUV Abyss’ (Geomar Kiel) equipped with a Canon EOS 6D camera system with 8-15 mm f4 fisheye zoom lens and 24 LED arrays for lightning (Kwasnitschka et al., 2016) flew approximately 4.5 m above the seafloor at a speed of 1.5 m s⁻¹ and took one picture every second (Greinert, 2015). Machine-vision processing was used to generate a photo-mosaic (Kwasnitschka et al., 2016). A subsample covering an area of 16,206 m² of the mosaic was annotated using the web-based annotation software ‘BIIGLE 2.0’ (Langenkämper et al., 2017). The lengths of all megafaunal taxa for which data were available from previous cruises were measured using the approach presented in Durden et al. (2016). Briefly, depending on the taxon, either body length, the diameter of the disk, or the length of an arm were measured on the photo-mosaic and converted into biomass per individual (g ind⁻¹) using the relationship between measured body dimensions (mm) and preserved wet weight (g ind⁻¹) (Durden et al., 2016). Subsequently, the preserved wet weight (g ind⁻¹) was converted to fresh wet weight (g ind⁻¹) using conversion factors from Durden et al. (2016) and to organic carbon (g C ind⁻¹ and mmol C ind⁻¹) using the taxon-specific conversion factors presented in Rowe (1983). For the taxa Cnidaria and Porifera no conversion factors were available. Therefore, taxon-specific individual biomass values were extracted from a study from the CCZ (Tilot, 1992). The individual biomass of Bryozoa and Hemichordata were calculated as the average biomass of an individual deep-sea megafaunal organism (B, mmol C ind⁻¹) at 4100 m depth following from the ratio of the regression for total biomass and abundance by Rex et al. (2006):

$$BB = \frac{10^{(-0.734 - 0.00039 \times \text{depth})}}{10^{(-0.245 - 0.00037 \times \text{depth})}} \quad (1)$$

Following the approach applied to the macrofaunal data set, individual biomasses of taxa with similar feeding types (

Comment [PA3]: I read that you estimated the mass of an individual chordate and a colony of bryozoans to be the same. This seems pretty shaky.

Table 1) were summed to determine the biomass of the megafauna food-web compartments (mmol C m⁻²; Supplement 1; Figure 1).

Individual biomass of fish was calculated using the allometric relationship for *Ipnops agassizii*:

$$5 \text{ wet weight} = a \times \text{length}^b, \quad (2)$$

where $a = 0.0049$ and $b = 3.03$ (Froese and Pauly, 2017; Froese et al., 2014), as *Ipnops* sp. was the most abundant ~~deep-sea~~ fish observed at the DEA (60% of total fish density at undisturbed and 40% of total fish density at disturbed sites). The length (mm) of all *Ipnops* sp. specimens was measured on the annotated 600 pictures (300 pictures from undisturbed site, 300 pictures from disturbed site) in PAPARA(ZZ)I (Marcon and Purser, 2017) using three laser points captured in each image (distance between laser points: 0.5 m (Boetius, 2015)). The wet weight (g) was converted to dry-weight and subsequently to carbon content (mmol C ind⁻¹) using the taxon-specific conversion factors presented in Brey et al. (2010).

2.2 ~~Food-Food-web~~ structure

~~The-f~~ Faunal biomass was further divided into feeding guilds in order to define ~~the-food-food-~~web compartments of the model. Fish (Osteichthyes) were classified as scavenger/ predator and invertebrate macrofauna and megafauna were divided into

15 filter/suspension feeders (FSF), deposit feeders (DF), carnivores (C) and omnivores (OF) (Figure 2). Since feeding types are well described for polychaetes (Jumars et al., 2015), we made a further detailed classification of the macrofaunal polychaetes into suspension feeders (PolSF), surface deposit feeders (PolSDF), subsurface deposit feeders (PolSSDF), carnivores (PolC), and omnivores (PolOF).

20 External carbon sources that were considered in the model included suspended detritus in the water column (Det_w), labile (lDet_s) and semi-labile detritus (sDet_s) in the sediment. Suspended detritus was considered a food source for polychaete, macrofaunal and megafaunal suspension feeders. Labile and semi-labile sedimentary detritus was a source for deposit-feeding and omnivorous polychaetes, macrofauna and megafauna. Omnivores and carnivores of each size class preyed upon organisms of the same and smaller size classes, i.e. MegC and MegOF preyed upon MegDF, MegFSF, MacFSF, MacDF, MacC, MacOF, 25 PolSDF, PolSSDF, PolSF, PolOF, and PolC. Furthermore, MacC, PolC, MacOF, and PolOF preyed upon MacFSF, MacDF, PolSDF, PolSSDF, and PolSF. Fish preyed upon all fauna and the carcass pool. This carcass pool consisted of all fauna (macrofauna, megafauna and fish) that died in the food web and was also ~~the~~ food source of omnivores.

Carbon losses from the food web were respiration to dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC), predation on macrofauna, megafauna and fish by pelagic/ benthopelagic fishes, scavenging on carcasses by pelagic/ benthopelagic scavengers and faeces production

30 by all faunal compartments.

Comment [PA4]: Was it "the" (only) or "a" food source of omnivores. I suspect "a."

2.3 Literature constraints

~~C~~The carbon flows between faunal compartments are constrained in all models by ~~the implementation of~~ various minimum and maximum process rates and conversion efficiencies as ~~inequalities in all models, which are described here~~. Assimilation efficiency (AE) is calculated as:

$$5 \quad AE = (I-F) / I, \quad (3)$$

where I is the ingested food and F ~~are is~~ the faeces (Crisp, 1971). The min-max range was set from 0.62 to 0.87 for macrofauna, ~~and including~~ polychaetes (Stratmann et al., in prep.), from 0.48 to 0.80 for megafauna (Stratmann et al., in prep.) and from 0.84 to 0.87 for fish (Drazen et al., 2007).

Net growth efficiency (NGE) is defined as:

$$10 \quad NGE = P / (P + R), \quad (4)$$

with P being secondary production and R being respiration (Clausen and Riisgård, 1996). The min-max ranges are set to 0.60 to 0.72 for macrofauna, ~~including and~~ polychaetes (Clausen and Riisgård, 1996; Navarro et al., 1994; Nielsen et al., 1995), from 0.48 to

0.60 for megafauna (Koopmans et al., 2010; Mondal, 2006; Nielsen et al., 1995) and from 0.37 to 0.71 for fish (Childress et al., 1980). The secondary production P (mmol C m⁻²) is calculated as:

$$15 \quad P = P/B\text{-ratio} \times \text{biomass}, \quad (5)$$

with the P/B-ratios for macrofauna ~~and, including~~ polychaetes (8.49×10^{-4} to $4.77 \times 10^{-3} \text{ d}^{-1}$; (Stratmann et al., in prep.)), megafauna (2.74×10^{-4} to $1.42 \times 10^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$; (Stratmann et al., in prep.)) and fish ($6.30 \times 10^{-4} \text{ d}^{-1}$; (Collins et al., 2005; Randall, 2002)). The respiration rate R (mmol C m⁻²) was calculated as:

$$R = \text{bsFR} \times \text{biomass}, \quad (6)$$

20 where bsFR is the biomass-specific faunal respiration rate (d⁻¹), and ranges were fixed between 7.12×10^{-5} to $2.28 \times 10^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ for macrofauna ~~and, including~~ polychaetes (Stratmann et al., in prep.), 2.74×10^{-4} to $1.42 \times 10^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ for megafauna (Stratmann et al., in prep.) and 2.3×10^{-4} and $3.6 \times 10^{-4} \text{ d}$ for fishes (Mahaut et al., 1995; Smith and Hessler, 1974).

2.4 Linear inverse model solution and network index

A ~~food-food~~-web model with all compartments present in the food web, ~~like e.g.~~ the PD₂₆ food web model for the undisturbed site,

25 consists of 147 carbon flows with 14 mass balances, i.e., food-web compartments, and 76 data inequalities leading to a mathematically under-determined model (14 equalities vs. 147 unknown flows). Therefore, the LIMs were solved with the R package 'LIM' (van Oevelen et al., 2010) in R (R-Core-Team, 2016) following the likelihood approach (van Oevelen et al., 2010) to quantify ~~the means~~ and standard deviations of each of the carbon flows from a set of 100,000 solutions. This set was sufficient to guarantee ~~the convergence of means~~ and standard deviations within a 2.5% deviation.

30 The network index 'total system throughput' (T..) was calculated with the R-package 'NetIndices' (Kones et al., 2009) for each of the 100,000 model solutions and subsequently summarized as mean ± standard deviation.

2.5 Statistical analysis

Statistical differences between compartment biomasses of the undisturbed vs. disturbed sites for the same sampling event (PD_{0.1}, PD_{0.5}, PD₃, and PD₇; PD₂₆ was/were omitted due to a lack of megafaunal replicates) were assessed by calculating Hedge's d (Hedges and Olkin, 1985a), which is especially suitable for small sample sizes (Koricheva et al., 2013):

$$d = \frac{\bar{x}^E - \bar{x}^C}{\sqrt{\frac{((n^E-1)(s^E)^2 + (n^C-1)(s^C)^2)/(n^E+n^C-2))^{0.5} \times J}} \quad (7)$$

$$\text{with } J = 1 - \frac{3}{4(n^E + n^C - 2) - 1}, \quad (8)$$

where \bar{x}^E is the mean of the experimental group (i.e., the biomass at disturbed sites of a particular year), \bar{x}^C is the mean of the control group (i.e., the biomass at undisturbed sites of the respective year), s^E and s^C are the standard deviations with corresponding groups, n^E and n^C are the sample sizes of the corresponding groups. The variance of Hedge's d ($\sigma_{d_i}^2$; Koricheva et al., 2013) is estimated as:

$$\sigma_{d_i}^2 = \frac{(n^E + n^C)}{(n^E n^C)} + \frac{d^2}{2(n^E + n^C)} \quad (9)$$

The weighted Hedge's d and the estimated variances (Hedges and Olkin, 1985b) of the total biomasses of all compartments of the same sampling event were calculated as:

$$d^+ = \frac{\sum(d_i / \sigma_{d_i}^2)}{\sum(1 / \sigma_{d_i}^2)}, \quad (10)$$

with $\sigma_{d^+}^2 = 1 / \sum(1 / \sigma_{d_i}^2)$.

Following Cohen's (1988) rule of thumb for effect sizes, Hedge's $d = |0.2|$ signifies a small experimental effect, implying that the biomass of the food-web compartments is similar between the disturbed and undisturbed sites. When Hedge's $d = |0.5|$, the effect size is medium, hence there is moderate difference, and when Hedge's $d = |0.8|$, the effect size is large, i.e. there is a large difference between the biomass of the compartments between sites.

The network index T_{\cdot} was compared between the undisturbed and disturbed sites of the same sampling event by assessing the fraction of the T_{\cdot} values of the 100,000 model solutions of the undisturbed food web that were larger than the T_{\cdot} values of the 100,000 model solutions of the disturbed food web. When this fraction is > 0.95 , the difference in 'total system throughput' between the two food-webs from the same sampling event is considered significantly different (van Oevelen et al., 2011), indicating that the carbon flows in the food web from that specific sampling event have not recovered from the experimental disturbance.

3 Results

3.1 Food-web structure and trophic composition

Total faunal biomass was always higher at the undisturbed sites as compared to the disturbed sites from the same sampling year (Figure 1, Supplement 1), and ranged from a minimum of $5.45 \pm 1.27 \text{ mmol C m}^{-2}$ (PD_{0.1}) to a maximum $22.33 \pm 3.40 \text{ mmol C m}^{-2}$ (PD₃) at the undisturbed sites and from a minimum of $1.36 \pm 1.24 \text{ mmol C m}^{-2}$ (PD_{0.1}) to a maximum $15.82 \pm 1.99 \text{ mmol C m}^{-2}$ (PD₃) at the disturbed sites. At PD_{0.1} the total faunal biomass at the disturbed sites was only 25% of

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [PA5]: Space on both sides of operators, equal signs and inequality signs.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: German (Germany)

Formatted: German (Germany)

Formatted: German (Germany)

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [PA6]: I doubt that the second place on the right of the decimal place is justified. Please assess and give only one decimal place if the second cannot be supported.

the total faunal biomass at the undisturbed sites, whereas at PD₃ the total faunal biomass at the disturbed sites was 71% of the total faunal biomass at the undisturbed sites. At PD₂₆, the faunal biomass at the disturbed sites was 54% of the biomass at the undisturbed sites. The absolute weighted ~~Hedges' d~~ of all faunal compartment biomasses for PD_{0.1} to PD₇ ranged from 0.053±0.019 at PD_{0.5} to 0.075±0.019 (Supplement 2), indicating a strong experimental effect and therefore that biomasses of

Formatted: Font: Italic

5 all faunal compartments ~~did not~~ failed to recover over the period analysed (PD_{0.1} to PD₇).

The faunal biomass at both the undisturbed and disturbed sites from PD_{0.1} to PD₇ was dominated by deposit feeders (from 63% at undisturbed PD_{0.1} to 83% at disturbed PD_{0.5} and disturbed PD₃) (Figure 3). In contrast, at the undisturbed sites of PD₂₆, the largest contribution to total faunal biomass was from filter- and suspension feeders (44%), whereas deposit feeders only contributed 35%. At the disturbed sites of PD₂₆, deposit feeders had the highest biomass (61%), followed by carnivores (19%)

10 and filter- and suspension feeders (14%).

3.2 Carbon flows

~~The~~ total faunal C ingestion (mmol C m⁻² d⁻¹) ranged from 8.63×10⁻³±1.58×10⁻⁵ at the disturbed sites at PD_{0.1} to 1.47×10⁻¹±8.55×10⁻⁴ at the undisturbed sites at PD₃ and was always lower at the disturbed sites compared to the undisturbed sites (Figure 4A; Supplement 3). The ingestion consisted mainly of ~~the~~ sedimentary detritus (labile and semi-labile) that contributed

15 between 56.97% (undisturbed sites, PD₂₆) and 99.50% (disturbed sites, PD_{0.1}) to ~~the~~ total carbon ingestion.

Faunal respiration (mmol C m⁻² d⁻¹) ranged from 6.02×10⁻³±6.75×10⁻⁵ (disturbed sites, PD_{0.5}) to 3.92×10⁻²±3.69×10⁻⁴ (undisturbed sites, PD₃). During the ~~twenty-six y26 y~~ years after the DISCOL experiment, modelled faunal respiration was always higher at undisturbed sites ~~as compared to~~ than at disturbed sites (Table 2, Figure 4). Over time, non-polychaete macrofauna contributed least to total faunal respiration (Table 2), except at the disturbed sites of PD_{0.5} and at both sites of PD₃. During this

20 PD₃ sampling campaign, macrofauna contributed 49.97% at the undisturbed sites and 58.35% at the disturbed sites to ~~the~~ total faunal respiration. Polychaetes respired between 18.59% of ~~the~~ total faunal respiration at the undisturbed sites at PD₂₆ and 77.61% of ~~the~~ total faunal respiration at the disturbed sites at PD_{0.5}. ~~The megafaunal respiration contribution to respiration~~ was highest at PD₂₆, ~~where when~~ they respired 64.95% of the total faunal respiration at the disturbed sites and 78.67% of the total faunal respiration at the undisturbed sites. The contribution of fish to total faunal respiration was always <2%. Besides respiration, faeces

25 production contributed between 20.07% at disturbed PD₃ and 34.65% at disturbed PD_{0.1} to total carbon outflow from the food web (Figure 4). The contribution of the combined outflow of predation by external predators and scavengers on carcasses to the total C loss from the food web ranged from 50.48% at disturbed PD₇ to 65.33% at disturbed PD_{0.1}.

The fraction of *T.* values that were larger for the food webs at the undisturbed sites than for the disturbed sites ~~from the same~~ sampling event was 1.0 at PD_{0.1}, PD_{0.5}, PD₃, PD₇ and PD₂₆. No decreasing trend in $\Delta T.$ over time was visible (Figure 5~~,-~~); in

Comment [PA7]: How many decimal places are warranted in your percentages. I suspect it is either none or one past the decimal point.

30 fact, the largest ΔT . were calculated for PD₃ ($7.87 \times 10^{-2} \pm 1.97 \times 10^{-3}$ mmol C m⁻² d⁻¹) and PD₂₆ ($7.67 \times 10^{-2} \pm 9.41 \times 10^{-4}$ mmol C m⁻² d⁻¹).

4 Discussion

This study assessed the evolution of the food-web structure and ecosystem function 'faunal C cycling' in an abyssal, nodule-rich, soft-sediment ecosystem following an experimental sediment disturbance. By comparing a time-series over 26 years-yr with food-web models (undisturbed vs. disturbed sites), we show that the total faunal biomass at the disturbed site was still only

5 about half of the total faunal biomass at the undisturbed sites 26 years-yr after the disturbance. Furthermore, the role of the various feeding types in the carbon cycling differs, and the 'total system throughput' T_{total} , i.e., the sum of all carbon flows in the food web, was still significantly lower at the disturbed sediment sites compared to the undisturbed sediment after 26 years-yr.

4.1 Model limitations

Our results are unique as it they allowed us for the first time to assess the recovery of C cycling in benthic deep-sea food webs from a

10 small-scale sediment disturbance in polymetallic nodule-rich areas. However, the models come with limitations. The standard procedures to assess megafaunal densities have evolved during the 26 years-yr of post-disturbance monitoring. The OFOS system used 26 years-yr after the initial DISCOL experiment took pictures automatically every 20 s from a distance of 1.5 m above the seafloor (Boetius, 2015; Stratmann et al., in review). By contrast, the OFOS system used in former cruises was towed approximately 3 m above the seafloor, and pictures were taken selectively by the operating scientists (Bluhm and Gebruk,


15 1999). Therefore, the procedure used in the former cruises very likely led to an overestimation of overestimated rare and charismatic megafauna, and probably to an underestimation of underestimated dominant fauna and organisms of small size (< 3 cm) for PD_{0.1} to PD₇ as compared to PD₂₆.

Previous cruises to the DEA focused on monitoring changes in faunal density and diversity, but not on changes in biomass. Hence, a major task in this study was to find appropriate conversion factors to convert density into biomass. However, no

20 individual biomass data for macrofaunal taxa were available for the Peru Basin, so we used data from sampling stations of similar water depths in the eastern Clarion-Clipperton Zone (CCZ, NE Pacific; Sweetman et al., in review). As organisms in deep-sea regions with higher organic carbon input are larger than their counterparts from areas with lower organic carbon input (McClain et al., 2012), using individual biomass data from the CCZ, a more oligotrophic region than the Peru Basin (Haeckel et al., 2001; Vanreusel et al., 2016) might have led to an underestimation of the underestimated biomass for macrofauna. However, this potential bias has

25 likely limited impact on the interpretation of the comparative results within the time series, because the same methodology was applied throughout the time-series dataset. Moreover, the determination of megafaunal biomass was also difficult as no size measurements were taken from megafaunal individuals during the PD_{0.1} to PD₇ cruises. Consequently, it was not possible to detect differences in size classes between disturbed and undisturbed sediments or recruitment events in, e.g., echinoderms (Ruhl, 2007) following the DISCOL experiment. Instead, we used fixed conversion factors for the different taxa for the entire

30 time series.



4.2 Feeding-type specific differences in recovery

Eight years before the experimental disturbance experiment was conducted at the DISCOL area, Jumars (1981) qualitatively predicted the response of different feeding types in the benthic community to polymetallic nodule removal. Although several seabed test mining or mining simulations were performed since then (Jones et al., 2017), no study compared or verified these conceptual predictions on feeding-type specific differences in recovery from deep-sea mining. As few comparative studies are available, we compare here our food-web model results with those of the conceptual model predictions for scavengers, surface and subsurface deposit feeders and suspension feeders by Jumars (1981).

Jumars (1981) predicted that organisms inside the mining tracks would be killed either by the fluid shear of the dredge/ plough or by abrasion and increased temperatures inside the rising pipe with a mortality rate of >95%. In contrast, the impact on mobile and sessile organisms in the vicinity of the tracks would depend on their feeding type (Jumars, 1981).


The author also predicted that the density of mobile scavengers, such as fish and lysianassid amphipods would rise shortly after the disturbance in response to the increased abundance of dying or dead organisms within the mining tracks. Indeed, when plotting the respiration of fish (in $\text{mmol C m}^{-1} \text{d}^{-1}$) normalized to the fish respiration at the undisturbed sediment at $\text{PD}_{0.1}$ over time, the respiration for the undisturbed sediment increased steeply until PD_3 and dropped subsequently (Figure 6).

However, experiments with baits at PAP and the Porcupine Seabight (NE Atlantic) showed that the scavenging deep-sea fish *Coryphaenoides armatus* intercept bait within 30 min (Collins et al., 1999) and stayed at the food fall for 114 ± 55 min (Collins et al., 1998). Hence, it is very likely that this rise in fish respiration at the undisturbed sediment 0.5 years after the DISCOL is a result of natural variability as opposed to the predicted rise in scavenger density and/ or biomass caused by the mining activity. At the disturbed sediment, no fish were detected at $\text{PD}_{0.1}$ or $\text{PD}_{0.5}$, which could be related to lack of prey in a potential predator-prey relationship (Bailey et al., 2006). However, because of the relatively small area of disturbed sediment (only 22% of the 10.8 km^2 of sediment were ploughed (Thiel and Schriever, 1989)), the low density of deep-sea fish (e.g. between 7.5 and 32 ind. ha^{-1} of the dominant fish genus *Coryphaenoides* sp. at Station M (Bailey et al., 2006)) and the high motility of fish, this observation may be coincidental.

Jumars (1981) predicted that, on a short term, subsurface deposit feeders outside the mining tracks would be the least impacted feeding type, because of their relative isolation from the re-settled sediment, and their relative independence of organic matter on the sediment surface, whereas subsurface deposit feeders inside the mining tracks would experience high mortality. For the long-term recovery, the author pointed to the dependence of subsurface deposit feeders on bacterial production in the sediment covered with re-settled sediment. In our food-web model, sub-surface and surface deposit feeders were grouped into the deposit feeder category, except for polychaetes, for which we kept the surface-subsurface distinction. The biomass of PolSSDF

fluctuated by one order of magnitude over the 26-year time series and had high biomass values at the undisturbed $\text{PD}_{0.1}$ site, the disturbed PD_3 sites and at both sites at PD_7 . The normalized respiration of PolSSDF also showed strong fluctuations at the undisturbed and disturbed sites over time (Figure 6), indicating a large natural variability or variable sampling results. Such

temporal dynamics in deep-sea macrofauna were detected at Station M, where the density of several dominating metazoan




macrofauna increased eight months after a peak in POC flux was measured at 50 and 600 m above the seafloor (Drzen et al., 1998). Hence, Jumars (1981) predictions for sub-surface deposit feeders could not be tested, provided the natural fluctuations in PoSSDF densities that were used to calculate biomass.

- Jumars (1981) anticipated that surface deposit feeders would suffer more strongly from deep-sea mining activities compared ~~to~~ with sub-surface deposit feeders because the rate of sediment deposition would increase inside and beyond mining tracks, with this newly settling sediment altering the sediment composition and food concentration in the sediment. Indeed, the recovery of holothurian densities at the DEA was probably delayed owing to unfavourable food conditions (Stratmann et al., in review). Nevertheless, deposit feeders seem to have advantages during the recovery from the DISCOL disturbance experiment. When comparing the contribution of deposit feeders from all size classes (macrofauna, polychaetes, megafauna) to respiration,
- 10 predation by external predators and faeces production to the contribution of omnivores, filter- and suspension feeders and carnivores, their contribution was always higher at the disturbed site compared to the undisturbed site of the same sampling event. However, owing to the overall lower biomass inside the disturbed area compared to the undisturbed area, the absolute carbon respiration (in $\text{mmol C m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$) remained lower for deposit feeders at the disturbed site compared to the corresponding undisturbed site, even after 26 ~~years~~ when this difference was 2.6%.
- 15 Jumars (1981) expected that the suspension feeders outside the mining tracks would be negatively affected during the presence of the sediment plumes and/ or as long as their filtration apparatus was clogged by sediment. This “clogging” hypothesis could not be tested here, because the models did not resolve these unknown changes in faunal physiology, but could only assess carbon cycling differences associated with differences in biomass. Furthermore, Jumars (1981) anticipated that the recovery of nodule-associated organisms, such as filter and suspension feeding Porifera, Antipatharia or Ascidiacea (Vanreusel et al.,
- 20 2016) would require more than 10,000 years, owing to the slow growth rate of polymetallic nodules (Guichard et al., 1978; Kuhn et al., 2017) and the removal and/ or burial of the nodules. Directly after the initial DISCOL disturbance event, the respiration rate of filter and suspension feeders at the disturbed sediment was only 1% of the respiration rate of this feeding type at the undisturbed sediment. After 26 ~~years~~, the relative difference in the filter and suspension feeding respiration rate was still 80%. Part of this difference at PD₂₆ resulted from the presence of a single specimen of Alcyonacea with a biomass of
- 25 4.71 mmol C m^{-2} at the undisturbed site. However, even if we ignore this Alcyonacea specimen in the model, the respiration of suspension and filter feeding in the disturbed site would still be 71% lower compared to the undisturbed site, indicating a slow recovery of this feeding group.

To summarize the comparison of modelled potential recovery of the different feeding types with the predictions by Jumars (1981), scavenging and predatory fish at the undisturbed sediment followed ~~first~~ the predicted density pattern, though this result

- 30 might also have been related to natural variability. After three years, however, the fish contribution to carbon cycling was lower than expected from the predictions. Owing to an apparently strong natural variability in polychaete subsurface deposit- feeder biomass, the recovery prognosis for subsurface deposit feeders could not be tested. Furthermore, it could not be assessed whether surface deposit feeders were more strongly affected by the mining activity than subsurface deposit feeders. In general, the time-series analysis showed that deposit feeders likely benefited from the disturbance experiment in comparison to other



feeding types. Confirming Jumars (1981) prediction, the activity of filter and suspension feeders in the food web did not recover within 26 ~~yearsyr~~.

5 Conclusion

Deep-sea mining will negatively impact the benthic ecosystem of abyssal ecosystems. It is therefore important to be able to estimate how long ~~the~~ recovery of the ecosystem after a deep-sea mining operation will take. This study used the linear inverse modelling technique to compare ~~the~~ carbon flows between different food web compartments at undisturbed and disturbed sites at the DISCOL experimental area in the Peru Basin over a period of 26 ~~yearsyr~~. Even after 26 ~~yearsyr~~, ~~the~~ total faunal biomass and ~~the~~ total food-web activity (i.e., summed carbon cycling) at the disturbed sites was only approximately half (54% and 56% respectively) of ~~the~~ total faunal biomass and food-web activity at the undisturbed sites. Deposit feeders were the least impacted by the sediment disturbance, with less than 3% relative difference in total carbon loss (i.e., respiration, external predation and ~~fa~~eces production) between undisturbed and disturbed sites after 26 ~~yearsyr~~. In contrast, filter and suspension feeders did not recover at all, and the relative difference in respiration rate was 79%. Overall, ~~it can be concluded that~~ ecosystem functioning (as measured by total carbon cycling) within the macrofauna, megafauna and fish has not recovered 26 ~~years-yr~~ after the experimental disturbance.

15 Data availability

Data on biomass of the different food web compartments are presented in Supplement 1. Data on ~~Hedge'sHedges' d-d~~, the corresponding standard deviations, weighted ~~Hedge'sHedges' d d~~ and weighted standard deviation are presented in Supplement 2. The mean and standard deviations calculated for each carbon flux over 100,000 iterations for all food webs from the undisturbed and disturbed site for all time steps is presented in Supplement 3. All OFOS images associated with this article are available from the

20 PANGAEA storage archive.

Authors contribution

TS went through the published literature for data input to the model, LL, AP, YM, CR, AR, MRC, ESL, AKS, DOBJ and KK contributed data, TS and DvO developed the food web models, TS and DvO wrote the manuscript with input from all co-authors.

25 Acknowledgements

Formatted: Font: Italic

We thank the chief scientists Jens Greinert (SO242-1) and Antje Boetius (SO242-2) as well as captain and crew of RV Sonne for their excellent support during both legs of cruise SO242. We also thank the 'AUV Abyss' team from Geomar, Kiel

(Germany) and Daniëlle de Jonge (Groningen University, The Netherlands) for identifying the fish species. The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under the MIDAS project, grant agreement n° 603418 and by the JPI Oceans – Ecological Aspects of Deep Sea Mining project (NWO-ALW grant 856.14.002) and the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF) grant n° 03F0707A-G.

5 Further financial support was granted to CESAM (UID/AMB/50017 - POCI-01-0145-FEDER-007638), to FCT/MCTES by national funds (PIDDAC), and by co-funding by the FEDER, within the PT2020 Partnership Agreement and Compete 2020. CFR was supported by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT) grant (SFRH/ BPD/107805/2015).

References

- Amon, D. J., Hilario, A., Arbizu, P. M., and Smith, C. R.: Observations of organic falls from the abyssal Clarion-Clipperton Zone in the tropical eastern Pacific Ocean, *Mar. Biodivers.*, 47, 311-321, 2017.
- 10 Bailey, D. M., Ruhl, H., and Smith, K.: Long-term change in benthopelagic fish abundance in the abyssal northeast Pacific Ocean, *Ecology*, 87, 549-555, 2006.
- Bluhm, H., and Gebruk, A.: Holothuroidea (Echinodermata) of the Peru Basin □ Ecological and Taxonomic Remarks Based on Underwater Images, *Mar. Ecol.*, 20, 167-195, 1999.
- 15 Bluhm, H.: Re-establishment of an abyssal megabenthic community after experimental physical disturbance of the seafloor, *Deep-Sea Res. II*, 48, 3841-3868, 2001.
- Boetius, A.: RV SONNE Fahrtbericht/Cruise Report SO242-2: JPI OCEANS Ecological Aspects of Deep-Sea Mining, DISCOL Revisited, Guayaquil-Guayaquil (Equador), 28.08.-01.10. 2015., 2015.
- Borowski, C., and Thiel, H.: Deep-sea macrofaunal impacts of a large-scale physical disturbance experiment in the Southeast Pacific, *Deep-Sea Res. II*, 45, 55-81, 1998.
- 20 Borowski, C.: Physically disturbed deep-sea macrofauna in the Peru Basin, southeast Pacific, revisited 7 years after the experimental impact, *Deep-Sea Res. II*, 48, 3809-3839, 2001.
- Brey, T., Müller-Wiegmann, C., Zittier, Z. M., and Hagen, W.: Body composition in aquatic organisms—a global data bank of relationships between mass, elemental composition and energy content, *J. Sea Res.*, 64, 334-340, 2010.
- 25 Childress, J. J., Taylor, S. M., Cailliet, G. M., and Price, M. H.: Patterns of growth, energy utilization and reproduction in some meso- and bathypelagic fishes off southern California, *Mar. Biol.*, 61, 27-40, 1980.
- Clausen, I., and Riisgård, H.: Growth, filtration and respiration in the mussel *Mytilus edulis*: no evidence for physiological regulation of the filter-pump to nutritional needs, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 141, 37-45, 1996.
- Cohen, J.: *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*, 2nd ed. ed., Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, Mahwah, NJ, 1988.
- 30 Collins, M., Priede, I. G., Addison, S., Smith, A., and Bagley, P. M.: Acoustic tracking of the dispersal of organic matter by scavenging fishes in the deep-sea, *Hydrobiologia*, 371/372, 181-186, 1998.
- Collins, M., Bailey, D., Ruxton, G., and Priede, I.: Trends in body size across an environmental gradient: a differential response in scavenging and non-scavenging demersal deep-sea fish, *Proc. R. Soc. B*, 272, 2051-2057, 2005.
- Collins, M. A., Priede, I. G., and Bagley, P. M.: In situ comparison of activity in two deep-sea scavenging fishes occupying different depth zones, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.*, 266, 2011-2016, 1999.
- 35 Crisp, D.: Energy flow measurements, in: *Methods for the study of marine benthos*, 1 ed., edited by: Holme, N. A., and McIntyre, A. D., Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, 284-367, 1971.
- Devey, C. W., Augustin, N., Brandt, A., Brenke, N., Köhler, J., Lins, L., Schmidt, C., and Yeo, I. A.: Habitat characterization of the Vema Fracture Zone and Puerto Rico Trench, *Deep-Sea Res. II*, 2018.
- 40 Drazen, J. C., Baldwin, R. J., and Smith Jr, K. L.: Sediment community response to a temporally varying food supply at an abyssal station in the NE Pacific, *Deep-Sea Res. II*, 45, 893-913, 1998.
- Drazen, J. C., Reisenbichler, K. R., and Robison, B. H.: A comparison of absorption and assimilation efficiencies between four species of shallow- and deep-living fishes, *Mar. Biol.*, 151, 1551-1558, 2007.
- Drazen, J. C., and Sutton, T. T.: Dining in the deep: the feeding ecology of deep-sea fishes, *Ann. Rev. Mar. Sci.*, 9, 337-366, 2017.
- 45 Dunlop, K. M., van Oevelen, D., Ruhl, H. A., Huffard, C. L., Kuhnz, L. A., and Smith, K. L.: Carbon cycling in the deep eastern North Pacific benthic food web: Investigating the effect of organic carbon input, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 61, 1956-1968, 2016.

- Durden, J. M., Bett, B. J., Horton, T., Serpell-Stevens, A., Morris, K. J., Billett, D. S., and Ruhl, H. A.: Improving the estimation of deep-sea megabenthos biomass: dimension to wet weight conversions for abyssal invertebrates, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 552, 71-79, 2016.
- Durden, J. M., Ruhl, H. A., Pebody, C., Blackbird, S. J., and van Oevelen, D.: Differences in the carbon flows in the benthic food webs of abyssal hill and plain habitats, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 62, 1771-1782, 10.1002/lno.10532, 2017.
- 5 Foell, E., Thiel, H., and Schriever, G.: DISCOL: a long-term, large-scale, disturbance-recolonization experiment in the abyssal eastern tropical South Pacific Ocean, *Offshore Technology Conference*, 1990, 1990.
- Foell, E., Thiel, H., and Schriever, G.: DISCOL: a long-term, large-scale, disturbance-recolonization experiment in the abyssal eastern tropical South Pacific Ocean, *Min. Eng.*, 44, 90-94, 1992.
- 10 Fox, R., Barnes, R. D., and Ruppert, E. E.: *Invertebrate Zoology: A Functional Evolutionary Approach*, 7 ed., Brooks/ Cole Thompson Learning, Belmont, California, 2003.
- Froese, R., Thorson, J. T., and Reyes, R.: A Bayesian approach for estimating length-weight relationships in fishes, *J. Appl. Ichthyol.*, 30, 78-85, 2014.
- FishBase www.fishbase.org, access: 2018/02/21, 2017.
- Gage, J. D., and Tyler, P. A.: *Deep-sea biology: a natural history of organisms at the deep-sea floor*, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- 15 Gollner, S., Kaiser, S., Menzel, L., Jones, D. O., Brown, A., Mestre, N. C., van Oevelen, D., Menot, L., Colaço, A., and Canals, M.: Resilience of benthic deep-sea fauna to mining activities, *Mar. Environ. Res.*, 129, 76-101, 10.1016/j.marenvres.2017.04.010, 2017.
- Greinert, J.: RV SONNE Fahrtbericht/ Cruise Report SO242-1 - JPI OCEANS Ecological Aspects of Deep-Sea Mining - DISCOL Revisited, GEOMAR Helmholtz-Zentrum für Ozeanforschung Kiel, Kiel, 290, 2015.
- 20 Guichard, F., Reyss, J. L., and Yokoyama, Y.: Growth rate of manganese nodule measured with ¹⁰Be and ²⁶Al, *Nature*, 272, 155-156, 10.1038/272155a0, 1978.
- Haeckel, M., König, I., Riech, V., Weber, M. E., and Suess, E.: Pore water profiles and numerical modelling of biogeochemical processes in Peru Basin deep-sea sediments, *Deep-Sea Res. II*, 48, 3713-3736, 2001.
- Hedges, L. V., and Olkin, I.: Estimation of a single effect size: Parametric and nonparametric methods, in: *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*, Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, 75-106, 1985a.
- 25 Hedges, L. V., and Olkin, I.: Parametric estimation of effect size from a series of experiments, in: *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*, Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, 107-145, 1985b.
- Hein, J. R., Mizell, K., Koschinsky, A., and Conrad, T. A.: Deep-ocean mineral deposits as a source of critical metals for high-and green-technology applications: Comparison with land-based resources, *Ore Geol. Rev.*, 51, 1-14, 2013.
- Jones, D. O., Kaiser, S., Sweetman, A. K., Smith, C. R., Menot, L., Vink, A., Trueblood, D., Greinert, J., Billett, D. S., Martinez Arbizu, P., 30 Radziejewska, T., Singh, R., Ingole, B., Stratmann, T., Simon-Lledo, E., Durden, J. M., and Clark, M. R.: Biological responses to disturbance from simulated deep-sea polymetallic nodule mining, *PLoS One*, 12, e0171750, 10.1371/journal.pone.0171750, 2017.
- Jumars, P. A.: Limits in predicting and detecting benthic community responses to manganese nodule mining, *Mar. Min.*, 3, 213-229, 1981.
- Jumars, P. A., Dorgan, K. M., and Lindsay, S. M.: Diet of worms emended: an update of polychaete feeding guilds, *Ann. Rev. Mar. Sci.*, 7, 497-520, 2015.
- 35 Kidd, R., and Huggett, Q.: Rock debris on abyssal plains in the northeast Atlantic—a comparison of epibenthic sledge hauls and photographic surveys, *Oceanol. Acta*, 4, 99-104, 1981.
- Klepper, O., and Van de Kamer, J.: The use of mass balances to test and improve the estimates of carbon fluxes in an ecosystem, *Math. Biosci.*, 85, 37-49, 1987.
- Kones, J. K., Soetaert, K., van Oevelen, D., and Owino, J. O.: Are network indices robust indicators of food web functioning? A monte carlo approach, *Ecol. Model.*, 220, 370-382, 2009.
- 40 Koopmans, M., Martens, D., and Wijffels, R. H.: Growth efficiency and carbon balance for the sponge *Haliclona oculata*, *Mar. Biotechnol.*, 12, 340-349, 2010.
- Koricheva, J., Gurevitch, J., and Mengersen, K.: *Handbook of meta-analysis in ecology and evolution*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2013.
- 45 Kuhn, T., Węgorzewski, A., Rühlemann, C., and Vink, A.: Composition, Formation, and Occurrence of Polymetallic Nodules, in: *Deep-Sea Mining*, Springer, 23-63, 2017.
- Kwasnitschka, T., Köser, K., Sticklus, J., Rothenbeck, M., Weiß, T., Wenzlaff, E., Schoening, T., Triebe, L., Steinführer, A., and Devey, C.: DeepSurveyCam—a deep ocean optical mapping system, *Sensors*, 16, 164, 2016.
- Langenkämper, D., Zurowietz, M., Schoening, T., and Nattkemper, T. W.: BIIGLE 2.0-Browsing and Annotating Large Marine Image Collections, *Front. Mar. Sci.*, 4, 83, 2017.
- 50 Levin, L. A., Mengerink, K., Gjerde, K. M., Rowden, A. A., Van Dover, C. L., Clark, M. R., Ramirez-Llodra, E., Currie, B., Smith, C. R., Sato, K. N., Gallo, N., Sweetman, A. K., Lily, H., Armstrong, C. W., and Bridler, J.: Defining "serious harm" to the marine environment in the context of deep-seabed mining, *Mar. Policy*, 74, 245-259, 2016.
- 55 Mahaut, M.-L., Sibuet, M., and Shirayama, Y.: Weight-dependent respiration rates in deep-sea organisms, *Deep-Sea Res. I*, 42, 1575-1582, 1995.

- Marcon, Y., and Purser, A.: PAPPARA (ZZ) I: An open-source software interface for annotating photographs of the deep-sea, *SoftwareX*, 6, 69-80, 2017.
- McClain, C. R., Allen, A. P., Tittensor, D. P., and Rex, M. A.: Energetics of life on the deep seafloor, *PNAS*, 109, 15366-15371, 2012.
- Menzies, R. J.: On the food and feeding habits of abyssal organisms as exemplified by the Isopoda, *Int. Rev. Hydrobiol.*, 47, 339-358, 1962.
- 5 Mondal, S. K.: Effect of temperature and body size on food utilization in the marine pearl oyster *Pinctada fucata* (Bivalvia: Pteridae), *Indian J. of Mar. Sci.*, 35, 43-49, 2006.
- Navarro, E., Iglesias, J. I. P., Ortega, M. M., and Larretxea, X.: The Basis for a Functional Response to Variable Food Quantity and Quality in Cockles *Cerastoderma edule* (Bivalvia, Cardiidae), *Physiol. Zool.*, 67, 468-496, 1994.
- 10 Nielsen, A. M., Eriksen, N. T., Iversen, J. J. L., and Riisgard, H. U.: Feeding, growth and respiration in the polychaetes *Nereis diversicolor* (facultative filter-feeder) and *N. virens* (omnivorous) - a comparative study, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 125, 149-158, 10.3354/meps125149, 1995.
- R-Core-Team: R: A language and environment for statistical computing R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, 2016.
- Radziejewska, T.: Characteristics of the sub-equatorial North-Eastern Pacific Ocean's abyss, with a particular reference to the Clarion-Clipperton Fracture Zone, in: *Meiobenthos in the sub-equatorial Pacific abyss*, Springer, Heidelberg, 13-28, 2014.
- 15 Ramirez-Llodra, E., Brandt, A., Danovaro, R., De Mol, B., Escobar, E., German, C., Levin, L., Arbizu, P., Menot, L., and Buhl-Mortensen, P.: Deep, diverse and definitely different: unique attributes of the world's largest ecosystem, *Biogeosciences*, 7, 2851-2899, 2010.
- Ramirez-Llodra, E., Tyler, P. A., Baker, M. C., Bergstad, O. A., Clark, M. R., Escobar, E., Levin, L. A., Menot, L., Rowden, A. A., and Smith, C. R.: Man and the last great wilderness: human impact on the deep sea, *PLoS One*, 6, e22588, 2011.
- 20 Randall, R.: Using allometry with fish size to estimate production to biomass (P/B) ratios of salmonid populations, *Ecol. Freshw. Fish*, 11, 196-202, 2002.
- Rex, M. A., Etter, R. J., Morris, J. S., Crouse, J., McClain, C. R., Johnson, N. A., Stuart, C. T., Deming, J. W., Thies, R., and Avery, R.: Global bathymetric patterns of standing stock and body size in the deep-sea benthos, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 317, 1, 2006.
- Rowe, G. T.: Biomass and production of the deep-sea macrobenthos, in: *Deep-Sea Biology*, edited by: Rowe, G. T., The Sea, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1983.
- 25 Ruhl, H. A.: Abundance and size distribution dynamics of abyssal epibenthic megafauna in the northeast Pacific, *Ecology*, 88, 1250-1262, 2007.
- Ruhl, H. A., Ellena, J. A., and Smith, K. L.: Connections between climate, food limitation, and carbon cycling in abyssal sediment communities, *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 105, 17006-17011, 2008.
- Smith, A. B., and Stockley, B.: The geological history of deep-sea colonization by echinoids: roles of surface productivity and deep-water ventilation, *Proc. R. Soc. B*, 272, 865-869, 2005.
- 30 Smith, C. R., De Leo, F. C., Bernardino, A. F., Sweetman, A. K., and Arbizu, P. M.: Abyssal food limitation, ecosystem structure and climate change, *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 23, 518-528, 2008.
- Smith, K., and Hessler, R.: Respiration of benthopelagic fishes: in situ measurements at 1230 meters, *Science*, 184, 72-73, 1974.
- Stratmann, T., Mevenkamp, L., Sweetman, A. K., Vanreusel, A., and van Oevelen, D.: Has phytodetritus processing by an abyssal soft-sediment community recovered 26 years after an experimental disturbance?, *Front. Mar. Sci.*, 5, 10.3389/fmars.2018.00059, 2018.
- 35 Stratmann, T., Soetaert, K., Wei, C.-L., and van Oevelen, D.: Global patterns of energy partitioning within the seafloor ecosystems show longitudinal and depth gradient, *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.*, in prep.
- Stratmann, T., Voorsmit, I., Gebruk, A., Brown, A., Purser, A., Marcon, Y., Sweetman, A. K., Jones, D. O., and van Oevelen, D.: Recovery of Holothuroidea population density, community composition and respiration activity after a deep-sea disturbance experiment, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, in review.
- 40 Sweetman, A. K., Smith, C. R., Shulse, C. N., Maillot, B., Lindh, M., Church, M. J., Meyer, K., van Oevelen, D., Stratmann, T., and Gooday, A. J.: Key role of bacteria in the short-term cycling of carbon at the abyssal seafloor, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, in review.
- Thiel, H., and Schriever, G.: Cruise report DISCOL 1, Sonne-Cruise 61, Institut für Hydrobiologie und Fischereiwissenschaft der Universität Hamburg, Hamburg, 1989.
- 45 Thiel, H., and Tiefsee-Umweltschutz, F.: Evaluation of the environmental consequences of polymetallic nodule mining based on the results of the TUSCH Research Association, *Deep-Sea Res. II*, 48, 3433-3452, 2001.
- Tilot, V.: La structure des assemblages mégabenthiques d'une province à nodules polymétalliques de l'Océan Pacifique tropical Est, PhD, Department de l'Environnement Profund, Direction des Recherches Oceaniques, IFREMER/ Centre de Brest, Université de Bretagne occidentale, Plouzane, 1992.
- 50 van Oevelen, D., Van den Meersche, K., Meysman, F. J., Soetaert, K., Middelburg, J. J., and Vézina, A. F.: Quantifying food web flows using linear inverse models, *Ecosystems*, 13, 32-45, 2010.
- van Oevelen, D., Soetaert, K., García, R., De Stigter, H. C., Cunha, M. R., Pusceddu, A., and Danovaro, R.: Canyon conditions impact carbon flows in food webs of three sections of the Nazaré canyon, *Deep-Sea Res. II*, 58, 2461-2476, 2011.
- Vanreusel, A., Hilario, A., Ribeiro, P. A., Menot, L., and Martinez Arbizu, P.: Threatened by mining, polymetallic nodules are required to preserve abyssal epifauna, *Sci. Rep.*, 6, 26808, 10.1038/srep26808, 2016.
- 55

Formatted: German (Germany)

Vézina, A. F., and Platt, T.: Food web dynamics in the ocean. I. Best-estimates of flow networks using inverse methods, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 269-287, 1988.

Table 1. Taxon-specific biomass per individual (mmol C ind⁻¹) for macrofauna and megafauna including the specific feeding types. Macrofaunal biomass data are based on macrofaunal specimens collected in the abyssal plains of the Clarion-Clipperton Zone (NE Pacific) (Sweetman et al., in review). In contrast, megafaunal biomass was estimated by converting size-measurements of specific body parts of organisms from DEA that were acquired using photo-annotation into preserved wet

weight per organism using the relationships presented in Durden et al. (2016). Subsequently the preserved wet weight was converted into fresh wet weight and biomass following the conversions presented in Durden et al. (2016) and Rowe (1983). Whenever no conversion factors for a specific taxon were reported in Durden et al. (2016) mean taxon-specific biomass data per individual were extracted from Tilot (1992) for the CCZ.

The abbreviations are: C = carnivores, DF = deposit feeders, FSF = filter/ suspension feeders, O = omnivores, PolC = carnivorous polychaetes, PolOF = omnivorous polychaetes, PolSF = suspension-feeding polychaetes, PolSDF = surface deposit-feeding polychaetes, PolSSDF = subsurface deposit-feeding polychaetes, S = scavengers.

References: ¹(Fox et al., 2003), ²(Menzies, 1962), ³(McClain et al., 2012), ⁴(Smith and Stockley, 2005), ⁵(Gage and Tyler, 1991), ⁷(Jumars et al., 2015), ⁸(Bluhm, 2001), ⁹(Drazen and Sutton, 2017)

Size class	Taxon	Feeding type	n	Biomass (mmol C ind ⁻¹) (Mean±Std)
Macro-fauna	Bivalvia ^a	FSF ¹	7	1.41×10 ⁻³ ±8.293×10 ⁻⁴
	Cumacea ^a	DF ¹	2	3.09×10 ⁻³ ±6.22×10 ⁻⁴
	Echinoidea ^b	85% O, 15% DF ⁴	64	9.66×10 ⁻³ ±2.844×10 ⁻²
	Gastropoda ^a	90% DF, 10% C ³	2	8.56×10 ⁻² ±3.98×10 ⁻²
	Isopoda ^a	93% DF, 7% C ²	4	1.33×10 ⁻³ ±1.06×10 ⁻³
	Ophiuroidea ^b	C ¹	64	9.66×10 ⁻³ ±2.844×10 ⁻²
	Polychaeta ^a	PolSF, PolSDF, PolSSDF, PolC, PolOF ⁷	26	1.33×10 ⁻² ±3.68×10 ⁻²
	Scaphopoda ^b	C ¹	64	9.66×10 ⁻³ ±2.84×10 ⁻²
Tanaidacea ^a	DF ¹	5	5.48×10 ⁻³ ±1.04×10 ⁻²	
Mega-fauna	Actiniaria	FSF ¹	301	2.95×10 ⁻¹ ±8.75×10 ⁻¹
	Antipatharia	FSF ¹	3	177.30±68.23
	Asciidiacea ^d	FSF ¹		8.30×10 ⁻¹
	Asteroidea	C ¹	53	139.23±43.56
	Bryozoa ^e	FSF ¹		22.38

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

	Cephalopoda	C!	7	46.85±27.88
--	-------------	----	---	-------------

	Ceriantharia ^d	FSF ¹		1923.17
	Cnidaria ^c	FSF ¹		2.35×10 ⁻¹
	Crinoidea ^d	FSF ¹		5.33
	Crustacea	C ^{1, 8}	541	2.56±10.05
	Echinoidea ^d	15% DF, 85% OF ⁴		59.17
	Alcyonacea ^d	FSF ¹		21.67
	Hemichordata ^g	DF ^{5, 8}		22.38
	Holothuroidea ^c	DF ¹	450	154.32±332.51
	Ophiuroidea	C ¹	527	16.05±10.15
	Pennatularia ^d	FSF ¹		21.67
	Polychaeta	PolSF, PolSDF, PolSSDF, PolC, PolOF ⁷	62	5.30×10 ⁻¹ ±1.20×10 ⁻²
	Porifera ^c	FSF ¹		6.74
Fish	Osteichthyes ^f	S, C ⁹	10	73.36±41.12

Formatted: Highlight


Formatted: Highlight

^aTaxon-specific individual biomass; ^bIndividual biomass calculated based on all other macrofauna data; ^cMedian taxon-specific individual biomass for individuals from the Porcupine Abyssal Plain where Durden et al. (2016) did not have reliable dimension measurements; ^dMean taxon-specific biomass data per individual were extracted from Tilot (1992) for the CCZ; ^eIndividual biomass of *Benthodytes* sp., one of the most abundant holothurian morphotype at the DISCOL site (Stratmann et al., in review); ^fIndividual biomass of *Ipnops* sp., the most abundant deep-sea fish at the PD₂₆ undisturbed site; ^gIndividual biomass calculated for mean ~~benthos~~-benthic megafauna at 4100 m depth based on the biomass-bathymetry and abundance-bathymetry relationships presented in Rex et al. (2006).

Table 2. Faunal respiration rate ($\text{mmol C m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$) and contribution (%) of the size classes macrofauna, polychaetes, megafauna and fish to the respiration for the undisturbed (Undist.) and disturbed (Dist.) sites directly after the disturbance event in March 1989 (PD_{0.1}), 0.5 years post-disturbance (September 1989, PD_{0.5}), 3 years post-disturbance (January 1992, PD₃), 7 years post-disturbance (February 1996, PD₇) and 26 years post-disturbance (September 2015, PD₂₆).

	PD _{0.1} , Undist.	PD _{0.1} , Dist.	PD _{0.5} , Undist.	PD _{0.5} , Dist.	PD ₃ , Undist.	PD ₃ , Dist.	PD ₇ , Undist.	PD ₇ , Dist.	PD ₂₆ , Undist.	PD ₂₆ , Dist.
Faunal respiration	1.02× 10 ⁻² ± 1.17×10 ⁻⁴	2.72× 10 ⁻³ ± 5.23×10 ⁻⁶	1.07× 10 ⁻² ± 5.73×10 ⁻⁵	6.02× 10 ⁻³ ± 6.75×10 ⁻⁵	3.92× 10 ⁻² ± 3.68×10 ⁻⁴	2.99× 10 ⁻² ± 2.33×10 ⁻⁴	2.14× 10 ⁻² ± 2.50×10 ⁻⁴	1.54× 10 ⁻² ± 1.49×10 ⁻⁴	2.00× 10 ⁻² ± 1.50×10 ⁻⁴	1.13× 10 ⁻² ± 1.04×10 ⁻⁴
Macrofauna	8.63	7.34	9.73	14.35	49.97	58.35	6.50	4.51	2.64	1.19
Polychaeta	61.59	77.80	62.69	77.61	27.09	30.03	67.08	83.51	18.52	32.43
Megafauna	29.47	14.85	27.06	8.04	22.30	11.54	25.75	11.63	78.67	64.95
Fish	3.02×10 ⁻¹	0.00	5.29×10 ⁻¹	0.00	6.43×10 ⁻¹	7.75×10 ⁻²	6.64×10 ⁻¹	3.53×10 ⁻¹	1.73×10 ⁻¹	1.44

Comment [MOU8]: Check precision



Comment [MOU9]: Change your color scheme. Your error bars are effectively invisible on many of the bar plots

Figure 1. Mean biomass (mmol C m^{-2}) of the ~~food~~-food-web compartments for the undisturbed and disturbed sites inside the DISCOL experimental area (Peru Basin, SE Pacific) 0.1 years post-disturbance ($\text{PD}_{0.1}$), for 0.5 years post-disturbance ($\text{PD}_{0.5}$), for three years post-disturbance (PD_3), for seven years post-disturbance (PD_7), and for 26 years post-disturbance (PD_{26}). The

5 error bars represent 1 standard deviation.

The abbreviation are: MacC = macrofauna carnivores, MacDF = macrofauna deposit feeders, MacFSF = macrofauna filter/suspension feeders, MacO = macrofauna omnivores, MegC = megafauna carnivores, MegDF = megafauna deposit feeders, MegFSF = megafauna filter/suspension feeders, MegOF = megafauna omnivores, PolC = polychaete carnivores, PolOF = polychaete omnivores, PolSDF = polychaete surface deposit feeders, PolSF = polychaete suspension feeders, PolSSDF =

10 polychaete subsurface deposit feeders.




Figure 2. Simplified schematic representation of the food-food-web structure that forms the basis of the linear inverse model (LIM). All compartments inside the box were part of the food-food-web model, whereas compartments outside the black box were only considered as carbon influx or efflux, but were not directly modelled. In order to simplify the graph, for macrofauna,

5 polychaetes and megafauna, only feeding types were presented and no size classes. Solid black arrows represent the carbon fluxes between food-web compartments and black dashed arrows represent the influx of carbon to the model. Blue-dotted arrows show the loss of carbon from the food web via respiration to DIC. The red-red-dashed arrows indicate the loss of carbon from the food web as faeces and as predation by pelagic/ benthopelagic fishes and the yellow-dashed arrow indicates the reduction of the carcass pool due to scavenging by pelagic/ benthopelagic fishes.




Figure 3. Proportional contribution (in %) of the feeding types C = carnivores, DF = deposit feeders, FSF = filter and suspension feeders, OF = omnivores to the total biomass for the undisturbed and disturbed sites inside the DISCOL experimental area (Peru Basin, SE Pacific) 0.1 years post-disturbance (PD_{0.1}), for 0.5 years post-disturbance (PD_{0.5}), for 3 years post-disturbance (PD₃), for 7 years post-disturbance (PD₇) and for 26 years post-disturbance (PD₂₆).

Comment [MOU10]: Use the abbreviation for years (yr) after Arabic numerals, both in this caption and the others.





Figure 4. A) Mean faunal carbon ingestion ($\text{mmol C m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$) as suspended detritus, sedimentary labile and sedimentary semi-labile detritus for the undisturbed and disturbed sites the DISCOL experimental area (Peru Basin, SE Pacific) 0.1 years post-disturbance ($\text{PD}_{0.1}$), 0.5 years post-disturbance ($\text{PD}_{0.5}$), 3 years post-disturbance (PD_3), 7 years post-disturbance (PD_7) and 26 years post-disturbance (PD_{26}). B) Mean carbon losses ($\text{mmol C m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$) from the food webs as predation, faeces, scavenging on the carcass, and faunal respiration for the undisturbed and disturbed sites at $\text{PD}_{0.1}$, $\text{PD}_{0.5}$, PD_3 , PD_7 , PD_{26} . In both figures, the error bars represent 1 standard deviation.




Figure 5. Development of $\Delta T..$ (mmol C m⁻² d⁻¹), i.e., the difference in 'total system throughput' $T..$ from the undisturbed compared to the disturbed sites, over time. PD_{0.1} corresponds to 0.1 years post-disturbance, PD_{0.5} is 0.5 years post-disturbance, PD₃ is 3 years post-disturbance, PD₇ is 7 years post-disturbance and PD₂₆ is 26 years post-disturbance.




Figure 6. Feeding-type-related differences in the recovery of faunal respiration ($\text{mmol C m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$) over time following the DISCOL disturbance experiment. Due to a lack of pre-disturbance respiration rates (T_0), the respiration rate for each feeding type (filter and suspension feeders=FSF, surface deposit feeders=SDF, subsurface deposit feeders=SSDF, fish) is standardized

5 to the respective feeding type specific respiration rate at the undisturbed sediment of 0.1 years post-disturbance. The respiration rate for filter and suspension feeders includes the respiration of macrofaunal, polychaete and megafaunal filter and suspension

feeders. The surface deposit feeders are the polychaete surface deposit feeders and the subsurface deposit feeders correspond to the polychaete subsurface deposit feeders. Fish are the scavengers and predators.