Foraminiferal community response to seasonal anoxia in Lake Grevelingen (the Netherlands)

Julien Richirt[1], Bettina Riedel[1,2], Aurélia Mouret[1], Magali Schweizer[1], Dewi Langlet[1,3], Dorina Seitaj[4], Filip J. R. Meysman[5,6], Caroline P. Slomp[7] and Frans J. Jorissen[1]

[1]UMR 6112 LPG-BIAF Recent and Fossil Bio-Indicators, University of Angers, 2 Boulevard Lavoisier, F-49045 Angers, France
[2]First Zoological Department, Vienna Museum of Natural History, Burgring 7, 1010 Vienna, Austria
[3]Univ. Lille, CNRS, Univ. Littoral Côte d'Opale, UMR 8187, LOG, Laboratoire d'Océanologie et de Géosciences, F 62930 Wimereux, France
[4]Department of Ecosystem Studies, Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research (NIOZ), Yerseke, the Netherlands
[5]Department of Biology, University of Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1, BE-2610 Wilrijk, Belgium
[6]Department of Biotechnology, Delft University of Technology, 2629 HZ Delft, the Netherlands
[7]Department of Earth Sciences (Geochemistry), Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, Princetonlaan 8a, 3584 CB Utrecht, the Netherlands

Correspondence to: Julien Richirt (richirt.julien@gmail.com)

Abstract. Over the last decades, hypoxia in marine coastal environments has become more and more widespread, prolonged and intense. Hypoxic events have large consequences for the functioning of benthic ecosystems. In severe cases, they may lead to complete anoxia and presence of toxic sulphides in the sediment and bottom-water, thereby strongly affecting biological compartments of benthic marine ecosystems. Within these ecosystems, benthic foraminifera show a high diversity of ecological responses, with a wide range of adaptive life strategies. Some species are particularly resistant to hypoxia/anoxia and consequently, it is interesting to study the whole foraminiferal community as well as species specific responses to such events. Here we investigated the temporal dynamics of living benthic foraminiferal communities (recognised by CellTracker™ Green) at two sites in the saltwater Lake Grevelingen in the Netherlands. These sites are subject to seasonal anoxia with different durations and are characterised by the presence of free sulphide (H_2S) in the uppermost part of the sediment. Our results indicate that foraminiferal communities are impacted by the presence of H_2S in their habitat, with a stronger response in case of longer exposure times. At the deepest site (34 m), in summer 2012, one to two months of anoxia and free H_2S in the surface sediment resulted in an almost complete disappearance of the foraminiferal community. Conversely, at the shallower site (23 m), where the duration of anoxia and free H_2S was shorter (one month or less), a dense foraminiferal community was found throughout the year excepted for a short period after the stressful event. Interestingly, at both sites, the foraminiferal community showed a delayed response to the onset of anoxia and free H_2S, suggesting that the combination of anoxia and free H_2S does not lead to increased mortality, but rather to strongly decreased reproduction rates. At the deepest site, where highly stressful conditions prevailed for one to two months, the recovery time of the community takes about half a year. In Lake Grevelingen, *Elphidium selseyense* and *Elphidium magellanicum* are much less affected by anoxia and free H_2S than *Ammonia*

sp. T6. We hypothesise that this is not due to a higher tolerance for H_2S, but rather related to the seasonal availability of food sources, which could have been less suitable for *Ammonia* sp. T6 than for the elphidiids.

1 Introduction

Hypoxia affects numerous marine environments, from the open ocean to coastal areas. Over the last decades, a general decline in oxygen concentration was observed in marine waters (Stramma et al., 2012), with an extent varying between the concerned regions. In coastal areas, oxygen concentrations have been estimated to decrease 10 times faster than in the open ocean, with indications of a recent acceleration, expressed by increasing frequency, intensity, extent and duration of hypoxic events (Diaz and Rosenberg, 2008; Gilbert et al., 2010). This is due to the combination of (1) global warming, which is strengthening seasonal stratification of the water column and decreasing oxygen solubility and (2) eutrophication resulting from increased anthropogenic nutrient and/or organic matter input, which is enhancing benthic oxygen consumption in response to increased primary production (Diaz and Rosenberg, 2008). Bottom water hypoxia has serious consequences for the functioning of all benthic ecosystem compartments (see Riedel et al., 2016 for a review). Benthic faunas are strongly impacted by these events (Diaz and Rosenberg, 1995) although the meiofauna, especially foraminifera, appears to be less sensitive to low dissolved oxygen (DO) concentrations than the macrofauna (e.g. Josefson and Widbom, 1988). Many foraminiferal taxa are able to withstand seasonal hypoxia/anoxia (see Koho et al., 2012 for a review), and consequently can play a major role in carbon cycling in ecosystems affected by seasonal low-oxygen concentrations (Woulds et al., 2007). Anoxia is often accompanied by free sulphide (H_2S) in pore and/or bottom-waters (e.g. Jørgensen, 1982; Seitaj et al., 2015), which is considered very harmful for the benthic macrofauna (Wang and Chapman, 1999). Neutral molecular H_2S can diffuse through cellular membranes and inhibits the functioning of cytochrome *c* oxydase (a mitochondrial enzyme involved in ATP production), finally inhibiting aerobic respiration (Nicholls and Kim, 1982; Khan et al., 1990; Dorman et al., 2002).

Lake Grevelingen (southwestern Netherlands) is a former branch of the Rhine-Meuse-Scheldt estuary, which was closed in its eastern part (riverside) by the Grevelingen Dam in 1964 and in its western part (seaside) by the Brouwers Dam in 1971. The resulting saltwater lake, with a surface of 115 km², is one of the largest saline lakes in Western Europe. Lake Grevelingen is characterised by a strongly reduced circulation (even after the construction of a small sluice in 1978) with a strong thermal stratification occurring in the main channels in summer, leading to seasonal bottom-water hypoxia/anoxia in late summer and early autumn (Bannink et al., 1984). This situation results in to a rise of the H_2S front in the uppermost part of the sediment, sometimes up to the sediment-water interface.

These observations especially concern the Den Osse Basin (i.e. one of the deeper basins, maximum depth 34 m; Hagens et al., 2015), which has been intensively monitored over the last decades, so that a large amount of environmental data is available (e.g. Wetsteijn, 2011; Donders et al., 2012). The annual net primary production in the Den Osse Basin (i.e. 225 g C m^{-2} y^{-1}, Hagens et al., 2015) is comparable to other estuarine systems in Europe (Cloern et al., 2014). However, there is almost no nutrient input from external sources, thus primary production is largely based on autochthonous recycling (>90 %, Hagens et

al., 2015), both in the water column and in the sediment, with a very strong pelagic/benthic coupling (de Vries and Hopstaken, 1984). The benthic environment is characterised by the presence of two antagonistic groups of bacteria, with contrasting seasonal population dynamics (i.e. cable bacteria in winter/spring and *Beggiatoaceae* in autumn/winter), which have a profound impact on all biogeochemical cycles in the sediment column (Seitaj et al., 2015; Sulu-Gambari et al., 2016a, 2016b). The combination of hypoxia/anoxia with sulphidic conditions, which is rather unusual in coastal systems without external nutrient input, and the activity of antagonistic bacterial communities make Lake Grevelingen a very peculiar environment. In the Den Osse Basin, seasonal anoxia coupled with the presence of H_2S at or very close to the sediment-water interface occurs in summer (i.e. between July–September). However, euxinia (i.e. diffusion of free H_2S in the water column) does not occur, because of cable bacterial activity (Seitaj et al., 2015).

Although the tolerance of foraminifera to low DO contents and long term anoxia (from weeks to 10 months) has been well documented for many species from different types of environments in laboratory culture (e.g. Moodley and Hess, 1992; Alve and Bernhard, 1995; Bernhard and Alve, 1996; Moodley et al., 1997; Duijnstee et al., 2003; Geslin et al., 2004; Duijnstee et al., 2005; Ernst et al., 2005; Pucci et al., 2009; Koho et al., 2011; Geslin et al., 2014) as well as in field studies (e.g. Piña-Ochoa et al., 2010b ; Langlet et al., 2013; 2014), their tolerance to free H_2S is still debated. In the vast majority of previous studies, no decrease in the total abundances of living foraminifera (i.e. strongly increased mortality) was observed during anoxic events. Unfortunately, studies on foraminiferal response in systems affected by seasonal hypoxia/anoxia with sulphidic conditions are still very sparse. The few available observations are not conclusive, but suggest that H_2S could be toxic for foraminifera even on fairly short time scales (Bernhard, 1993; Moodley et al., 1998b; Panieri and Sen Gupta, 2008; Langlet et al., 2014).

To our knowledge, all earlier studies show that the foraminiferal response to hypoxia/anoxia is species-specific (e.g. Bernhard and Alve, 1996; Ernst et al., 2005; Bouchet et al., 2007; Geslin et al., 2014; Langlet et al., 2014). However, this species-specific response generally follows the same scheme (usually decrease in density, reduction of growth and/or reproduction), with different response intensities. Duijnstee et al. (2005) suggested that oxic stress leads to an increased mortality and an inhibited growth and reproduction. The suggestion of inhibited growth is supported by LeKieffre et al. (2017) who observed that the morphospecies *Ammonia tepida* (probably *Ammonia* sp. T6) showed minimal or no growth under anoxia. Conversely, Geslin et al. (2014) and Nardelli et al. (2014) suggested that, in the same morphospecies, reproduction was strongly reduced, but growth would not be affected by hypoxic and/or short anoxic events. Additionally, under low-oxygen conditions, some species are able to shift to anaerobic metabolism (i.e. denitrification, Risgaard-Petersen et al., 2006; Piña-Ochoa et al., 2010a), to sequester chloroplast (i.e. kleptoplastidy, Jauffrais et al., 2018), to associate with bacterial symbionts (Bernhard et al., 2010) or to enter into a state of dormancy (Ross and Hallock, 2016; LeKieffre et al., 2017).

The highly peculiar environmental context of Lake Grevelingen offers an excellent opportunity to study this still poorly known aspect of foraminiferal ecology.

The conventional method to discriminate between live and dead foraminifera uses Rose Bengal, a compound which stains proteins (i.e. organic matter). This method was proposed for foraminifera by Walton (1952) and is based on the assumption

that "*the presence of protoplasm is positive indication of a living or very recently dead organism*". The author already noted that this assumption implied that the rate of degradation of organic material should be relatively high. Previous studies of living benthic foraminifera in environments subjected to hypoxia/anoxia were almost all based on Rose Bengal stained samples (e.g. Gustafsson and Nordberg, 1999, 2000; Duijnstee et al., 2004; Panieri, 2006; Schönfeld and Numberger, 2007; Polovodova et al., 2009; Papaspyrou et al., 2013). However, foraminiferal protoplasm may remain stainable from several weeks to months after their death (Corliss and Emerson, 1990), especially under low dissolved oxygen concentrations where organic matter degradation may be very slow (Bernhard, 1988; Hannah and Rogerson, 1997; Bernhard et al., 2006). The Rose Bengal staining method is therefore not suitable for studies in environments affected by hypoxia/anoxia. Consequently, the results of foraminiferal studies in low-oxygen environments based on this method have to be considered with reserve. In order to avoid this problem, we used CellTracker™ Green (CTG) to recognise living foraminifera. CTG is a fluorescent probe which marks only living individuals with cytoplasmic (i.e. enzymatic) metabolic activity (Bernhard et al., 2006). Since metabolic activity stops after the death of the organism, CTG should give a much more accurate assessment of the living assemblages at the various sampling times, and thereby avoid over-estimation of the live foraminiferal abundances.

In this study, samples were collected in August and November 2011 and then every month through the year 2012, at two different stations in the Den Osse Basin, with two replicates dedicated to foraminifera. The two stations were chosen in contrasted environments regarding water depth (34 m and 23 m, respectively) and duration of seasonal hypoxia/anoxia and sulphidic conditions. Living foraminiferal assemblages were studied in the uppermost sediment and size distributions were determined in order to get insight into the possible moment(s) of reproduction or accelerated growth in test size. The seasonal variability study of the foraminiferal community allows us (1) to better understand the foraminiferal tolerance to seasonal hypoxia/anoxia with presence of free H_2S in their microhabitat and (2) to obtain information about the responses of the various species to adverse conditions. This knowledge will be useful for the development of indices assessing environmental quality (i.e. biomonitoring) and may also improve paleoecological interpretations of coastal records (e.g. Murray, 1967; Gustafsson and Nordberg, 1999).

2 Material and Methods

2.1 Studied area – environmental settings in the Den Osse Basin.

Lake Grevelingen is a part of the former Rhine-Meuse-Scheldt estuary, in the southwestern Netherlands. This former estuarine branch was turned into an artificial saltwater lake during the Delta Works project. In Lake Grevelingen, the water circulation is strongly limited by the construction of dams (in the early 1970s) and only a small sluice allows water exchanges with open sea waters (i.e. very weak hydrodynamics). In the Lake, development of bottom-water hypoxia/anoxia occurs in the deepest part of the basin in summer (i.e. July–September) to early autumn (i.e. October–December, Bannink et al., 1984; Hagens et al., 2015). In the literature, the terminology and threshold values used to describe oxygen depletion are highly variable (e.g., oxic, dysoxic, hypoxic, suboxic, microxic, postoxic; see Jorissen et al., 2007; Altenbach et al., 2012). In this study we defined

hypoxia as a concentration of oxygen <63 µmol L^{-1} (1.4 mL L^{-1} or 2 mg L^{-1}) whereas anoxia is defined as no detectable oxygen (following Rabalais et al., 2010).

In Den Osse Basin, the nutrient input from external sources is very low and pelagic/benthic coupling is essential, as already noted by de Vries and Hopstaken (1984). In 2012, phytoplankton blooms occurred in April-May and July (Hagens et al., 2015, Fig. 10) in response to the increasing solar radiation and nutrient availability in the water column following organic matter recycling in winter. This led to an increased food availability in the benthic compartment in the same periods. In general, Chl *a* concentrations in Den Osse Basin are below 10 µg L^{-1}, excluding very short peaks during blooms in April–May and July which did not exceed 30 µg L^{-1} in 2012 (Hagens et al., 2015). Thermal stratification of the water column and increased oxygen consumption due to organic matter input (i.e. from phytoplankton blooms) both are responsible for the development of seasonal bottom-water hypoxia/anoxia in summer (i.e. July–September). Although euxinia (i.e. the presence of free H_2S in the water column) does not occur in the Den Osse Basin due to cable bacterial activity in winter, free H_2S is present in the uppermost layer of the sediment in summer (Seitaj et al., 2015). Summarising, in the benthic ecosystem, increased food availability in summer is counterbalanced by strongly decreasing oxygen contents, sometimes accompanied by the presence of free sulphides in the topmost sediment.

2.2 Field Sampling

The two studied sites are located along a depth gradient in the Den Osse Basin of Lake Grevelingen. Both station 1 (51°44.834' N, 3°53.401' E) and station 2 (51°44.956' N, 3°53.826' E) are located in the main channel, at 34 and 23 m depth, respectively (see map in Hagens et al, 2015).

Measurements of bottom-water oxygen (BWO) concentrations were performed at 2 m above the sediment-water interface and are from Donders et al. (2012), whereas the data for 2012 were published in Hagens et al. (2015). Sediment cores were collected monthly in 2012 using a single core gravity corer (UWITEC, Austria) using PVC core liners (6cm inner diameter, 60cm length). All cores were inspected upon retrieval and only visually undisturbed sediment cores were used for further analysis (Seitaj et al., 2017). Oxygen penetration depth (OPD) and depth of free H_2S detection were determined by Seitaj et al., (2015) using profiling microsensors for station 1. The data for station 2 (Supplementary Table 1) were acquired similarly and during the same cruises but never published, for further details about the sampling method, see Seitaj et al. (2015).

Two replicate sediment cores dedicated to the foraminiferal study were sampled in August and November 2011 using the same gravity corer (UWITEC, Austria) and then monthly throughout the year 2012 at the same sampling time as for BWO concentration and OPD and H_2S measurements in the sediment (see Seitaj et al., 2015). Consequently, for 2012 at station 1 and 2, OPD and H_2S were measured in the sediment column at the same time as foraminifera were sampled (Seitaj et al., 2015). For each replicate, the uppermost centimetre of the core was then transferred on board in a vial of 250 mL, and 30 mL of seawater (at the same temperature than *in situ*) was added in the vial. Then we labelled the samples with CellTracker™ Green CMFDA (CTG, 5-chloromethylfluorescein diacetate, final concentration of 1µmol L^{-1} following Bernhard et al., 2006) and

slowly agitated manually to allow the CTG diffusion in the whole sample. Samples were then fixed in 5 % sodium borate buffered formalin after 24 h of incubation in the dark.

2.3 Sample Treatment

All samples were sieved over 315, 150, 125 µm meshes, and foraminiferal assemblages were studied in all three size fractions. Individuals were picked wet under an epifluorescence stereomicroscope (Olympus SZX12, light fluorescent source Olympus URFL-T, excitation/emission wavelengths: 492 nm/517 nm) and placed on micropalaeontological slides. Only specimens that fluoresced brightly green were considered as living and were identified to the (morpho-)species level when possible. Since picking foraminifera under an epifluorescence stereomicroscope is particularly time-consuming, we decided to study samples only every two months for the year 2012. At a later stage, in view of the large differences in foraminiferal abundances between the samples of September and November 2012 at station 2, we decided to study the October and December 2012 samples as well for this station. The sampling dates investigated in this study are listed in Table 1.

Abundances were then standardised to a volume of 10 cm^3. The abundances of living foraminifera for each sampling time and replicate are listed in Supplementary Tables 2 and 3. The mean abundance and standard deviation ($\overline{x} \pm sd$) for the two replicates for each sampling date were calculated both for the total living assemblage and the individual species, as an indication of spatial patchiness.

2.4 Taxonomy of dominant species

Four dominant species (>1 % of the total assemblage) were present in our material: *Ammonia* sp. T6, *Elphidium magellanicum* (Heron-Allen and Earland, 1932), *Elphidium selseyense* (Heron-Allen and Earland, 1911) and *Trochammina inflata* (Montagu, 1808). As we identified these species on the basis of morphological criteria, we will use them as "morphospecies".

Concerning the genus *Ammonia*, two living specimens collected at Grevelingen station 1 were molecularly identified (by DNA barcoding) as phylotype T6 by Bird et al. (2019). At the same site, we genotyped seven other living *Ammonia* specimens, which were all T6. Their sequences were deposited on GenBank (accession numbers MN190684 to MN190690) and Supplementary Figure 1 shows Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) images of the spiral side and of the penultimate chamber at 1000x magnification for four individuals. A morphological screening based on the criteria proposed by Richirt et al. (2019) confirmed that T6 accounts for the vast majority (>98 %) of *Ammonia* individuals, whereas phylotypes T1, T2, T3 and T15 are only present in very small amounts (Supplementary Table 3).

The specimens of *Elphidium magellanicum* were identified exclusively on the basis of morphological criteria, as there are no molecular data available yet. This morphospecies, although rare, is regularly recognised in Boreal and Lusitanean provinces of Europe (e.g. Gustafsson and Nordberg, 1999; Darling et al., 2016; Alve et al., 2016). However, as the type species was described from the Magellan strait (Southern Chile), the European specimens may represent a different species and further studies involving DNA sequencing of both populations are needed to confirm or infirm this taxonomic attribution (see Roberts et al., 2016).

In the past, *Elphidium selseyense* has often been considered as an ecophenotype of *Elphidium excavatum* (Terquem, 1875) and has been identified as *E. excavatum* forma *selseyensis* (e.g. Feyling-Hanssen, 1972; Miller et al., 1982). Recently, Darling et al. (2016) showed that the various ecophenotypes recognised in *E. excavatum* are in fact genetically separated and therefore represent different species. Four living specimens of the *E. excavatum* group sampled at station 1 for DNA analysis were all identified as *E. selseyense* (phylotype S5, Darling et al., 2016). We only observed minor morphological variations in our material, especially concerning the number of small bosses in the umbilical region, which we considered as intraspecific variability. Consequently, we identified all our specimens as *E. selseyense*.

The specimens attributed to *Trochammina inflata* were also identified exclusively on the basis of morphological criteria, as no molecular data are available yet.

2.5 Size distribution measurement

In order to detect periods of increased growth and/or reproduction, size measurements were performed on all samples of 2012. The measurements were made for all species, which represent together 4176 individuals for station 1 and 19624 individuals for station 2. Prior to measurements, trochospiral species were all orientated in the same way (spiral side up). High-resolution images (3648*2736 pixels) of all micropalaeontological slides were taken with a stereomicroscope (Leica S9i, 10x magnification). In order to obtain measurements for all individual specimens, images were processed using ImageJ software (Schneider et al., 2012, Fig. 1).

The three size fractions (125–150, 150–315, >315 µm) were analysed together for the size distribution analyses. Each individual was isolated on the image (Fig. 1) and its maximum diameter was measured (i.e. Feret's diameter). We represented all size distributions using histograms with 20 µm classes (the best compromise between the total number of individuals and the size range (Supplementary Figure 2). In order to compare more easily months and species, the median and the mode (associated with the numbers of individuals) were calculated for each size distribution. As we only examined the size fractions >125 µm, our analysis mainly concerns adult specimens, and does not include juveniles. This limitation should be kept in mind when interpreting the results.

In an attempt to recognize the different cohorts for each species in each of the bimonthly samples, we assumed that the size distribution was a sum of Gaussian curves, each of them representing a cohort. In order to identify the approximate mode for the Gaussian curves (i.e. cohorts), we used the changes in slope (i.e. inflexion points) of the second-order derivative of the total size distribution (Gammon et al., 2017). Unfortunately, this tentative to distinguish cohorts by using a deconvolution method was not conclusive. The main problem was the lack of information concerning individuals smaller than 125 µm, so that our size distributions were systematically skewed on the left side (i.e. toward small individuals). An additional problem was the large number of smaller specimens which were always present. Because the identification of individual cohorts was not successful, parameters like reproduction rate, growth rate or lifespan were not assessable, and therefore a study of population dynamics was not possible. For this reason, the data are shown in the supplementary material (Supplementary

Figures 2). Nevertheless, the size distribution data give some clues concerning the possible moment(s) of reproduction or intensified test growth for the different species.

2.6 Encrusted forms of *E. magellanicum*

In our samples, we found abundant encrusted forms of *E. magellanicum* at station 1 (May 2012) and station 2 (May, July, September and December 2012, Fig. 8). Most individuals were totally encrusted (Fig. 8a), others only partly (Fig. 8b). These crusts were hard, firmly stuck to the shell (difficult to remove with a brush), thin (Fig. 8c–e) and rather coarse. In order to determine if the crust matrix is constituted of carbonate, we placed some specimens in microtubes and exposed them to 0.1 M of EDTA (EthyleneDiamineTetraacetic Acid) diluted in 0.1 M cacodylate buffer (acting as a carbonate chelator). After an exposition of 24h, we checked under a stereomicroscope if the crust was still cohesive (no carbonate in the crust) or was disaggregated (crust contains carbonate).

3 Results

3.1 Total abundances of foraminiferal assemblages

Averaged total abundances varied between 1.1 ± 1.5 and 449.9 ± 322.1 ind. 10 cm^{-3} for station 1, and between 91.1 ± 25 and 604.8 ± 3.5 ind. 10 cm^{-3} for station 2 (Figure 2 and Table 2). For every studied month, the total density was higher at station 2 than at station 1. The seasonal succession is very different between the two sites (Figure 2). Station 1 shows very low total foraminiferal abundances for most months, contrasting with much higher densities in May and July. Conversely, station 2 shows high total foraminiferal abundances throughout the year, with somewhat lower values in November 2011, and October and November 2012 (Figure 2).

At station 1, almost no individuals were present in August ($\overline{x} = 3.4 \pm 1.3$) and November 2011 ($\overline{x} = 1.1 \pm 1.5$). In 2012, total abundances were very low in January ($\overline{x} = 11.5 \pm 9.3$), showed a slight increase in March ($\overline{x} = 62.1 \pm 19.3$) and reached a maximal abundance in May ($\overline{x} = 449.9 \pm 322.1$). Total abundances then progressively decreased from May to September ($\overline{x} = 34 \pm 17$) and almost no foraminifera were present in November ($\overline{x} = 1.6 \pm 0.3$).

At station 2, total abundances were comparatively low in August and November 2011 ($\overline{x} = 174 \pm 48$ and $\overline{x} = 128.7 \pm 25$ ind. 10 cm^{-3}, respectively). In 2012, total abundances were relatively high and stable from January to September (between $\overline{x} = 523.6 \pm 30.7$ to $\overline{x} = 604.8 \pm 3.5$), then decreased in October ($\overline{x} = 211.5 \pm 8$) and November ($\overline{x} = 91.1 \pm 25.3$) and finally increased again in December ($\overline{x} = 377.9 \pm 38.8$).

3.2 Dominant Species

At station 1, the major species were, in order of decreasing abundances, *Elphidium selseyense* (Fig. 3a–b), *Elphidium magellanicum* (Fig. 3c–d) and *Ammonia* sp. T6 (Fig. 3e–g). In Figure 4, we added *Trochammina inflata* (Fig. 3h–j) to facilitate

comparison with station 2, where this species is among the dominant ones. The "Other species" account only for 2.2 % of the total assemblage at station 1. The fact that they are well represented in some months (e.g. 26.3 % of the assemblage in August 2011) is due to the extremely low number of individuals (see Fig. 2 and Table 2). At station 2, the dominant species, in order of decreasing abundances, were *E. selseyense*, *Ammonia* sp. T6, *E. magellanicum* and *T. inflata* (Table 2). Here, "Other species" account only for 2.6 % of the total assemblage. Whereas *E. selseyense* and *E. magellanicum* were dominant species at both stations, both *Ammonia* sp. T6 and *T. inflata* were present in much higher abundances at station 2 compared to station 1, where the latter species was almost absent (Fig. 4–5).

At station 1, only some very scarce individuals of *E. selseyense* were observed in August and November 2011 (Fig. 4 and Table 2). In 2012, *E. selseyense* abundances were very low in January started to increase in March ($\overline{x} = 23.9 \pm 6.8$) to reach maximal values in May ($\overline{x} = 336.5 \pm 275.8$). In July, values for *E. selseyense* were still high ($\overline{x} = 162 \pm 121.5$) and further decreased until an almost total absence in November 2012. No specimen of *E. magellanicum* was observed in 2011 (Fig. 4 and Table 2). The abundance of *E. magellanicum* was very low in January 2012, started to increase in March ($\overline{x} = 21.6 \pm 11$) to reach maximal values in May ($\overline{x} = 96.4 \pm 47.3$), then strongly decreased in July ($\overline{x} = 3.7 \pm 0.3$). The species was absent from samples in September and November 2012. *Ammonia* sp. T6 was almost absent in August and November 2011 and present with very few specimens in January 2012 ($\overline{x} = 3.2 \pm 3.5$). Maximum abundances were reached between March and July 2012 (ranging between $\overline{x} = 9.2 \pm 6.5$ and $\overline{x} = 12.9 \pm 1.3$). Then abundances rapidly decreased until the species was almost absent in November. *Trochammina inflata* was absent in 2011 and was only present with very low abundances from January to May and in September 2012.

At station 2, the two dominant species were *E. selseyense* and *Ammonia* sp. T6, which together always represented at least 70 % of the total assemblage (Fig. 5 and Table 2). These two species showed a different seasonal pattern over the considered period. Abundances of *E. selseyense* were comparable in August ($\overline{x} = 74.8 \pm 29.8$) and November 2011 ($\overline{x} = 52.3 \pm 27$) then showed a progressive increase until a maximum in September 2012 ($\overline{x} = 365.5 \pm 70.3$). Abundances then showed a sharp decrease in October and November (respectively $\overline{x} = 98.7 \pm 8.5$ and $\overline{x} = 30.9 \pm 2.3$) to increase again in December ($\overline{x} = 252.2 \pm 41$). For *Ammonia* sp. T6, abundances strongly increased between November 2011 ($\overline{x} = 60.8 \pm 1.5$) and January 2012 ($\overline{x} = 226.2 \pm 52.3$) and then progressively decreased until the end of 2012 ($\overline{x} = 48.1 \pm 26$ in November 2012). *Trochammina inflata* showed an analogous pattern to *Ammonia* sp. T6. Abundances strongly increased between November 2011 ($\overline{x} = 11.8 \pm 1.8$) and January 2012 ($\overline{x} = 121.5 \pm 29.8$), and then progressively decreased until very low abundances in November ($\overline{x} = 3.7 \pm 3$). *E. magellanicum* was completely absent in August and November 2011, almost absent in January 2012 ($\overline{x} = 0.9 \pm 0.3$) and then suddenly increased until a maximum of $\overline{x} = 116 \pm 6.5$ in May. Abundances stayed relatively high in July ($\overline{x} = 37.8 \pm 2.5$) and September ($\overline{x} = 72 \pm 35.8$), and then drastically decreased until minimum numbers in October and November. Finally, like all other species, *E. magellanicum* abundances increased again in December ($\overline{x} = 25.5 \pm 13$).

3.3 Encrusted forms of *Elphidium magellanicum*

After exposition to 0.1 M of EDTA diluted in 0.1 M cacodylate buffer, the crusts remained cohesive, indicating that it does not consist of carbonate, and suggesting that it is composed of sediment particles cemented by an organic matrix.

At station 1, encrusted forms of *E. magellanicum* were present in moderate proportions in May (26.8 % of the total *E. magellanicum* population, Fig. 9) and July (47.6 %); the species disappeared thereafter. At station 2, encrusted forms strongly dominated the *E. magellanicum* population from May (72.3 %) to December (88 %, Fig. 9).

4 Discussion

4.1 Tolerance of foraminiferal communities to anoxia and free sulphide

At station 1, bottom-waters were hypoxic in July 2012 and became anoxic in August (Fig. 10). Both in July and August, oxygen penetration into the sediment was null, whereas it was 0.7 ± 0.1 mm depth in September. In all three months (July to September 2012), sulphidic conditions were observed very close to the sediment-water interface (1 mm or less, Fig. 10 and Supplementary Table 1). In view of these results, the duration of anoxic and sulphidic conditions in the uppermost sediment layer can be estimated as one to two months (in July and August, Fig. 10).

After the strong increase of foraminiferal densities in May 2012, there was a decrease starting in July, leading to a near-absence of foraminifera at station 1 in November (Fig. 10). The most probable cause of the strong decline of the foraminiferal community appears to be a prolonged presence of sulphides in the foraminiferal microhabitat. However, the fact that foraminiferal abundances reached almost zero only in September (about two months after the first occurrence of anoxic and sulphidic conditions in the upper sediment, in July) suggests that the presence of H_2S did not cause instantaneous mortality, but that the disappearance of the foraminiferal community was a delayed response, probably caused by inhibited reproduction and, eventually, increased mortality. Inhibited reproduction has previously been suggested as a response to hypoxic/short anoxic (Geslin et al., 2014) and sulphidic conditions (Moodley et al., 1998b).

Such a time lag between a change in foraminiferal abundances and changes in environmental parameters affecting reproduction and/or growth of foraminifera has been suggested previously by Duijnstee et al. (2004). These authors highlighted that the density patterns of some foraminiferal species showed a higher correlation with measured environmental parameters (e.g., oxygenation or temperature) when a time lag of about three months was applied.

For 2011, at station 1, no pore-water O_2 and H_2S measurements are available. However, severe hypoxia was observed in the bottom-waters from May to August, with anoxia in June 2011 (Fig. 10). We therefore assume that like in 2012, anoxic and probably co-occurring sulphidic conditions were responsible for the very low standing stocks in August and November 2011 and January 2012.

Our observations confirm the suggestion in previous studies that the foraminiferal community is severely affected by a long-term presence of H_2S in its habitat, but does not show instant mortality. In fact, after a 66-day incubation in euxinic conditions

(a maximum of 11.9 ± 0.4 µmol L^{-1} of H_2S in the overlying water) of foraminiferal assemblages collected at a 19 m deep site in the Adriatic Sea, Moodley et al. (1998a) found a strong decrease of the total density of Rose Bengal stained foraminifera. After 21 days, living specimens were still observed, whereas after 42 and 66 days, the live checks (based on protoplasm movement) gave only negative results. Langlet et al. (2013, 2014), performed an *in situ* experiment with closed benthic chambers at a 24 m deep site in the Gulf of Trieste, in the Adriatic Sea. They observed a decrease of living foraminiferal density (labelled with CTG), but also found that almost all species survived after 10 months of anoxia and periodically co-occurring H_2S in the sediment and overlying water. However, the duration of sulphidic conditions, which was estimated to several weeks, could not be assessed precisely (Metzger et al., 2014). The suggestion that short-time exposure to euxinic conditions is not directly lethal for foraminifera is confirmed by the experimental results of Bernhard (1993), who found that foraminiferal activity (as determined by ATP content) was not significantly affected after 30-day exposure to euxinia (32.6 ± 8.6 % of active individuals, n=174. in control conditions versus 29.5 ± 6.2 %, n= 173 in sulphidic conditions).

After the 2011 hypoxia/anoxia, standing stocks at station 1 only started to increase in March 2012, indicating a very long recovery time (about 6 months) of the foraminiferal faunas after a temporary near-extinction due to anoxic and sulphidic conditions. This confirms observations of relatively long recovery times in the literature (e.g. Alve, 1995, 1999; Gustafsson and Nordberg, 2000; Hess et al., 2005). For instance, Gustafsson & Nordberg (1999) showed that in the Koljö Fjord, at comparable water depths, foraminiferal populations responded with increased densities only three months after a renewal of sea-floor oxygenation following hypoxic conditions in the bottom-waters. However, in that case, the disappearance of the foraminiferal population was only partial, and not nearly complete as in our study.

At station 2, in 2012, hypoxia was only observed in August, when the OPD was zero, and sulphidic conditions were observed in the superficial sediment (i.e. from 0.4 ± 0.2 mm downwards, Fig. 11, Supplementary Table 1). Both in July and September, oxygen penetrated more than one millimetre into the sediment (1.3 ± 0.4 mm and 1.2 ± 0.2 mm, respectively). However, free H_2S was still detected at about one millimetre depth in the sediment (1.1 ± 0.8 mm in July and 0.8 ± 0.2 mm in September). Although the sampling plan does not allow us to be very precise about the duration of anoxic and sulphidic conditions, we can estimate their duration to be 1 month or less (Fig. 11).

Foraminiferal abundances showed a strong decrease in October and November 2012, about two months after the presence of anoxic and sulphidic conditions in the topmost part of the sediment (Fig. 11). Like at station 1, this temporal offset between the presence of anoxia/sulphidic conditions at station 2 (in August) and the strong decrease of faunal densities may be explained as a delayed response, mainly due to inhibited reproduction during the anoxic/sulphidic event. If true, the mortality of adults did not strongly increase in the months following the H_2S production in the uppermost sediment. Nevertheless, there was no replacement in the >125 µm fraction by growing juveniles, probably because reproduction was interrupted when H_2S was present in the foraminiferal microhabitat. A renewed recruitment after the last stage of sulphidic conditions somewhere in September would then explain why the faunal density in the >125 µm fraction increased again in December 2012 (Supplementary Figure 2).

In 2011, at station 2, bottom-waters oscillated between hypoxic and oxic conditions between May and August (Fig. 11). Although we have no measurements of H_2S in the pore waters for this year, it seems probable that bottom-water hypoxia was accompanied by the presence of free H_2S very close to the sediment surface, strongly affecting the foraminiferal communities. If we assume that, like in 2012, rich foraminiferal faunas were present in May–July 2011 at both stations, the low faunal densities observed in August and November 2011 could suggest that foraminifera may have also shown a delayed response to sulphidic conditions in 2011.

It is interesting to note that the foraminiferal densities observed at station 2 were lower in August 2011 than in July or September 2012. This may be a consequence of the repetition of short hypoxic events in the bottom-water between May and August 2011 (probably associated with anoxia and maybe H_2S in the uppermost part of the sediment), which possibly affected the foraminiferal community more substantially in 2011 than in 2012, when a hypoxic event was recorded in August only.

The important decrease of total standing stocks at station 2 in October and November 2012 (Fig. 11) suggests that, in spite of the shorter duration of anoxia and sulphide conditions (compared to station 1; one month or less compared to one to two months), the foraminiferal faunas were still strongly affected. However, at station 2, foraminiferal abundances increased again in December 2012, suggesting a recovery time of about two months, which is likely much shorter than at station 1, where standing stocks in the >125 µm fraction only increased 6 months after the presence of anoxia and free sulphides.

Summarising, the foraminiferal communities of both stations 1 and 2 seem strongly impacted by the anoxic and sulphidic conditions developing in the uppermost part of the sediment in summer (i.e. July–September). However, at station 1, where anoxic and sulphidic conditions lasted for one to two months, the response is much stronger, leading ultimately (in November) to almost complete disappearance of the foraminiferal fauna. The delayed response at both stations shows that instantaneous mortality was limited, and suggests that the decreasing standing stocks might rather be the result of inhibited reproduction, and eventually, increased mortality. Recovery is much faster at station 2 (about two months) than at station 1 (about six months), probably because at station 1 (in contrast to station 2) the foraminiferal extinction was nearly complete, and the site had to be recolonised (e.g. possibly by nearby sites or by the remaining few individuals) after reoxygenation of the sediment. At station 2, a reduced but significant foraminiferal community remained present, explaining the faster recovery.

4.2 Species-specific response to anoxia, sulphide and food availability in Lake Grevelingen

The comparison of the different seasonal patterns of the major species at the two investigated stations allows us to draw some conclusions about interspecific differences in the response to seasonal anoxic and sulphidic conditions.

First, there is a clear faunal difference between the two stations. Station 1 is dominated by *E. selseyense* and *E. magellanicum* while at station 2, these two taxa are accompanied by *Ammonia* sp. T6 and *T. inflata*. The latter species is almost absent at station 1, where *Ammonia* sp. T6 is present with low densities. At first view, the dominance of the two *Elphidium* species at station 1, would suggest that they have a greater tolerance to the seasonal anoxic and sulphidic conditions, which lasted much longer there. It is interesting to note that the temporal evolution of standing stocks at station 1 is different for the two *Elphidium*

species. *Elphidium magellanicum* shows a strong drop in absolute density in July 2012, at the onset of H_2S presence in the uppermost part of the sediment, whereas the diminution of *E. selseyense* is more progressive and the species disappears almost completely only in November (Fig. 4). This strongly suggests that *E. magellanicum* is more affected by increased mortality than *E. selseyense* in response to the combined effects of anoxic and sulphidic conditions. This hypothesis is confirmed by the patterns observed at station 2, where the drop in standing stocks in October–November is also more drastic in *E. magellanicum* than in *E. selseyense* (Fig. 5).

As mentioned earlier, certain species of foraminifera can use an anaerobic metabolism (i.e. denitrification, Risgaard-Petersen et al., 2006; Piña-Ochoa et al., 2010a), sequester chloroplasts (i.e. kleptoplastidy, Jauffrais et al., 2018), host bacterial symbiont (Bernhard et al., 2010) or enter in dormancy (Ross and Hallock, 2016; LeKieffre et al., 2017) to deal with low-oxygen conditions. Concerning the species found in this study, although the presence of intracellular nitrate was shown for *Ammonia*, denitrification tests yielded negative results (Piña-Ochoa et al., 2010a; Nomaki et al. 2014). Similarly, the presence of active symbionts was previously suggested for *Ammonia* but never confirmed (Nomaki et al., 2016; Bernhard et al., 2018). To our knowledge, denitrification or the presence of bacterial symbionts was never shown for *Elphidium* either. In conclusion, a shift to an alternative anaerobic metabolism or an association with bacterial symbionts has never been shown conclusively for the dominant foraminiferal species found in Lake Grevelingen.

The greater tolerance of *E. selseyense* to low-oxygen conditions could be explained by the fact that it is able to sequester chloroplasts from ingested diatoms, and to keep them active for several days to weeks, conversely to *Ammonia* sp. T6 (Jauffrais et al., 2018). These active chloroplasts could serve as an alternative source of oxygen and/or food through photosynthesis (Bernhard and Alve, 1996) or another metabolic pathway (Jauffrais et al., 2019), and thereby increase the capability of this species to survive anoxic events. Although sequestration of chloroplasts was never investigated for *E. magellanicum*, its abundant spinose ornamentation in the umbilical region and in the vicinity of the aperture (Fig. 3c–d) suggests that this species is capable to crush diatom frustules as some kleptoplastic species (Bernhard and Bowser, 1999; Austin et al., 2005). As Hagens et al. (2015) observed that the light penetration depth in the Den Osse Basin never exceeded 15 m in 2012, and therefore photosynthesis by kleptoplasts (Bernhard and Alve, 1996) appears unlikely for both our aphotic stations (34 and 23 m depth). However, other foraminifera from aphotic and anoxic environments such as deep fjords are kleptoplastic and use these kleptoplasts for a yet unknown purpose (Jauffrais et al. 2019).

Rather surprisingly, the drop in foraminiferal densities at station 2 in October–November, which we interpreted as a delayed response to sulphidic conditions, is less strong for *Ammonia* sp. T6 than for the two *Elphidium* species, suggesting that this species is less affected. However, this does not agree with our previous suggestion that the two *Elphidium* species would be more tolerant to anoxic and sulphidic conditions. As already proposed by LeKieffre et al. (2017), *Ammonia* seems to be able to deal with anoxia (up to 28 days, but with no sulphide) by reducing its metabolic activity, but this ability was never shown

for *Elphidium* species. If *E. selseyense* and *E. magellanicum* are indeed unable to resist to anoxia by reducing their metabolism or by entering a dormancy state, this could explain their stronger decrease in densities at station 2 compared to *Ammonia* sp. T6. Nevertheless, further studies about the ability and mechanisms of the two *Elphidium* species to resist to anoxic/sulphidic conditions are necessary.

Another remarkable observation is that *Ammonia* sp. T6 (and *T. inflata*) shows maximum densities in January–March, contrasting with the two *Elphidium* species, which have their density maxima later in the year (May–September). This temporal offset could possibly be explained by a difference in preferential food source, with food particles available in winter (January–March) being more suitable for *Ammonia* sp. T6 (and *T. inflata*), versus food particles available later in the year, resulting from phytoplankton blooms, being more favourable for *E. selseyense* and *E. magellanicum*.

In our study, for *E. selseyense* (and *E. magellanicum*), the continuous presence of a high proportion of small sized specimens and progressively increasing densities between January and September 2012 strongly suggest ongoing and continuous reproduction (Supplementary Figure 2A). Continuous reproduction during the year has been described earlier for different foraminiferal genera, such as *Elphidium, Ammonia, Haynesina, Nonion* and *Trochammina* (e.g. Jones and Ross, 1979; Murray, 1983; Cearreta, 1988; Murray, 1992; Basson and Murray, 1995; Gustafsson and Nordberg, 1999; Murray and Alve, 2000). Conversely, for *Ammonia* sp. T6, a decrease in densities coupled with a rapid increase of overall test size between March and May 2012 (small sized specimens remain present but in smaller proportions) could be indicative of a period of reduced recruitment (Supplementary Figure 2B).

In fact, foraminifera exhibit a large range of feeding strategies, with several species showing selective feeding with specific food particles (Muller, 1975; Suhr et al., 2003; Chronopoulou et al., 2019). Hagens et al. (2015) reported that in Lake Grevelingen the phytoplankton composition was different between April–May and July 2012. In April–May, the phytoplankton bloom was mainly composed of the haptophyte *Phaeocystis globose* (Scherffel, 1899), whereas it was dominated by the dinoflagellate *Prorocentrum micans* (Ehrenberg, 1834) in July. *Elphidium* was reported to be able to feed on various food sources (e.g. diatoms, dinoflagellates, green algae; Correia and Lee, 2002; Pillet et al., 2011). However, diatoms are a major food source for kleptoplastic species (Bernhard and Bowser, 1999), such as *E. selseyense* (Jauffrais et al., 2018; Chronopoulou et al., 2019). *Ammonia* spp. seems able to feed on very diverse food sources including microalgae, diatoms, bacteria or even metazoans (Lee et al., 1969; Moodley et al., 2000; Dupuy et al., 2010; Jauffrais et al., 2016; Chronopoulou et al., 2019). Recently, Chronopoulou et al. (2019) showed different feeding preferences for *Ammonia* sp. T6 and *E. selseyense* in intertidal environments in the Dutch Wadden Sea. Although diatoms are ingested by both species (but much more by *E. selseyense*), dinoflagellates were consumed by *E. selseyense* but not by *Ammonia* sp. T6. The latter species is also capable to feed on metazoans by active predation (Dupuy et al., 2010).

These observations suggest that at station 2, the different seasonal density patterns of *Ammonia* sp. T6 and the two *Elphidium* species are not the consequence of a large difference in tolerance to anoxia/sulphides, but rather a different adjustment to the seasonal cycle of food availability. At station 1, the very low densities of *Ammonia* sp. T6 could putatively be explained by a

recolonization starting in January, when food conditions were favourable for this taxon (as testified by the strong density increase in January 2012 at station 2). However, once a more abundant pioneer population had developed (in March-May), food conditions may have been no longer favourable for *Ammonia* sp. T6, explaining why its density did not show a further increase. Conversely, the food conditions may have become optimal for the two *Elphidium* species, explaining their strong density increase between March and May 2012. If true, this would mean that the lower densities of *Ammonia* sp. T6 would not be due to a lower resistance to anoxia and free sulphides, but rather due to an unfavourable seasonal succession of food availability. Previous studies already suggested that hypoxic/anoxic conditions coupled with increased food input from autumnal phytoplankton blooms (composed of diatoms and dinoflagellates) would favour the development of *E. magellanicum* (Gustafsson and Nordberg, 1999). The fact that also at station 2, this species was mainly observed between March and September 2012 corroborates our conclusion of its dependence on a specific food regime.

Finally, encrusted forms of *E. magellanicum* were observed at both stations from May until the end of the year, but were absent in the samples of March 2012. In view of the fact that the crusts consist mainly of organic matter, the encrusted individuals appear to be specimens with preserved feeding cysts. The precise functions of cysts observed around foraminifera are not clear, and include feeding, reproduction, chamber formation, protection or resting (Cedhagen, 1996; Heinz et al., 2005). Concerning the cysts of *E. magellanicum* described here, very similar observations have been made for *Elphidium incertum* at different locations (Norwegian Greenland Sea and Baltic Sea in Linke and Lutze, 1993; Koljö Fjord in Gustafsson and Nordberg, 1999; Kiel Bight in Polovodova et al., 2009). If we assume that encrusted specimens indeed present remains of feeding cysts, the observation of abundant encrusted specimens corroborates our conclusion that the surface water phytoplankton bloom in May 2012 (i.e. probably mainly *Phaeocystis globosa*) provided a food source particularly well suited to the nutritional preferences of this species.

5 Conclusion

In this study we examined the foraminiferal community response to different durations of seasonal anoxia coupled with the presence of sulphide in the uppermost layer of sediment at two stations in Lake Grevelingen. In both stations investigated, foraminiferal communities are highly impacted by the combination of anoxia and H_2S in their habitat. The foraminiferal response varied depending on the duration of adverse conditions, and led to a near extinction at station 1, where anoxic and sulphidic conditions were present for one to two months, compared to a drop in standing stocks at station 2, where these conditions lasted for one month or less. At both sites, foraminiferal communities showed a two-month delay in the response to anoxic and sulphidic conditions, suggesting that the presence of H_2S inhibited reproduction, whereas mortality was not necessarily increased. The duration of the subsequent recovery depended on whether the foraminiferal community was almost extinct (station 1) or remained present with reduced numbers (station 2). In the former case, six months were needed for faunal recovery, whereas in the latter case, it took only two months. We hypothesize that the dominance of *E. selseyense* and *E. magellanicum* at station 1 is not due to a lower tolerance of *Ammonia* sp. T6 to anoxic and sulphidic conditions, but is rather

the consequence of a different adjustment between the two *Elphidium* species and *Ammonia* sp. T6 with respect to the seasonal cycle of food availability.

Data availability

Raw data are available in Supplementary Material.

Author contributions

J.R.: generated the size distribution data. B.R. and D.L. picked the foraminifera. D.S.: provided geochemical data. All authors contributed to the writing of the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to Sandra Langezaal for inviting us to study the fascinating environments of the Grevelingenmeer. We acknowledge the support of P. van Rijswijk, M. Hagens, A. Tramper, and the crew of the R/V *Luctor* (P. Coomans and M. Kristalijn) during the sampling campaigns. We are grateful to Romain Mallet and the team of the SCIAM imaging facility at the University of Angers. We acknowledge Jassin Petersen for his help with recovering some of the environmental data and Thierry Jauffrais and Charlotte LeKieffre for discussion about alternative metabolisms. This manuscript benefited from the comments and suggestions of Laurie Charrieau and an anonymous reviewer. This study profited from funding of Rijkswaterstaat and of the CNRS program CYBER-LEFE (project AMTEP).

References

Altenbach, A. V., Bernhard, J. M. and Seckbach, J., Eds.: Anoxia: evidence for eukaryote survival and paleontological strategies, Springer, Dordrecht., 2012.

Alve, E.: Benthic foraminiferal distribution and recolonization of formerly anoxic environments in Drammensfjord, southern Norway, Mar. Micropaleontol., 25(2), 169–186, doi:10.1016/0377-8398(95)00007-N, 1995.

Alve, E.: Colonization of new habitats by benthic foraminifera: a review, Earth-Sci. Rev., 46(1), 167–185, doi:10.1016/S0012-8252(99)00016-1, 1999.

Alve, E. and Bernhard, J. M.: Vertical migratory response of benthic foraminifera to controlled oxygen concentrations in an experimental mesocosm, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 116(1/3), 137–151, ISSN:0171-8630, 1995.

Alve, E., Korsun, S., Schönfeld, J., Dijkstra, N., Golikova, E., Hess, S., Husum, K. and Panieri, G.: Foram-AMBI: A sensitivity index based on benthic foraminiferal faunas from North-East Atlantic and Arctic fjords, continental shelves and slopes, Mar. Micropaleontol., 122, 1–12, doi:10.1016/j.marmicro.2015.11.001, 2016.

Austin, H. A., Austin, W. E. N. and Paterson, D. M.: Extracellular cracking and content removal of the benthic diatom Pleurosigma angulatum (Quekett) by the benthic foraminifera Haynesina germanica (Ehrenberg), Mar. Micropaleontol., 57(3), 68–73, doi:10.1016/j.marmicro.2005.07.002, 2005.

Bannink, B. A., Van der Meulen, J. H. M. and Nienhuis, P. H.: Lake grevelingen: From an estuary to a saline lake. An introduction, Neth. J. Sea Res., 18(3), 179–190, doi:10.1016/0077-7579(84)90001-2, 1984.

Basson, P. W. and Murray, J. W.: Temporal Variations in Four Species of Intertidal Foraminifera, Bahrain, Arabian Gulf, Micropaleontology, 41(1), 69–76, doi:10.2307/1485882, 1995.

Bernhard, J. M.: Postmortem vital staining in benthic foraminifera; duration and importance in population and distributional studies, J. Foraminifer. Res., 18(2), 143–146, doi:10.2113/gsjfr.18.2.143, 1988.

Bernhard, J. M.: Experimental and field evidence of Antarctic foraminiferal tolerance to anoxia and hydrogen sulfide, Mar. Micropaleontol., 20(3), 203–213, doi:10.1016/0377-8398(93)90033-T, 1993.

Bernhard, J. M. and Alve, E.: Survival, ATP pool, and ultrastructural characterization of benthic foraminifera from Drammensfjord (Norway): response to anoxia, Mar. Micropaleontol., 28(1), 5–17, doi:10.1016/0377-8398(95)00036-4, 1996.

Bernhard, J. M. and Bowser, S. S.: Benthic foraminifera of dysoxic sediments: chloroplast sequestration and functional morphology, Earth-Sci. Rev., 46(1), 149–165, doi:10.1016/S0012-8252(99)00017-3, 1999.

Bernhard, J. M., Ostermann, D. R., Williams, D. S. and Blanks, J. K.: Comparison of two methods to identify live benthic foraminifera: A test between Rose Bengal and CellTracker Green with implications for stable isotope paleoreconstructions, Paleoceanography, 21(4), doi:10.1029/2006PA001290, 2006.

Bernhard, J. M., Goldstein, S. T. and Bowser, S. S.: An ectobiont-bearing foraminiferan, Bolivina pacifica, that inhabits microxic pore waters: cell-biological and paleoceanographic insights, Environ. Microbiol., 12(8), 2107–2119, doi:10.1111/j.1462-2920.2009.02073.x, 2010.

Bernhard, J. M., Tsuchiya, M. and Nomaki, H.: Ultrastructural observations on prokaryotic associates of benthic foraminifera: Food, mutualistic symbionts, or parasites?, Marine Micropaleontology, 138, 33–45, doi:10.1016/j.marmicro.2017.09.001, 2018.

Bird, C., Schweizer, M., Roberts, A., Austin, W. E. N., Knudsen, K. L., Evans, K. M., Filipsson, H. L., Sayer, M. D. J., Geslin, E. and Darling, K. F.: The genetic diversity, morphology, biogeography, and taxonomic designations of Ammonia (Foraminifera) in the Northeast Atlantic, Mar. Micropaleontol., doi:10.1016/j.marmicro.2019.02.001, 2019.

Bouchet, V. M. P., Debenay, J.-P., Sauriau, P.-G., Radford-Knoery, J. and Soletchnik, P.: Effects of short-term environmental disturbances on living benthic foraminifera during the Pacific oyster summer mortality in the Marennes-Oléron Bay (France), Mar. Environ. Res., 64(3), 358–383, doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2007.02.007, 2007.

Cearreta, A.: Population dynamics of benthic foraminifera in the Santoña estuary, Spain, Revue de Paleobiologie, 2, 721–724, ISSN:0253-6730, 1988.

Cedhagen, T.: Foraminiferans as food for cephalaspideans (Gastropoda: Opisthobranchia), with notes on secondary tests around calcareous foraminiferans. Phuket Marine Biological Center Special Publication, 16, 279–290, 1996.

Chronopoulou, P.-M., Salonen, I., Bird, C., Reichart, G.-J. and Koho, K. A.: Metabarcoding Insights Into the Trophic Behavior and Identity of Intertidal Benthic Foraminifera, Front. Microbiol., 10, 1169, doi:10.3389/fmicb.2019.01169, 2019.

Cloern, J. E., Foster, S. Q. and Kleckner, A. E.: Phytoplankton primary production in the world's estuarine-coastal ecosystems, Biogeosciences, 11, 25, doi:10.5194/bg-11-2477-2014, 2014.

Corliss, B. H. and Emerson, S.: Distribution of rose bengal stained deep-sea benthic foraminifera from the Nova Scotian continental margin and Gulf of Maine, Deep Sea Res. Part Oceanogr. Res. Pap., 37(3), 381–400, doi:10.1016/0198-0149(90)90015-N, 1990.

Correia, M. and Lee, J. J.: Fine structure of the plastids retained by the foraminifer Elphidium excavatum (Terquem), Symbiosis, 32(1), 15–26, ISSN:03345114, 2002.

Darling, K. F., Schweizer, M., Knudsen, K. L., Evans, K. M., Bird, C., Roberts, A., Filipsson, H. L., Kim, J.-H., Gudmundsson, G., Wade, C. M., Sayer, M. D. J. and Austin, W. E. N.: The genetic diversity, phylogeography and morphology of Elphidiidae (Foraminifera) in the Northeast Atlantic, Mar. Micropaleontol., 129, 1–23, doi:10.1016/j.marmicro.2016.09.001, 2016.

Diaz, R. J. and Rosenberg, R.: Marine benthic hypoxia: a review of its ecological effects and the behavioural responses of benthic macrofauna, Oceanogr. Lit. Rev., 12(43), 1250, ISSN:0967-0653, 1995.

Diaz, R. J. and Rosenberg, R.: Spreading Dead Zones and Consequences for Marine Ecosystems, Science, 321(5891), 926–929, doi:10.1126/science.1156401, 2008.

Donders, T. H., Guasti, E., Bunnik, F. P. M. and an Aken, H.: Impact van de Brouwersdam op zuurstofcondities in de Grevelingen; reconstructies uit natuurlijke sediment archieven., 2012.

Dorman, D. C., Moulin, F. J.-M., McManus, B. E., Mahle, K. C., James, R. A. and Struve, M. F.: Cytochrome Oxidase Inhibition Induced by Acute Hydrogen Sulfide Inhalation: Correlation with Tissue Sulfide Concentrations in the Rat Brain, Liver, Lung, and Nasal Epithelium, Toxicol. Sci., 65(1), 18–25, doi:10.1093/toxsci/65.1.18, 2002.

Duijnstee, I., de Lugt, I., Vonk Noordegraaf, H. and van der Zwaan, B.: Temporal variability of foraminiferal densities in the northern Adriatic Sea, Mar. Micropaleontol., 50(1), 125–148, doi:10.1016/S0377-8398(03)00069-0, 2004.

Duijnstee, I. a. P., Ernst, S. R. and Zwaan, G. J. van der: Effect of anoxia on the vertical migration of benthic foraminifera, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 246, 85–94, doi:10.3354/meps246085, 2003.

Duijnstee, I. a. P., Nooijer, L. J. de, Ernst, S. R. and Zwaan, G. J. van der: Population dynamics of benthic shallow-water foraminifera: effects of a simulated marine snow event, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 285, 29–42, doi:10.3354/meps285029, 2005.

Dupuy, C., Rossignol, L., Geslin, E. and Pascal, P.-Y.: Predation of mudflat meio-macrofaunal metazoans by a calcareous foraminifer, *Ammonia tepida* (cushman, 1926), J. Foraminifer. Res., 40(4), 305–312, doi:10.2113/gsjfr.40.4.305, 2010.

Ernst, S., Bours, R., Duijnstee, I. and Zwaan, B. van der: Experimental effects of an organic matter pulse and oxygen depletion on a benthic foraminiferal shelf community, J. Foraminifer. Res., 35(3), 177–197, doi:10.2113/35.3.177, 2005.

Feyling-Hanssen, R. W.: The Foraminifer Elphidium excavatum (Terquem) and Its Variant Forms, Micropaleontology, 18(3), 337–354, doi:10.2307/1485012, 1972.

Gammon, P. R., Neville, L. A., Patterson, R. T., Savard, M. M. and Swindles, G. T.: A log-normal spectral analysis of inorganic grain-size distributions from a Canadian boreal lake core: Towards refining depositional process proxy data from high latitude lakes, Sedimentology, 64(3), 609–630, doi:10.1111/sed.12281, 2017.

Geslin, E., Heinz, P., Jorissen, F. and Hemleben, Ch.: Migratory responses of deep-sea benthic foraminifera to variable oxygen conditions: laboratory investigations, Mar. Micropaleontol., 53(3), 227–243, doi:10.1016/j.marmicro.2004.05.010, 2004.

Geslin, E., Barras, C., Langlet, D., Nardelli, M. P., Kim, J.-H., Bonnin, J., Metzger, E. and Jorissen, F. J.: Survival, Reproduction and Calcification of Three Benthic Foraminiferal Species in Response to Experimentally Induced Hypoxia, in Approaches to Study Living Foraminifera: Collection, Maintenance and Experimentation, edited by H. Kitazato and J. M. Bernhard, pp. 163–193, Springer Japan, Tokyo., 2014.

Gilbert, D., Rabalais, N. N., Diaz, R. J. and Zhang, J.: Evidence for greater oxygen decline rates in the coastal ocean than in the open ocean, Biogeosciences, 2283–2296, doi:10.5194/bg-7-2283-2010, 2010.

Gustafsson, M. and Nordberg, K.: Benthic foraminifera and their response to hydrography, periodic hypoxic conditions and primary production in the Koljö fjord on the Swedish west coast, J. Sea Res., 41(3), 163–178, doi:10.1016/S1385-1101(99)00002-7, 1999.

Gustafsson, M. and Nordberg, K.: Living (Stained) Benthic Foraminifera and their Response to the Seasonal Hydrographic Cycle, Periodic Hypoxia and to Primary Production in Havstens Fjord on the Swedish West Coast, Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci., 51(6), 743–761, doi:10.1006/ecss.2000.0695, 2000.

Hagens, M., Slomp, C. P., Meysman, F. J. R., Seitaj, D., Harlay, J., Borges, A. V. and Middelburg, J. J.: Biogeochemical processes and buffering capacity concurrently affect acidification in a seasonally hypoxic coastal marine basin, Biogeosciences, 12(5), 1561–1583, doi:10.5194/bg-12-1561-2015, 2015.

Hannah, F. and Rogerson, A.: The Temporal and Spatial Distribution of Foraminiferans in Marine Benthic Sediments of the Clyde Sea Area, Scotland, Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci., 44(3), 377–383, doi:10.1006/ecss.1996.0136, 1997.

Heinz, P., Geslin, E. and Hemleben, C.: Laboratory observations of benthic foraminiferal cysts, Marine Biology Research, 1(2), 149–159, doi:10.1080/17451000510019114, 2005.

Hess, S., Jorissen, F. J., Venet, V. and Abu-Zied, R.: Benthic foraminiferal recovery after recent turbidite deposition in Cap Breton canyon, Bay of Biscay, J. Foraminifer. Res., 35(2), 114–129, doi:10.2113/35.2.114, 2005.

Jauffrais, T., Jesus, B., Geslin, E., Briand, F. and Jézéquel, V. M.: Locomotion speed of the benthic foraminifer Ammonia tepida exposed to different nitrogen and carbon sources, J. Sea Res., 118, 52–58, doi:10.1016/j.seares.2016.07.001, 2016.

Jauffrais, T., LeKieffre, C., Koho, K. A., Tsuchiya, M., Schweizer, M., Bernhard, J. M., Meibom, A. and Geslin, E.: Ultrastructure and distribution of kleptoplasts in benthic foraminifera from shallow-water (photic) habitats, Mar. Micropaleontol., 138, 46–62, doi:10.1016/j.marmicro.2017.10.003, 2018.

Jauffrais, T., LeKieffre, C., Schweizer, M., Geslin, E., Metzger, E., Bernhard, J. M., Jesus, B., Filipsson, H. L., Maire, O. and Meibom, A.: Kleptoplastidic benthic foraminifera from aphotic habitats: insights into assimilation of inorganic C, N and S studied with sub-cellular resolution, Environ. Microbiol., 21(1), 125–141, doi:10.1111/1462-2920.14433, 2019.

Jones, G. D. and Ross, C. A.: Seasonal Distribution of Foraminifera in Samish Bay, Washington, J. Paleontol., 53(2), 245–257, ISSN:0022-3360, 1979.

Jørgensen, B. B., Postgate, J. R., Postgate, J. R. and Kelly, D. P.: Ecology of the bacteria of the sulphur cycle with special reference to anoxic—oxic interface environments, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. B, Biological Sciences, 298(1093), 543–561, doi:10.1098/rstb.1982.0096, 1982.

Jorissen, F. J., Fontanier, C. and Thomas, E.: Chapter Seven Paleoceanographical Proxies Based on Deep-Sea Benthic Foraminiferal Assemblage Characteristics, in Developments in Marine Geology, vol. 1, edited by C. Hillaire–Marcel and A. De Vernal, pp. 263–325, Elsevier, 2007.

Josefson, A. B. and Widbom, B.: Differential response of benthic macrofauna and meiofauna to hypoxia in the Gullmar Fjord basin, Mar. Biol., 100(1), 31–40, doi:10.1007/BF00392952, 1988.

Khan, A. A., Schuler, M. M., Prior, M. G., Yong, S., Coppock, R. W., Florence, L. Z. and Lillie, L. E.: Effects of hydrogen sulfide exposure on lung mitochondrial respiratory chain enzymes in rats, Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol., 103(3), 482–490, doi:10.1016/0041-008X(90)90321-K, 1990.

Koho, K. A. and Piña-Ochoa, E.: Benthic Foraminifera: Inhabitants of Low-Oxygen Environments, in Anoxia: Evidence for Eukaryote Survival and Paleontological Strategies, edited by A. V. Altenbach, J. M. Bernhard, and J. Seckbach, pp. 249–285, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht., 2012.

Koho, K. A., Piña-Ochoa, E., Geslin, E. and Risgaard-Petersen, N.: Vertical migration, nitrate uptake and denitrification: survival mechanisms of foraminifers (Globobulimina turgida) under low oxygen conditions, FEMS Microbiol. Ecol., 75(2), 273–283, doi:10.1111/j.1574-6941.2010.01010.x, 2011.

Langlet, D., Geslin, E., Baal, C., Metzger, E., Lejzerowicz, F., Riedel, B., Zuschin, M., Pawlowski, J., Stachowitsch, M. and Jorissen, F. J.: Foraminiferal survival after long-term in situ experimentally induced anoxia, Biogeosciences, 10(11), 7463–7480, doi:10.5194/bg-10-7463-2013, 2013.

Langlet, D., Baal, C., Geslin, E., Metzger, E., Zuschin, M., Riedel, B., Risgaard-Petersen, N., Stachowitsch, M. and Jorissen, F. J.: Foraminiferal species responses to in situ, experimentally induced anoxia in the Adriatic Sea, Biogeosciences, 11(7), 1775–1797, doi:10.5194/bg-11-1775-2014, 2014.

Lee, J. J., Muller, W. A., Stone, R. J., McEnery, M. E. and Zucker, W.: Standing crop of foraminifera in sublittoral epiphytic communities of a Long Island salt marsh, Mar. Biol., 4(1), 44–61, doi:10.1007/BF00372165, 1969.

LeKieffre, C., Spangenberg, J., Mabilleau, G., Escrig, S., Meibom, A. and Geslin, E.: Surviving anoxia in marine sediments: The metabolic response of ubiquitous benthic foraminifera (Ammonia tepida), PLoS ONE, 12, e0177604., doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0177604, 2017.

Linke, P. and Lutze, G. F.: Microhabitat preferences of benthic foraminifera—a static concept or a dynamic adaptation to optimize food acquisition?, Mar. Micropaleontol., 20(3), 215–234, doi:10.1016/0377-8398(93)90034-U, 1993.

Metzger, E., Langlet, D., Viollier, E., Koron, N., Riedel, B., Stachowitsch, M., Faganeli, J., Tharaud, M., Geslin, E. and Jorissen, F.: Artificially induced migration of redox layers in a coastal sediment from the Northern Adriatic, Biogeosciences, 11(8), 2211–2224, doi:10.5194/bg-11-2211-2014, 2014.

Miller, A. A. L., Scott, D. B. and Medioli, F. S.: Elphidium excavatum (Terquem); ecophenotypic versus subspecific variation, J. Foraminifer. Res., 12(2), 116–144, doi:10.2113/gsjfr.12.2.116, 1982.

Moodley, L. and Hess, C.: Tolerance of Infaunal Benthic Foraminifera for Low and High Oxygen Concentrations, Biol. Bull., 183(1), 94–98, doi:10.2307/1542410, 1992.

Moodley, L., Zwaan, G. J. van der, Herman, P. M. J., Kempers, L. and Breugel, P. van: Differential response of benthic meiofauna to anoxia with special reference to Foraminifera (Protista: Sarcodina), Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 158, 151–163, doi:10.3354/meps158151, 1997.

Moodley, L., van der Zwaan, G. J., Rutten, G. M. W., Boom, R. C. E. and Kempers, A. J.: Subsurface activity of benthic foraminifera in relation to porewater oxygen content: laboratory experiments, Mar. Micropaleontol., 34(1), 91–106, doi:10.1016/S0377-8398(97)00044-3, 1998a.

Moodley, L., Schaub, B. E. M., Zwaan, G. J. van der and Herman, P. M. J.: Tolerance of benthic foraminifera (Protista: Sarcodina) to hydrogen sulphide, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 169, 77–86, doi:10.3354/meps169077, 1998b.

Moodley, L., Boschker, H. T. S., Middelburg, J. J., Pel, R., Herman, P. M. J., Deckere, E. de and Heip, C. H. R.: Ecological significance of benthic foraminifera: 13C labelling experiments, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 202, 289–295, doi:10.3354/meps202289, 2000.

Muller, W. A.: Competition for food and other niche-related studies of three species of salt-marsh foraminifera, Mar. Biol., 31(4), 339–351, doi:10.1007/BF00392091, 1975.

Murray, J. W.: Production in benthic foraminiferids, J. Nat. Hist., 1(1), 61–68, doi:10.1080/00222936700770631, 1967.

Murray, J. W.: Population dynamics of benthic foraminifera; results from the Exe Estuary, England, J. Foraminifer. Res., 13(1), 1–12, doi:10.2113/gsjfr.13.1.1, 1983.

Murray, J. W.: Distribution and population dynamics of benthic foraminifera from the southern North Sea, J. Foraminifer. Res., 22(2), 114–128, doi:10.2113/gsjfr.22.2.114, 1992.

Murray, J. W. and Alve, E.: Major aspects of foraminiferal variability (standing crop and biomass) on a monthly scale in an intertidal zone, J. Foraminifer. Res., 30(3), 177–191, doi:10.2113/0300177, 2000.

Nardelli, M. P., Barras, C., Metzger, E., Mouret, A., Filipsson, H. L., Jorissen, F. and Geslin, E.: Experimental evidence for foraminiferal calcification under anoxia, Biogeosciences, 11(14), 4029–4038, doi:10.5194/bg-11-4029-2014, 2014.

Nicholls, P. and Kim, J. K.: Sulphide as an inhibitor and electron donor for the cytochrome c oxidase system, Can. J. Biochem., 60(6), 613–623, doi:10.1139/o82-076, 1982.

Nomaki, H., Chikaraishi, Y., Tsuchiya, M., Toyofuku, T., Ohkouchi, N., Uematsu, K., Tame, A. and Kitazato, H.: Nitrate uptake by foraminifera and use in conjunction with endobionts under anoxic conditions, Limnology and Oceanography, 59, doi:10.4319/lo.2014.59.6.1879, 2014.

Nomaki, H., Bernhard, J. M., Ishida, A., Tsuchiya, M., Uematsu, K., Tame, A., Kitahashi, T., Takahata, N., Sano, Y. and Toyofuku, T.: Intracellular Isotope Localization in Ammonia sp. (Foraminifera) of Oxygen-Depleted Environments: Results of Nitrate and Sulfate Labeling Experiments, Front. Microbiol., 7, doi:10.3389/fmicb.2016.00163, 2016.

Panieri, G.: Foraminiferal response to an active methane seep environment: A case study from the Adriatic Sea, Mar. Micropaleontol., 61(1), 116–130, doi:10.1016/j.marmicro.2006.05.008, 2006.

Panieri, G. and Sen Gupta, B. K.: Benthic Foraminifera of the Blake Ridge hydrate mound, Western North Atlantic Ocean, Mar. Micropaleontol., 66(2), 91–102, doi:10.1016/j.marmicro.2007.08.002, 2008.

Papaspyrou, S., Diz, P., García-Robledo, E., Corzo, A. and Jimenez-Arias, J.-L.: Benthic foraminiferal community changes and their relationship to environmental dynamics in intertidal muddy sediments (Bay of Cádiz, SW Spain), Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 490, 121–135, doi:10.3354/meps10447, 2013.

Pillet, L., de Vargas, C. and Pawlowski, J.: Molecular Identification of Sequestered Diatom Chloroplasts and Kleptoplastidy in Foraminifera, Protist, 162(3), 394–404, doi:10.1016/j.protis.2010.10.001, 2011.

Piña-Ochoa, E., Koho, K. A., Geslin, E. and Risgaard-Petersen, N.: Survival and life strategy of the foraminiferan Globobulimina turgida through nitrate storage and denitrification, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 417, 39–49, doi:10.3354/meps08805, 2010a.

Piña-Ochoa, E., Høgslund, S., Geslin, E., Cedhagen, T., Revsbech, N. P., Nielsen, L. P., Schweizer, M., Jorissen, F., Rysgaard, S. and Risgaard-Petersen, N.: Widespread occurrence of nitrate storage and denitrification among Foraminifera and Gromiida, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 107(3), 1148–1153, doi:10.1073/pnas.0908440107, 2010b.

Polovodova, I., Nikulina, A., Schönfeld, J. and Dullo, W.-C.: Recent benthic foraminifera in the Flensburg Fjord (Western Baltic Sea), J. Micropalaeontology, 28(2), 131–142, doi:10.1144/jm.28.2.131, 2009.

Pucci, F., Geslin, E., Barras, C., Morigi, C., Sabbatini, A., Negri, A. and Jorissen, F. J.: Survival of benthic foraminifera under hypoxic conditions: Results of an experimental study using the CellTracker Green method, Mar. Pollut. Bull., 59(8), 336–351, doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2009.08.015, 2009.

Rabalais, N. N., Díaz, R. J., Levin, L. A., Turner, R. E., Gilbert, D. and Zhang, J.: Dynamics and distribution of natural and human-caused hypoxia, Biogeosciences, 7(2), 585–619, doi:10.5194/bg-7-585-2010, 2010.

Richirt, J., Schweizer, M., Bouchet, V. M. P., Mouret, A., Quinchard, S. and Jorissen, F. J.: Morphological distinction of three Ammonia phylotypes occurring along european coasts, J. Foraminifer. Res., 49(1), 77–94, 2019.

Riedel, B., Diaz, R., Rosenberg, R. and Stachowitsch, M.: The ecological consequences of marine hypoxia: from behavioural to ecosystem responses, in: Stressors in the marine environment: physiological responses and ecological implication, edited by Martin Solan and Nia M. Whiteley., Oxford University Press., 175–194, 2016.

Risgaard-Petersen, N., Langezaal, A. M., Ingvardsen, S., Schmid, M. C., Jetten, M. S. M., Camp, H. J. M. O. den, Derksen, J. W. M., Piña-Ochoa, E., Eriksson, S. P., Nielsen, L. P., Revsbech, N. P., Cedhagen, T. and Zwaan, G. J. van der: Evidence for complete denitrification in a benthic foraminifer, Nature, 443(7107), 93–96, doi:10.1038/nature05070, 2006.

Roberts, A., Austin, W., Evans, K., Bird, C., Schweizer, M. and Darling, K.: A New Integrated Approach to Taxonomy: The Fusion of Molecular and Morphological Systematics with Type Material in Benthic Foraminifera, PLOS ONE, 11(7), e0158754, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0158754, 2016.

Ross, B. J. and Hallock, P.: Dormancy in the Foraminifera: A Review, J. Foraminifer. Res., 46(4), 358–368, doi:10.2113/gsjfr.46.4.358, 2016.

Schneider, C. A., Rasband, W. S. and Eliceiri, K. W.: NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image analysis, Nat. Methods, 9(7), 671–675, doi:10.1038/nmeth.2089, 2012.

Schönfeld, J. and Numberger, L.: Seasonal dynamics and decadal changes of benthic foraminiferal assemblages in the western Baltic Sea (NW Europe), J. Micropalaeontology, 26(1), 47–60, doi:10.1144/jm.26.1.47, 2007.

Seitaj, D., Schauer, R., Sulu-Gambari, F., Hidalgo-Martinez, S., Malkin, S. Y., Burdorf, L. D. W., Slomp, C. P. and Meysman, F. J. R.: Cable bacteria generate a firewall against euxinia in seasonally hypoxic basins, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 112(43), 13278–13283, doi:10.1073/pnas.1510152112, 2015.

Seitaj, D., Sulu-Gambari, F., Burdorf, L. D. W., Romero-Ramirez, A., Maire, O., Malkin, S. Y., Slomp, C. P. and Meysman, F. J. R.: Sedimentary oxygen dynamics in a seasonally hypoxic basin, Limnol. Oceanogr., 62(2), 452–473, doi:10.1002/lno.10434, 2017.

Stramma, L., Oschlies, A. and Schmidtko, S.: Mismatch between observed and modeled trends in dissolved upper-ocean oxygen over the last 50 yr, Biogeosciences, 9(10), 4045–4057, doi:10.5194/bg-9-4045-2012, 2012.

Suhr, S. B., Pond, D. W., Gooday, A. J. and Smith, C. R.: Selective feeding by benthic foraminifera on phytodetritus on the western Antarctic Peninsula shelf: evidence from fatty acid biomarker analysis, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 262, 153–162, doi:10.3354/meps262153, 2003.

Sulu-Gambari, F., Seitaj, D., Meysman, F. J. R., Schauer, R., Polerecky, L. and Slomp, C. P.: Cable Bacteria Control Iron–Phosphorus Dynamics in Sediments of a Coastal Hypoxic Basin, Environ. Sci. Technol., 50(3), 1227–1233, doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b04369, 2016a.

Sulu-Gambari, F., Seitaj, D., Behrends, T., Banerjee, D., Meysman, F. J. R. and Slomp, C. P.: Impact of cable bacteria on sedimentary iron and manganese dynamics in a seasonally-hypoxic marine basin, Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta, 192, 49–69, doi:10.1016/j.gca.2016.07.028, 2016b.

de Vries, I. and Hopstaken, C. F.: Nutrient cycling and ecosystem behaviour in a salt-water lake, Neth. J. Sea Res., 18(3), 221–245, doi:10.1016/0077-7579(84)90003-6, 1984.

Walton, W. R.: Techniques for recognition of living foraminifera, Contrib. Cushman Found. Foraminifer. Res., 3(2), 56–60, 1952.

Wang, F. and Chapman, P. M.: Biological implications of sulfide in sediment—a review focusing on sediment toxicity, Environ. Toxicol. Chem., 18(11), 2526–2532, doi:10.1002/etc.5620181120, 1999.

Wetsteijn, L. P. M. J.: Grevelingenmeer: meer kwetsbaar? Een beschrijving van de ecologische ontwikkelingen voor de periode 1999 t/m 2008-2010 in vergelijking met de periode 1990 t/m 1998., RWS Waterdienst., Lelystad, Netherlands., 2011.

Woulds, C., Cowie, G. L., Levin, L. A., Andersson, J. H., Middelburg, J. J., Vandewiele, S., Lamont, P. A., Larkin, K. E., Gooday, A. J., Schumacher, S., Whitcraft, C., Jeffreys, R. M. and Schwartz, M.: Oxygen as a control on sea floor biological communities and their roles in sedimentary carbon cycling, Limnol. Oceanogr., 52(4), 1698–1709, doi:10.4319/lo.2007.52.4.1698, 2007.

Table 1: **Sampling dates of the samples which were investigated for living foraminifera for stations 1 and 2. x = one core investigated, o = no core investigated.**

Year	Month	Day	Station 1	Station 2
2011	August	22	x x	x x
2011	November	15	x x	x x
2012	January	23	x x	x x
2012	March	12	x x	x x
2012	May	30	x x	x x
2012	July	24	x x	x x
2012	September	20	x x	x x
2012	October	18	o	x x
2012	November	2	x x	x x
2012	December	3	o	x x

Table 2: **Mean living foraminiferal abundances (ind. 10 cm^{-3}) and relative abundances (between brackets) of the dominant species and total assemblage in 2011 and 2012 for both stations 1 (top) and 2 (bottom).**

STATION 1

Year	Month	*Elphidium selseyense*	*Ammonia* sp. T6	*Elphidium magellanicum*	*Trochammina inflata*	Others	Total assemblage
2011	**August**	1.2 (36.8%)	1.2 (36.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0.9 (26.3%)	3.4 (100%)
2011	**November**	0.5 (50%)	0.4 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0.2 (16.7%)	1.1 (100%)
2012	**January**	5.1 (44.6%)	3.2 (27.7%)	0.2 (1.5%)	1.2 (10.8%)	1.8 (15.4%)	11.5 (100%)
2012	**March**	23.9 (38.5%)	12.9 (20.8%)	21.6 (34.8%)	1.4 (2.3%)	2.3 (3.7%)	62.1 (100%)
2012	**May**	336.5 (74.8%)	9.2 (2%)	96.4 (21.4%)	1.8 (0.4%)	6 (1.3%)	449.9 (100%)
2012	**July**	162 (90.2%)	10.3 (5.7%)	3.7 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	3.5 (2%)	179.5 (100%)
2012	**September**	29.7 (87.5%)	2.3 (6.8%)	0 (0%)	0.4 (1%)	1.6 (4.7%)	34 (100%)
2012	**November**	1.1 (66.7%)	0.4 (22.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0.2 (11.1%)	1.6 (100%)
	Sum	560 (75.4%)	39.8 (5.4%)	121.8 (16.4%)	4.8 (0.6%)	16.4 (2.2%)	742.9 (100%)

STATION 2

Year	Month	*Elphidium selseyense*	*Ammonia* sp. T6	*Elphidium magellanicum*	*Trochammina inflata*	Others	Total assemblage
2011	**August**	74.8 (43%)	82.1 (47.2%)	0 (0%)	14.7 (8.4%)	2.5 (1.4%)	174 (100%)
2011	**November**	52.3 (40.7%)	60.8 (47.3%)	0 (0%)	11.8 (9.2%)	3.7 (2.9%)	128.7 (100%)
2012	**January**	161.8 (30.9%)	226.2 (43.2%)	0.9 (0.2%)	121.5 (23.2%)	13.3 (2.5%)	523.6 (100%)
2012	**March**	214.7 (38.2%)	214 (38.1%)	48.8 (8.7%)	75 (13.3%)	9.9 (1.8%)	562.3 (100%)
2012	**May**	288.2 (47.7%)	147.1 (24.3%)	116 (19.2%)	36.1 (6%)	17.3 (2.9%)	604.8 (100%)
2012	**July**	282.6 (53.2%)	158.4 (29.8%)	37.8 (7.1%)	31.5 (5.9%)	21.2 (4%)	531.6 (100%)

2012	**September**	365.5 (64.4%)	102.4 (18%)	72 (12.7%)	16.1 (2.8%)	11.5 (2%)	567.5 (100%)
2012	**October**	98.7 (46.7%)	99 (46.8%)	1.8 (0.8%)	7.4 (3.5%)	4.6 (2.2%)	206.9 (100%)
2012	**November**	30.9 (34%)	48.1 (52.8%)	4.1 (4.5%)	3.7 (4.1%)	4.2 (4.7%)	91.1 (100%)
2012	**December**	252.2 (66.7%)	78 (20.6%)	25.5 (6.7%)	12.7 (3.4%)	9.5 (2.5%)	368.4 (100%)
	Sum	1821.8 (48.3%)	1216.1 (32.2%)	306.8 (8.1%)	330.5 (8.8%)	83.6 (2.6%)	3758.9 (100%)



Figure 1: Numerical treatment used for the size measurement for each image performed with ImageJ software. The left figure shows the untreated image, the middle figure presents the next step, when all individual foraminifera are depicted. Finally, the figure on the right shows the individual foraminiferal outlines which were measured.



Figure 2: The grey bars represent the living foraminiferal abundances for the two replicates. The mean abundances (diamonds) and standard deviations (black error bars) were calculated for the two replicates for stations 1 (34 m depth, top panel) and 2 (23 m depth, bottom panel). All abundance values are for the 0–1 cm layer and were standardised to 10 cm^3. Months where foraminiferal communities were investigated are indicated in bold (excluding October and December at station 1).



Figure 3: **SEM images of *Elphidium selseyense* in lateral (a) and peripheral (b) view, *Elphidium magellanicum* in lateral (c) and peripheral (d) view, *Ammonia* sp. T6 in spiral (e), peripheral (f) and umbilical (g) view, and *Trochammina inflata* in spiral (h), peripheral (i) and umbilical (j) view. All scale bars are 50 µm.**



Figure 4: **The bars represent the living foraminiferal abundances for the two replicates for *Elphidium selseyense* (blue), *Elphidium magellanicum* (green), *Ammonia* sp. T6 (orange) and *Trochammina inflata* (yellow) at station 1 in 2011 and 2012. The mean abundances (diamonds) and standard deviations (black error bars) were calculated for the two replicates. All abundances values are for 0–1cm layer and were standardised to 10 cm^3. Months where foraminiferal communities were investigated are indicated in bold. Scales were chosen in order to facilitate comparison with station 2.**



Figure 5: **The bars represent the living foraminiferal abundances for the two replicates for *Elphidium selseyense* (blue), *Elphidium magellanicum* (green), *Ammonia* sp. T6 (orange) and *Trochammina inflata* (yellow) at station 2 in 2011 and 2012. The mean abundances (diamonds) and standard deviations (black error bars) were calculated for the two replicates. All abundances values are for 0–1cm layer and were standardised to 10 cm^3. Months where foraminiferal communities were investigated are indicated in bold. Scales were chosen in order to facilitate comparison with station 1.**



Figure 8: **SEM images of (a) fully encrusted specimen, (b) partially encrusted specimen, (c) crushed encrusted specimen of *Elphidium magellanicum*. Note the thinness of the crust and the spinose structures on (d) and (e).**



<u>Figure 9:</u> Mean abundances (ind. 10 cm^{-3}) of non-encrusted (grey) and encrusted forms (black) of *Elphidium magellanicum* in 2012, at station, 1 (left) and 2 (right), with proportion of encrusted forms above each bar (in %). Investigated months are indicated in bold.



Figure 10: The top panel represents bottom-water oxygen concentrations (µmol L^{-1}) in 2011 and 2012 at station 1, from Donders et al. (2012) and Seitaj et al. (2017). The grey horizontal dotted line indicates the hypoxia limit (63 µmol L^{-1}). The middle panel represents the depth (in mm) distribution of the oxic (blue), absence of oxygen and sulphides (orange,) and sulphidic (black) zones within the sediment in 2012, from Seitaj et al. (2015). The bottom panel shows the total living foraminiferal abundances for both replicates (grey bars), mean abundances (diamonds) and standard deviations (black error bars) calculated for the two replicates, for all investigated months (in bold) in 2011 and 2012.



Figure 11: The top panel represents bottom-water oxygen concentrations (µmol L^{-1}) in 2011 and 2012 at station 2, from Donders et al. (2012) and Seitaj et al. (2017). The grey horizontal dotted line indicates the hypoxia limit (63 µmol L^{-1}). The middle panel represents the depth (in mm) distribution of the oxic (blue), suboxic (orange, absence of oxygen and sulphides) and sulphidic (black) zones within the sediment in 2012. The bottom panel shows the total living foraminiferal abundances for both replicates (grey bars), mean abundances (diamonds) and standard deviations (black error bars) calculated for the two replicates, for all investigated months (in bold) in 2011 and 2012.