



Research article

Effects of sediment disturbance by the heart urchin *Echinocardium cordatum* on the sediment–seawater solute exchange: An exclusion experiment

Roen McLeod, Michelle N. Simone and Kay Vopel*

School of Science, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

* **Correspondence:** Email: kay.vopel@aut.ac.nz; Tel: +64-21-221-4242.

Abstract: Spatangoid heart urchins are dominant bioturbators in marine soft-sediment ecosystems worldwide. Their repeated sediment reworking prevents biogeochemical sediment stratification and colonization by other species, with implications for sedimentary reaction processes that affect the local sediment–seawater solute exchange. Here, we used a simple exclusion experiment to investigate how a subtidal *Echinocardium cordatum* population (18.2 ± 6.7 individuals m^{-2}), foraging at an individual speed of ~ 45 cm per day affects the sediment–seawater solute exchange. To do so, we removed all heart urchins from eight one-meter-diameter areas of the 10-m deep seafloor of Man O’War Bay, Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand, and prevented recolonization and thus sediment reworking for 56 days. Subsequently, we measured the sediment–seawater exchange of O_2 , NO_3^- , NO_2^- , NH_4^+ , and N_2 both within and outside the exclusion areas, under light or dark conditions, and found no difference. The absence of a legacy effect of foraging *E. cordatum* after their removal suggests that, at least in this habitat, their influence on the sediment–seawater solute exchange may be limited to sediment being displaced in the immediate surrounding of the urchin. This unexpected result underlines the importance of evaluating the influence of bioturbators on the sediment–seawater solute exchange in the context of local environmental conditions, animal behavior, and population characteristics.

Keywords: bioturbation; sediment-water solute exchange; oxygen; nitrogen

1. Introduction

Macrofaunal bioturbation profoundly influences the mineralization of carbon in seafloor sediment by displacing particles and solutes [1–4]. Persistent sediment disturbances by, for example, bottom trawling or deposition of organic fish farm waste, can alter the composition of the resident macrofaunal assemblage and therefore affect carbon remineralization rates and the associated sediment–seawater exchange of dissolved carbon and nitrogen. Because this exchange links seafloor with pelagic ecosystem functions, changes in sediment bioturbation can have far-reaching consequences for coastal primary and secondary production [5–7].

Heart urchins of the genus *Echinocardium* Gray, 1825 have a disproportionately large influence on sedimentary transport and reaction processes [6,8–10]. They are globally widespread through soft sediment environments, inhabiting intertidal mud or sand flats to abyssal plains, and can form up to 60% of the macrobenthic biomass in some ecosystems [11,12]. Functioning as key bioturbators, they alter the physical and biological structure of their surrounding sediment both directly, by mixing sediment particles and porewater [4,6,9], and indirectly, by suppressing the presence of tube building polychaetes and small bivalve species (authors unpublished observation).

One well-studied species of the genus *Echinocardium*, *E. cordatum* (Pennant, 1777), forages by burying itself at depths of up to 20 cm in sandy sediment and up to 6 cm in muddy (silt and clay) cohesive sediment [12–14]. Once buried, *E. cordatum* ploughs the sediment horizontally at speeds ranging from 1–8 cm h⁻¹ [9,13,15], selectively consuming microalgae and organic detritus [16–18]. When foraging, *E. cordatum* can displace and mix 60–150 times more sediment particles than the amount it ingests [9,19].

To meet its respiratory requirements while buried, *E. cordatum* maintains a current that irrigates the restructured sediment with oxygenated seawater, thereby enhancing the oxidation of reduced solutes and particulates, a process that would otherwise be constrained by the slow molecular diffusion of oxygen through cohesive sediment. Using dorsal spines and tube feet, the urchin constructs and sustains a vertical funnel, connecting the ambulacrum with the sediment surface [13,16]. The cilia of the ambulacral groove move oxygenated seawater down this funnel, facilitating gas exchange over respiratory tube feet [12,13]. To prevent suffocation due to the collapse of the respiratory funnel, the funnel-building tube feet excrete and apply mucus to the wall of the funnel [12,20]. Once the urchin has abandoned the funnel, microbial activity degrades this mucus, causing the funnel to eventually collapse [14]. Individuals dwelling in shallow cohesive sediment often maintain a second, larger funnel that connects the sediment surface in front of the urchin with the urchin's mouth [15]. Furthermore, subanal spines and tube feet construct and sustain a sanitary drain, extending laterally behind the urchin to accommodate excrements [12].

The displacement of particles and porewater by *E. cordatum* may create effects that last beyond the duration of the displacement event. For example, the tracks of *E. cordatum* contribute to the small-scale roughness of the sediment surface, potentially influencing the solute transport across the sediment–seawater interface [13,15]. Furthermore, particle mixing can stimulate sedimentary remineralization and oxidation processes by, respectively, introducing fresh organic matter into subsurface sediment layers either in the form of excrements or by displacement from the surface, and displacing reduced particles at depth to the surface, where they are exposed to oxygenated seawater [6,15,21–23]. These effects can collectively enhance the remineralization of labile and refractory organic carbon, potentially altering the rates of the sediment–seawater exchange of dissolved carbon and nitrogen.

Here, we asked if the previously demonstrated influence of moving *E. cordatum* on sedimentary solute transport and reaction processes extends beyond the sediment immediately next to the urchin.

In other words, we asked if moving *E. cordatum* cause a ‘legacy effect’ that sustains a sediment–seawater solute exchange different from the exchange across a similar but never disturbed sediment? If so, then removing *E. cordatum* from the seafloor ecosystem should result in measurable difference between the solute exchange across the now undisturbed surface sediment and the surface of the repeatedly reworked sediment.

We experimentally tested this prediction by removing urchins from eight plots of the 10-m deep seafloor of Man O’War Bay, Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand, and then preventing recolonization and thus sediment reworking for about two months. Following this manipulation, we measured the sediment–seawater exchange of O_2 , NO_3^- , NO_2^- , NH_4^+ , and N_2 within and outside the exclusion areas. Because this exchange may be influenced by the activity of benthic algae and cyanobacteria, we conducted these measurements under conditions of light and darkness.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study site

Man O’War Bay is situated on the east coast of Waiheke Island in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand (S 36° 47' 38", E 175° 10' 14", Figure 1). The Hauraki Gulf covers nearly 4,000 km², with water depths up to 50 m and provides sheltered conditions that facilitate particle settling. The sediment in Man O’War Bay, which consists of terrigenous silt and clay with a small proportion of sand, is iron-rich, resulting in a dark grey-to-black subsurface layer due to an abundance of iron sulfides. Organic matter accounts for >6% of the sediment dry weight, but the pore water of the top 20 cm of the sediment remains free of dissolved sulfides [24]. In May 2022, the salinity and temperature of the bottom seawater in Man O’War Bay were 34.5 and ~15 °C, respectively.

The seafloor at our 10-m deep site in Man O’War Bay is devoid of macroalgae and sessile epifauna, with golden-brown diatom patches that accentuate the centimeter-scale surface topography shaped by two bioturbators: a burrowing mud shrimp of the genus *Upogebia*, and the ploughing heart urchin *Echinocardium cordatum* (Figure 2A). Other macroinfauna consists of small polychaetes (*Prionospio*, *Sthenelais*, and *Cossura*), an amphipod species (*Paraphoxus*), and a bivalve species (*Theora lubrica*) [25].

To describe the resident population of *E. cordatum*, a seafloor survey was conducted two weeks before the exclusion experiment. SCUBA divers used a GoPro Hero 4 camera to capture a still images of a 0.5 × 0.5-meter quadrat placed on the surface of the seafloor at 40 locations randomly distributed within a 1260 m² area. At 10 locations, time-lapse photography was used to estimate the speed at which individuals ploughed the sediment. The frame that held the underwater camera (Figure 2A) was positioned within the camera’s field of view, providing a reference for measuring distance.

2.2. Experimental procedures

On 3 May 2022, two SCUBA divers buried nine plastic rings (1 m diameter, 28 cm wide) within a ~700 m² circular area. The placement of each ring was carried out with a 30-m guide rope anchored in the sediment and nine pre-determined compass/distance coordinates (i.e., 0–360 degrees, 1–30 m away from the anchor). The divers pushed each ring ~25 cm deep into the sediment, leaving about 3 cm exposed above the sediment surface. Subsequently, they carefully removed all urchins (10–20 individuals per ring) from the area within the rings. The rings remained free of *E. cordatum* and in place for 56 days, effectively isolating the enclosed sediment from further sediment restructuring by the urchins.

2.3. Laboratory setup

In the laboratory, we removed the top lids of the acrylic tubes, and then submerged the sediment cores in the recirculating seawater (salinity = 34.5) of two 450-L holding tanks for a 3-day acclimatization. A third and identical tank (measurement tank) was set up to which sets of four or five cores were transferred for sediment–seawater solute flux measurements (see below).

Each tank was fitted with a pump (3260, Eheim) that moved ~9 L seawater per minute through a chiller unit (HC Chiller 300A, Hailea) and a UV sterilizer (Pond One UV-C 9W, ClearTec) to a 200 L header tank from which the seawater returned to the tank by gravity. The chiller maintained the seawater temperature close to the in-situ seawater temperature (15 ± 0.5 °C). An additional pump pushed seawater through a UV particle filter (Aqua One Ocellaris 1400 UVC). A wave maker (SW, Jebao) attached to the inner wall of each tank, along with two jets of returning seawater from the UV particle filter and the header tank, ensured that advection was sufficient to prevent the seawater overlying the submerged sediment cores from becoming stagnant. Each tank had a Kessil A160WE Tuna Blue LED mounted above it, gradually increasing the intensity of photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) from 06:00 h to a midday maximum of $\sim 120 \mu\text{mol quanta m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ and then gradually decreased this intensity until 18:00 h, when the LED was turned off. To account for evaporation, we monitored and adjusted the salinity of tank water each morning using reverse osmosis water.

2.4. Solute flux measurements

We transferred four or five cores at a time from the holding tanks into the measurement tank to determine the sediment–seawater solute flux under conditions of light and darkness. The light and dark solute flux was derived from the difference in the solute concentration in seawater collected ~10 mm above the sediment surface before and after a 4-h incubation period. This seawater was withdrawn slowly, using a tube connected to a syringe, avoiding particle resuspension. During the 4-h incubation period, the acrylic tube holding the sediment core and its overlying seawater was closed with a valved O-ring sealed lid. A peristaltic pump recirculated the enclosed seawater through Teflon tubes at a flow rate of 135 mL min^{-1} to prevent stagnation. The seawater O_2 concentration was measured at the beginning and the end of each incubation with a dipping probe (DP-PSt3, Presens GmbH) connected to a portable fiber optic oxygen meter (Microx 4, Presens GmbH). The O_2 concentration in the enclosed seawater never decreased below 86% saturation.

2.5. Sample analyses

For analyses of nitrite-N, nitrate + nitrite-N, and ammonia-N we collected, filtered (Sartorius CA 0.45 μm filter), and froze 10 mL of the seawater from each core, at the beginning and the end of each incubation. These samples were kept frozen until analyses. Seawater aliquots collected for N_2 analyses (2×12 mL exetainers) were poisoned with 0.01 mL of a saturated mercuric chloride solution. Following the seawater sampling, we decanted the seawater above the sediment cores, extruded the cores, and extracted the top 2 cm of sediment for granulometric analyses.

We determined the sediment granulometric indices by laser particle size analyses (Mastersizer 2000, Malvern Instruments Ltd.) of 10 homogenized samples, one taken from the top 2 cm of each of 5 Control and 5 Treatment cores. The sediment water content was determined as the loss of weight after 24 h drying at 90 °C. The seawater N_2 content was measured with a Pfeiffer PrismaPlus QME mass spectrometer and a Bay Instruments S-25-75D membrane inlet, and the seawater concentrations

of nitrite-N, nitrate + nitrite-N, and ammonia-N were determined with an Astoria Pacific 2 micro-segmented flow analyzer (<https://astoria-pacific.com/>) following the Astoria protocols A182-A00 (range: 0.02–2.0 $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$), A177-A00 (range: 0.05–7.5 $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$) and A027-A00 (range: 0.05–5 $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$) for operating their respective individual nutrient channels [26].

2.6. Solute flux estimates

We determined the sediment–seawater solute flux ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{h}^{-1}$) multiplying the start–end difference in solute concentrations ($\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$) by the volume of enclosed seawater (L) and dividing this by the surface area of the sediment core (m^2) and the duration of the incubation (h). Since previous measurements revealed that the consumption/production of solutes in the seawater is negligible, this was not considered in our flux calculation. Note that a positive flux indicates sediment consumption whilst a negative flux is interpreted as solute release from the sediment.

2.7. Statistical analysis

All statistical data analyses were completed with R-4.4.0 [27]. For each solute we used Shapiro-Wilks test to confirm a normal distribution of the continuous variable. We then performed a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) investigating the effects of light (light versus dark conditions), experimental treatment (cores from within the exclusion rings versus cores from outside the rings), and the interaction between these discrete predictors, on the direction and magnitude of each solute flux. Visual analysis of the diagnostic plots for each of the five solutes confirmed that they met the assumptions of an ANOVA, including homogeneity of variance. When a significant result was found (alpha threshold = 0.05), we followed with post-hoc TukeyHSD analyses to further investigate significant individual effects.

Table 1. Mean sediment–seawater flux ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{h}^{-1}$, Mean \pm C.I., $n = 9$) of ammonium (NH_4^+), nitrite (NO_2^-), nitrate (NO_3^-), nitrogen gas (N_2), and oxygen (O_2) in darkness and light, derived from laboratory incubations of sediment collected in Man O’ War Bay, Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand outside (Control) and inside (Treatment) sea urchin exclusion rings after 56 days. A positive flux indicates sediment solute uptake. Number in parenthesis, n ; hash sign, one outlier removed.

| | Control | | Treatment | |
|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | Darkness | Light | Darkness | Light |
| N_2 | 121.4 \pm 28.6 (9) | 169.2 \pm 35.1 (9) | 93.7 \pm 24.5 (9) | 141.3 \pm 30.4 (8) [#] |
| O_2 | 149.6 \pm 22.8 (9) | 140.4 \pm 23.8 (8) [#] | 148.2 \pm 29.0 (9) | 137.6 \pm 45.3 (9) |
| NO_2^- | 13.3 \pm 18.9 (9) | 8.1 \pm 25.9 (9) | 5.8 \pm 7.7 (9) | 7.6 \pm 16.2 (9) |
| NO_3^- | –22.8 \pm 20.8 (9) | –22.9 \pm 26.5 (9) | –18.2 \pm 9.1 (9) | –22.4 \pm 19.3 (9) |
| NH_4^+ | 2.5 \pm 29.0 (9) | –49.7 \pm 13.7 (9) | –6.5 \pm 11.3 (9) | –30.4 \pm 11.8 (9) |

3. Results

3.1. Habitat

The sediment in the sheltered Man O'War Bay consisted of ~74% silt, 17% sand, and ~9% clay. The laser particle size analyses returned the following granulometric indices: Median = 30 μm (silt), Lower Quartile Q1 = 63 μm , Upper Quartile Q3 = 10 μm , Inclusive Sorting Coefficient QD1 = 1.95 (poorly sorted), and Inclusive Graphic Skewness Sk1 = 0.07. The water content of the sediment decreased from 75% in the top 2 cm to 65% at 9 cm depth.

Analyses of 100 photographs of the sediment surface revealed $\sim 18.2 \pm 6.7$ (mean \pm SD, $n = 100$) *Echinocardium cordatum* individuals per square meter. Time-lapse videos showed that urchins moved at $\sim 45 \pm 12$ cm per day (mean \pm SD, $n = 6$).




Figure 2. (A) Sediment surface at Man O'War Bay, Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand, showing tracks (tr) made by the heart urchin *E. cordatum*. Orange arrows indicate the direction of the heart urchin's movement. Black arrows indicate the respiratory (rf) and feeding (ff) funnels. Larger holes are the openings of shrimp burrows, presumably made by *Upogebia* sp. Darker areas lining the tracks are diatoms. (B) Schematic illustrating the direction and magnitude of the sediment-seawater solute flux under conditions of light (light grey arrows) and darkness (dark grey arrows). The horizontal line indicates the sediment surface.

3.2. Experimental control

The sediment outside the exclusion rings, between foraging *E. cordatum*, and away from the immediate surrounding of the urchin, consumed O₂ at similar rates under conditions of darkness and light (Table 1, Figures 2B and 3). In light, this sediment took up on average ~39% more N₂ from the overlying seawater than under conditions of darkness (Table 1, Figures 2B and 3). The average sediment–seawater fluxes of nitrate and nitrite were an order of magnitude lower than that of N₂; on average nitrate was released (negative flux in Table 1, Figures 2B and 3) while nitrite was taken up by the sediment, at similar rates under conditions of light and darkness (Figures 2B and 3).

Table 2. Two-way ANOVA and TukeyHSD (df, Mean Sum of Squares, F values, adjusted P Values, C.I. 95%) of solute flux across the surface of sediment cores as a function of the presence (Control) or absence (Treatment) of *E. cordatum*, the measurement light regime (light/dark), and their interaction.

| Solute | df | Mean SS | F value | P value | TukeyHSD |
|------------------------------|----|---------|---------|---------|------------------------------|
| N ₂ | | | | | |
| Urchin presence | 1 | 7449 | 3.658 | 0.055 | |
| Light regime | 1 | 19835 | 9.741 | <0.004 | CL:TD < 0.00066 |
| Interaction | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.996 | |
| O ₂ | | | | | |
| Urchin presence | 1 | 560 | 0.164 | 0.458 | |
| Light regime | 1 | 3707 | 1.087 | 0.247 | |
| Interaction | 1 | 395 | 0.116 | 0.429 | |
| NO ₂ ⁻ | | | | | |
| Urchin presence | 1 | 142 | 0.180 | 0.674 | |
| Light regime | 1 | 26 | 0.033 | 0.857 | |
| Interaction | 1 | 108 | 0.136 | 0.714 | |
| NO ₃ ⁻ | | | | | |
| Urchin presence | 1 | 59 | 0.063 | 0.803 | |
| Light regime | 1 | 39 | 0.042 | 0.839 | |
| Interaction | 1 | 37 | 0.040 | 0.843 | |
| NH ₄ ⁺ | | | | | |
| Urchin presence | 1 | 240 | 0.317 | 0.577 | |
| Light regime | 1 | 13026 | 17.171 | <0.001 | CL:CD < 0.025; CL:TD < 0.019 |
| Interaction | 1 | 1804 | 2.378 | 0.133 | |

The flux of ammonium in light differed significantly from that measured in darkness ($p < 0.025$, Tables 1 and 2). In light, the sediment released ammonium into the overlying seawater (negative flux in Table 1), while the average of fluxes measured in darkness indicated a small uptake (Table 1, Figures 2B and 3).

3.3. Sea urchin exclusion–experimental treatment

The solute fluxes (O_2 , N_2 , NO_3^- , NO_2^- , NH_4^+) across the surface of the sediment collected within the exclusion rings (Treatment) did not significantly differ from the fluxes measured across the surface of the sediment collected outside the exclusion rings (Control), under conditions of both light and darkness (Tables 1 and 2, Figure 3).




Figure 3. Sediment–seawater flux ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{h}^{-1}$, $n = 9$) of ammonium (NH_4^+), nitrite (NO_2^-), nitrate (NO_3^-), nitrogen gas (N_2), and oxygen (O_2) in darkness (closed symbols) and light (open symbols), derived from laboratory incubations of sediment collected in Man O’ War Bay, Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand outside (Control) and inside (Treatment) sea urchin exclusion rings after 56 days. A positive flux indicates sediment solute uptake. Horizontal bars are means, the asterisk indicates a significant difference, and the hash sign marks two groups from each of which one outlier has been removed ($n = 8$).

4. Discussion

We expected that the exchange of dissolved oxygen and nitrogen across the surface of the sediment that lies beyond the immediate surrounding of foraging *E. cordatum* individuals would reflect a history of repeated reworking, so that after a 56-day cessation of this reworking the solute fluxes measured inside (Treatment) and outside (Control) the urchin exclusion rings would differ in their magnitude and/or direction. Our measurements, however, did not reveal any statistically significant differences between Treatment and Control. We considered the potential influence of *E. cordatum* on sedimentary solute reaction processes; repeated particle mixing and porewater oxygenation should have altered remineralization rates and thus modified the associated sediment–seawater solute exchange. Apparently, the rate at which the sediment was mixed and oxygenated by the resident *E. cordatum* population did not cause the expected influence; thus, the removal of urchins did not make a difference.

Besides the potential direct effects of sediment mixing on microbial reaction processes, we expected indirect effects, which can result from the influence of *E. cordatum* on cohabiting biota, most importantly, benthic microphytes. Photosynthesis of microphytes can cause dark/light differences in the total sediment–seawater O₂ exchange as measured by core incubations, and an influence of *E. cordatum* on the abundance and activity of microphytes would then be evident from either an increase or decrease of these differences. Our sediment core incubations revealed, however, that the Control removed as much O₂ from the bottom seawater in darkness than it did in light (Table 1). Assuming that the O₂ demand of the sediment in light did not differ from that in darkness, this suggests that benthic photosynthetic O₂ production must have been negligible. If this was the result of heart urchin predation limiting the growth of microphytes, then we would expect algae growth and photosynthesis to increase following the exclusion of the heart urchins. However, there was no evidence of such increase; apparently, benthic primary production in the Control sediment was not limited by predation, so the removal of predation as a potential factor made no difference.

Other studies reported a positive correlation between the abundance of *E. cordatum* (consuming microphytobenthos) and the chlorophyll-*a* content of its surrounding sediment [6,9,10,28]. In habitats where photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) is not limiting microphytobenthic production, this may follow from a stimulation of bacterial mineralization processes, increasing the porewater concentrations of inorganic nitrogen, so that algal growth outweighs consumption. Such gardening effect will be subject to seasonal variations in environmental conditions and heart urchin abundance and activity. Lower PAR and temperature in winter, for example, can hamper benthic primary production and slow urchin movement, respectively [29]. A repeat of our study in November/December may reveal if the influence of *E. cordatum* on the sediment–seawater solute exchange at our site in fact depends on seasonal changes in conditions for growth and production of microphytes or if what we have observed in May/June generally applies throughout the year.

Interestingly, both sediments, Control and Treatment, served as a sink for N₂. Others have reported nitrogen fixation in ammonium-rich sediments, like those found in seagrass beds [30] or subtidal coastal sediments [31,32], and such fixation may be limited to microenvironments in which nitrogen becomes limiting [33]. As Bertics et al. [34] pointed out, however, sediments rich in organic matter and reduced substrates provide an unusual conundrum for anaerobic organisms—the excess electrons can damage cells and there is a need to regenerate electron carriers. Nitrogen fixation may be a mechanism for dissipating reducing power and maintaining an ideal intracellular redox state [35,36], so that nitrogen fixation is observed despite high ammonium concentrations.

The significant light–dark difference in the ammonium exchange of the Control sediment—a small uptake under conditions of darkness, but release in light—suggests an influence of photosynthesis on nitrogen cycling. This is in contrast to the interpretation of our light/dark O₂ exchange data (negligible benthic photosynthesis, see above), and raises the question if our assumption of similar sediment O₂ demand in light and darkness was valid. If the sediment O₂ demand in light was greater than in darkness, then benthic photosynthesis may have played a role without leaving a measurable signature in the total sediment–seawater O₂ exchange. Assuming that the ammonium and N₂ concentrations in the sediment overlying seawater remained stable and independent of light, then the difference in the derived sediment–seawater flux must have resulted from changes in the sediment porewater solute concentrations. Phototrophs assimilating ammonium in darkness, but not in light, would then cause a light/darkness difference in the sediment–seawater ammonium exchange. Similarly, if more porewater N₂ was to be consumed by diazotrophs in light than in darkness (energy limited N₂ fixation [37]), then this would explain why the sediment uptake was greater in light than in darkness. Alternatively, a production of N₂ via anammox in darkness would increase the porewater N₂ concentration and so lower the rate at which the sediment removes N₂ from the bottom seawater. Since this process also lowers the porewater ammonium concentration, it can explain both observations, a lower release or even uptake of ammonium, and lower uptake of N₂ under conditions of darkness.

In conclusion, although foraging *E. cordatum* enhance the sediment–seawater solute exchange where and when they displace sediment particles, this effect does not necessarily outlast the disturbance event. At our subtidal site, at least in May/June, removal of the heart urchins did not alter the solute exchange across the surface of the sediment area that is not actively disturbed. This underlines the importance of evaluating the influence of bioturbators on ecosystem processes in the context of local environmental conditions, seasonal changes in these conditions and biological activity, urchin behavior, and population characteristics.

Author contributions

Evan Brown assisted in the field. K.V. designed the experiment, R.M. and M.S. with the assistance of Mohammad H. A. Usmani completed the laboratory sediment incubations. M.S. measured the inorganic nitrogen content of seawater samples, and R.M. and K.V. analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript.

Use of AI tools declaration

The authors declare they have not used Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in the creation of this article.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research has no financial or personal relationship with other people or organizations that can interfere with it.

References

1. Aller RC, Aller JY (1998) The effect of biogenic irrigation intensity and solute exchange on diagenetic reaction rates in marine sediments. *J Mar Res* 56: 905–936. <https://doi.org/10.1357/002224098321667413>
2. Banta G, Holmer M, Jensen M, et al. (1999) Effects of two polychaete worms, *Nereis diversicolor* and *Arenicola marina*, on aerobic and anaerobic decomposition in a sandy marine sediment. *Aquat Microb Ecol* 19: 189–204. <https://doi.org/10.3354/ame019189>
3. Solan M, Wigham BD (2005) Biogenic particle reworking and bacterial–invertebrate interactions in marine sediments. In: Kristensen E, Haese RR, Kostka JE Eds., *Coastal and Estuarine Studies*, Vol. 60, 105–124. American Geophysical Union. <https://doi.org/10.1029/CE060p0105>
4. Kristensen E, Penha-Lopes G, Delefosse M, et al. (2012) What is bioturbation? The need for a precise definition for fauna in aquatic sciences. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 446: 285–302. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps09506>
5. Forster S, Graf G, Kitlar J, et al. (1995) Effects of bioturbation in oxic and hypoxic conditions: A microcosm experiment with a North Sea sediment community. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 116: 153–161. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps116153>
6. Lohrer AM, Thrush SF, Gibbs MM (2004) Bioturbators enhance ecosystem function through complex biogeochemical interactions. *Nature* 431: 1092–1095. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03042>
7. Volkenborn N, Hedtkamp SIC, van Beusekom JEE, et al. (2007) Effects of bioturbation and bioirrigation by lugworms (*Arenicola marina*) on physical and chemical sediment properties and implications for intertidal habitat succession. *Estuarine Coastal Shelf Sci* 74: 331–343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2007.05.001>
8. Osinga R, Kop AJ, Malschaert JFP, et al. (1997) Effects of the sea urchin *Echinocardium cordatum* on bacterial production and carbon flow in experimental benthic systems under increasing organic loading. *J Sea Res* 37: 109–121. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1385-1101\(97\)00003-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1385-1101(97)00003-8)
9. Lohrer AM, Thrush SF, Hunt L, et al. (2005) Rapid reworking of subtidal sediments by burrowing spatangoid urchins. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 321: 155–169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2005.02.002>
10. Lohrer AM, Thrush SF, Hewitt JE, et al. (2015) The up-scaling of ecosystem functions in a heterogeneous world. *Sci Rep* 5: 10349. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep10349>
11. Nakamura Y (2001) Autoecology of the heart urchin, *Echinocardium cordatum*, in the muddy sediment of the Seto Inland Sea, Japan. *J Mar Biol Assoc U K* 81: 289–297. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315401003769>
12. De Ridder C, Saucède T (2020) *Echinocardium cordatum*. In: *Developments in Aquaculture and Fisheries Science*, Vol. 43, 337–357. Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-819570-3.00020-2>
13. Buchanan JB (1966) The biology of *Echinocardium cordatum* [Echinodermata: Spatangoidea] from different habitats. *J Mar Biol Assoc U K* 46: 97–114. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315400017574>
14. Foster-Smith RL (1978) An analysis of water flow in tube-living animals. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 34: 73–95. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0981\(78\)90058-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0981(78)90058-8)

15. Vopel K, Vopel A, Thistle D, Hancock N (2007) Effects of spatangoid heart urchins on O₂ supply into coastal sediment. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 333: 161–171. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps333161>
16. Smith AB (1980) The structure and arrangement of echinoid tubercles. *Philos Trans R Soc B* 289: 1–54. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1980.0026>
17. Boon AR, Duineveld GCA (2012) Phytopigments and fatty acids in the gut of the deposit-feeding heart urchin *Echinocardium cordatum* in the southern North Sea: Selective feeding and its contribution to the benthic carbon budget. *J Sea Research* 67: 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seares.2011.10.004>
18. De Ridder C, Jangoux M, Impe E (2020) Food selection and absorption efficiency in the spatangoid echinoid, *Echinocardium cordatum* (Echinodermata). In: Keegan BF, O'Connor BDS, *Echinodermata* 1st ed., 245–251. CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003079224-48>
19. Hollertz K, Duchêne JC (2001) Burrowing behaviour and sediment reworking in the heart urchin *Brissopsis lyrifera* Forbes (Spatangoida). *Mar Biol* 139: 951–957. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002270100629>
20. Kanazawa K (1995) How spatangoids produce their traces: Relationship between burrowing mechanism and trace structure. *Lethaia* 28: 211–219. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1502-3931.1995.tb01424.x>
21. Aller RC (1982) The Effects of macrobenthos on chemical properties of marine sediment and overlying water. In: McCall PL, Tevesz MJS, *Animal-Sediment Relations* Vol. 100, 53–102. Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-1317-6_2
22. Glud RN (2008) Oxygen dynamics of marine sediments. *Mar Biol Res* 4:243–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17451000801888726>
23. Braeckman U, Provoost P, Gribsholt B, et al. (2010) Role of macrofauna functional traits and density in biogeochemical fluxes and bioturbation. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 399: 173–186. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08336>
24. Wilson PS, Vopel K (2012) Estimating the in situ distribution of acid volatile sulfides from sediment profile images. *Limnol Oceanogr Methods* 10: 1070–1077. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lom.2012.10.1070>
25. Wong KC, O'Shea S (2010) Sediment macrobenthos off eastern Waiheke Island, Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand. *N Z J Mar Freshwater Res* 44: 149–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00288330.2010.498088>
26. Rho T, Coverly S, Kim ES, et al. (2016) Practical considerations for the segmented-flow analysis of nitrate and ammonium in seawater and the avoidance of matrix effects. *Ocean Sci J* 50: 709–720. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12601-015-0064-7>
27. R Core Team (2022) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. [Computer software]. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>.
28. Needham HR, Pilditch CA, Lohrer AM, Thrush SF (2011) Context-specific bioturbation mediates changes to ecosystem functioning. *Ecosystems* 14: 1096–1109. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-011-9468-0>
29. Seike K, Sassa S, Shirai K, et al. (2022) Sediment hardness and water temperature affect the burrowing of *Echinocardium cordatum*: Implications for mass mortality during the 2011 earthquake–liquefaction–tsunami disaster. *Estuarine Coastal Shelf Sci* 267: 107763. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2022.107763>

30. Aoki L, McGlathery K (2019) High rates of N fixation in seagrass sediments measured via a direct $^{30}\text{N}_2$ push-pull method. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 616: 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps12961>
31. Fulweiler RW, Nixon SW, Buckley BA, et al. (2007) Reversal of the net dinitrogen gas flux in coastal marine sediments. *Nature* 448: 180–182. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05963>
32. Newell SE, McCarthy MJ, Gardner WS, et al. (2016) Sediment nitrogen fixation: A call for re-evaluating coastal N budgets. *Estuaries Coasts* 39: 1626–1638. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-016-0116-y>
33. Whiting GJ, Gandy EL, Yoch DC (1986) Tight coupling of root-associated nitrogen fixation and plant photosynthesis in the salt marsh grass *Spartina alterniflora* and carbon dioxide enhancement of nitrogenase activity. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 52: 108–113. <https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.52.1.108-113.1986>
34. Bertics VJ, Löscher CR, Salonen I, et al. (2013) Occurrence of benthic microbial nitrogen fixation coupled to sulfate reduction in the seasonally hypoxic Eckernförde Bay, Baltic Sea. *Biogeosciences* 10: 1243–1258. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-10-1243-2013>
35. Joshi HM, Tabita FR (1996) A global two component signal transduction system that integrates the control of photosynthesis, carbon dioxide assimilation, and nitrogen fixation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 93: 14515–14520. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.93.25.14515>
36. Bombar D, Paerl RW, Riemann L (2016) Marine non-cyanobacterial diazotrophs: Moving beyond molecular detection. *Trends Microbiol* 24: 916–927. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2016.07.002>
37. Stal LJ (2015) Nitrogen Fixation in Cyanobacteria. In: *Encyclopedia of Life Sciences*, 1st ed., 1–9. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470015902.a0021159.pub2>



AIMS Press

© 2024 the Author(s), licensee AIMS Press. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)