



HAL
open science

Pond turtle carapaces, an alternative natural substrate for the use of a diatom-based water quality index

Véronique Vassal, Luc L. Ector, Bart van de Vijver, Vincent Roubeix, Anthony Olivier, Samuel Pauvert, Cédric Roy, Stéphanie Fayolle

► **To cite this version:**

Véronique Vassal, Luc L. Ector, Bart van de Vijver, Vincent Roubeix, Anthony Olivier, et al.. Pond turtle carapaces, an alternative natural substrate for the use of a diatom-based water quality index. *Botany Letters*, 2021, 168 (1), pp.18-24. 10.1080/23818107.2020.1724825 . hal-02568916

HAL Id: hal-02568916

<https://hal.science/hal-02568916>

Submitted on 13 May 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**Pond turtle carapaces, an alternative natural substrate for
the use of a diatom-based water quality index**

Journal:	<i>Botany Letters</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	vassal, veronique; DREAL PACA, ector, luc; Luxembourg Institute of Science and Technology Van de Vijver, Bart; Botanic Garden Meise, Roubeix, Vincent; DREAL PACA Olivier, Anthony; Foundation Tour du Valat Pauvert, Samuel; DREAL PACA Roy, Cédric; CEN PACA Fayolle, Stéphanie; IMBE
Keywords:	Epizotic diatoms, Emys orbicularis, epilithic diatoms, epiphytic diatoms, wetland, biomonitoring, BDI, water quality assessment

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Pond turtle carapaces, an alternative natural substrate for the use of a**
4 **diatom-based water quality index**
5
6
7

8 Véronique Vassal^a, Luc Ector^b, Bart Van de Vijver^{c,d}, Vincent Roubeix^a, Anthony
9 Olivier^e, Samuel Pauvert^a, Cédric Roy^f and Stéphanie Fayolle^g
10
11
12

13 ^a DREAL PACA, Laboratoire d'Hydrobiologie, Pôle d'activités Les Milles, Avenue
14 Albert Einstein, Bâtiment E Cerema – Dter med 13593m, CS 70499, 13593 Aix-en-
15 Provence Cedex 3, France.

16 ^b Environmental Research and Innovation (ERIN) Department, Luxembourg Institute of
17 Science and Technology (LIST), Belvaux, Luxembourg.

18 ^c Research Department, Meise Botanic Garden, Meise, Belgium.

19 ^d Department of Biology-ECOBIE, University of Antwerp, Wilrijk, Belgium.

20 ^e La Tour du Valat, Institut de recherche pour la conservation des zones humides
21 méditerranéennes, Le Sambuc, 13200 Arles, France.

22 ^f CEN PACA Pôle Alpes du Sud, Appartement n°5, 96 rue Droite, 04200 SISTERON

23 ^g Aix Marseille Université Avignon, CNRS, IRD, IMBE, Marseille Cedex 20, France.
24
25
26

27 **Corresponding author :** Véronique Vassal [veronique.vassal@developpement-
29 durable.gouv.fr](mailto:veronique.vassal@developpement-
28 durable.gouv.fr) DREAL PACA, Laboratoire d'Hydrobiologie, Pôle d'activités
30 Les Milles, Avenue Albert Einstein, Bâtiment E Cerema – Dter med 13593m, CS
31 70499, 13593 Aix-en-Provence Cedex 3, France
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Benthic diatoms are widely used as bio-indicators in water quality monitoring of rivers and streams, but less commonly of stagnant waterbodies such as pools and lakes. Currently, a new method for assessing the ecological status of lakes is being tested in France to meet the requirements of the European Water Framework Directive (WFD) 2000/60/EC. This new method uses epilithic and epiphytic diatoms growing on stones and aquatic plants. Alternatively, freshwater turtles and the epibiotic algae found on their carapaces may provide an excellent substrate for estimating water quality. Our study proposes an original diatom-based method for assessing the quality of water bodies in which turtles live. The main objective was to compare the Biological Diatom Index (BDI) values measured from epizoic diatom samples taken on the carapace of turtles with classical epilithic or epiphytic samples. Epizoic samples were taken from the carapaces of the turtle *Emys orbicularis* in two shallow French Mediterranean wetlands. Our results indicate that diatom assemblages differ slightly within the three substrates studied with limited variations in index value. However, some variability among results from the same site suggests that several turtle individuals should be sampled.

KEYWORDS: Epizoic diatoms; *Emys orbicularis*; epilithic diatoms; epiphytic diatoms; wetland; biomonitoring; BDI; water quality assessment

Introduction

Primary producers (phytoplankton, phytobenthos and macrophytes) are widely used as ecological indicators in the European Water Framework Directive (WFD) 2000/60/EC (European Union 2000, Kelly 2013). Diatoms (Bacillariophyceae), small unicellular algae characterized by the presence of an outer silica carapace (Round et al. 1990), are considered one of the most powerful bio-indicators due to their short generation times, their high diversity and their fast reaction to even very slight variations in the physico-chemical characteristics of their aquatic environment (pH, salinity, organic matter, nutrients, metal pollution). Diatoms are commonly found on all kinds of submerged vegetal and inert mineral substrates such as the submerged parts of helophytes, aquatic plants, stones and sand grains (Kelly et al. 1998). The presence of a broad array of taxa indicating low water quality provides an excellent early warning signal of degraded water conditions for managers (Kelly et al. 2016).

In France, the Biological Diatom Index (BDI) has been commonly used in the past 15 years for monitoring running waters (AFNOR 2007, 2016; Coste et al. 2009). The index reflects the level of organic (saprobity) and trophic (nitrogen) pollution, as well as contamination by toxic substances such as mineral or synthetic micropollutants. Currently, a diatom-based method for assessing the ecological status of European lakes is being tested in France to meet the European Water Framework Directive requirements (WFD, 2000/60/EC) for stagnant waterbodies. The sampling method uses both epilithic and epiphytic diatoms. Apart from living on these inert substrates, diatoms found epizoically on many aquatic animals (e.g. Wu & Bergey 2017, Ferrario

1
2
3 et al. 2018), could likewise provide an excellent population for the application of water
4
5 quality indices.
6
7

8
9 Freshwater turtles such as the European pond turtle (*Emys orbicularis* Linnaeus, 1758)
10
11 are an important component of freshwater ecosystems worldwide. This species has a
12
13 vast longitudinal and latitudinal range of distribution, from Portugal to the Aral Sea and
14
15 from North Africa to Russia, respectively (Fritz 2003). Their large carapaces provide a
16
17 perfect inert natural and challenging habitat for the growth of epizoic algae. In the past,
18
19 a fairly large diversity of different algal groups has been described on the carapaces and
20
21 skin of freshwater turtles (Edgren et al. 1953; Soylu et al. 2006; Garbary et al. 2007;
22
23 Wetzel et al. 2010, 2012; Wu & Bergey 2017). A study on the European pond turtle in
24
25 the Camargue region (South France) identified 77 epizoic algal taxa on the carapaces,
26
27 amongst which diatoms formed the most diverse group with 51 recorded taxa (Fayolle
28
29 et al. 2016).
30
31
32
33

34
35 We hypothesize in the present study that epizoic diatoms living on turtle carapaces can
36
37 be used as water quality indicators. In the present study we investigated in two different
38
39 Mediterranean localities, (1) whether diatom assemblages on *Emys orbicularis* were
40
41 habitat-specific or similar to those living on the surrounding mineral or vegetal
42
43 substrates, and (2) the consequences on the BDI of the choice of an epizoic instead of an
44
45 epilithic or epiphytic diatom sample. The final goal is to extend the possibilities of
46
47 diatom sampling for the application of a diatom index, especially in sites where mineral
48
49 or vegetal substrates are not available.
50
51
52
53

54 55 **Materials and methods**

56
57 The two sampling localities investigated in this study, are located in the south of France.
58
59 The first site (Charpines, 43°71'48" N, 5°31'42" E, altitude 147 m, date of sampling:
60

1
2
3 06/29/2016) is a wetland with a small surface area (0.22 ha), shallow and very silted
4
5 (maximum water depth of 1 m and 0.10 m on accessible shores), located near the lower
6
7 reaches of the Durance River. Following the collapse of the riverbed (Renet et al. 2017),
8
9 this wetland is only connected to the Durance during major floods. The inflow comes
10
11 from a water treatment plant resulting in an overall low water quality. The second site
12
13 (Esquineau, 43°51'20" N, 4°66'76" E, altitude 1 m, sampling date: 06/08/2017) is a vast
14
15 (16 ha) rather shallow (average water depth of 50 cm) wetland area located in the
16
17 natural reserve of the Tour du Valat in the Camargue region and composed of semi-
18
19 permanent marshes and man-made managed irrigation canals (Olivier et al. 2010). The
20
21 wetland area has a moderate water quality.
22
23
24
25

26
27 Epilithic and epiphytic diatoms were sampled as recommended by the IRSTEA method
28
29 (DCE Plan d'eau Phytobenthos Irstea REBX Version 1.2 February 2013). The epilithic
30
31 and epiphytic samples were collected separately as pooled biofilm extracts from at least
32
33 five pebbles which had been previously placed in both sites for 4 weeks, and five
34
35 submerged helophyte stems (*Phragmites australis* (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud.), respectively.
36
37
38

39
40 The two sites host two distinct turtle populations that are yearly monitored using
41
42 capture-recapture methods (Ficheux et al. 2014; Renet et al. 2017). Epizoic diatoms
43
44 were collected at each site by brushing off an area of 20 cm² on the back of ten adult
45
46 turtle carapaces using single-use toothbrushes. Half of the samples were pooled to form
47
48 a single mixed epizoic sample. The resulting number of samples from each site was 13
49
50 (11 epizoic, one epilithic and one epiphytic). The samples were preserved in 90 %
51
52 ethanol.
53
54

55
56 Diatom identifications were performed after having prepared permanent slides
57
58 following BDI standard NF T90-354. The organic matter in the small fraction of raw
59
60

1
2
3 samples was digested with hot (90°C., ±10h) concentrated solution of hydrogen
4 peroxide (30% v/v) using a digestion block system (DigiPREP systems, SCP Science)
5
6 and calcium salts were dissolved with concentrated hydrochloric acid (30% v/v).
7
8 Following digestion and decantation, cleaned material was rinsed and diluted with
9
10 deionized water and mounted permanently on glass slides using Naphrax® resin
11
12 (refractive index = 1.74). Light microscopy (LM) analysis was performed using a Nikon
13
14 (Eclipse Ni) light microscope equipped with phase contrast plan apochromat ×100 oil
15
16 optic. In each sample, at least 400 valves were identified to the lowest taxonomic level
17
18 possible and counted along random transects. Most taxa were determined according to
19
20 Lange-Bertalot (2001, 2017), Krammer (2002, 2003), Levkov et al. (2016) and Lange-
21
22 Bertalot et al. (2017). The BDI was calculated from diatom counts using Omnidia
23
24 software, version 6.0.8 (2018) (Lecointe et al. 1993). Data analysis was performed using
25
26 R (R Core Team 2018). The comparison of epizoic, epiphytic and epilithic diatom
27
28 communities was carried out on the basis of their specific composition using Ward's
29
30 hierarchical classification method with Canberra distance. Only the relative abundances
31
32 of species with at least three valves counted were considered. The IndVal analysis of
33
34 indicator species in clusters was done using the labdsv R package (Roberts 2019). BDI
35
36 values between clusters were compared using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Results**

47
48 A total of 81 diatoms taxa (including species, varieties and forms, with abundance ≥ 2
49
50 valves) were identified in 26 samples: 28 were recorded in Charpines and 53 in
51
52 Esquineau (Supplementary material 1). At both sites, the cluster analysis did not show a
53
54 strong differentiation between communities taken from conventional substrates and
55
56 from turtle carapaces (Fig. 1). Indeed, the first node of each tree separated epizoic
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 samples, which means that the type of substrate was not the most important factor
4
5 determining diatom assemblages. The analysis also revealed considerable heterogeneity
6
7 among epizoic communities. However, the pattern was not the same at the two sites. In
8
9 Charpines, three main groups could be identified: the first one included only the
10
11 epiphytic and epilithic samples (n=2). This first group was closer to most epizoic
12
13 samples, forming Group 2 (n=7), than to a third marginal group of 4 epizoic samples
14
15 (Fig 1a). In Esquineau, the communities were more homogeneous than in Charpines,
16
17 but similarly, three groups could likewise be distinguished (Fig. 1b). In a first large
18
19 cluster, the epilithic and epiphytic as well as most epizoic samples were grouped (n=9).
20
21 Two pairs of samples, forming groups 2 and 3, were separated from the main group by
22
23 an increasing distance, corresponding to an increasingly different composition of
24
25 communities.
26
27
28
29

30
31
32 The consequences of variations in communities between groups of substrates on the
33
34 diatomic index BDI was greater in Charpines than in Esquineau. Indeed, group 3 of
35
36 epizoic samples from Charpines had significantly higher BDI ($p < 0.05$, Kruskal-Wallis
37
38 test), between 3 and 4 points above the values of the other groups (Fig. 1a). These
39
40 differences in BDI could lead to different assessments of water quality (poor or bad)
41
42 depending on the samples considered for this site. The communities in Group 3 were
43
44 characterized by *Sellaphora pupula* and *Nitzschia linearis*, both species showing
45
46 relatively high specific BDI values (Table 1). In Esquineau, the differences in BDI
47
48 between the three groups were smaller (between 1 and 2 points, $p = 0.05$, Fig 1b). Groups
49
50 2 and 3 had lower values and were characterized by indicator species such as
51
52 *Tryblionella littoralis* or *Craticula cuspidata* (group 2) and *Fragilaria gracilis* or
53
54 *Mastogloia smithii* (group 3, Table 1). Nevertheless, considering only the mixed epizoic
55
56 samples being representative of the carapace substrate, the absolute differences in BDI
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 between epizoic and standard samples were similar in Charpines and Esquineau (≤ 1.5 ,
4
5 Figure 1).
6
7

8 **Discussion**

9
10
11 The main result of this study was a higher degree of similarity in diatom communities
12 and BDI values between samples from *Emys orbicularis* carapaces and from stones or
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The chitin structure of the carapaces and the production of secretions and excreta by
turtles (Edgren et al. 1953) could be selection factors for epizoic species. The
movements of the turtles may also increase the risk of species abrasion, especially in
case of friction between the carapace and the macrophyte vegetation in which the turtles
live. It also generates variable abiotic conditions that can be stressful for microalgae.
Light intensity on the carapace may change considerably according to the position of
the turtle in the water column. Moreover, European pond turtles often exit their aquatic
environment for basking at sunlight. This out-of-water thermoregulation activity can
last several hours in spring when the water and air temperatures are low. The resulting
desiccation of the biofilm on the carapace during sun exposure may probably affect the
composition of attached diatom communities. Recurrent emersion may be a strong
pressure that epilithic or epiphytic biofilm may not commonly experience, unless there
are large water level fluctuations. Also, the overall similarity of the communities on
stones, macrophytes and turtles carapace suggests that the type of substrate is not a
determinant of periphyton specific composition as strong as the water quality
(Cellamare et al. 2012) or the date of sampling (Cetin 2008). It can also be assumed a
high turnover of periphyton on turtle carapaces due to frequent attachment/detachment
in relation to host motion and therefore little time for selection of most adapted species

1
2
3 to operate. This 'mass effect' hypothesis (Shmida and Wilson 1985) could explain why
4
5 there is no clear differentiation between epizoic and epiphytic or epilithic communities.
6
7

8
9 However, some differences were observed between turtles especially in the Charpines
10
11 site. They may be due to differences between individuals in size, age, sex or behaviour.
12

13
14 If the turtles can be considered, because of their movement, more representative of a
15
16 water body than stones or macrophytes, they may use only a part of a lake and even
17
18 expand their living area to another neighboring freshwater system (Olivier 2002) . The
19
20 case of the Charpines site showed that there is a risk of considerable deviation of the
21
22 BDI and misclassification if only one individual is considered. Thus, it should be
23
24 recommended to sample biofilm on several individuals to reduce variance, analogously
25
26 as for stones in the BDI protocol. In addition, it may be preferable to select individuals
27
28 of the same species to avoid more variability due to differences in the ecology of
29
30 chelonian species (Soylu et al. 2006), such as *Emys orbicularis* and *Mauremys leprosa*
31
32 in Europe. The BDI, initially developed for running waters, may be replaced in the next
33
34 years by a new index more appropriate for lakes or wetlands. However, the conclusion
35
36 of this study concerning the suitability of the turtle carapace substrate for diatom
37
38 bioindication should be still valid when another specific index will be used.
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Conclusion**

45
46
47 The method applied in this study represents a potential tool for the assessment of
48
49 wetlands where *Emys orbicularis* is monitored using CMR methods. It implies the
50
51 application of a diatom index such as the BDI, on epizoic diatoms. The European pond
52
53 turtle carapace offers an alternative substrate in wetlands without stone or macrophytes
54
55 available for sampling, allowing managers to monitor in the same time a protected
56
57 species and the ecological status of wetlands which are generally not included in the
58
59
60

1
2
3 national WFD networks.
4
5
6
7

8 **Acknowledgements** 9

10
11 We are indebted to the many people who participated in the turtle catches, in particular
12 Maëlys Marage (Tour du Valat) and Rozen Rocher (CEN PACA) as well as to Sophie
13 Guingand for her assistance in data processing. We thank the French Ministry of
14 Environment for giving us the permission to capture European pond turtle in Esquineau
15 and Charpines. We are grateful to the Association des Diatomistes de Langue Française
16 (ADLaF) for allowing us to present this work at the conference held in Dijon
17 (September 2017), and to the anonymous reviewers for their useful comments on the
18 manuscript. This study was made possible thanks to the support of Séverine Lopez and
19 the management of the Service Biodiversité Eau et Paysage of the DREAL PACA. We
20 would like to express our sincere thanks to them.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Notes on contributors** 38 39 40

41
42 *Véronique Vassal* is hydrobiologist at the Direction Régionale de l'Environnement, de
43 l'Aménagement et du Logement Provence Alpes Côte d'Azur. She has been working
44 mostly on rivers and lakes of the PACA region. *Contribution:* Coordination of the
45 project, sample collection, LM pictures, plates and writing of the article.
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53 *Luc Ector* is a botanist and senior researcher at the Luxembourg Institute of Science and
54 Technology. He has written over 210 articles and has been working on diatoms in
55 rivers, lakes and soils for the last 30 years. He was the President of the “Association des
56 Diatomistes de Langue Française (ADLaF)”, which organizes annual meetings on
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 diatom taxonomy, ecology and related subjects. Over the last 20 years, he has been
4
5 organizing and teaching numerous training courses on diatom ecology and taxonomy
6
7 designed for biologists, technicians and ecologists, contributing to the continuous
8
9 improvement in the Water Framework Directive implementation in Europe.

10
11
12 *Contribution:* Provision of literature, bibliographic research, help with identification of
13
14 diatom species, discussion of results, revision and editing of the manuscript.
15
16

17
18
19 *Bart Van de Vijver* is a full-time senior researcher at Meise Botanic Garden, Belgium,
20
21 and a part-time professor in botany at the University of Antwerp, Belgium. His research
22
23 focuses mainly on the taxonomy, morphology and biogeography of Antarctic freshwater
24
25 and terrestrial diatoms. He has been studying non-marine diatoms in various parts of the
26
27 Antarctic region for more than 20 years. He has described almost 400 new taxa and
28
29 revised an additional 250 taxa. Currently his research interest also includes the diversity
30
31 and ecology of epizoic diatoms living mainly on marine vertebrates. *Contribution:*
32
33 Discussion of results, revision and editing of the manuscript.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 *Vincent Roubeix* is a R&D consultant in hydrobiology and ecology, specialist of
42
43 diatoms. *Contribution:* Data analysis, discussion of results and manuscript co-writing
44
45 and edition.
46
47
48

49
50 *Anthony Olivier* is a nature reserve ranger and herpetologist at the Tour du Valat. He is
51
52 interested in the ecology and conservation of amphibians and reptiles in the Camargue
53
54 and the Mediterranean basin. In particular, he has been leading a long-term study *on the*
55
56 *Emys orbicularis* population of the Tour du Valat since 1997. *Contribution:* Sample
57
58 collection and help with the redaction of the manuscript.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 *Samuel Pauvert* is hydrobiologist and head of the hydrobiology laboratory of the
6 Direction Régionale de l'Environnement, de l'Aménagement et du Logement Provence
7 Alpes Côte d'Azur. *Contribution*: Discussion and revision of the manuscript.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 *Cédric Roy* is herpetologist and coordinator of the regional actions plan for *Emys*
15 *orbicularis* at Conservatoire d'espaces naturels de Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur.
16
17 *Contribution*: Sample collection and revision of the manuscript.
18
19
20
21

22
23
24 *Stéphanie Fayolle* is an assistant professor in hydrobiology at the University (Aix-
25 Marseille). Specialist of algal ecology. *Contribution*: Discussion of results and
26 manuscript co-writing and revision.
27
28
29
30

31 32 33 ORCID

34
35 Luc Ector <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4573-9445>

36
37 Bart Van de Vijver <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6244-1886>

38
39 Vincent Roubex <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3809-8678>
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 47 **References**

- 48
49 AFNOR. 2007. Norme française NF T90-354 Décembre 2007. Qualité de l'eau –
50 Détermination de l'Indice Biologique Diatomées (IBD). La Plaine Saint-Denis
51 Cedex: Association Française de Normalisation (AFNOR); p. 1–79.
52
53
54
55 AFNOR. 2016. Norme française NF T90-354 Avril 2016. Qualité de l'eau –
56 Échantillonnage, traitement et analyse de diatomées benthiques en cours d'eau et
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 canaux. La Plaine Saint-Denis Cedex: Association Française de Normalisation
4
5 (AFNOR); p. 1–119.
6
7
8 Cellamare, M, S Morin, M Coste, J Haury. 2012. Ecological assessment of French
9
10 Atlantic lakes based on phytoplankton, phytobenthos and macrophytes. Environ
11
12 Monit Assess. 184(8):4685–4708. doi:10.1007/s10661-011-2295-0
13
14
15 Cetin, AK. 2008. Epilithic, epipellic, and epiphytic diatoms in the Göksu Stream:
16
17 Community relationships and habitat preferences. J Freshw Ecol. 23(1):143–
18
19 149. doi:10.1080/02705060.2008.9664565
20
21
22 Coste, M, S Boutry, J Tison-Rosebery, F Delmas. 2009. Improvements of the Biological
23
24 Diatom Index (BDI): Description and efficiency of the new version (BDI-2006).
25
26 Ecol Indic. 9(4):621–650. doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2008.06.003
27
28
29 Edgren, RA, MK Edgren, LH Tiffany. 1953. Some North American turtles and their
30
31 epizoophytic algae. Ecology. 34(4):733–740. doi:10.2307/1931336
32
33
34 European Union (2000) Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the
35
36 Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for community action in
37
38 the field of water policy. Off J Eur Commun. L327:1–72.
39
40
41 Fayolle, S, C Moriconi, B Oursel, C Koenig, M Suet, S Ficheux, M Logez, A Olivier.
42
43 2016. Epizoic algae distribution on the carapace and plastron of the European
44
45 pond turtle (*Emys orbicularis*, Linnaeus, 1758): A study from the Camargue,
46
47 France. Cryptogam Algal. 37(4):221–232. doi:10.7872/crya/v37.iss4.2016.221
48
49
50 Ferrario, ME, AO Cefarelli, A Fazio, P Bordino, OE Romero. 2018. *Bennettella*
51
52 *ceticola* (Nelson ex Bennett) Holmes on the skin of Franciscana dolphin
53
54 (*Pontoporia blainvillei*) of the Argentinean Sea: an emendation of the generic
55
56 description. Diatom Res. 33(4):485–497. doi:10.1080/0269249X.2019.1572651
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ficheux, S, A Olivier, R Fay, A Crivelli, A Besnard, A Béchet. 2014. Rapid response of
4 a long-lived species to improved water and grazing management: The case of the
5 European pond turtle (*Emys orbicularis*) in the Camargue, France. J Nat
6 Conserv. 22(4):342–348. doi:10.1016/j.jnc.2014.03.001
7
8
9
10
11
12 Fritz, U. 2003. Die Europäische Sumpfschildkröte. Bielefeld: Laurenti Verlag; p. 1–224.
13
14 Garbary, DJ, G Bourque, TB Herman, JA McNeil. 2007. Epizoic algae from freshwater
15 turtles in Nova Scotia. J Freshw Ecol. 22(4):677–685.
16
17 doi:10.1080/02705060.2007.9664828
18
19
20
21 Kelly, M. 2013. Data rich, information poor? Phytobenthos assessment and the Water
22 Framework Directive. Eur J Phycol. 48(4):437–450.
23
24 doi:10.1080/09670262.2013.852694
25
26
27
28 Kelly, MG, A Cazaubon, E Coring, A Dell’Uomo, L Ector, B Goldsmith, H Guasch, J
29 Hürlimann, A Jarlman, B Kawecka, J Kwadrans, R Laugaste, E-A Lindstrøm,
30 M Leitao, P Marvan, J Padisák, E Pipp, J Prygiel, E Rott, S Sabater, H van Dam,
31 J Vizinet. 1998. Recommendations for the routine sampling of diatoms for water
32 quality assessments in Europe. J Appl Phycol. 10:215–224.
33
34 doi:10.1023/A:1008033201227
35
36
37
38 Kelly, MG, S Birk, NJ Willby, L Denys, S Drakare, M Kahlert, SM Karjalainen, A
39 Marchetto, J-A Pitt, G Urbanič, S. Poikane. 2016. Redundancy in the ecological
40 assessment of lakes: Are phytoplankton, macrophytes and phytobenthos all
41 necessary? Sci Total Environ. 568:594–602. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.02.024
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 Krammer, K. 2002. *Cymbella*. Diatoms of Europe. 3:1–584.
52
53 Krammer, K. 2003. *Cymbopleura*, *Delicata*, *Navicymbula*, *Gomphocymbellopsis*,
54 *Afrocymbella*. Diatoms of Europe. 4:1–529.
55
56
57
58
59
60


- 1
2
3 Lange-Bertalot, H. 2001. *Navicula* sensu stricto. 10 genera separated from *Navicula*
4 sensu lato. *Frustulia*. Diatoms of Europe. 2:1–526.
5
6
7
8 Lange-Bertalot, H, G Hofmann, M Werum, M Cantonati. 2017. Freshwater benthic
9 diatoms of Central Europe: over 800 common species used in ecological
10 assessment. English edition with updated taxonomy and added species. Edited
11 by, M Cantonati, MG Kelly, H Lange-Bertalot. Schmitten-Oberreifenberg:
12 Koeltz Botanical Books; p. 1–942.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Lecointe, C, M Coste, J Prygiel. 1993. “Omnidia”: software for taxonomy, calculation
20 of diatom indices and inventories management. *Hydrobiologia* 269/270:509–
21 513. doi:10.1007/BF00028048
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Levkov, Z, D Mitić-Kopanja, E Reichardt. 2016. The diatom genus *Gomphonema* from
the Republic of Macedonia. *Diatoms of Europe*. 8:1–552.
- Olivier, A. 2002. Ecologie, traits d’histoire de vie et conservation d’une population de
cistude d’Europe *Emys orbicularis* en Camargue. Dissertation. Ecole Pratique
des Hautes Etudes, Université de Montpellier II, Montpellier; p. 1–165.
- Olivier, A., C. Barbraud, E. Rosecchi, C. Germain, M. Cheylan. 2010. Assessing spatial
and temporal population dynamics of cryptic species: an example with the
European pond turtle. *Ecol Appl*. 20(4):993–1004. doi:10.1890/09-0801.1
- R Core Team. 2016. A language and environment for statistical computing [Internet].
Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Renet, J, F Boca, C Legouez, C Roy. 2017. Distribution de la Cistude d’Europe *Emys*
orbicularis (Linnaeus, 1758) en Basse-Durance : bilan après quatre années de
prospection (2013-2016). *Bull Soc Herp Fr*. 162:1–16.
- Roberts, DW, 2019. "labdsv: Ordination and Multivariate Analysis for Ecology. R
package version 2.0-1." <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=labdsv>

- 1
2
3 Round, FE, RM Crawford, DG Mann. 1990. The diatoms: biology & morphology of the
4
5 genera. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6
7
8 Shmida, A, MV Wilson. 1985. Biological determinants of species diversity. J Biogeogr.
9
10 12(1):1–20. doi:10.2307/2845026
11
12 Soylu, EN, A Gönülol, A Sukatar, D Ayaz, CV Tok. 2006. Epizoic freshwater algae on
13
14 *Emys orbicularis* (Testudinata: Emydidae) from the Central Anatolia region of
15
16 Turkey. J Freshw Ecol. 21(3):535–538. doi:10.1080/02705060.2006.9665033
17
18
19 Wetzel, CE, B Van de Vijver, L Ector. 2010. *Luticola deniseae* sp. nov. a new epizoic
20
21 diatom from the Rio Negro (Amazon hydrographic basin). Vie Milieu.
22
23 60(3):177–184.
24
25
26 Wetzel CE, B Van de Vijver, EJ Cox, DC Bicudo, L Ector. 2012. *Tursiocola*
27
28 *podocnemicola* sp. nov., a new epizoic freshwater diatom species from the Rio
29
30 Negro in the Brazilian Amazon Basin. Diatom Res. 27(1):1–8.
31
32 doi:10.1080/0269249X.2011.642498
33
34
35 Wu, SC, EA Bergey. 2017. Diatoms on the carapace of common snapping turtles:
36
37 *Luticola* spp. dominate despite spatial variation in assemblages. PLoS One.
38
39 12(2):e0171910. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0171910
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


Table 1. Indicator species of the three clusters considered in each site with indication of their IndVal value and their BDI score (0 to 20).

Site	Diatom species	cluster	Ind-Val	p-val	BDI score	
Charpines	<i>Eolimna subminuscula</i> (Manguin) Gerd Moser, Lange-Bertalot & Metzeltin	1	0.83	0.003	4.3	
	<i>Nitzschia</i> sp Hassall	1	0.80	0.025	nd	
	<i>Planothidium frequentissimum</i> (Lange-Bertalot) Lange-Bertalot	1	0.92	0.025	11.7	
	<i>Cocconeis placentula</i> Ehrenberg	2	0.84	0.017	15.4	
	<i>Diademsis confervacea</i> Kützing	2	0.68	0.006	1	
	<i>Luticola goeppertiana</i> (Bleisch) D.G.Mann in Round et al.	2	0.73	0.001	5	
	<i>Nitzschia amphibia</i> Grunow	2	0.75	0.001	7.7	
	<i>Nitzschia palea</i> (Kützing) W.Smith	2	0.65	0.002	5	
	<i>Pseudostaurosira trainori</i> E.Morales	2	0.83	0.002	nd	
	<i>Sellaphora seminulum</i> (Grunow) D.G.Mann	2	0.67	0.001	2.9	
	<i>Lemnicola hungarica</i> (Grunow) Round & Basson	3	0.94	0.001	3	
	<i>Nitzschia linearis</i> (C.Agardh) W.Smith	3	0.90	0.003	12.1	
	<i>Sellaphora pupula</i> (Kützing) Mereschkowski	3	0.85	0.005	9.4	
	<i>Tryblionella littoralis</i> (Grunow) D.G.Mann in Round et al.	3	0.75	0.049	2.9	
	Esquineau	<i>Eunotia bilunaris</i> (Ehrenberg) Schaarschmidt	1	0.63	0.029	20
		<i>Navicula cryptotenella</i> Lange-Bertalot	1	0.73	0.003	16
<i>Navicula lundii</i> E.Reichardt		1	0.84	0.003	12.7	
<i>Sellaphora seminulum</i> (Grunow) D.G.Mann		1	0.81	0.002	2.9	
<i>Amphora copulata</i> (Kützing) Schoeman & R.E.M.Archibald		2	0.82	0.007	14.2	
<i>Craticula cuspidata</i> (Kützing) D.G.Mann in Round et al.		2	1.00	0.017	2.6	
<i>Pinnularia</i> sp. Ehrenberg		2	0.88	0.011	nd	
<i>Sellaphora pupula</i> (Kützing) Mereschkowski		2	0.68	0.017	9.4	
<i>Tryblionella littoralis</i> (Grunow) D.G.Mann in Round et al.		2	0.93	0.045	2.9	
<i>Diploneis</i> Ehrenberg ex Cleve		3	0.96	0.028	nd	
<i>Fragilaria gracilis</i> Østrup		3	0.90	0.035	17	
<i>Mastogloia smithii</i> Thwaites		3	1.00	0.028	nd	
<i>Navicula simulata</i> Manguin		3	0.83	0.022	9.2	
<i>Navicula veneta</i> Kützing		3	0.59	0.005	2.3	
<i>Tabularia fasciculata</i> (C.Agardh) D.M.Williams & Round		3	0.60	0.041	3.5	
nd = no data						

Figure 1. Cluster analysis and BDI values of the diatom samples collected at Charpines (a) and Esquineau (b) sites. Three clusters (numbered 1 to 3) have been considered in each site. BDI values were represented for each sample separately (middle barplots) and in each cluster (bottom boxplots). Eph= epiphytic, Eli=epilithic, Ez1-10= epizoic, EzM= mixed epizoic sample.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



228x271mm (150 x 150 DPI)

Supplementary material 1. Percentage abundance of the diatom species identified in the Charpines and Esquineau sites. EzM= mixed epizoic samples, Eph= epiphytic sample, Eli= epilithic sample.

Diatom species	Charpines			Esquineau		
	EzM	Eph	Eli	EzM	Eph	Eli
<i>Amphora copulata</i> (Kützing) Schoeman & R.E.M.Archibald				2		1
<i>Achnanthydium minutissimum</i> (Kützing) Czarnecki	2.7	1.2		0.8	1.2	
<i>Amphora pediculus</i> (Kützing) Grunow					0.5	
<i>Anomoeoneis sphaerophora</i> (Ehrenberg) Pfitzer	0.5					0.5
<i>Bacillaria paxillifera</i> (O.F.Müller) T.Marsson				1.3		
<i>Cocconeis placentula</i> Ehrenberg	0.5					
<i>Craticula buderi</i> (Hustedt) Lange-Bertalot	0.7			0.5	1	
<i>Diadesmis confervacea</i> Kützing	0.5					
<i>Encyonema ventricosum</i> (Kützing) Grunow in Schmidt et al.			0.5			
<i>Eolimna minima</i> (Grunow) Lange-Bertalot	2.7		4.3	1	1.7	2
<i>Eolimna subminuscula</i> (Manguin) Gerd Moser, Lange-Bertalot & Metzeltin	1.7	2.5	24			
<i>Eunotia bilunaris</i> (Ehrenberg) Schaarschmidt				5.8	7.5	1
<i>Eunotia soleirolii</i> (Kützing) Rabenhorst				1.8		
<i>Eunotia</i> Ehrenberg				1.3		
<i>Fallacia pygmaea</i> ssp. <i>subpygmaea</i> Lange-Bertalot, Cavacini, Tagliaventi & Alfinito	0.7					
<i>Fistulifera saprophila</i> (Lange-Bertalot & Bonik) Lange-Bertalot			1.3			
<i>Fragilaria famelica</i> (Kützing) Lange-Bertalot					3	
<i>Fragilaria gracilis</i> Østrup				2.3	1	
<i>Geissleria acceptata</i> (Hustedt) Lange-Bertalot & Metzeltin				0.5		0.5
<i>Gomphonema acidoclinatum</i> Lange-Bertalot & E.Reichardt					1.2	0.7
<i>Gomphonema affine</i> var. <i>rhombicum</i> E.Reichardt				1.8	1	
<i>Gomphonema capitatum</i> Ehrenberg					6	
<i>Gomphonema clavatum</i> Ehrenberg				1	6.2	1
<i>Gomphonema gracile</i> Ehrenberg					1.2	1
<i>Gomphonema parvulum</i> Kützing	1.7	74.1	3.8	0.5	2.2	
<i>Gomphonema saprophilum</i> (Lange-Bertalot & E.Reichardt) N.Abarca, R.Jahn, J.Zimmermann & Enke	11.9	5.7	2.3	0.8	1.5	
<i>Luticola goeppertiana</i> (Bleisch) D.G.Mann in Round et al.	9	1.2				
<i>Mayamaea</i> Lange-Bertalot			0.8	1		
<i>Mayamaea permitis</i> (Hustedt) Bruder & Medlin			1	0.5		1
<i>Navicula antonii</i> Lange-Bertalot						4.5
<i>Navicula cincta</i> (Ehrenberg) Ralfs in Pritchard					0.7	
<i>Navicula cryptotenella</i> Lange-Bertalot				2	2	1
<i>Navicula eidrigiana</i> J.R.Carter				1.3	1.5	
<i>Navicula erifuga</i> Lange-Bertalot in Krammer & Lange-Bertalot				2	4.7	0.5
<i>Navicula gregaria</i> Donkin				1.3		
<i>Navicula lundii</i> E.Reichardt				3.3	6	1.2

1									
2									
3	<i>Navicula simulata</i> Manguin							0.5	
4	<i>Navicula trivialis</i> Lange-Bertalot	0.5						7.8	
5	<i>Navicula veneta</i> Kützing	3.7		3.8	12.3	22.2		8.7	
6	<i>Naviculadicta cosmopolitana</i> Lange-Bertalot							0.5	
7	<i>Nitzschia</i> Hassall			1.2	0.5				
8	<i>Nitzschia amphibia</i> Grunow	5.2	1.2	0.5			4.7	1.5	
9	<i>Nitzschia dissipata</i> (Kützing) Grunow							0.5	
10	<i>Nitzschia filiformis</i> var. <i>conferta</i> (P.G.Richter) Lange-Bertalot							3.8	
11	<i>Nitzschia frustulum</i> (Kützing) Grunow	4.5	3.5	33					
12	<i>Nitzschia frustulum</i> var. <i>subsalina</i> Hustedt							1.2	
13	<i>Nitzschia inconspicua</i> Grunow						4.5	3.5	23.9
14	<i>Nitzschia liebethuthii</i> Rabenhorst						1.3	0.5	
15	<i>Nitzschia linearis</i> (C.Agardh) W.Smith	8.2						0.5	
16	<i>Nitzschia linearis</i> var. <i>tenuis</i> (W.Smith) Grunow in Cleve & Grunow							0.5	
17	<i>Nitzschia microcephala</i> Grunow in Cleve & Möller							1.8	
18	<i>Nitzschia palea</i> (Kützing) W.Smith	15.2	4	11	11.3	4.2		29.2	
19	<i>Nitzschia palea</i> var. <i>debilis</i> (Kützing) Grunow in Cleve & Grunow	3.5				3.8		7	
20	<i>Nitzschia solita</i> Hustedt							1.5	
21	<i>Pinnularia lata</i> (Brébisson) Rabenhorst							0.5	
22	<i>Planothidium frequentissimum</i> (Lange-Bertalot) Lange-Bertalot					1.5	1		
23	<i>Pseudostaurosira trainori</i> E.Morales	0.7							
24	<i>Sellaphora pupula</i> (Kützing) Mereschkowsky	10.9	1.7	2	1.3			0.7	
25	<i>Sellaphora seminulum</i> (Grunow) D.G.Mann	12.7	0.5	8	6.8	4.5		11.5	
26	<i>Stauroneis kriegei</i> R.M.Patrick			0.5					
27	<i>Tabularia fasciculata</i> (C.Agardh) D.M.Williams & Round						1.5	4.7	
28	<i>Tryblionella hungarica</i> (Grunow) D.G.Mann in Round et al.							3.5	
29	<i>Ulnaria acus</i> (Kützing) Aboal in Aboal et al.							1.2	
30	<i>Ulnaria biceps</i> (Kützing) Compère							0.8	
31									
32									
33									
34									
35									
36									
37									
38									
39									
40									
41									
42									
43									
44									
45									
46									
47									
48									
49									
50									
51									
52									
53									
54									
55									
56									
57									
58									
59									
60									



138x68mm (96 x 96 DPI)