



HAL
open science

Small-scale effects of hydrodynamics on the structure of intertidal macroalgal communities: A novel approach

Thomas Burel, Gauthier Schaal, Jacques Grall, Michel Le Duff, Georges Chapalain, Blondie Schmitt, Maxence Gemin, Olivier Boucher, Erwan Ar Gall

► To cite this version:

Thomas Burel, Gauthier Schaal, Jacques Grall, Michel Le Duff, Georges Chapalain, et al.. Small-scale effects of hydrodynamics on the structure of intertidal macroalgal communities: A novel approach. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 2019, 226, pp.UNSP 106290. 10.1016/j.ecss.2019.106290 . hal-02749002

HAL Id: hal-02749002

<https://hal.science/hal-02749002>

Submitted on 29 Jun 2023

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.

Small-scale effects of hydrodynamics on the structure of intertidal macroalgal communities: A novel approach

Burel Thomas ^{1,*}, Schaal Gauthier ¹, Grall Jacques ², Le Duff Michel ², Chapalain Georges ³, Schmitt Blondie ¹, Gemin Maxence ¹, Boucher Olivier ³, Ar Gall Erwan ¹

¹ Laboratoire des Sciences de l'Environnement Marin, UMR 6539 UBO/CNRS/IRD/IFREMER, Rue Dumont d'Urville, 29280, Plouzané, Brittany, France

² Institut Universitaire Européen de la Mer. Observatoire du Domaine Côtier, UMS 3113. Université de Bretagne Occidentale, Rue Dumont d'Urville, 29280, Plouzané, Brittany, France

³ Laboratoire de Génie Côtier et Environnement (LGCE), Cerema, 155 rue Pierre Bouguer, Technopôle Brest-Iroise BP 5, 29280, Plouzané, Brittany, France

* Corresponding author : Burel Thomas, email address : thomas.burel@univ-brest.fr

Abstract :

Wave height was used as a proxy to assess the effect of hydrodynamics on the development and structure of intertidal North-East Atlantic rocky macroalgal communities (Brittany). The characterization of hydrodynamics at small-scale (about 10 m) was performed through wave height in situ monitoring using pressure sensors. Both the diversity and the cover of the macroalgal communities were sampled in parallel. Wave heights exhibit large variations with values ranging from ca. 5 cm to 1.60 m. We show that wave height directly controls the cover of macroalgal canopies (Pearson's r between -0.62 and -0.39). In all communities, most of the furoid covers regressed with increasing wave height values. By contrast, positive correlations were found at low shore levels between wave heights and the cover of the kelp *Laminaria digitata* and also of several species of Rhodophyta. Redundancy analysis points out the significant effect of wave height on the inner variability of macroalgal communities, explaining up to 19% of their upright structure and more than 15% of the distribution of canopy-forming groups. In assemblages dominated by either *Pelvetia canaliculata* or *Fucus serratus*, a significant negative correlation was also evidenced with the index of community structure (Ics), which gives an appraisal of both the structure and the development of macroalgal communities. In conclusion, this study provides a novel experimental approach helping to quantify the effects of hydrodynamics on the structure of macroalgal communities using a small-scale in situ quantification of wave heights, revealing hydrodynamics as the main environmental driver of inner structural variations in seaweed assemblages.

Highlights

► Wave heights have a significant effect on the extent of macroalgal canopies. ► Hydrodynamics explains most of intra-community structural variations. ► *In situ* pressure measurements enable small-scale evaluation of wave heights.

Keywords : macroalgal communities, intertidal zone, rocky shores, wave heights, hydrodynamics, Mini-Diver, Brittany

34 **1. Introduction**

35 On rocky shores, the main factors influencing biocenoses distribution are tide and waves
36 (Menge and Branch, 2001; Bird et al., 2013). Tidal conditions generate various abiotic and
37 biotic pressures in the intertidal zone (Paine, 1966; Dahlhoff, 2004), inducing vertical
38 zonation of organisms, which is observed globally (Stephenson and Stephenson, 1949).

39 Rocky shores in the Northern Atlantic are commonly dominated by extensive canopies of
40 seaweeds, which largely structure the habitat and the associated diversity (Little and Kitching,
41 1996). Fucooids typically dominate the higher and mid-intertidal zone, while Laminariales
42 dominate the lower intertidal and high subtidal environments (Lüning, 1990). These intertidal
43 macroalgae are distributed vertically according to their physiological preferendum, structuring
44 six successive communities, commonly observed on the coasts of Brittany (Ar Gall and Le
45 Duff, 2014). The composition and the extent of these communities vary according to several
46 abiotic factors, including substratum composition, nutrient concentration and hydrodynamics
47 (Boaventura, 2000; Mieszkowska et al., 2013). However, communities do not necessarily
48 respond in the same way to similar environmental pressures highlighting the interest of a

49 study based on several well-structured canopies. In that way, the highly diversified megatidal
50 zone of Brittany constitutes a convenient model for such a study compared to rocky shores of
51 less extent that are therefore less differentiated (Ar Gall et al., 2016).

52 Hydrodynamics is known to be a major driver of intertidal biocenoses composition (Denny
53 and Wethey, 2001; Gilman et al., 2006). In the North-East Atlantic, sheltered shores, where
54 macroalgal canopies are well developed, may be distinguished from exposed shores, where
55 the presence of these canopies is largely reduced, and where sessile animals (*e.g.* barnacles,
56 mussels) and limpets dominate the substratum (Raffaelli and Hawkins, 1999). As underlined
57 by O'Connor et al. (2011), competition for the substratum on rocky shores occurs mostly
58 between seaweeds and the benthic fauna in wave-exposed sites, whereas sheltered areas are
59 more influenced by grazing. Some seaweed species are nevertheless well-adapted to wave
60 exposed rocks, such as *Pelvetiopsis limitata* in the North-East Pacific (Abbott and Hollenberg,
61 1976) or the variety *linearis* of *Fucus vesiculosus* in the North-East Atlantic (Want et al.,
62 2014). The effects of hydrodynamics on intertidal organisms is well documented at the
63 species level, including the decrease of drag coefficient in macroalgae (Gaylord et al., 1994)
64 and the modification of either their size (Wolcott, 2007) or their morphology (Denny, 2006).

65 Hydrodynamics results from the combined effect of swell and wave action, caused by wind-
66 induced forces far at sea and driven by tide and currents (Holthuijsen, 2010). Hydrodynamics
67 in the intertidal zone has first been investigated indirectly through the presence of
68 characteristic taxa (Ballantine, 1961; Floc'h, 1964; Munda, 1978), which allows a rapid and
69 costless overview of the shore exposure to waves. However, such approaches, although still in
70 use because of their simplicity, are limited by local specificities. Alternative methods based
71 on fetch measurements (*i.e.* the maximum distance swell and waves may travel without
72 obstacle) have been developed, providing convincing results on the effects of hydrodynamics
73 on intertidal community structure (Baardseth, 1970; Burrows et al., 2008). Approaches based

74 on wind measurements depend on the local availability of reliable weather data (Thomas,
75 1986). Predictive models have also been developed to integrate wave energy and / or wave
76 height at a regional scale (*e.g.* Holthuijsen, 2010; Reguero et al., 2012; Camus et al., 2013;
77 Guillou and Chapalain, 2015; Rattray et al., 2015). Such models give a framework for local
78 studies and open up new prospects to determine the effect of waves on the shores (Cefalì et
79 al., 2016; Puente et al., 2016). Although aforementioned approaches have provided valuable
80 insights into the relationship between hydrodynamics and intertidal communities, they are of
81 little use at local scale, where small-scale topography (*i.e.* outcrops, rock orientation, crevices)
82 can induce a variability in hydrodynamic forces actually affecting benthic habitats (Paine and
83 Levin, 1981; Helmuth and Denny, 2003; Le Hir and Hily, 2005). Therefore, in order to
84 characterize the extent of hydrodynamics variability at the metric scale and associated effects
85 on intertidal biota, direct measurements are necessary. However, such measurements are still
86 very rare for intertidal environments (Jones and Demetropoulos, 1968; Bell and Denny, 1994;
87 O'Donnell and Denny, 2008). *In situ* hydrodynamical measurements are generally carried out
88 using large (>30 cm) pressure transducers in the intertidal zone, including wave height
89 assessment (Autret et al., 2016; Suanez et al., 2019). Small-size (*ca.* 10 cm) pressure sensors
90 are currently used to assess water levels and less often tidal variations (Balliston et al., 2018;
91 Van Putte et al., 2019). In this study, small-size pressure sensors have been used as wave
92 height recorders on intertidal rocky shores. The relatively low price of these instruments with
93 regards to the quality of their measurements together with the fact that they can be easily
94 displayed in the field as a constellation, makes it possible to conduct a detailed study of small-
95 scale hydrodynamics. Combined to a concomitant accurate evaluation of the structure of
96 macroalgal communities, this small-scale (*ca.* 10 m) monitoring could provide data to specify
97 the impact of hydrodynamics at the community level.

98 The working hypothesis of this study is that hydrodynamics would explain most of the inner
99 variability observed in both the extent and the structure of macroalgal communities. Based on
100 this hypothesis, three questions may be addressed: (1) in the context macroalgae dominated
101 rocky shores, is wave height an adequate descriptor/proxy of hydrodynamics? (2) is the small-
102 scale approach proposed in this study efficient when trying to characterize hydrodynamics at
103 the community level? (3) do every studied macroalgal communities respond in the same way
104 to hydrodynamics variations? Thus, the effect of hydrodynamics on both the extent and the
105 structure of macroalgal communities has been investigated, using *in situ* wave height
106 measurements, in parallel to the ecological evaluation of six vertically distributed seaweed
107 assemblages on three rocky shores of Western Brittany.

108 **2. Material and methods**

109 2.1. Sites and communities

110 Three sites were studied at the western end of Brittany, open to the Atlantic Ocean (Figure 1).
111 Porsal (48°33.848'N / 4°42.309'W), Porspoder (48°28.876'N / 4°46.293'W) and the Isle of
112 Segal (48°26.330'N / 4°47.376'W) are about 15 km from each other. Tidal ranges are around 8
113 m at Spring tides and the sampling sites are 150 - 500 m long and 50 – 200 m wide. These
114 sites were first selected in order to embrace natural variability from a single coast and
115 waterbody (in the sense of the WFD). They are relatively sheltered locations with a similar
116 extensive intertidal vegetation, presenting the six macroalgal communities usually found in
117 the North-East Atlantic Ocean (Cabioc'h et al., 2014). Macroalgal communities are defined as
118 assemblages dominated by either one or two structuring Fucales or Laminariales (Ar Gall and
119 Le Duff, 2014). Communities of the intertidal zone are dominated from top to bottom by: (1)
120 *Pelvetia canaliculata* (called *Pc* in the text), then (2) *Fucus spiralis* (*Fspi*), both structuring
121 low (< 30 cm) canopies characterized by a reduced diversity. In the mid intertidal zone two
122 species are co-dominating (3), *Ascophyllum nodosum* and *Fucus vesiculosus* (*An – Fves*)

123 forming canopies up to 2 m high and more than 50 cm high, respectively. Then, in the low
124 intertidal zone, (4) *Fucus serratus* (*Fser*) structures a canopy up to 50 cm and (5) *Bifurcaria*
125 *bifurcata* and *Himantalia elongata* (*He – Bb*), up to 30 cm for the first one and up to 4 m
126 high for the second one, are the Fucales co-dominating the lowest level of the intertidal zone.
127 In the subtidal fringe, (6) the kelp *Laminaria digitata* (*Ld*) forms canopies reaching 3 m high.
128 Two other kelp species, *Saccharina latissima* and *Saccorhiza polyschides* may be found in
129 association in this community. The altitude (average tidal height) of these communities was
130 determined by GIS monitoring and post-treatment with Litto3D® data from the SHOM
131 (Service Hydrographique et Océanographique de la Marine; diffusion.shom.fr): *P.*
132 *canaliculata* ($6.44 \pm 0.39\text{m}$), *F. spiralis* ($5.71 \pm 0.50\text{m}$), *A. nodosum* – *F. vesiculosus* ($4.29 \pm$
133 0.72m), *F. serratus* ($2.54 \pm 0.46\text{m}$), *H. elongata* – *B. bifurcata* ($1.94 \pm 0.48\text{m}$), *L. digitata*
134 ($1.32 \pm 0.47\text{m}$).

135 2.2. Field sampling

136 Field sampling was conducted from late winter to mid spring (January to May 2017). Each
137 macroalgal community was sampled at low tide, during a one-week period (Table 1). For each
138 community, thirty-six sampling surfaces or spots (twelve per site), evenly spaced, were
139 determined by both photographs and GPS positioning. The substratum was mainly bedrock
140 avoiding microhabitats (*i.e.* crevices, pools, boulders, sediments). For the sampling, a mobile
141 $1.65 * 1.65$ m plastic grid structure consisting of 25 quadrats of $33 * 33$ cm was laid on the
142 spot. Cover was visually determined and classified within five percentage intervals:]0-5[, [5-
143 25[, [25-50[, [50-75[and [75-100]. Two complementary methods were used to estimate the
144 respective abundances of different algal species (Figure 2). “Undisturbed” sampling aims at
145 describing the distribution of macroalgal groups during emersion, when thalli are lying on the
146 substratum, giving a characterization of the canopy-forming species. Only dominating species
147 of Phaeophyceae and large groups of flora (other Phaeophyceae, erect and crustose

148 Rhodophyta, Chlorophyta) were considered in this method. Macroalgal undisturbed covers
149 were measured on the area defined by the whole mobile structure (approximately 2.72 m²
150 corresponding to one per spot).

151 “Upright profile” sampling aims at describing both the horizontal and vertical structures of the
152 macroalgal canopy during immersion. The cover of all seaweed species was estimated based
153 on the vertical projection of their thalli on the substratum, to mimic their habit at immersion.
154 Only individuals or patches larger than 5 mm were taken into consideration and classified
155 within the following four strata: crustose, micro-meibiotic (< 30 cm), macrobiotic (30 – 100
156 cm) and mega-megalobiotic (> 100 cm). Where necessary, species identification was
157 undertaken in the laboratory. In this method, the sampled area was defined by the cumulated
158 surface of three 33cm * 33cm quadrats randomly chosen within the structure (*i.e.* about 0.33
159 m² per spot).

160 2.3. Acquisition and treatment of hydrodynamic data

161 In this study, wave heights were used as a proxy of hydrodynamics and estimated by pressure
162 sensors. Mini-Diver® sensors (Schlumberger Water Services or SWS) were used to measure
163 the absolute pressure (P_{abs}), equal to the sum of atmospheric pressure (P_{atm}) and water
164 pressure (P_{hydro}). A plastic base was screwed to the rock and sensors were additionally fasted
165 with cable ties; this method proved secure and allowed easy removal after measurements.
166 They were programmed to record local pressures during seven consecutive days to include
167 about 12-14 tidal cycles, to span various tidal amplitudes, with a relatively high acquisition
168 frequency (0.04 Hz for a 25 s period, providing a total of 24000 values). For a given
169 community, recording was performed by 36 sensors (12 for each site, one per spot),
170 simultaneously to the sampling of macroalgae.

171 Once recording was achieved, data were downloaded using Diver-Office® (SWS). P_{hydro}
172 values were obtained from P_{abs} data by subtracting local P_{atm} , acquired by a control probe.
173 Each tide period was treated remotely and a polynomial regression was applied to it in order
174 to remove the tide oscillation itself and to leave secondary pressure oscillations generated by
175 waves and globally representative of wave heights. The twenty highest and the twenty lowest
176 pressure values were then selected to determine the average wave height per tide. This
177 estimator was proven to be similar to the Significant Wave Height, defined as the mean of
178 third of the highest waves in the classical wave-by-wave analysis (*e.g.* Holthuijsen, 2010) of
179 an ancillary, synchronous and co-located signal sampled at a rate in excess of 2 Hz. Since
180 altitude variations between the sensors within a given community were negligible, average
181 wave heights were not corrected.

182 2.4. Data treatment and statistics

183 For both types of community sampling (undisturbed and upright profile), medians of
184 percentage intervals were used to calculate the average cover of taxa or groups of taxa per
185 community. Data from upright profile sampling were used for the calculation of diversity
186 indices. The mean species richness was defined as the total number of species / taxa
187 determined per sampled spot and averaged per community. Furthermore, the Shannon-Wiener
188 index and the Rhodophyta / Phaeophyceae specific richness ratio (R/P ratio) were calculated
189 for each sampled spot. The development and structural state of each macroalgal community
190 was evaluated by the index of community structure (Ics) (Ar Gall and Le Duff, 2014), which
191 takes into account the cover of taxonomic, stratum and structural / functional groups of
192 seaweeds. Wave height values were treated after standardization of the variable.

193 All analyses were conducted within the R environment (R Development Core Team, 2014).

194 Both normality and variance homogeneity were first assessed on all biological and physical

195 data sets with Shapiro–Wilk and Bartlett / Levene tests, respectively. Macroalgal community
196 parameters (diversity, indices) were compared between the three sites using Kruskal-Wallis
197 (KW) tests. To establish potential correlations between species and variables Pearson's r
198 coefficients were calculated, using the “corrplot” package (Wei and Wei, 2017). Redundancy
199 analysis (RDA) was carried out with “vegan” (Oksanen et al., 2013) to determine how
200 environmental factors influence the development and the structure of macroalgal
201 communities. Undisturbed sampling or upright profile sampling data were used as response
202 variables and the latitude, for site position, and average wave heights, for hydrodynamics, as
203 explanatory variables. Then, an ANOVA and a constrained ordination were applied to
204 variables of the RDA to determine if the reduced model is significant and, if so, which
205 explanatory variable is mostly involved. Variation of communities was then partitioned with
206 respect to both explanatory variables, *i.e.* site and wave height. The relative importance of
207 each explanatory variable and their degree of interaction were summarized in Venn diagrams.

208 **3. Results**

209 3.1. Community structure

210 Within the sampling period in the three sites, 125 macroalgal species were determined
211 including 15 Chlorophyta, 83 Rhodophyta and 27 Phaeophyceae. Cover of dominating
212 Phaeophyceae, mean species richness and Ics values are given by community and site in
213 Table 1. Cover values of dominating Phaeophyceae ranged between *ca.* 45% in *Pc* and 70%
214 in *An – Fves*, with large intra-community and inter-site variations corresponding to the
215 heterogeneity of the intertidal canopies. It is the highest at Porsal for the high and middle
216 intertidal levels and at Porspoder for low intertidal levels (Table 1). Nevertheless, no
217 significant difference was found between sites. Maximum values of macroalgal mean species
218 richness for a spot ($\approx 0.33 \text{ m}^2$), *i.e.* 37 species in *Ld* and 34 species in *He – Bb*, were obtained

219 in Segal. The mean species richness did not differ significantly between sites for a given
220 community, except for *Fspi* and *He – Bb* with higher values at Segal (KW, p-value < 0.05). It
221 increased from the high intertidal zone to the *He – Bb* community, with a plateau for *Ld*.
222 Values of the Shannon-Wiener index ranged between 0.2 – 3.0 and those of the R/P ratio
223 varied between 0.5 and 20.0, suggesting large discrepancies in macroalgal diversity between
224 communities (significant differences, KW, p-value < 0.05). However, values did not differ
225 significantly between successive tidal heights (KW, p-value < 0.05). The Shannon-Wiener
226 index showed higher values in Segal for the *He – Bb* community (KW, p-value < 0.05),
227 corresponding to a higher mean species richness (see above). KW tests did not reveal any
228 significant intra-community difference for Ics. Three groups of communities differing
229 significantly (KW, p-value < 0.05) may be observed (*Pc* and *Fspi* | *An – Fves*, *Fser* and *He –*
230 *Bb* | *Ld* alone), with increasing values of Ics between these groups.

231 3.2. Wave heights

232 Wave heights were calculated for each spot and then averaged per community and per site
233 (Table 1), according to the procedure and to the periods defined above. Given that recording
234 periods were different, wave heights were smaller in high level communities than in lower
235 levels and show a reduced variability between sites. Thus, wave heights ranged from 15 to 25
236 cm between sites, with an average of 18.90 ± 6.66 cm, in *Pc* and from 23 to 28 cm, with an
237 average of 24.28 ± 6.83 cm, in *Fspi*. In *An – Fves*, wave heights were greater but show little
238 fluctuation between sites, ranging from 52 cm to 65 cm, with an average of 58.93 ± 15.40 cm.
239 For the three lowest communities of the shore, a larger variability occurred in wave heights
240 between sites, *i.e.* from 94 to 125 cm in *Fser*, from 59 to 135 cm in *He – Bb* and from 45 to 89
241 cm in *Ld*, with average values per community of 107.16 ± 21.72 cm, 93.04 ± 35.96 cm and
242 72.30 ± 21.77 cm, respectively. The least exposed site was Porsal, for all communities of the
243 shore, while Segal was the most exposed site for high level communities and Porspoder for

244 mid and low intertidal communities. Including all recording periods, the maximum value of
245 wave height obtained in one spot was 158.3 cm, in *He – Bb* at Porspoder, and the minimum is
246 5.91 cm in *Pc* at Porsal. Considering the spatial distribution of wave heights inside each
247 community on shorelines up to 250 m, their values may be either randomly distributed or vary
248 significantly with the distance between sampling spots. The most drastic variation observed
249 was a doubling of height values between two neighboring spots in *Pc* at Segal separated only
250 by 8 m, rising from 19 cm to 37 cm. At the opposite, wave heights may only differ slightly
251 between two spots, like a 12 % discrepancy in *He – Bb* at Porsal, from *ca.* 51 cm to 57 cm, *i.e.*
252 6 cm over 190 m distance. Wave heights increase towards the open sea in communities with
253 sampling spots placed on an axis perpendicular to the coastline. On the contrary, when the
254 axis parallels the coastline, wave height values were distributed randomly.

255 3.3. Effects of hydrodynamics on seaweed communities based on undisturbed sampling

256 In order to point out significant factors affecting the structure of seaweed canopies, a
257 redundancy analysis (RDA) was performed for each community. The constrained ordination
258 (p -value < 0.05) on RDA revealed that wave heights influence five out of six macroalgal
259 communities, and that the site had an impact on the highest and the lowest macroalgal
260 communities on the shore (Figure 3).

261 Wave height variation explained between 9.0 and 15.8% of the variance for four communities
262 (*Pc*, *An – Fves*, *Fser*, *He – Bb*). By contrast, site effects never explained more than 2% of the
263 variance and may be considered as negligible. The interaction between wave height and site
264 had also a small impact for most of the communities, except *Pc* and *Ld*. For *Ld*, the
265 contribution of each physical variables was difficult to determine. No significant result was
266 evidenced for the *Fspi* community, suggesting no effect of site nor wave height on the
267 community structure.

268 To assess the effect of hydrodynamics in community structure, correlation tests were applied
269 between wave heights and undisturbed cover data, results shown in Figure 4. Cover of several
270 dominating Fucales was negatively correlated with wave heights. The highest correlation ($r =$
271 -0.54) was observed for the *Pc* community, whereas correlation coefficients were between $-$
272 0.39 and -0.48 for mid-to-low intertidal communities. Other Fucales did not show any
273 correlation, like *F. spiralis* with a p -value of 0.84 in its own community, *F. vesiculosus* with
274 p -value = 0.39 in *An – Fves* and *H. elongata* with a p -value of 0.05 in *He – Bb*. Two opposite
275 cases were observed with Laminariales structuring the lowest levels (*Ld* community), a
276 positive correlation with wave heights for *L. digitata* ($r = 0.39$), but a negative one with *S.*
277 *latissima* ($r = -0.36$). A positive correlation was also observed between wave heights and the
278 total cover of erect Rhodophyta in the *An – Fves* community ($r = 0.37$) and in *He – Bb* ($r =$
279 0.39), and a negative correlation with the cover of *H. elongata* in the *Ld* community ($r = -$
280 0.44).

281 3.4. Effects of hydrodynamics on seaweed communities based on upright profile sampling

282 Following the same method used for undisturbed sampling, a RDA was conducted on the
283 covering of all seaweed species. Wave height had an impact on four communities, while the
284 site factor affects significantly five communities (Figure 5). The variation of the two
285 explanatory variables partly diverged from the results obtained in the case of the undisturbed
286 sampling. The range of variation due to wave heights was larger, between 3.6 and 19.1% . The
287 site effect was globally higher and varies between 4.1 and 17.4% . Unlike the undisturbed
288 sampling, the *Fspi* community showed a significant response, whereas *An – Fves* did not.
289 Correlation coefficients were calculated for all seaweed species and for various biological
290 indices relative to wave heights. Results are summarized in Table 1. The same tendencies
291 were found in both upright profile and undisturbed samplings for the cover of *P. canaliculata*

292 in *Pc*, *B. bifurcata* in *He – Bb*, *L. digitata* and *H. elongata* in *Ld*, with similar correlation
293 values (Figure 6). In contrast, no correlation was found with any Fucales in *An – Fves* and in
294 *Fser*.

295 Considering Chlorophyceae, a negative correlation was evidenced in *An – Fves* and in *Fser*
296 between the cover of *Cladophora rupestris* and wave heights, with coefficients of -0.46 and -
297 0.36 respectively.

298 The cover of several erect Rhodophyta appeared to be dependent on wave heights. At
299 intermediate intertidal levels, *Chondracanthus acicularis* and *Gelidium spinosum* were
300 positively correlated with hydrodynamics with Pearson's r of 0.44 and 0.35, respectively. A
301 similar result was obtained in *He – Bb* for *G. spinosum* ($r = 0.62$), *Ellisolandia (Corallina)*
302 *elongata* ($r = 0.40$), *Chondrus crispus* ($r = 0.39$), *Gelidium corneum* ($r = 0.35$) and *Ceramium*
303 *virgatum* ($r = 0.33$).

304 Mean species richness and Shannon index did not correlate with wave heights. However, the
305 Ics index showed negative correlations at the community level in *Pc* ($r = -0.42$) and *Fser* ($r =$
306 -0.39). In low levels of the shore, correlations were evidenced for the R/P ratio, positive in *He*
307 $- Bb$ ($r = 0.41$) and negative in *Ld* ($r = -0.38$).

308 4. Discussion

309 Although the existence of a relationship between wave exposure and rocky intertidal
310 assemblages has been described for a long time (Little and Kitching, 1996), few studies have
311 addressed this issue beyond the clear contrast opposing sheltered, seaweed-covered shores, to
312 exposed, less-vegetated ones (e.g. Cabioc'h et al., 2014). The variability of wave exposure
313 occurring within a shore and its potential impact on inducing small-scale (at the metric scale)
314 variability in intertidal habitats (e.g. O'Donnell and Denny, 2008) are often overlooked in the
315 literature. Our study addressed this paradigm on six different macroalgal communities

316 distributed vertically on rocky shores of the Western Brittany coastline, using *in situ* high-
317 frequency direct monitoring of wave exposure. Therefore, this work provides insights about
318 this important aspect of intertidal ecology.

319 Correlations between dominating Phaeophyceae and wave height nearly show the same
320 patterns for undisturbed and upright profile samplings suggesting that both approaches are
321 pertinent to evaluate the effects of hydrodynamics on macroalgal communities. Thus, negative
322 correlations occur between the cover of several dominating Fucales and wave height
323 following both procedures. This result is in agreement with the statement that tearing off
324 macroalgae by strong hydrodynamics make canopies regress drastically (Ballantine, 1961;
325 Lewis, 1964; Burrows et al., 2008). As shown in other works (Grenager and Baardseth, 1965),
326 cover regression affects particularly dominating Phaeophyceae, except for *L. digitata* which is
327 favored by an increase of wave exposure. In sheltered locations, important sediment deposit
328 may occur (Ballantine, 1961), limiting the development of large, perennial macroalgae to the
329 benefit of short-lived opportunistic macroalgae (Daly and Mathieson, 1977). *L. digitata*, for
330 instance, does not withstand a long burying of its large holdfast under sediments (Ar Gall et
331 al., 2016). In that way, in low wave exposure, *L. digitata* may be replaced relatively quickly
332 by *S. latissima* which is more efficient in colonizing unstable substrata (Bunker et al., 2017).
333 Furthermore, *L. digitata* shows higher growth rates in relatively agitated water (Kregting et
334 al., 2016). Consequently, the fact that the *Ld* community exhibits a positive correlation
335 between wave heights and cover of *L. digitata* is not surprising and in agreement with studies
336 on hydrodynamic tolerant kelps (Starko and Martone, 2016). The lack of correlation between
337 wave height and the cover of dominating species in *Fspi* might be related to a heatwave in
338 summer 2016 which resulted in a decrease of *F. spiralis* cover by nearly 70% at Porspoder
339 (*pers. obs.*). The size of *H. elongata* follows high seasonal variations, with the elongation of
340 receptacles up to four meters in Spring and their falling down in Autumn (Cabioch et al.,

2014). Such a high seasonality might account for the lack of correlation observed between the cover of that co-dominating species and wave heights in *He – Bb*.

The mean species richness may be a good tool to evaluate the ecological state of a seaweed community (Wells et al., 2007) and was occasionally related to hydrodynamics (Nishihara and Terada, 2010). Although they did not reveal any correlation between macroalgal diversity and hydrodynamics, our results remain consistent with those of Connan (2004) and Ar Gall and Le Duff (2014). Ics values found in this study are similar to those reported by Ar Gall and Le Duff (2014) in all communities. However, in the low shore of Porspoder, Ics scores of *He – Bb* and *Ld* communities are clearly higher (beyond the standard deviation). Besides, other monitoring results from the Rebent (Benthic Network in Brittany) has already shown values exceeding 1.32 for *He – Bb* in seven sites and 1.52 for *Ld* at three sites (Ar Gall and Le Duff, *pers. comm.*). This descriptive index is negatively correlated to hydrodynamics in *Pc* and *Fser* with no significant relationship in other communities, pointing out an irregular effect of waves and swell on both the extension and the structure of macroalgal communities. The absence of a correlation between hydrodynamics and Shannon-Wiener index is probably related to the large dispersion of values. At the opposite, the R/P ratio is positively correlated to wave height in *He – Bb* and negatively in *Ld*, showing that hydrodynamics promotes the predominance of Rhodophyta in *He – Bb*, while it favors Phaeophyceae species in *Ld*.

The variance partitioning shows that hydrodynamics has an effect on most of the studied communities explaining up to 15.8% of the total variance in undisturbed sampling and 19.1% in upright profile sampling. These values are high when considering a single explanatory variable in variance partitioning (*e.g.* Quillien et al., 2015). They tend to confirm the major role of hydrodynamics on intertidal assemblages at local scale (Cefali et al., 2016).

Differences were evidenced between the two sampling approaches when comparing Venn diagrams. Undisturbed sampling is mainly influenced by wave heights, whereas upright

366 profile sampling is also affected by the site explanatory variable. This discrepancy is stronger
367 in the low intertidal zone, with more contrasted positive and negative correlations with
368 hydrodynamics. While undisturbed sampling only detects variations in the cover of canopy
369 forming Phaeophyceae, upright profile sampling gives also information on the effect of wave
370 exposure on understory species. For instance, positive correlations between wave height and
371 epilithic turf-forming species like *Chondrus crispus*, *Gelidium spinosum* and *G. corneum*
372 reflect the fact that Rhodophytes better withstand hydrodynamics thanks to an overall smaller
373 size than large Phaeophyta in the intertidal zone (Puente et al., 2016). Increasing cover of red
374 seaweeds may also explain partially the concomitant regression of large Fucales such as *F.*
375 *serratus* and *A. nodosum*, suggesting a competition between these two functional groups.
376 Increasing covers due to stronger hydrodynamics is documented so far in the genus *Gelidium*
377 (Prathep et al., 2009). In the same way, a positive correlation with hydrodynamics is observed
378 for *Ellisolandia (Corallina) elongata*, a finding already reported from the North of Spain
379 where *Corallina* spp. dominate intertidal communities (Ramos et al., 2016a). Indeed, the
380 thallus organization of articulate coralline seaweeds is considered as well adapted to exposed
381 biotopes (Martone and Denny, 2008). In the case of *Ceramium virgatum*, mostly growing as
382 epiphyte on other species (Maggs and Hommersand, 1993), the positive correlation may be
383 associated to the physical damages caused by hydrodynamics to host species, either directly
384 by wave action, or indirectly by grazing, which both favor the development of epiphytes
385 (Gaylord, 1999). An indirect relationship between *Cladophora rupestris* and hydrodynamics
386 may be suspected, since this species grows preferentially under the canopies of *Fucus* spp.
387 and *A. nodosum* (Brodie et al., 2007), as underlined in our study by a strong correlation with
388 the cover of Fucales ($r = 0.68$ in *Fser* and $r = 0.61$ in *An - Fves*).

389 Wave heights inside a community may vary randomly or follow a coastline – open sea
390 gradient, depending on the distribution of the sampling spots. Wave heights averaged on three

391 sites vary between *ca.* 19 cm in *Pc* and *ca.* 108 cm in *Fser* with maximal values reaching
392 around 160 cm. The data presented in our study are consistent with those from previous
393 studies for assemblages dominated by sessile animals and limpets obtained by *in situ* wave
394 height recording (O'Donnell and Denny, 2008) or by buoy sensors (Gilman et al., 2006).
395 However, values are rather low compared to those reported from previous works (e.g. Jones
396 and Demetropoulos, 1968; Bell and Denny, 1994), probably because these recordings are one-
397 off measurements. Wave heights differ between communities and so between corresponding
398 altitudes on the shore, but no statement can be inferred from these data, given that recording
399 periods are different. To carry out an inter-community study of hydrodynamics, it would be
400 necessary to monitor pressures simultaneously on a single site. Discrepancies in wave heights
401 occur also between sites for a single community, a result which may be linked to surrounding
402 topography and site openness. For example, Porsal is the least exposed site, probably due to
403 the occurrence of numerous reefs off the coast (more than 30 islets permanently emerged in
404 all directions within a radius of 4 km from the site).

405 Even though all wave oscillations (usual periods between 6 s and 12 s, versus 25 s in our
406 study) could not be taken into account in our *in situ* monitoring of hydrodynamics, data
407 obtained by Mini-Diver® sensors at a frequency of 0.04 Hz ($T = 25$ s) are coherent with
408 significant wave heights calculated from values obtained at a frequency of 1 Hz ($T = 1$ s)
409 (unpublished personal data), measured by the same sensors within shorter durations (*e.g.* 6 h
410 versus *ca.* 7 days) and by Wave Gauge OSS1-010-003C-03 sensor (Ocean Sensor Systems
411 Inc., Coral Springs, USA). Considering the one-week period used to evaluate wave height
412 exposure, structural differences observed in a given macroalgal community depend on the
413 hydrodynamic forces conditioning it all year long (Levin and Paine, 1974; Ramos et al.,
414 2016b). Thus, the spatial study of community structure, relatively to a condensed set of wave
415 exposure data (here wave heights), may be informative enough about the long-term effect of

416 hydrodynamics. The coherence of the following results suggests the temporal
417 representativeness of our wave height data: (1) when sampling spots are distributed along a
418 coastline –open sea transect, wave height values follow a corresponding increasing gradient
419 (2) sampling spots are numerous enough to consider the micro-topography of the shore at the
420 intra-community level (3) the average wave height follows site patterns per community.
421 Considering the above assertions, wave height may be considered as an adequate
422 descriptor/proxy of local hydrodynamics. In the same way, the small-scale monitoring
423 performed in this study is efficient to characterize the hydrodynamics at the community level.
424 However, further experiments should be scheduled to assess the accuracy of our experimental
425 approach with longer time hydrodynamic regimes (*cf.* Guillou and Chapalain, 2015). Finally,
426 it would be interesting to compare the trends delineated at the assemblage level by our local
427 scale wave height proxy to larger scale approaches at the site level, such as fetch
428 measurements or Baardseth index (Baardseth, 1970; Burrows et al., 2008).

429 The originality of the ecological evaluation of seaweed assemblages carried out in this study
430 lies in (1) the community approach (Ar Gall et al., 2016) (2) the fine space scale used to assess
431 hydrodynamics (3) the double (undisturbed and upright profile) sampling analysis. Although
432 the zonation of communities is well described in the world (Lüning, 1990; Barnes and
433 Hughes, 1999; Witman and Roy, 2009), and the contribution of hydrodynamics to the
434 differentiation of seaweed canopies has been partially investigated, an inter-community study
435 of wave exposure at the site level has still to be achieved. In this prospect, the intra-
436 community procedure developed in this work may constitute an efficient approach.

437 **Acknowledgments**

438 We thank Antoine Douchin for data comparison between Mini-Diver® and Wave Gauge
439 OSSI-010-003C-03 sensors. We also thank Sarah Beauvais, Valentin Lagarde and Jean-
440 Baptiste Valerdi for helping at field sampling. This work benefited from the experience

441 gained during the Rebent (funded by the Brittany Regional Council and the DREAL at
442 Rennes) and the WFD (Ifremer, Agence de l'Eau Loire – Bretagne, Agence Française de la
443 Biodiversité – ONEMA) surveys. Thomas Burel received a fellowship from the Doctoral
444 School of Marine Sciences (Ecole Doctorale des Sciences de la Mer et du Littoral) and the
445 laboratory Lemar UMR6539.

446 **Bibliography**

- 447 Abbott, I.A., Hollenberg, G.J., 1976. Marine algae of California. Stanford University Press, Stanford,
448 CA, USA, p. 827 pp.
- 449 Ar Gall, E., Le Duff, M., 2014. Development of a quality index to evaluate the structure of macroalgal
450 communities. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 139, 99-109.
- 451 Ar Gall, E., Le Duff, M., Sauriau, P.G., de Casamajor, M.N., Gevaert, F., Poisson, E., Hacquebart, P.,
452 Joncourt, Y., Barillé, A.L., Buchet, R., Bréret, M., Miossec, L., 2016. Implementation of a new index to
453 assess intertidal seaweed communities as bioindicators for the European Water Framework
454 Directory. *Ecological Indicators* 60, 162-173.
- 455 Autret, R., Dodet, G., Fichaut, B., Suanez, S., David, L., Leckler, F., Arduin, F., Ammann, J., Grandjean,
456 P., Allemand, P., Filipot, J.-F., 2016. A comprehensive hydro-geomorphic study of cliff-top storm
457 deposits on Banneg Island during winter 2013–2014. *Marine Geology* 382, 37-55.
- 458 Baardseth, E., 1970. A square scanning, two stage sampling method of estimating seaweed
459 quantities. *Rep Norw Inst Seaweed Res* 33, 1-41.
- 460 Ballantine, W.J., 1961. A biologically-defined exposure scale for the comparative description of rocky
461 shores. *Field Studies Journal* 1, 1-19.
- 462 Balliston, N.E., McCarter, C.P.R., Price, J.S., 2018. Microtopographical and hydrophysical controls on
463 subsurface flow and solute transport: A continuous solute release experiment in a subarctic bog.
464 *Hydrological Processes* 32, 2963-2975.
- 465 Barnes, R.S.K., Hughes, R.N., 1999. An introduction to marine ecology. John Wiley & Sons, p. 296 pp.
- 466 Bell, E.C., Denny, M.W., 1994. Quantifying “wave exposure”: a simple device for recording maximum
467 velocity and results of its use at several field sites. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and*
468 *Ecology* 181, 9-29.
- 469 Bird, C.E., Franklin, E.C., Smith, C.M., Toonen, R.J., 2013. Between tide and wave marks: a unifying
470 model of physical zonation on littoral shores. *PeerJ* 1, e154.
- 471 Boaventura, D.M., 2000. Patterns of distribution in intertidal rocky shores: the role of grazing and
472 competition in structuring communities. *University of Faro*, 149 pp.
- 473 Brodie, J., Maggs, C.A., John, D.M., Blomster, J., 2007. Green seaweeds of Britain and Ireland. *British*
474 *Phycological Society*, p. 250 pp.
- 475 Bunker, F., Brodie, J., Maggs, C., Bunker, A., 2017. Seaweeds of Britain and Ireland. *Wild Nature Press*
476 *Plymouth, UK*, p. 312 pp.
- 477 Burrows, M.T., Harvey, R., Robb, L., 2008. Wave exposure indices from digital coastlines and the
478 prediction of rocky shore community structure. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 353, 1-12.
- 479 Cabioc'h, J., Floc'h, J.-Y., Le Toquin, A., Boudouresque, C.F., Meinesz, A., Verlaque, M., 2014. *Algues*
480 *des mers d'Europe*. Delachaux et Niestlé, p. 272 pp.
- 481 Camus, P., Mendez, F.J., Medina, R., Tomas, A., Izaguirre, C., 2013. High resolution downscaled ocean
482 waves (DOW) reanalysis in coastal areas. *Coastal Engineering* 72, 56-68.
- 483 Cefali, M.E., Cebrian, E., Chappuis, E., Pinedo, S., Terradas, M., Mariani, S., Ballesteros, E., 2016. Life
484 on the boundary: Environmental factors as drivers of habitat distribution in the littoral zone.
485 *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 172, 81-92.

- 486 Connan, S., 2004. Etude de la diversité spécifique des macroalgues de la Pointe de Bretagne et
487 analyse des composés phénoliques des Phéophycées dominantes. University of Brest, 280 pp.
- 488 Dahlhoff, E.P., 2004. Biochemical Indicators of Stress and Metabolism: Applications for Marine
489 Ecological Studies. *Annual Review of Physiology* 66, 183-207.
- 490 Daly, M., Mathieson, A., 1977. The effects of sand movement on intertidal seaweeds and selected
491 invertebrates at Bound Rock, New Hampshire, USA. *Marine Biology* 43, 45-55.
- 492 Denny, M.W., 2006. Ocean waves, nearshore ecology, and natural selection. *Aquatic Ecology* 40, 439-
493 461.
- 494 Denny, M.W., Wethey, D.S., 2001. Physical processes that generate patterns in marine communities,
495 in: Bertness, M.D., Gaines, S.D., Hay, M.E. (Eds.), *Marine Community Ecology*. Sinauer, Sunderland,
496 Massachusetts, USA, pp. 3-37.
- 497 Floc'h, J.Y., 1964. Distribution verticale et écologie des algues marines sur les côtes bretonnes. *Penn*
498 *Ar Bed* 4, 182-190.
- 499 Gaylord, B., 1999. Detailing agents of physical disturbance: wave-induced velocities and accelerations
500 on a rocky shore. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 239, 85-124.
- 501 Gaylord, B., Blanchette, C.A., Denny, M.W., 1994. Mechanical Consequences of Size in Wave-Swept
502 Algae. *Ecological Monographs* 64, 287-313.
- 503 Gilman, S.E., Harley, C.D.G., Strickland, D.C., Vanderstraeten, O., O'Donnell, M.J., Helmuth, B., 2006.
504 Evaluation of effective shore level as a method of characterizing intertidal wave exposure regimes.
505 *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods* 4, 448-457.
- 506 Grenager, B., Baardseth, E., 1965. A two-stage sampling method of estimating seaweed quantities,
507 *Proceedings of the 5th International Seaweed Symposium*, pp. 129-135.
- 508 Guillou, N., Chapalain, G., 2015. Numerical modelling of nearshore wave energy resource in the
509 Sea of Iroise. *Renewable Energy* 83, 942-953.
- 510 Helmuth, B., Denny, M.W., 2003. Predicting wave exposure in the rocky intertidal zone: Do bigger
511 waves always lead to larger forces? *Limnology and Oceanography* 48, 1338-1345.
- 512 Holthuijsen, L.H., 2010. *Waves in oceanic and coastal waters*. Cambridge University Press, p. 387 pp.
- 513 Jones, W.E., Demetropoulos, A., 1968. Exposure to wave action: Measurements of an important
514 ecological parameter on rocky shores on Anglesey. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and*
515 *Ecology* 2, 46-63.
- 516 Kregting, L., Blight, A.J., Elsässer, B., Savidge, G., 2016. The influence of water motion on the growth
517 rate of the kelp *Laminaria digitata*. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 478, 86-95.
- 518 Le Hir, M., Hily, C., 2005. Macrofaunal diversity and habitat structure in intertidal boulder fields.
519 *Biodiversity & Conservation* 14, 233.
- 520 Levin, S.A., Paine, R.T., 1974. Disturbance, Patch Formation, and Community Structure. *Proceedings*
521 *of the National Academy of Sciences* 71, 2744-2747.
- 522 Lewis, J.R., 1964. *The Ecology of Rocky Shores*. English University Press, London, p. 323 pp.
- 523 Little, C., Kitching, J.A., 1996. *The biology of rocky shores*. Oxford University Press, USA, p. 240 pp.
- 524 Lüning, K., 1990. *Seaweeds: their environment, biogeography, and ecophysiology*. John Wiley & Sons,
525 p. 527 pp.
- 526 Maggs, C., Hommersand, M.H., 1993. *Seaweeds of the British Isles. Volume 1 Rhodophyta, Part 3A*
527 *Ceramiales*, p. 444 pp.
- 528 Martone, P.T., Denny, M.W., 2008. To break a coralline: mechanical constraints on the size and
529 survival of a wave-swept seaweed. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 211, 3433-3441.
- 530 Menge, B.A., Branch, G.M., 2001. Rocky Intertidal Communities, in: Bertness, M.D., Gaines, S.D., Hay,
531 M.E. (Eds.), *Marine Community Ecology*. Sinauer, Sunderland, Massachusetts, USA, pp. 221-251.
- 532 Mieszkowska, N., Milligan, G., Burrows, M.T., Freckleton, R., Spencer, M., 2013. Dynamic species
533 distribution models from categorical survey data. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 82, 1215-1226.
- 534 Munda, I.M., 1978. Survey of the benthic algal vegetation of the Dýrafjörður, Northwest Iceland.
535 *Nova Hedwigia* 29, pp. 281-403.
- 536 Nishihara, G.N., Terada, R., 2010. Species richness of marine macrophytes is correlated to a wave
537 exposure gradient. *Phycological Research* 58, 280-292.

- 538 O'Connor, N.E., Donohue, I., Crowe, T.P., Emmerson, M.C., 2011. Importance of consumers on
539 exposed and sheltered rocky shores. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 443, 65-75.
- 540 O'Donnell, M.J., Denny, M.W., 2008. Hydrodynamic forces and surface topography: Centimeter-scale
541 spatial variation in wave forces. *Limnology and Oceanography* 53, 579-588.
- 542 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., Minchin, P.R., O'hara, R., Simpson, G.L., Solymos,
543 P., Stevens, M.H.H., Wagner, H., 2013. Package 'vegan'. *Community ecology package*, version 2.
- 544 Paine, R.T., 1966. Food Web Complexity and Species Diversity. *The American Naturalist* 100, 65-75.
- 545 Paine, R.T., Levin, S.A., 1981. Intertidal Landscapes: Disturbance and the Dynamics of Pattern.
546 *Ecological Monographs* 51, 145-178.
- 547 Prathep, A., Lewmanomont, K., Buapet, P., 2009. Effects of wave exposure on population and
548 reproductive phenology of an algal turf, *Gelidium pusillum* (Gelidales, Rhodophyta), Songkhla,
549 Thailand. *Aquatic Botany* 90, 179-183.
- 550 Puente, A., Guinda, X., Juanes, J.A., Ramos, E., Echavarri-Erasun, B., De La Hoz, C.F., Degraer, S.,
551 Kerckhof, F., Bojanić, N., Rousou, M., Orav-Kotta, H., Kotta, J., Jourde, J., Pedrotti, M.L., Leclerc, J.-C.,
552 Simon, N., Bachelet, G., Lavesque, N., Arvanitidis, C., Pavloudi, C., Faulwetter, S., Crowe, T.P.,
553 Coughlan, J., Cecchi, L.B., Dal Bello, M., Magni, P., Como, S., Coppa, S., De Lucia, G.A., Rugins, T.,
554 Jankowska, E., Weslawski, J.M., Warzocha, J., Silva, T., Ribeiro, P., De Matos, V., Sousa-Pinto, I.,
555 Troncoso, J., Peleg, O., Rilov, G., Espinosa, F., Ruzafa, A.P., Frost, M., Hummel, H., Van Avesaath, P.,
556 2016. The role of physical variables in biodiversity patterns of intertidal macroalgae along European
557 coasts. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom* 97, 549-560.
- 558 Quillien, N., Nordström, M.C., Gauthier, O., Bonsdorff, E., Paulet, Y.-M., Grall, J., 2015. Effects of
559 macroalgal accumulations on the variability in zoobenthos of high-energy macrotidal sandy beaches.
560 *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 522, 97-114.
- 561 R Development Core Team, 2014. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna:
562 R Foundation for Statistical Computing. , Available at : [www. R-project. org](http://www.R-project.org).
- 563 Raffaelli, D.G., Hawkins, S.J., 1999. *Intertidal ecology*, 2 ed, Dordrecht, p. 356 pp.
- 564 Ramos, E., Díaz de Terán, J.R., Puente, A., Juanes, J.A., 2016a. The role of geomorphology in the
565 distribution of intertidal rocky macroalgae in the NE Atlantic region. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf*
566 *Science* 179, 90-98.
- 567 Ramos, E., Puente, A., Juanes, J.A., 2016b. An ecological classification of rocky shores at a regional
568 scale: a predictive tool for management of conservation values. *Marine Ecology* 37, 311-328.
- 569 Rattray, A., Ierodiaconou, D., Womersley, T., 2015. Wave exposure as a predictor of benthic habitat
570 distribution on high energy temperate reefs. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 2, 1-14.
- 571 Reguero, B.G., Menéndez, M., Méndez, F.J., Mínguez, R., Losada, I.J., 2012. A Global Ocean Wave
572 (GOW) calibrated reanalysis from 1948 onwards. *Coastal Engineering* 65, 38-55.
- 573 Starko, S., Martone, P.T., 2016. Evidence of an evolutionary-developmental trade-off between drag
574 avoidance and tolerance strategies in wave-swept intertidal kelps (Laminariales, Phaeophyceae).
575 *Journal of Phycology* 52, 54-63.
- 576 Stephenson, T., Stephenson, A., 1949. The universal features of zonation between tide-marks on
577 rocky coasts. *The Journal of Ecology*, 289-305.
- 578 Suanez, S., Stéphan, P., Floc'h, F., Autret, R., Fichaut, B., Blaise, E., Houron, J., Ammann, J., Grandjean,
579 P., Accensi, M., 2019. Fifteen years of hydrodynamic forcing and morphological changes leading to
580 breaching of a gravel spit, Sillon de Talbert (Brittany). *Géomorphologie: relief, processus,*
581 *environnement* 24, 403-428.
- 582 R Development Core Team, 2014. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna:
583 R Foundation for Statistical Computing. , Available at : [www. R-project. org](http://www.R-project.org).
- 584 Thomas, M.L.H., 1986. A physically derived exposure index for marine shorelines. *Ophelia* 25, 1-13.
- 585 Van Putte, N., Temmerman, S., Verreydt, G., Seuntjens, P., Maris, T., Heyndrickx, M., Boone, M., Joris,
586 I., Meire, P., 2019. Groundwater dynamics in a restored tidal marsh are limited by historical soil
587 compaction. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*.
- 588 Want, A., Beharie, R.A., Bell, M.C., Side, J.C., 2014. Baselines and Monitoring Methods for Detecting
589 Impacts of Hydrodynamic Energy Extraction on Intertidal Communities of Rocky Shores, in: Shields,


- 590 M.A., Payne, A.I.L. (Eds.), Marine Renewable Energy Technology and Environmental Interactions.
591 Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 21-38.
- 592 Wei, T., Wei, M.T., 2017. Package 'corrplot'. *Statistician* 56, 316-324.
- 593 Wells, E., Wilkinson, M., Wood, P., Scanlan, C., 2007. The use of macroalgal species richness and
594 composition on intertidal rocky seashores in the assessment of ecological quality under the European
595 Water Framework Directive. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 55, 151-161.
- 596 Witman, J.D., Roy, K., 2009. *Marine macroecology*. University of Chicago Press, p. 424 pp.
- 597 Wolcott, B.D., 2007. Mechanical size limitation and life-history strategy of an intertidal seaweed.
598 *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 338, 1-10.
- 599

600 *Table 1: Average values and standard deviations of Ics, mean species richness, cover of*
 601 *dominating Phaeophyceae, average wave heights corresponding recording periods per*
 602 *community and site. Communities dominated by: Pc = Pelvetia canaliculata, Fspi = Fucus*
 603 *spiralis, An – Fves = Ascophyllum nodosum – Fucus vesiculosus, Fser = Fucus serratus, He*
 604 *– Bb = Himanthalia elongata – Bifurcaria bifurcata, Ld = Laminaria digitata.*

| Intertidal level | Community | Site | Ics | Mean species richness | % cover of dominating Phaeophycean | Average wave height (cm) | Wave height / seaweed sampling period |
|------------------|------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| High | <i>Pc</i> | Segal | 0.56 ± 0.23 | 5.08 ± 1.24 | 38.13 ± 21.75 | 24.96 ± 4.91 | 08/05/17 to 14/05/17 |
| | | Porspoder | 0.57 ± 0.15 | 4.17 ± 1.03 | 39.38 ± 24.52 | 16.16 ± 3.41 | |
| | | Porsal | 0.56 ± 0.16 | 4.58 ± 1.16 | 54.17 ± 33.63 | 15.56 ± 6.72 | |
| | <i>Fspi</i> | Segal | 0.86 ± 0.24 | 13.17 ± 5.10 | 60.21 ± 30.22 | 27.61 ± 5.21 | 15/02/17 to 22/02/17 |
| | | Porspoder | 0.73 ± 0.25 | 7.83 ± 4.45 | 41.45 ± 27.02 | 23.82 ± 4.88 | |
| | | Porsal | 0.87 ± 0.18 | 7.92 ± 2.02 | 60.83 ± 31.34 | 23.54 ± 9.11 | |
| Medium | <i>An – Fves</i> | Segal | 1.12 ± 0.30 | 13.75 ± 6.73 | 61.04 ± 34.70 | 59.91 ± 8.52 | 12/01/17 to 19/01/17 |
| | | Porspoder | 1.07 ± 0.28 | 13.17 ± 3.93 | 75.00 ± 33.51 | 64.23 ± 20.96 | |
| | | Porsal | 1.03 ± 0.52 | 12.17 ± 3.90 | 76.04 ± 26.23 | 52.64 ± 12.95 | |
| | <i>Fser</i> | Segal | 1.13 ± 0.23 | 19.25 ± 4.67 | 45.42 ± 27.11 | 102.04 ± 9.63 | 01/02/17 to 08/02/17 |
| | | Porspoder | 0.95 ± 0.29 | 14.42 ± 5.99 | 45.00 ± 34.79 | 124.66 ± 29.38 | |
| | | Porsal | 0.96 ± 0.25 | 15.75 ± 3.96 | 55.21 ± 25.88 | 94.77 ± 3.81 | |
| Low | <i>He – Bb</i> | Segal | 1.15 ± 0.27 | 30.17 ± 3.71 | 41.46 ± 32.64 | 84.93 ± 24.61 | 15/03/17 to 22/03/17 |
| | | Porspoder | 1.32 ± | 22.83 ± 3.66 | 57.08 ± 21.50 | 134.7 ± 17.45 | |


| | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| | | 0.16 | | | | |
| | Porsal | 1.07 ± 0.14 | 23.25 ± 3.28 | 52.71 ± 29.30 | 59.50 ± 3.61 | |
| | Segal | 1.42 ± 0.19 | 25.58 ± 6.24 | 57.82 ± 21.02 | 84.10 ± 13.29 | |
| <i>Ld</i> | Porspoder | 1.52 ± 0.17 | 21.82 ± 7.39 | 78.18 ± 16.92 | 88.72 ± 8.96 | 31/03/17 to 07/04/17 |
| | Porsal | 1.42 ± 0.19 | 24.17 ± 4.41 | 69.79 ± 20.79 | 45.44 ± 2.78 | |

605



606


607 *Figure 1: Location of the three sites on the North-West coast of Brittany*




610

611

612 *Figure 2: Description of the two methods of sampling used in the study. Undisturbed*
 613 *sampling takes into account the major groups of macrophytes on the whole structure. upright*
 614 *profile sampling is based on a finer description of the macrophytes species and their canopy*
 615 *and is applied in three quadrats of the structure.*




621 *Figure 2: Description of the two methods of sampling used in the study. Undisturbed*
 622 *sampling takes into account the major groups of macrophytes on the whole structure, upright*
 623 *profile sampling is based on a finer description of the macrophytes species and their canopy*
 624 *and is applied in three quadrats of the structure.*




625

626 *Figure 3: Venn diagrams illustrating the result of variance partitioning for the undisturbed*
 627 *sampling, taking into account the undisturbed sampling data (cover of dominating species of*
 628 *Phaeophyceae, groups of seaweeds), per community with contribution of physical variables.*
 629 *Contribution of each variable is expressed as a fraction of 1 corresponding to a percentage.*
 630 *[S]: site, [W]: wave height. Residuals: unexplained variation. Communities dominated by: Pc*
 631 *= Pelvetia canaliculata, Fspi = Fucus spiralis, An - Fves = Ascophyllum nodosum - Fucus*
 632 *vesiculosus, Fser = Fucus serratus, He - Bb = Himanthalia elongata - Bifurcaria bifurcata,*
 633 *Ld = Laminaria digitata.*




634

635 *Figure 4: Cover of dominating brown seaweeds in the six studied communities related to*
 636 *normalized wave heights in the case of the undisturbed sampling method. p-value < 0.05 and*
 637 *r = coefficient of regression. Sites: ● Porsal, ■ Segal, ▲ Porspoder*



638


639 *Figure 4: Cover of dominating brown seaweeds in the six studied communities related to*
 640 *normalized wave heights in the case of the undisturbed sampling method. p-value < 0.05 and*
 641 *r = coefficient of regression. Sites: ● Porsal, ■ Segal, ▲ Porspoder*



642
643


644 *Figure 5: Venn diagrams illustrating the result of variance partitioning for the upright profile*
 645 *sampling, taking into account the cover of every conspicuous seaweed species found in*
 646 *quadrats per community with contribution of physical variables. Contribution of each*
 647 *variable is expressed as a fraction of 1 corresponding to a percentage. [S]: site, [W]: wave*
 648 *height. Residuals: unexplained variation. Communities dominated by: Pc = Pelvetia*
 649 *canaliculata, Fspi = Fucus spiralis, An - Fves = Ascophyllum nodosum - Fucus vesiculosus,*
 650 *Fser = Fucus serratus, He - Bb = Himanthalia elongata - Bifurcaria bifurcata, Ld =*
 651 *Laminaria digitata.*

652



653

654 *Figure 6: Cover of dominating brown seaweeds in the six communities related to normalized*
 655 *wave heights in the case of the upright profile sampling method. p-value < 0.05 and r =*
 656 *coefficient of regression. Sites: ●Porsal, ■Segal, ▲Porspoder*



657
 658 *Figure 6: Cover of dominating brown seaweeds in the six communities related to normalized*
 659 *wave heights in the case of the upright profile sampling method. p -value < 0.05 and $r =$*
 660 *coefficient of regression. Sites: ● Porsal, ■ Segal, ▲ Porspoder*

661

Wave heights have a significant effect on the extent of macroalgal canopies.

Hydrodynamics explains most of intra-community structural variations.

In situ pressure measurements enable small-scale evaluation of wave heights.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT