# Accepted Manuscript

Species-Area Relationship (SAR) models as tools for estimating faunal biodiversity associated with habitat builder species in sensitive areas: The case of the Mediterranean stony coral (*Cladocora caespitosa*)

Valentina Pitacco, Michele Mistri, Lovrenc Lipej

PII: S0141-1136(19)30200-4

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2019.05.016

Reference: MERE 4737

To appear in: Marine Environmental Research

Received Date: 29 March 2019

Revised Date: 22 May 2019

Accepted Date: 22 May 2019

Please cite this article as: Pitacco, V., Mistri, M., Lipej, L., Species-Area Relationship (SAR) models as tools for estimating faunal biodiversity associated with habitat builder species in sensitive areas: The case of the Mediterranean stony coral (*Cladocora caespitosa*), *Marine Environmental Research* (2019), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2019.05.016.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



# Species-Area Relationship (SAR) models as tools for estimating faunal biodiversity associated with habitat builder species in sensitive areas: the case of the Mediterranean stony coral (*Cladocora caespitosa*)

- Valentina Pitacco<sup>1</sup>\*, Michele Mistri<sup>1</sup>, Lovrenc Lipej<sup>2</sup>
- <sup>1</sup> Department of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Ferrara, Via Fossato di Mortara 17,
  44121 Ferrara, Italy

7 <sup>2</sup> Marine Biology Station, National Institute of Biology, Fornače 61, 6630 Piran, Slovenia

8 \*corresponding author, email: v.pitacco@gmail.com

#### 9 Abstract

4

Biodiversity associated with the Mediterranean stony coral *Cladocora caespitosa*, (Linnaeus, 1767) 10 was investigated at three levels: "microscale", focused on macrobenthic invertebrates within 11 colonies; "mesoscale", focused on epibenthic megafauna among colonies; "macroscale", focused on 12 associated ichthyofauna. The aim was to quantify associated diversity in terms of species richness, 13 testing the efficiency of colony size (surface covered by a single colony) for the "microscale", and 14 colony density or total coral coverage for "meso-" and "macroscale" as predictors and the 15 consistency of models based on Species-Area Relationship (SAR) for those estimations. At level of 16 "microscale", colony size was a good predictor, with richness of invertebrates increasing with the 17 increasing of surface covered by each colony of C. caespitosa, following Arrhenius model. At 18 levels of "mesoscale" and "macroscale", richness of epibenthic megafauna and fish were not related 19 neither to colony density nor total coral coverage, but to sampled area, and frequency-based 20 estimates of richness were used. The importance of C. caespitosa varied according to the 21 investigation level, with most of taxa richness detected at the level of "microscale". 22

23

Keywords: *Cladocora caespitosa;* habitat builder species; benthos; invertebrates; ichthyofauna;
Species-Area Relationship (SAR); Mediterranean Sea

### 27 **1. INTRODUCTION**

The Mediterranean stony coral Cladocora caespitosa (Linnaeus, 1767) is a well-known habitat 28 builder, physiologically and morphologically similar to the typical tropical reef-building corals, and 29 as such it is supposed to host a diversified faunal assemblage (Zibrowius 1980, Peirano et al. 1994). 30 The few papers available to date from Adriatic (Sciscioli and Nuzzaci 1970, Zavodnik 1976, 31 Schiller 1993, Pitacco et al. 2014, Pitacco et al. 2017), Ionian Sea (Lumare 1965) and Aegean Sea 32 33 (Arvanitidis and Koukouras 1994, Koukouras et al. 1998, Antoniadou and Chintiroglou 2010), confirm that macrofaunal communities associated with C. caespitosa are particularly rich. 34 Nevertheless, information provided is extremely fragmented, since most of these works focused 35 only on invertebrates, and mostly on single taxonomic groups, such as polychaetes (Arvanitidis and 36 Koukouras 1994, Sciscioli and Nuzzaci 1970) and echinoderms (Zavodnik 1976), and the different 37 methodologies used make it difficult to compare results. Coral associated species could represent an 38 important food source for other invertebrates and benthic fishes, therefore areas with massive 39 presence of C. caespitosa are expected to attract them. Nevertheless, while fish assemblages 40 associated with other habitat builders, such as macroalgae and seagrasses have been intensively 41 investigated (e.g. Lipej et al. 2003, Pais et al. 2007, Orlando-Bonaca and Lipej 2007, Orlando-42 Bonaca et al. 2008, Cheminée et al. 2016), there is a gap of knowledge on the role of C. caespitosa 43 44 for benthic fishes. Cladocora caespitosa is the only native colonial and obligate zooxanthellate coral in the Mediterranean Sea (Zibrowius 1980) and it is present in the whole Mediterranean, 45 although is only locally abundant (Peirano et al. 1994). It has adapted to live in different 46 environments, from shallow photophilic algal communities to deeper circalittoral assemblages 47 (Zibrowius 1980, Schiller 1993, Kružić and Benković 2008, Kersting and Linares 2012, Chefaoui et 48 al. 2017, Kersting et al. 2017). Nevertheless, given its particular sensitivity to different types of 49 anthropogenic impacts and climate change (Rodolfo-Metalpa et al. 2005, Kersting et al. 2013, 50 2015) and the fact that its slow dynamics increases its vulnerability to catastrophic events (Kersting 51 et al. 2014), its populations are actually decreasing, and the species was included as "Endangered" 52

in the IUCN Red List (Casado de Amezua et al. 2015). The loss of this coral could be detrimental also for invertebrates and fish living in symbiosis (especially if parasitic or obligate mutualistic) with it and, at the same time, associated invertebrates may interfere positively or negatively with coral recovery capacity after a stressful event, as it was reported for tropical corals (reviewed by Baker et al. 2008). Nevertheless, given the scarce information available on its associated fauna, the mutual influence between *C. caespitosa* and its associated benthic communities is still poorly understood.

Models based on Species-area relationship (SAR) have been proposed in conservation biology to 60 project the expected loss of species richness from a region undergoing specified levels of habitat 61 degradation (e.g. Connor and McCoy 2001, Ulrich 2005) and to estimate local species richness for 62 hotspot identification (e.g. Veech 2000). SAR is among the best known and most studied paradigms 63 in ecology (Arrhenius 1921, Rosenzweig 1995). It describes the pattern in which the species 64 65 richness increases with the increasing sampling area, and is recognized as one of the few true laws of ecology (Gotelli and Colwell, 2001). The species-area curve is central argument for the theory of 66 67 island biogeography (MacArthur and Wilson 1963), but the pattern holds not only for geographic islands, that are pieces of land surrounded by water (MacArthur and Wilson 1963, Holt et al. 1999), 68 but also for 'island' system where similar habitat types are separated in space by relatively 69 unfavourable habitats islands (MacArthur 1972). SAR applications have been widely used for 70 terrestrial ecosystems, applied to plants (Arrhenius 1921, Gleason 1922) and birds (Preston 1960, 71 MacArthur and Wilson 1963), conversely there are considerably less similar studies for the marine 72 realm (McGuinness 1984; Chittaro 2002, Neigel 2003, Balasubramanian and Foster 2007, Reichert 73 et al. 2010), and most of them deal only with large scale patterns (Sabetta et al. 2007; Bevilacqua et 74 al. 2018). 75

The scope of the work was to improve the present knowledge on fauna associated with the Mediterranean stony coral and test the efficiency of SAR models to estimate associated diversity, in terms of species richness. The aim of the work was threefold: (i) to quantify and characterize

diversity associated with *C. caespitosa* in terms of species richness; (ii) to test the efficiency of colony size (surface covered by a single colony, for the "microscale"), colony density and total coral coverage (for "meso-" and "macroscale") as predictors of associated species richness; (iii) to test the consistency of different SAR models for the estimation of species richness in areas with high colony density. Investigation was performed at three different levels, using for each level different sampling techniques and designs, and focusing on different scales (from square centimetres to square metres) and taxonomic groups.

86

# 87 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

#### 88 **2.1. Study area**

The Gulf of Trieste is a shallow semi-enclosed embayment located in the northernmost part of the 89 Adriatic Sea (Mediterranean Sea). It extends from Cape Savudrija (Croatia) to Grado (Italy) and 90 includes the entire Slovenian coast. The maximum depth (approximately 33 m) is found in waters 91 off Piran. The area is characterized by the lowest winter temperatures in the Mediterranean Sea, 92 which can fall below 10°C (Boicourt et al. 1999). Salinity is about 37 on average, but it is 93 influenced near the coast by fresh water inputs (Mozetič et al. 1998). The embayed situation of the 94 Gulf of Trieste, together with dominant winds blowing in an offshore direction (from the North-95 96 East) and very shallow waters create a quite sheltered condition (Boicourt et al. 1999). The coastal morphology of the study area varies from steep rocky cliffs to gradual sloping beaches consisting of 97 gravel and pebbles (Ogorelec et al. 1991). The rocky substratum of the Slovenian coast consists 98 mainly of Eocene flysch layers, with alternating solid sandstone and soft marl (Ogorelec et al. 99 1997). C. caespitosa is well distributed throughout the Slovenian Sea, and in some places it forms 100 beds (sensu Peirano et al., 1994) with very high density of living colonies per unit area (from 3 to 101 652 colonies/100m<sup>2</sup>; Lipej et al. 2016), although the average total coral coverage is not high (21%) 102 with a maximum of 56% (Zunino et al., 2018). Most of those areas are located in the infralittoral 103 zone, up to about 11 m depth, with the only exception of a biogenic formation located deeper, from 104

105 12.4 to 21 m depth. This solitary structure is surrounded by a muddy bottom, and completely 106 composed by a secondary detritic bottom mainly made of dead corallites of *C. caespitosa* (Lipej et 107 al. 2016). In past decades the Slovenian coastal sea suffered from many anthropogenic impacts such 108 as intensive fishing, sewage outfalls and mariculture (Francé and Mozetič 2006, Mozetič et al. 109 2008).

#### 110 **2.2. Field work**

Sampling sites and procedures were chosen in order to limit as much as possible the impact on the local benthic community. Five sampling sites, which were previously assessed as rich with *Cladocora caespitosa* colonies (from 83 to 186 colonies/100m<sup>2</sup>; Lipej et al. 2016), were selected along the Slovenian coast (Fig. 1): Debeli Rtič (DR), Pacug (PA), Piranček (PR), Cape Ronek (RR) and Cape Strunjan (STR).

116

Fig. 1 Map of the study area with indicated sampling sites: Debeli Rtič - DR, Pacug - PA, Piranček
- PR, Cape Ronek – RR and Cape Strunjan- STR.



119

Sampling surveys were performed from 2012 to 2015 with SCUBA diving in the infralittoral belt, between 4 m and 9 m of depth (Table 1). Sampled areas can be considered transitional zones between infralittoral and circalittoral belts, showing a coexistence of photophilic and sciaphilic algal assemblages (*personal observation*). In order to assess faunistic diversity associated with *C*. *caespitosa* a combination of standard techniques and non-destructive methods was used.

**Table 1** Sampling sites with coordinates and depth range.

Code	Site	Latitude (N)	Longitude (E)	Depth range (m)
RR	Cape Ronek	45°32'25"	13°36'56"	6-10
PR	Piranček	45°31'38"	13°34'30"	5-10
STR	Cape Strunjan	45°32'5"	13°36'10"	3-6
PA	Pacug	45°31'34"	13°35'24"	5-8
DR	Debeli rtič	45°35'28"	13°42'88"	5-7

Research was carried out at three different levels, sampling physically independent areas with different sampling strategies and different focal targets (Fig. 2): (i) "microscale" level, biodiversity of invertebrates inside *C. caespitosa* colonies, scale of square centimetres; (ii) "mesoscale" level, biodiversity of epibenthic megafauna among colonies, scale of square meters; (iii) "macroscale" level, biodiversity of ichthyofauna within the area dominated by *C. caespitosa*, scale of tens of square meters, were sampled. For each level a different sampling design was followed.

134

135 Fig. 2 Research design with the three levels of investigations. For each level are indicated: scale,





137

138

139 At the microscale level macrobenthic organisms living inside coral colonies were targeted (Fig. 2).

140 Those animals are strictly associated with corals, so a destructive traditional method was necessary,

being the unique proper technique for determination of cryptic animals such as polychaetes. 141 Physically separate areas with different size, corresponding to colonies of C. caespitosa were 142 sampled in summer 2012 (Fig. 2). Five colonies of C. caespitosa from the most common size 143 classes were collected at each site, for a total of 25 colonies. Along the Slovenian coast colony sizes 144 were ranked in six different size classes based on the length of maximum axis (Schiller 1993, 145 Zunino et al. 2018): class I (maximum axis <5 cm), class II (5-10 cm), class III (10-15 cm), class IV 146 (15-20 cm), class V (20-25 cm), class VI (>25 cm). The biggest colony found by Zunino et al. 147 (2018) had a maximum axis of 68 cm, but the most frequent size class was class II (maximum axis 148 from 5 to 10 cm). Colonies of class VI were rare and observed only at two sites (Zunino et al. 149 2018). In order to reduce the impact of sampling procedure on C. caespitosa population only two 150 large-sized colonies were collected. In this way we could check if predictions based on small 151 colonies could be reliable also for the big ones (class IV). Only colonies fixed to small rocks and 152 153 detritus, which could be easily detached from the substrate without hammer and chisel, were collected. Colonies were immediately put in plastic buckets, and then transported to the laboratory. 154 This method has proved to be efficient for investigating macroinvertebrates living in association 155 156 with tropical corals (Abele and Patton 1976). In addition, as living and dead coral colonies can host different faunal assemblages (Cantera et al. 2003), a threshold of colonies with at least 50% of 157 living polyps was set during sampling, in order to reduce the potential bias. This parameter was 158 estimated before sampling by a SCUBA diver through visual analysis, by dividing the colony in 159 two parts by a virtual axis and selecting only colonies composed of at least 50% living polyps. 160

At the mesoscale level epibenthic megafauna inhabiting areas among *C. caespitosa* colonies was targeted (Fig. 2). Sampling was performed during summer 2013 and 2014, analysing separate areas with the same size (quadrats). Quadrat sampling method is a non-destructive diving visual census methodology, used for benthic fish and invertebrate assemblages studies, particularly useful to study sensitive or protected habitat (e.g. Nieder et al. 2000; Sswat et al. 2015; Yesson et al. 2016). The term 'megafauna', was operatively defined as the benthic fraction with organisms large enough

to be identified in seafloor images (Gage and Tyler 1992), and in the present work it was used to 167 define benthic animals determined *in situ* or through photo analysis. A metal frame of  $1 \times 1$  m 168 separated in 4 subquadrats was placed in areas where C. caespitosa was more abundant (minimum 169 of 2 colonies per quadrat). Each quadrat was photographed, species were determined to the lowest 170 possible taxonomic level in situ and organisms were counted and marked on a diver slate. For 171 colonial organisms colonies were counted. A total of 45 quadrats were analysed (18 in 2013 and 27 172 in 2014) with a minimum of 3 replicates per site. Quadrat size of  $1 \times 1$  m was chosen as the most 173 appropriate, in terms of cost(time)/efficiency balance, after a preliminary test, comparing quadrats 174 of different sizes  $(0.5 \times 0.5 \text{ m}, 1 \times 1 \text{ m} \text{ and } 2 \times 2 \text{ m})$ . Sampling time was dependent on the 175 heterogeneity of substrate inside the quadrats. The density (CC) of C. caespitosa, colony size, as the 176 surface covered by each colony (A), and the percentage of living polyps (LP) for each quadrat were 177 calculated later from photographs. In order to check if the sampling effort was appropriate to get a 178 179 general picture of biodiversity at the studied sites, additional 25 quadrats for each of four studied sites (RR, PA, STR, and PR), were analysed with photographic techniques. Four photographs for 180 181 each quadrat were taken in 2014 and 2015, one for each subquadrat of 0.5×0.5m, for a total of 400 photographs per site. To reduced possible bias, visual count was performed always by the same 182 researcher. 183

At the macroscale level the associated nectobenthic ichthyofauna was targeted (Fig. 2). The 184 fieldwork was carried out by SCUBA diving from June to September of 2013, 2014 and 2015, 185 when the fish species were most active. Data were collected in situ using the visual transect 186 technique (Harmelin 1987), a common non-destructive underwater visual survey methods, preferred 187 when sampling in vulnerable habitat types or marine protected areas (e.g. La Mesa et al. 2017; 188 Emslie et al. 2018). Horizontal transects (MacPherson 1994, Orlando-Bonaca and Lipej 2005, Lipej 189 190 and Orlando-Bonaca 2006) from 30 to 50 m in length were laid out at different depths, depending on the presence of colonies of C. caespitosa. Transect lengths were chosen in order to include 191 homogeneous habitat. Depth was more or less constant over the whole length of the transect. For 192

each range, a fixed transect was placed on the bottom with meter-marks. Fish were counted mostly 193 within 2 m, 1 m to the left and 1 m to the right of the line. Since diver disturbance could influence 194 the results (Emslie et al. 2018), when possible 2 consecutive passages on the same transect were 195 performed, to test the effect of such disturbance on species counts. During the surveys, a constant 196 swimming speed was maintained. A number from 2 to 6 transects were performed at each site each 197 year, for a total of 51 transects distributed over the five sampling sites. Species names and 198 abundances of fishes and number of colonies of C. caespitosa were marked on a diver slate during 199 diving. Visual count was performed always by the same researcher. 200

201

#### 202 **2.3.** Laboratory work and data processing

For the microscale level, the percentage of living polyps (LP), previously assessed in the field, was 203 again confirmed at the laboratory by a different co-author, following the same methods described 204 205 above. Subsequently, maximum (length, D1) and minimum axis (width, D2) and height (H) (in cm) of each colony were measured with a ruler. Finally, the area covered by each colony (A) (in cm<sup>2</sup>) 206 207 was calculated by the classic formula used for the calculation of the area of an ellipse: A = (D1/2) $(D2/2) \pi$ , and the volume (in cm<sup>3</sup>) was measured by water displacement. The net volume (V<sub>net</sub>) was 208 calculated first, and then colonies were covered with plastic foil to measure the total volume ( $V_{tot}$ ). 209 Interstitial volume ( $V_{int}$ ) was calculated as follows:  $V_{int} = V_{tot} - V_{net}$ . All these analyses follows 210 methods already described and used by Schiller (1993), who performed his study in the very same 211 area, and Peirano et al. (2001). Then all coral colonies were broken down for sorting and 212 determination of associated macrobenthic animals. In order to remove sediment trapped between 213 corallites, samples were sieved through a 0.5 mm mesh, and the sieved material was then preserved 214 in 70% ethanol. Organisms that were alive at the moment of sampling were determined to the 215 lowest possible taxonomic level according to relevant literature and then they were counted. 216 Colonial species were also determined and their coverage on a surface of 20×20 cm was calculated, 217

but they were excluded from calculation of diversity indices. For determination a stereomicroscopeand a microscope were used for details (morphological characteristics).

At the mesoscale level all photographs taken underwater were analysed using PhotoQuad software 220 (Trygonis and Sini 2012). For the visual methods photographs were used to measure colony length 221 (D1), colony width (D2), and percentage of living polyps (LP) of each colony, and colony density 222 (CC) per each quadrat. The area covered by each colony (A) was calculated by the formula 223 described above for the microscale and used as colony size descriptor. For each quadrat the total 224 coral coverage  $(A_{cov})$  was calculated as the sum of the areas covered by each colony (A). For the 225 photographic method photographs of each subquadrat (0.5x0.5 m) were analysed for benthic taxa 226 determination. Since the determination of certain species of invertebrates and macroalgae requires 227 sample collection and a detailed analysis in laboratory, some of them were left to the genus, family 228 level and the following operational definitions were employed. 229

#### 230 **2.4. Data analysis**

For the microscale level data exploration techniques were used to check the presence of outliers, 231 232 influential points, and collinearity between variables. Log transformation was applied when needed. 233 Data exploration procedures followed Zuur et al. (2007) and were performed with R version 3.2.0 (R Core Team 2015). Relationships among colony parameters (D1, D2, H, A, V<sub>tot</sub> and LP) were 234 tested with Spearman's coefficients  $-r_s$  (Spearman 1907), and chi square test applied to Kruskal-235 Wallis ranks - KW (Kruskal and Wallis 1952) was used to check if those parameters differed 236 among sites. Cumulative curves for taxa richness with increasing sample volume  $(V_{tot})$  were created 237 to check whether the sample size was representative for the sampled area. Curves were also created 238 for the dominant taxonomic groups separately. Trellis graphs were used to check whether the 239 relationship between colony size (A) and number of total taxa ( $S_{tot}$ ) was independent from sampling 240 sites and depth. Graphs were created using Lattice package for R (Sarkar 2008). 241

The relationship between total number of taxa ( $S_{tot}$ ) and colony size (covered area – A) was first tested with Spearman's coefficients for non-parametric distributions (Spearman 1907). The same

analysis was used to test the relation between colony size (A) and taxa richness of the dominant 244 phyla (polychaetes  $S_{poly}$ , molluscs  $S_{mol}$  and crustaceans  $S_{cr}$ ) separately. Regression lines were 245 calculated to describe the relationship between colony size (A) and richness of total taxa (S<sub>tot</sub>), 246 mollusc (S<sub>mol</sub>), polychaete (S<sub>poly</sub>) and crustacean richness (S<sub>cr</sub>). Calculation were performed also 247 using V<sub>tot</sub> as colony size descriptor. Analyses on residuals were performed to verify the assumption 248 of normality, homogeneity, independence and absence of pattern in the residuals for validation of 249 regression models. The linear regression model on log-transformed data was compared with the 250 non-linear regression models most frequently used to fit SAR data: Arrhenius, Gleason, Gitay and 251 Lomolino (Dengler 2009). AIC (Akaike Information Criterion) (1) and Adjusted R-squared (2) 252 were used to choose the best model describing the Species-Area Relationship. They are defined by: 253

254 
$$AIC = n(logSS_{residual}) + 2(K+1) - nlog(n)$$
 ... (1)

255 Adjusted 
$$R^2 = 1 - (SS_{residual}/(n-K))/(SS_{total}/(n-1))$$
 ... (2)

Where n = sample size, SS<sub>residual</sub> =sum of squared deviations of observed values from fitted values, SS<sub>total</sub> =sum of squared deviations of observed data from the mean, K= number of parameters. With a lower AIC, the model is considered better in explaining the data, conversely the higher the Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> the best the model. Calculations were performed using vegan package (Oksanen et al. 2015) for R.

261

For the mesoscale level data collected with the two methods (underwater counting and analysis of 262 photographs) were analysed separately with the same statistical methods described below, and 263 results were compared. Non-parametric Spearman's correlation  $-r_s$  (Spearman 1907) was used to 264 test if colony density (CC) was related to sampling depth, percentage of living polyps (LP), and if 265 observed species richness (S<sub>obs</sub>) was related to colony density (CC), percentage of living polyps 266 (LP), or total coral coverage (A<sub>cov</sub>). Chi square tests applied to Kruskal-Wallis ranks - KW 267 (Kruskal and Wallis 1952) was used to check if colony density (CC) and total coral coverage (A<sub>cov</sub>) 268 differed significantly among sites. 269

To check whether sampling effort was appropriate for a good estimate of species richness of the studied area, species accumulation curves were performed for the total data set and for each site separately, in both cases with two different methods: *(i)* according to the original sequence of recording and *(ii)* by calculating the mean of species-area curve and its standard deviation from random order of quadrats, sampled without replacement. Calculations were performed using vegan package (Oksanen et al. 2015) for R.

In order to estimate the number of unseen species and add them to the observed species richness incidence-based estimates using the frequencies of species were used (Colwell and Coddington 1994). The functions are the following: Chao bias-corrected (3), first order jackknife (4), bootstrap (5).

280	$S_{P=} S_0 + (a_1(a_1-1) / 2(a_2+1)) (N-1)/N$		(3)
281	$S_{P=} S_0 + a_1((N-1)/N)$		(4)
282	$S_{P=} S_0 + \Sigma \sum_{i=1}^{S0} (1\text{-}p_i)^N$	A H	(5)

where  $S_P$  is the extrapolated richness in a pool,  $S_0$  is the observed number of species in the collection,  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are the number of species occurring only in one or only in two sites in the collection,  $p_i$  is the frequency of species i, and N is the number of sites in the collection.

For the macroscale level the number of fish species observed in each transect was weighted 286 according to the transect length. Density for 100  $m^2$  was calculated for fishes and colonies of C. 287 caespitosa. Non-parametric Spearman's correlation (Spearman 1907) was used to test if colony 288 density (CC) was related to sampling depth, fish richness, total fish densities and densities of the 289 dominant species. Species accumulation curves, built with the same methods described above for 290 the mesoscale, were calculated: (i) for the first, the second and for the two passages combined, to 291 test the effect of successive passages on the same transect; (ii) for all transects together and for each 292 site separately, to test the suitability of sampling effort to get a general picture of the fish 293 community. Estimations of species pool were also performed with the same functions described 294

above for the mesoscale. Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney (WMW) statistic was used to compare results of
both accumulation curves and species estimation (Mann and Whitney 1947).

297 A p < 0.05 was chosen as significance threshold. All calculations were performed using R version 298 2.4.0.

299

#### **300 3. RESULTS**

#### 301 **3.1. "Microscale" level**

All measured attributes of colonies of *Cladocora caespitosa* (D1, D2, H, A, and V<sub>tot</sub>; p < 0.05), except LP (p > 0.05), were strongly positively correlated (Supplementary material, Table S1), confirming that the area covered by each colony (A) can be used as colony size descriptor. The smallest studied colony (A = 39.9 cm<sup>2</sup>) was collected at site PA, while the biggest (A = 937.1 cm<sup>2</sup>) was collected at site PR. All measured coral attributes (D1, D2, H, A, and V<sub>tot</sub>, and LP) did not varied significantly among the five sampling sites (KW, p > 0.05).

A total of 222 different taxa were found: 95 polychaetes, 64 molluscs, 43 crustaceans, 5 tunicates, 5 308 bryozoans, 3 sponges, 4 echinoderms, 1 cnidarian and 1 sipunculid. Among non-colonial organisms 309 11561 invertebrates were counted and 182 taxa were determined to the species level (Electronic 310 supplements, Table S2). Polychaetes were the most abundant (46%), followed by molluscs (26%) 311 312 and crustaceans (18%). The most frequent and abundant species (present in every colony) were the bivalves Rocellaria dubia, and Hiatella arctica, the decapod Athanas nitescens, the polychaetes 313 Lysidice ninetta and Eunice vittata and sipunculids. The sampling effort (estimated as total sampled 314 volume - V<sub>tot</sub>) for the microscale level was appropriate in order to get a representative picture of the 315 entire invertebrate community and of the dominant phyla (molluscs, polychaetes, and crustaceans) 316 considered separately (cumulative curves, supplementary material, Fig. S3). 317

Total taxa richness  $S_{tot}$  increased with increasing A and the relationship was strong ( $r_s = 0.813$ ; p < 0.001). This pattern was consistent in all sampled site (Trellis graph, supplementary material, Fig. S4), and all sampling depths (Trellis graph, supplementary material, Fig. S5). The same relationship

held for richness of molluscs  $S_{mol}$  ( $r_s = 0.622$ ; p < 0.001), polychaetes  $S_{poly}$  ( $r_s = 0.711$ ; p < 0.001) and crustaceans  $S_{cr}$  ( $r_s = 0.519$ ; p < 0.01) considered separately (Fig. 3).

323

324

Fig. 3 Linear regressions between the area covered (A) by colonies of *C. caespitosa* in cm<sup>2</sup> and: (a) the total number of non-colonial invertebrates ( $S_{tot}$ ), (b) total number of molluscs ( $S_{mol}$ ), (c) total number of polychaetes ( $S_{poly}$ ), (d) total number of crustaceans ( $S_{cr}$ ). All axes are log-transformed. Dots = sampled colonies.



329

The best model describing how  $S_{tot}$  increased with A was a linear regression on log-transformed variables, following Arrhenius model. AIC values for the comparison among the most frequently used non-linear models (Arrhenius, Gleason, Gitay, and Lomolino) are shown in Table 2. Colony size (A) exerted a major influence on total invertebrate richness ( $S_{tot}$ ) (regression in Fig. **3**a explains about 68% of the relation between S and A). The efficiency of the model in predicting  $S_{tot}$  slightly

- improved using total colony volume  $(V_{tot})$  instead of area covered (A) as colony size descriptor and
- the same was observed considering only richness of polychaetes  $S_{poly}$  (AIC values, Table 2).
- 338

 	¥7 • 11	10	110	A 11 D <sup>2</sup>
 Model	Variables	df	AIC	Adj R⁻
Arrhenius	Stot and A	3	187.5	
Gleason	S <sub>tot</sub> and A	3	185.3	
Gitay	S <sub>tot</sub> and A	3	186.0	
Lomolino	$\mathbf{S}_{tot}$ and $\mathbf{A}$	3	186.2	
log-log linear regression	S <sub>tot</sub> and A	3	-18.5	0.7
log-log linear regression	$S_{tot}$ and $V_{tot}$	3	-19.9	0.7
log-log linear regression	S <sub>mol</sub> and A	3	16.2	0.5
log-log linear regression	$S_{mol}$ and $V_{tot}$	3	16.8	0.4
log-log linear regression	S <sub>poly</sub> and A	3	2.3	0.5
log-log linear regression	$S_{poly}$ and $V_{tot}$	3	0.3	0.5
log-log linear regression	S <sub>cr</sub> and A	3	23.7	0.2
log-log linear regression	$S_{cr}$ and $V_{tot}$	3	24.2	0.2

**Table 2** AIC values, and adjusted R-square (Adj  $R^2$ ) for models comparison

340

#### 341 **3.2. "Mesoscale" level**

Colony size (A, KW =24.442, p < 0.001), percentage of living polyps (LP, KW = 16.285, p =342 0.003), colony density (CC, KW = 18.027, p = 0.001), and total coral coverage (A<sub>cov</sub>, KW = 25.117, 343 p < 0.001), varied among the studied sites. The biggest colonies (A) were observed at site PR (941.1) 344  $\pm$  370.8 SD cm<sup>2</sup>), and the smallest at DR (216.5  $\pm$  164.6 SD cm<sup>2</sup>), the highest values of LP at site 345 DR  $(71 \pm 11\%)$  and the lowest at site PA  $(48 \pm 32\%)$ . The highest densities (CC) were observed at 346 sites PA (7.1  $\pm$  2.8 SD colony/m<sup>2</sup>) and PR (6.4  $\pm$  3 SD colony/m<sup>2</sup>), the lowest at site STR (3.6  $\pm$  1.3 347 SD colony/m<sup>2</sup>); the highest total coral coverage (A<sub>cov</sub>) was observed at site PR (18.8  $\pm$  7.4%) and 348 PA (13.6  $\pm$  6.9%), the lowest at site DR (4.3  $\pm$  3.2%) and STR (5.3  $\pm$  3.3%). CC was positively 349 correlated with sampling depth ( $r_s = 0.586$ , p < 0.001). Conversely, LP was not correlated with CC 350  $(r_s = -0.217, p = 0.147)$  nor with depth  $(r_s = -0.278, p = 0.061)$ . No significant relationship was 351 observed between the observed epibenthic megafaunal species richness ( $S_{obs}$ ) and CC ( $r_s = -0.087$ , 352 p = 0.567), LP ( $r_s = 0.268$ , p = 0.07516), nor total coral coverage (A<sub>cov</sub>,  $r_s = -0.068$ , p = 0.659). 353

With underwater visual counting a total of 61 different taxa were found: 23 molluscs, 11 sponges, 4 354 echinoderms, 4 cnidarians, 3 polychaetes, 3 crustaceans, 3 tunicates, 2 bryozoans. A total of 6764 355 invertebrates and 1 fish were counted and 48 taxa were determined to the species level. Molluscs 356 were the most diversified (47 %) and abundant (79 %) taxa, followed by sponges (19 % of taxa and 357 16 % of abundance). With the photographic technique additional three species of invertebrates and 358 four of fish were observed, for a total of 55 different species. With the use of this technique, 359 molluscs and sponges were confirmed as the richest groups. Species accumulation curves for 360 epibenthic megafauna recorded with the underwater visual counting (Fig. 4) have horizontal 361 asymptotes when all collected samples were used, but not when a curve was drawn for each 362 sampling site. This suggested that more samples were needed to get a representative picture of each 363 site, and thus enabling a comparison. 364

365

Fig. 4 Cumulative curves for benthic invertebrates at mesoscale level according to the original
sequence of recording (a, b) and from random order of quadrats, (c, d), for the entire dataset (a, c)
and for each site separately (b, d). Data were recorded in situ with underwater visual counting.
Vertical lines = SD.



Fig. 5 Cumulative curves for benthic invertebrates at mesoscale level according to the original
sequence of recording (a, b) and from random order of quadrats (c, d), for the entire dataset (a, c)
and for each site separately (b, d). Data were obtained from photographs. Vertical lines = SD.



Species accumulation curves for epibenthic megafauna recorded with the photographic technique 379 380 (Fig. 5Fig. 5) instead were long enough to enable discrimination between sites: site RR showed the highest richness (> 40 taxa) compared with other sites (< 30 taxa). 381

Fig. 5 Cumulative curves for benthic invertebrates at mesoscale level according to the original 383 sequence of recording (a, b) and from random order of quadrats (c, d), for the entire dataset (a, c) 384 385 and for each site separately (b, d). Data were obtained from photographs. Vertical lines = SD.



The two methods gave also different results in terms of estimation of species richness. Using data 388 obtained with underwater counting with extrapolation techniques we obtained an expected total 389 number of taxa ranging from 64 to 71, according to the different functions used (Table 3). From 390 391 calculation based on photographic technique lower values were obtained, with total richness ranging from 56 to 62. The two different sampling techniques gave markedly different results also 392 in terms of comparison of extrapolated taxa richness for each sampling site. Extrapolation from data 393 394 obtained with underwater counting (Table 3) showed site RR as the poorest in terms of species richness, with S<sub>obs</sub>=23, whereas using data obtained with photographic technique site RR resulted 395 396 the richest with  $S_{obs}=39$  (Table 3).

**Table 3** Estimates ( $\pm$  SE) of macrobenthic species richness for each site and for the whole area using different functions, with underwater counting (visual) and photographic technique (photo). DR =Debeli Rtič, PA = Pacug, PR = Piranček, RR = Cape Ronek, STR = Cape Strunjan, S<sub>obs</sub> = observed number of taxa; chao = Chao bias-corrected function, jack1 = first order jackknife, boot = bootstrap, n = number of samples.

Site	method	Sobs	chao	jack1	boot	n
DR	visual	32	$53 \pm 18$	$43 \pm 5$	37 ± 3	8
PA	visual	34	$60 \pm 22$	$46\pm5$	39 ± 3	15
PA	photo	27	$37 \pm 10$	35 ± 3	$30 \pm 2$	25
PR	visual	34	$48 \pm 10$	$46 \pm 6$	$39 \pm 3$	8
PR	photo	31	$43 \pm 13$	$38 \pm 3$	$34 \pm 2$	25
RR	visual	23	$31 \pm 7$	$30 \pm 4$	$26 \pm 2$	4
RR	photo	39	$45\pm5$	$48 \pm 3$	$43 \pm 2$	25
STR	visual	29	$62 \pm 30$	$40 \pm 4$	$34 \pm 2$	11
STR	photo	31	43 ± 13	$38 \pm 3$	$34 \pm 1$	25
Total	visual	58	$66 \pm 6$	$71 \pm 4$	$64 \pm 2$	46
Total	photo	51	58 ± 6	$62 \pm 4$	$56 \pm 2$	100

403

The comparison between the two techniques showed that despite the bigger number of samples analysed, the total number of taxa identified with the photographic technique was lower than the one obtained with the underwater method (45 against 61 taxa) and this difference increase considering only lower taxonomical levels, such genus (31 against 50 genera) or species (26 against 48 species). Considering all species recorded for mesoscale level, 46% of them were recorded with both methods, 48% with underwater counting and 6% only with photo analysis. Forty % of species recorded with underwater counting were recorded also at level of microscale.

- 411
- 412 **3.3. "Macroscale" level**

The density of colonies of *C. caespitosa* varied among sampling sites (KW = 32.1, p < 0.001). Considering all colonies from all sampling sites a relation between colony density and sampling depth ( $r_s = 0.311$ , p = 0.020) was observed. The highest density of coral colonies was observed at the deepest site PR (210 ± 51 colonies/100 m<sup>2</sup>), while the lowest was observed in more shallow

waters at sites DR (55 ± 35 colonies/100 m<sup>2</sup>), and STR (80 ± 25 colonies/100 m<sup>2</sup>). Fish richness was not correlated with number of coral colonies ( $r_s = 0.188$ , p = 0.170), but there was a weak increase of fish abundances with increasing density of colonies ( $r_s = 0.359$ , p = 0.007), mainly due to abundances of *Gobius cruentatus* ( $r_s = 0.552$ , p = 0.00001), *Symphodus cinereus* ( $r_s = 0.458$ , p =0.0004), and *Parablennius rouxi* ( $r_s = 0.264$ , p = 0.05).

A total of 1383 fish specimens were counted and 25 different species were identified
(Supplementary material, Table S2), among them only 8 were recorded at all sampling sites. The
most frequent species were *Serranus scriba*, *G. cruentatus*, *Chromis chromis*, *Diplodus vulgaris*, *Serranus hepatus*, *S. cinereus*, *P. rouxi* and *Symphodus tinca*.

Results of fish counting did not differed significantly between the two successive passages on the 426 same transect, nor between each passage and the mean value of the two (WMW test, p > 0.05), 427 confirming that diver disturbance had no significant effect on species counts. Species accumulation 428 429 curves showed that the total number of transects performed was enough to get a representative picture of fish richness of the study area (Fig. 6a, c). Comparing species accumulation curves for 430 each sampling site (Fig. 6b,d), we saw that the equilibrium was reached for a lower number of 431 species at site STR and RR, compared with site PR. At sites PA and DR the cumulative species 432 curve did not reach an asymptote, but the shape of cumulative curves indicate that species richness 433 at these sites should be higher than at STR. Expected fish richness differed significantly only 434 between sites RR and STR (WMW test, p < 0.05), with richness at STR lower than at RR. 435 Estimations using different extrapolation functions gave the same results (Table 4). 436

437

Fig. 6 Species accumulation curves for fish species found at all sites (a, c) and at each site
separately (b, d), with transects in order of occurrence (a, b) and in random order (c, d). Each
transect is weighted according to its length. Vertical lines = SD.



**Table 4** Estimates ( $\pm$  SE) of fish richness for each site and for the whole area using different 449 functions. DR = Debeli Rtič, PA = Pacug, PR Piranček, RR = Cape Ronek, STR = Cape Strunjan, 450 S<sub>obs</sub> = observed number of species; chao = Chao bias-corrected function, jack1 = first order 451 jackknife, boot = bootstrap, n = number of samples.

Site	Sobs	chao	jack1	boot	n
DR	17	$24\pm7$	$23 \pm 3$	$20\pm2$	7
PA	16	$22\pm 6$	$22 \pm 3$	$19 \pm 2$	4
PR	20	$24 \pm 5$	$24 \pm 2$	$22 \pm 2$	12
RR	18	$22\pm 6$	$21 \pm 2$	$19 \pm 1$	8
STR	16	$17 \pm 1$	$18 \pm 1$	$17 \pm 1$	10
Total	25	$29\pm7$	$28 \pm 2$	$26 \pm 1$	41

#### 453 **4. DISCUSSION**

Climate change, in synergy with other anthropogenic pressures, is leading to a decline of 454 populations of C. caespitosa across the Mediterranean (Casado de Amezua et al. 2015). Given its 455 456 role of habitat builder its fate is strictly connected to the fate of its associated fauna, but knowledge on those relationships are still scant and fragmented (e.g. Koukouras et al. 1998, Pitacco et al. 457 2014). The present work provides the first investigation focused extensively on biodiversity 458 459 associated with C. caespitosa at different levels. It's a pioneer work filling some gaps in basic knowledge and testing promising methods, that could be used to estimate the potential ecological 460 effects of the loss of this coral also in other areas of the Mediterranean. 461

#### 462 **4.1. Macrobenthic invertebrates strictly associated with coral colony**

Invertebrate community living inside coral colonies of *Cladocora caespitosa* was dominated by 463 polychaetes, which is consistent with previous investigations on associated fauna in northern 464 Adriatic (Pitacco et al. 2014) and other areas of the Mediterranean Sea (Lumare 1965, Koukouras et 465 al. 1998). Their success was probably due to their higher level of differentiation with regards to 466 feeding modes and motility compared with other taxonomic groups such as crustaceans, enabling 467 them to colonize all different niches provided by coral colony. In tropical scleractinian corals some 468 studies reported arthropods as the most frequent, abundant and rich group (Abele and Patton 1976, 469 470 Garcia et al. 2008, Stella et al. 2011), whereas other studies found Polychaeta to be the richest group (Cantera et al. 2003). While a certain amount of information on arthropods associated with 471 tropical corals is available, only few studies targeted polychaetes (140 papers for arthropods and 472 only 10 for polychaetes, reviewed by Stella et al. 2011), and this could result in a general 473 underestimation of the richness of associated tropical polychaetes. 474

In the present work some uncommon species were found, together with animals whose taxonomic position is still under debate. In particular, among mollusc species the presence of the alien mytilid *Brachidontes pharaonis* deserves particular attention, as it constitutes the first record of this taxon from Slovenia and the third confirmed from the Adriatic Sea (Lipej et al. 2017). Among

polychaetes the flabelligerid *Flabelliderma cinari* was recorded for the first time outside its *locus typicus* in Turkish waters (Karhan et al. 2012). All reported species associated with *C. caespitosa* (Koukouras et al. 1998, Pitacco et al. 2014, present work) have also been found in other habitats, mainly hard substrate, so by now there are no evidences of obligatory relationships. The same observation was made for species associated with another temperate coral *Oculina arbuscula* by McCloskey (1970), whereas, obligatory relationships are quite common in tropics, involving mainly decapod crustaceans (e.g. Castro 1978, Coles 1980).

The number of associated invertebrate taxa increases with C. caespitosa colony size (A), 486 confirming the Arrhenius (1921) model as the best SAR model. We can reasonably say that the 487 relationship between area (A) and species richness (S<sub>tot</sub>) was independent from factors such as 488 sampling site and depth. Nevertheless, given the limited spatial scale and depth range of the present 489 work and the wide range of depth and habitats inhabited by C. caespitosa, additional investigation 490 491 in other areas of the Mediterranean are required to generalise. For dominant groups (polychaetes, molluscs and crustaceans) considered separately there was also an increase of richness with 492 493 increasing colony size, so the SAR holds also for the single dominant phyla. Colony size, in terms of surface covered by each colony (A), resulted therefore as a good predictor of species richness 494 (Stot). A significant SAR according to Arrhenius (1921) model was found also for decapod 495 crustaceans associated with the tropical coral Pocillopoda damicornis by Abele and Patton (1976), 496 497 but their calculation of expected species number, based on number of individuals for different coral size, lead to a significant overestimation. A positive relationship between colony size and associated 498 species richness was observed also by other authors for temperate and tropical corals (Koukouras et 499 al. 1998, Garcia et al. 2008). In most of those studies total colony volume (e.g. Abele & Patton 500 1976, Koukouras et al. 1998, Garcia et al. 2008, Belmaker 2009) and weight (e.g. Reed and 501 502 Mikkelsen 1987) were generally considered to offer the most appropriate parameters to estimate coral size. Also in the present work, total colony volume (V<sub>tot</sub>) resulted to be a better predictor and 503 slightly improved the model. This was due to the fact that the surface covered by colonies did not 504

represent the real surface available for macroinvertebrates to settle, which increased with the 505 complexity of the colony. This fact affects in particular molluscs, because they are mainly sessile 506 and endolithic, and to a lesser extent polychaetes, because even if they are mainly free living 507 (vagile), they are represented also by a consistent number of sessile and endolithic species. For 508 those groups a species-volume relation (SVR, sensu Belmaker 2009) could be more predictive for 509 species richness. Nevertheless, the strict correlation between total colony volume and the area 510 covered by colonies, suggested that both parameters could be used as colony size descriptor, and the 511 use of area covered by colonies resulted the best option, being a less destructive and less time 512 consuming measure. 513

Most of works based on SAR models were performed at larger scales (squared metres to squared kilometers), also in marine environment (Smith and Witman 1999, Levin et al. 2009, Guilhaumon et al. 2012), and very few papers investigated the relationship between area and species richness in other marine habitats, such as boulders (McGuinness 1984), mussel beds (Witman 1985), and artificial settling plates (Anderson 1999). Our results supported the applicability of SAR also at a spatial scale of squared centimetres.

#### 520 **4.2.** Epibenthic megafaunal community associated with beds of *C. caespitosa*

The present work confirmed that the analysed beds of C. caespitosa are located in a transition zone 521 between infralittoral communities, with the presence of molluscs such as Thylacodes arenarius and 522 Columbella rustica, characteristic of the biocoenosis of Photophilic Algae (AP, Pérès and Picard 523 1964), and circalittoral communities, for the presence of coralline algae of genera Lithophyllum and 524 Lithothamnion (personal observations), characteristic of the biocoenosis of Coastal Detritic (DC, 525 Pérès and Picard 1964). Also macroalgal species observed were typical of both photophilic algal 526 assemblages (Padina pavonica and Dictyota dichotoma; Giaccone et al. 1994) and sciaphilic algal 527 assemblages (Peyssonellia spp., and Halimeda tuna; Giaccone et al. 1994, pre-coralligenous, sensu 528 Pérès and Picard 1964), but they showed low coverage and poorly developed thalli where coral beds 529 occur (personal observations). Such a composition differed from the biogenic formation of Cape 530

Ronek, located close to the studied sites (STR site) and hosting the highest density of living coral 531 colonies of the Slovenian area (up to 652 colonies/ $100m^2$ , mostly with maximum axis < 15 cm; 532 Lipej et al. 2016). On this formation the epibenthic community was also dominated by species 533 typical of the infralittoral belt (e.g. the sponge Aplysina aerophoba and coralline algae) but even 534 more by species typical of other habitats, such as the sponge *Geodia cydonium*, the sea cucumber 535 Holoturia tubulosa, the brittle star Ophioderma longicauda, and the sea urchins Sphaerechinus 536 granularis (Lipej et al. 2016) and Psammechinus microtuberculatus (Pitacco et al. 2014). To date 537 there is a lack of information on the composition of epibenthic communities of *C. caespitosa* beds 538 in other areas of the Mediterranean Sea, but since C. caespitosa is a species thriving along a wide 539 range of habitats and depth (Peirano et al. 1994, Kersting et al. 2017), the composition of 540 macrobenthic community associated with coral beds and banks is likely highly variable. 541

At level of mesoscale, observed epibenthic megafaunal species richness (Sobs) was not directly 542 543 related to colony density (CC), nor with total coral coverage (A<sub>cov</sub>), therefore estimates of species richness could not be based on colony presence or sizes. This could be due to the fact that, even if 544 545 average colony density was high, the total coral coverage was not, therefore C. caespitosa was not the dominant species, as observed in other areas of the Mediterranean, where this species creates 546 banks (e.g. Mljet bank, Kružić and Benković 2008) or high concentrations of big colonies and 547 microreefs with high coral cover (Kersting & Linares 2012). Differences among sites were mainly 548 related to different abundance of the dominant species and presence of rare or occasional species. 549 Consequently, the variation of species richness was mainly related to the records of occasional and 550 uncommon species with increasing sampled area. The incidence-based estimates calculated are 551 popular ways of estimating the number of unseen rare species and are based on the frequencies of 552 rare species in a collection of sites. Adding this number to the observed number of species we 553 554 obtain a better estimation of species richness (Oksanen et al. 2015), and consequently a better prediction of species loss in case of habitat degradation. Our results confirmed frequency-based 555

estimates on sampled areas as a suitable tool for species estimate for the mesoscale level, whensampling effort is appropriate.

#### 4.3. Ichthyofauna in areas with beds of *C. caespitosa*

The Northern Adriatic ichthyofauna has lower species richness than other Adriatic areas (Orlando-559 Bonaca and Lipej 2005). The number of species found within the present work showed that fish 560 assemblages associated with C. caespitosa beds are in accordance with average fish richness of 561 infralittoral habitats in the Gulf of Trieste (Orlando-Bonaca and Lipej 2005). As already observed at 562 the level of mesoscale, also at level of macroscale, there were no direct relations between fish 563 richness and colony density, and estimates of fish richness could not be based on colony sizes. 564 Previous results obtained from the very sampled area (Zunino et al. 2018) confirmed a generally 565 low total coral coverage, with a maximum of 49% at site PR and a minimum value of 6% at site 566 DR. High species number and density of fish are known to be related to high substratum complexity 567 568 (*i.e.* habitat heterogeneity), such as rocks and boulders opposed to sand or gravel (Macpherson 1994, Gratwicke and Speight 2005), providing more shelter for adults and recruits (Guidetti 2000, 569 570 Cheminée et al. 2016) as well as more nesting sites for spawning (Lipej et al. 2009). Similarly, Balasubrumanian and Foster (2007) identify an increase of habitat heterogeneity as an important 571 factor explaining the increase in species relative to space. Their study evidenced that species 572 richness of coral reef fishes in water of Santiago de Cuba is positively related to space (area and 573 volume) in all studied sites. Previously, Chittaro (2002) stated the importance of microhabitat 574 richness in increasing the coral fish species richness. Compared with other infralittoral habitat types 575 in the Gulf of Trieste, our results showed lower richness compared with highly structured habitat 576 types, such as Cystoseira algal belts (31 species) and higher richness compared with more 577 homogenous habitats, such as seagrass meadow (9 species) (Orlando-Bonaca and Lipej 2005). Fish 578 579 species recorded are all nektobenthic and epibenthic with the exception of *Chromis chromis*, which is nektonic and diurnal planktivore (Bell and Harmelin-Vivien 1983). The most frequent and 580 abundant species (Serranus scriba, Gobius cruentatus, Diplodus vulgaris, Serranus hepatus, 581

Symphodus cinereus, Parablennius rouxi and Symphodus tinca) are considered resident species. 582 They are strictly related to the substrate, since their main source of food are benthic 583 macroinvertebrates. Only the density of G. cruentatus, S. cinereus, and P. rouxi showed a 584 correlation with the density of colonies of C. caespitosa. Colonies of C. caespitosa, with their 585 physical structure provide shelter for blennies and gobies, in fact both *P. rouxi*, and the less frequent 586 Parablennius gattorugine were observed to hide within colonies. S. scriba, C. chromis and P. rouxi, 587 are usually associated with rocky unvegetated areas or with short vegetation, and were already 588 recorded in the lower part of the infralittoral belt at the same depth range of the present work (4-10 589 m; Orlando-Bonaca and Lipej 2005). Such a habitat was not suitable for most species of labrids, 590 strictly associated with vegetated areas. Symphodus cinereus, was the only labrid that could be 591 considered resident and associated with C. caespitosa, while the wrasse Symphodus roissali, strictly 592 related to complex algal canopies in shallow depth, such as *Cystoseira* and *Halopithys* algal belts 593 594 (Orlando-Bonaca et al. 2008), was found only at one site (PR) between 5 and 6 m depth. The occasional presence of species like *Pomatoschistus bathi* and *Gobius fallax*, was due to the ability 595 596 of C. caespitosa to settle also on debris, colonizing areas covered by sediment and gravel (Zibrowius 1980), which is the habitat preferred by this two species (Lipej et al. 2005; Orlando-597 Bonaca and Lipej 2005). 598

Also for the macroscale level, considering only the most frequent and abundant species, assemblages were quite homogeneous among sampling sites, and depth, varying only for species abundance. Consequently, variation of species richness with increasing sampled area was mainly related to the records of occasional and uncommon species, confirming frequency-based estimates on sampled area as a suitable tool for species estimate, and prediction of species loss in response to habitat degradation.

#### 4.4. Comparison of diversity and methodology at the different levels

The present work confirmed the important role of *C. caespitosa* as a habitat builder. In total about 300 taxa were recorded, counting for about 1/7 of the almost 2000 species known (Turk and Lipej

2002) for the study area (i.e. the Slovenian part of the Gulf of Trieste). At the same time our results showed how the importance of this coral depends on the strength of the associations between the coral itself and the focal associated taxonomic group. The relationship between the coral and the associated fauna was stronger at the level of microscale and weaker at the level of macroscale. The major component of biodiversity (almost 80%) recorded in the present work was detected at the microscale level (Table 5), which represented the most time-consuming and destructive part of the work (Table 6).

615

**Table 5** Total number of taxa and individuals counted in the present work. For colonial organisms a
colony was counted as one individual. \* = colonial organisms excluded.

	Number of taxa	Abundance
Microscale	222	11561*
Mesoscale photo	46	/
Mesoscale visual	61	6765
Total mesoscale	71	/
Macroscale	25	1383
Total	290	19709

618

619 The finding of rare and very poorly known species among the invertebrates associated with C. *caespitosa* at this level showed how the present knowledge is still limited and how the loss of this 620 precious habitat builder could negatively affect certain species before they are fully known or even 621 vet discovered. Also results obtained at the mesoscale level showed that beds of C. caespitosa in the 622 studied area host rich and diversified communities of invertebrates. Nevertheless, the number of 623 taxa recorded with the visual technique represented only the 21 % of total taxa found with the 624 present work, and the number of taxa recorded with the photographic technique only 16 %, and not 625 direct relationship was found between species richness and coral colony. This underestimation of 626 total invertebrate diversity at this level was mostly due to the methodology. With fast and non-627 destructive methods only larger epibenthic animals detectable with SCUBA-diving and from 628

pictures (megafauna), were considered, overlooking the smallest cryptic ones, hidden among rocksand algae, such as polychaetes.

631

**Table 6** Comparison of methods applied at different scales. <sup>1</sup> = hours spent underwater; <sup>2</sup> = dimension of sampling units; <sup>3</sup> = total surface analysed; <sup>4</sup> = % of taxa determined till the level of species. x = few hours, xx = few days, xxx = many days, xxxx = many months.

Microscale	Mesoscale photo	Mesoscale visual	Macroscale
Colony (cm <sup>2</sup> )	Quadrat (m <sup>2</sup> )	Quadrat (m <sup>2</sup> )	Transect (m)
Х	xx	xxx	XX
XXXXX	XXX	Х	Х
25	100	45	51
$0.01 \text{ to } 0.09 \text{ m}^2$	0.25/1 m <sup>2</sup>	$0.25/1 \text{ m}^2$	60/100 m <sup>2</sup>
$0.588 \text{ m}^2$	$100 \text{ m}^2$	$45 \text{ m}^2$	$4804 \text{ m}^2$
80%	59%	79%	100%
no	yes	no	no
	Microscale Colony (cm <sup>2</sup> ) x xxxxx 25 0.01 to 0.09 m <sup>2</sup> 0.588 m <sup>2</sup> 80% no	Microscale photoMesoscale photoColony (cm²)Quadrat (m²)xxxxxxxxxxx251000.01 to 0.09 m²0.25/1 m²0.588 m²100 m²80%59%noyes	Microscale photoMesoscale photoMesoscale visualColony (cm2)Quadrat (m2)Quadrat (m2)xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx25100450.01 to 0.09 m20.25/1 m20.25/1 m20.588 m2100 m245 m280%59%79%noyesno

635

At the level of macroscale, richness of fish associated with *C. caespitosa* beds represent 1/10 of the 259 fish species recorded in the Gulf of Trieste, 1/7 of the 184 species recorded in Slovenian waters (Marčeta 1999) and 1/17 of the 440 species recorded for Adriatic Sea (Lipej and Dulčić 2010). Nevertheless, those species represent only 8 % of total taxa richness recorded in the present work, and a direct relationship with colonies of *C. caespitosa* was observed only for few species, those for which coral physical structures provide shelter.

At level of microscale there was a direct relationship between species richness and colony size, so estimates based on the SAR could be suitable methods to estimate species richness strictly associated with corals in a non-destructive way. The largest colony found along the Slovenian coast so far (Zunino et al. 2018) had 68 cm of length (estimated volume = 19369 cm<sup>3</sup>). The prediction based on calculated regressions, using the covered surface (A) as size descriptor, suggests that such a colony may host a total of 130 taxa (95% confidence intervals: 105-162), among them 39 taxa of molluscs (95% confidence intervals: 29-53) and 61 (95% confidence intervals: 43-85) taxa of

polychaetes. The poor fit of species/area regression for crustaceans, leave a certain bias on eventual 649 estimates of crustacean richness. Although such extrapolations should be treated with caution, 650 especially since colonies larger than 50 cm are rather rare in the studied area (Schiller 1993, Kružić 651 et al. 2014, Zunino et al. 2018) our results supported the suitability of SAR to predict species 652 extirpation resulting from the loss of coral colonies, bed or banks. Communities living inside 653 colonies of C. caespitosa did not varied among sites. Given the limited differences among sites in 654 the study area, estimates based on SAR are consistent for all sites analysed and can be reasonably 655 extended to other similar sites along the Slovenian coast. The habitat and depth range in which this 656 coral lives is likely to influence the composition of its associated macrofauna, and this could be an 657 interesting focus for future investigations. In the Aegean Sea Koukouras et al. (1998) found 658 differences between macroinvertebrates associated with C. caespitosa inhabiting at different depths 659 (3-5 vs 15-19 m), surrounded by different assemblages (photophilic algal assemblage vs biogenic 660 661 bank surrounded by gravel and sand). In the same areas, notwithstanding compositional differences, a positive relationship between C. caespitosa colony volume and number of associated 662 663 polychaetes was observed (Arvanitidis and Koukouras 1994), supporting the possible extension of the application of SAR models to other Mediterranean areas. Additional studies are needed in order 664 to refine those estimates and to extend them to C. caespitosa colonies in other habitats and areas of 665 the Mediterranean Sea. 666

667

At level of meso- and macroscale the stable components of fish and invertebrate assemblages associated with beds of *C. caespitosa* have specific characteristics compared with surrounding infra- and circalittoral assemblages, despite slight differences among sites. Given the structure of epibenthic megafauna and fish community, frequency-based estimates were suitable to estimate species richness based on sampling area at both meso- and macroscale level. Differently from the microscale level, at level of meso- and macroscale colonies species richness was not correlated with size nor density of *C. caespitosa*. Comparison with other habitat types suggested that species

richness at those levels likely responded to habitat heterogeneity, related not only to the presence of 675 colonies of C. caespitosa, but also to the different typology of substrate and the presence of other 676 benthic species, such as sponges and seaweeds. Therefore, colony density and coverage were not 677 suitable predictors of species richness at meso- and macroscale levels. Habitat degradation and loss 678 is considered as one among the most important drivers responsible for species extinctions (Schipper 679 et al. 2008). Consequently, the frequency-based estimates calculated on sampled area could be 680 suitable for the prediction of reducing diversity related to loss of areas with high colony density, but 681 did not allow to disentangle the effect of the loss of coral itself from other factors increasing habitat 682 heterogeneity at the study site. 683

684

#### 685 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was financially supported by the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment of Slovenia.
Part of this work was possible thanks to the MARS travel award received in 2015.

Special thanks to the staff of Marine Biology Station in Piran (Slovenia), in particular Dr. Borut 688 689 Mavrič, Tihomir Makovec, Jernej Uhan, Ariana Stojnič and Aleksandra Popović for their help in the fieldwork, to Domen Trkov for his precious help during laboratory work, to Dr. Martina 690 Orlando-Bonaca for her support and advices. Special thanks also to Dr. Nicola Bettoso, Dr. Floriana 691 Aleffi, Dr. Lisa Faresi (ARPA FVG, Italy) and Dr. Barbara Mikac for their help in taxa 692 determination. I would like also to thank Prof. Adriana Giangrande (University of Salento, Italy), 693 Prof. Maria Cristina Gambi (Zoological Station Anton Dohrn, Italy), and Prof. Maria Flavia 694 Gravina (University of Tor Vergata, Italy) and the biodiversity team at the Hellenic Centre for 695 Marine Research in Crete (Greece): Dr. Giorgos Chatzigeorgiou, Prof. Christos Arvanitidis, Niki 696 Keklikoglou, Sarah Faulwetter, Katerina Vasileiadou and Christina Pavloudi, for their help in 697 dealing with the uncertainty of the taxonomic position of some polychaetes. Finally thanks also to 698 Milijan Šiško and Ana Rotter for their help with statistics and R programming. 699

# 701 Conflict of interest statement

- 702 On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no actual or potential conflict
- of interest of any kind, and that the sources of funding do not bias the work.

# 705 **REFERENCES**

- Abele, L.G., Patton, W.K., 1976. The Size of Coral Heads and the Community Biology of
   Associated Decapod Crustaceans. J. Biogeogr. 3:35-47.
- Anderson, M.J., 1999. Effects of patch size on colonisation in estuaries: revisiting the species-area
   relationship. Oecologia 118(1):87-98.
- Antoniadou, C., Chintiroglou, C., 2010. Biodiversity of zoobenthos associated with a *Cladocora caespitosa* bank in the North Aegean Sea. Rapp Comm int Mer Médit 39, 432.
- Arrhenius, O., 1921) Species and area. J. Ecol. 9:95-99.
- Arvanitidis, C., Koukouras, A., 1994. Polychaete fauna associated with the coral *Cladocora caespitosa* (L.) in the eastern Mediterranean. Mém. du Mus. Nation. Hist. Nat. 162:347-353.
- Baker, A.C., Glynn, P.W., Riegl, B., 2008. Climate change and coral reef bleaching: an ecological assessment of long-term impacts, recovery trends and future outlook. Estuar. Coast. Shelf. S. 80 (4):435–471.
- Balasubramanian, H., Foster, R.S., 2007. Species and space: Role of volume in organizing coral
   reef fish assemblages in SE Cuba Mar Ecol. Prog. Ser. 345:229-236.
- Bell, J., Harmelin-Vivien, M., 1983. Fish fauna of French Mediterranean *Posidonia oceanica* seagrass meadows. II: feeding habits. Tethys 11:1-14.
- Belmaker, J., 2009. Species Richness of Resident and Transient Coral-Dwelling Fish Responds
   Differentially to Regional Diversity. Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. 18:426-436.
- Bevilacqua, S., Ugland, K.I., Plicanti, A., Scuderi, D., Terlizzi, A., 2018. An approach based on the
   total species accumulation curve and higher taxon richness to estimate realistic upper limits
   in regional species richness. Ecol. Evol. 8: 405-415.
- Boicourt, W., Kuzmić, M., Hopkins, T., 1999. Ecosystems at the Land-Sea Margin: Drainage Basin
  to Coastal Sea. In: Malone, T., Malej, A., Harding, Jr. L., Smodlaka, N., Turner, R., (Hrsg.)
  Coastal and Estuarine Studies 55:81-129.
- Cantera, K., Jaime, R., Orozco, C., Londono-Cruz, E., Toro-Farmer, G., 2003. Abundance and distribution patterns of infaunal associates and macroborers of the branched coral (*Pocillopora damicornis*) in Gorgona Island (eastern tropical Pacific). Bull. Mar. Sci. 72:207-219.
- Casado de Amezua, P., Kersting, D., Linares, C.L., Bo, M., Caroselli, E., Garrabou, J., Cerrano, C.,
  Ozalp, B., Terrón-Sigler, A., Betti, F., 2015. *Cladocora caespitosa*. The IUCN Red List of
  Threatened Species 2015: e.T133142A75872554. http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.20152.RLTS.T133142A75872554.en. Downloaded on 13 February 2019.
- Castro, P., 1978. Movements between coral colonies in *Trapezia ferruginea* (Crustacea: Brachyura),
   an obligate symbiont of scleractinian corals. Mar. Biol. 46:237-245.
- Chefaoui, R.M., Casado-Amezúa, P., Templado, J., 2017. Environmental drivers of distribution and
   reef development of the Mediterranean coral *Cladocora caespitosa*. Coral Reefs 36 4, 1195 1209.
- Cheminée, A., Merigot, B., Vanderklift, M., Francour, P., 2016. Does habitat complexity influence
   fish recruitment? Mediterr. Mar. Sci. 17/1:39-46.
- Chittaro, P.M., 2002. Species-area relationships for coral reef fish assemblages of St. Croix, US
   Virgin Islands. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 233:253–261.
- Coles, S., 1980. Species-diversity of Decapods associated with living and dead reef coral
   *Pocillopora-Meandrina*. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 2:281-291.
- Colwell, R.K., Coddington, J.A., 1994. Estimating terrestrial biodiversity through extrapolation.
   Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London 345(1311): 101-118
- 751 Connor, E., McCoy, E., 2001. Species-area relationships. Encyclopedia of biodiversity 5:397-411
- Dengler, J., 2009) Which Function Describes the Species: Area Relationship Best? A Review and
   Empirical Evaluation. J. Biogeogr. 36:728-744.
- Emslie, M.J., Cheal, A.J., MacNeil, M.A., Miller, I.R., Sweatman, H.P., 2018. Reef fish communities are spooked by scuba surveys and may take hours to recover. PeerJ, 6, e4886.

- Francé, J., Mozetič, P., 2006. Ecological characterization of toxic phytoplankton species
  (*Dinophysis* spp., Dinophyceae) in Slovenian mariculture areas (Gulf of Trieste, Adriatic
  Sea) and the implications for monitoring. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 52:1504-1516.
- Gage, J.D., Tyler, P.A., 1992. Deep-sea biology: a natural history of organisms at the deep-sea
   floor. Cambridge University Press, UK.
- Garcia, T.M., Cascon, H., Franklin-Junior, W., 2008. Macrofauna associated with branching fire
   coral. Thalassas 24:11-19.
- Giaccone, G., Alongi, G., Pizzuto, F., Cossu, A.V.L., 1994. La Vegetazione marina bentonica
  fotofila del Mediterraneo. 2. Infralitorale e Circalitorale: proposte di aggiornamento. Boll.
  Accademia Gioenia di scienze naturali Catania 27:111-157.
- 766 Gleason, H., 1922. On the relation between species and area. Ecology 3:158-162.
- Gotelli, N.J., Colwell, R.K., 2001. Quantifying biodiversity: procedures and pitfalls in the
   measurement and comparison of species richness. Ecol. Lett. 4:379-391.
- Gratwicke, B., Speight, M.R., 2005. Effects of habitat complexity on Caribbean marine fish
   assemblages. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 292:301-310.
- Guidetti, P., 2000. Differences among fish assemblages associated with nearshore *Posidonia oceanica* seagrass beds, rocky–algal reefs and unvegetated sand habitats in the Adriatic Sea.
   Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci. 50:515-529.
- Guilhaumon, F., Basset, A., Barbone, E., Mouillot, D., 2012. Species-area relationships as a tool for
   the conservation of benthic invertebrates in Italian coastal lagoons. Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.
   114:50-58.
- Harmelin, J., 1987. Structure et variabilité de l'ichtyofaune d'une zone rocheuse protégée en Méditerranée (Pare national de Port-Cros, France). Mar. Ecol. 8:263-284.
- Holt, R.D., Lawton, J.H., Polis, G.A., Martinez, N.D., 1999. Trophic rank and the species-area
   relationship. Ecology 80: 1495-1504.
- Karhan, S., Simboura, N., Salazar-Vallejo, S., 2012. *Flabelliderma cinari* (Polychaeta:
   Flabelligeridae), a new species from the Eastern Mediterranean. Mediterr. Mar. Sci. 13:175 178.
- Kersting, D., Linares, C., 2012. *Cladocora caespitosa* bioconstructions in the Columbretes Islands
   Marine Reserve (Spain, NW Mediterranean): distribution, size structure and growth. Mar.
   Ecol. 33 (4):427-436.
- Kersting, D.K., Cebrian, E., Casado, C., Teixidó, N., Garrabou, J., Linares, C., 2015. Experimental
  evidence of the synergistic effects of warming and invasive algae on a temperate reefbuilder coral. Scientific Reports 5:18635.
- Kersting, D., Cebrian, E., Verdura, J., Ballesteros, E., 2017. A new *Cladocora caespitosa* population with unique ecological traits. Mediterr. Mar. Sci. 18(1):38-42.
- Kersting, D.K., Bensoussan, N., Linares, C., 2013. Long-Term Responses of the Endemic Reef Builder *Cladocora caespitosa* to Mediterranean Warming PLoS ONE 8(8): e70820.
- Kersting, D.K., Teixidó, N., Linares, C., 2014. Recruitment and mortality of the temperate coral
   *Cladocora caespitosa*: implications for the recovery of endangered populations. Coral
   Reefs, 33(2), 403-407.
- Koukouras, A., Kuhlmann, D., Voultsiadou, E., Vafidis, D., Dounas, C., Chintiroglou, C.,
   Koutsoubas, D., 1998. The macrofaunal assemblage associated with the scleractinian coral
   *Cladocora caespitosa* (L.) in the Aegean Sea. Ann. Inst. Oceanogr. Paris 74, 97-114.
- Kružić, P., Lipej, L., Mavrič, B., Rodić, P., 2014. Impact of bleaching on the coral *Cladocora caespitosa* in the eastern Adriatic Sea. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 509:193-202.
- Kružić, P., Benković, L., 2008. Bioconstructional features of the coral *Cladocora caespitosa* (Anthozoa, Scleractinia) in the Adriatic Sea (Croatia). Mar. Ecol. 29:125-139.
- Kruskal, W., Wallis, W., 1952. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. J. Am. Stat. Assoc.
   47:583-621.
- La Mesa, G., Salvati, E., Agnesi, S., Tunesi, L., 2017. Assessment of coastal fish assemblages

- before the establishment of a new marine protected area in central Mediterranean: its role in
  formulating zoning proposal. Medit. Mar. Sci., 18(1), 11-21.
- Levin, P.S., Kaplan, I., Grober-Dunsmore, R., Chittaro, P.M., Oyamada, S., Andrews, K., Mangel,
   M., 2009. A Framework for Assessing the Biodiversity and Fishery Aspects of Marine
   Reserves. J. Appl. Ecol. 46:735-742.
- Lipej, L., Acevedo, I., Fernández-Álvarez, F.Á., Rodriguez-Flores, P.C., et al. 2017. New
  Mediterranean Biodiversity Records (March 2017). Mediterr. Mar. Sci. 18(1):179-201.
- Lipej, L., Bonaca, M., Sisko, M., 2003. Coastal fish diversity in three marine protected areas and
   one unprotected area in the Gulf of Trieste (Northern Adriatic). Mar. Ecol. 24:259-273.
- Lipej, L., Orlando-Bonaca, M., 2006. Assessing blennioid fish populations in the shallow Gulf of
   Trieste: a comparison of four in situ methods. Period. Biol. 108:151-157.
- Lipej, L., Dulčić, J., 2010. Checklist of the Adriatic Sea Fishes. Zootaxa 2589:1-92.
- Lipej, L., Orlando-Bonaca, M., Mavrič, B., 2016. Biogenic Formations in the Slovenian Sea.
  National Institute of Biology, Marine Biology Station, Piran, Slovenia, 204 pp.
- Lipej, L., Orlando-Bonaca, M., Ozebek, B., Dulčić, J., 2009. Nest characteristics of three labrid
   species in the Gulf of Trieste (northern Adriatic Sea). Acta Adriat. 50:139-150.
- Lipej, L., Orlando-Bonaca, M., Richter, M., 2005. New contributions to the marine coastal fish
   fauna of Slovenia. Annales Ser. Hist. Nat. 15:165-172.
- Lumare, F., 1965. Sulla scogliera a *Cladocora* di Crotone e le sue biocenosi. Rend. Accad. Naz. XL
  Serie 4,16-17:101-131.
- MacArthur, R.H., 1972. Geographical ecology: patterns in the distribution of species Princeton
   University Press. 288 pp.
- MacArthur, R.H., Wilson, E.O., 1963. An equilibrium theory of insular zoogeography. Evolution
   17:373-387.
- Macpherson, E., 1994. Substrate utilization in a Mediterranean littoral fish community. Mar. Ecol.
   Prog. Ser. 114:211-218.
- Mann, H.B., Whitney, D.R., 1947. On a test whether one of two random variables is stochastically
  larger than the other. Ann. Math. Statist. 18:50-60.
- Marčeta, B., 1999. Biodiversity and Conservation of the Slovenian Coastal Sea at the Threshold of
   the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Forte J, Lipej L (Eds) National Institute of Biology Ljubljana, Marine
   Biology Station, Piran, pp. 53-63 (in Slovenian).
- McCloskey, L., 1970. The dynamics of the community associated with a marine scleractinian coral.
   Internationale Int. Rev. gesamten Hydrobiol. Hydrogr. 55:13-81.
- McGuinness, K.A., 1984. Species-area relations of communities on intertidal boulders: testing the
   null hypothesis. J. Biogeogr. 11:439-456.
- Mozetič, P., Umani, S.F., Cataletto, B., Malej, A., 1998. Seasonal and inter-annual plankton
  variability in the Gulf of Trieste (northern Adriatic). ICES J. Mar. Sci. 55:711-722.
- Mozetič, P., Malačič, V., Turk, V., 2008. A case study of sewage discharge in the shallow coastal
  area of the Adriatic Sea (Gulf of Trieste). Mar. Ecol. 29 (4):483-494.
- Neigel, J.E., 2003. Species-Area Relationships and Marine Conservation. Ecol. Appl. 13:S138 S145.
- Nieder, J., La Mesa, G., Vacchi, M., 2000. Blenniidae along the Italian coasts of the Ligurian and
   the Tyrrhenian Sea: Community structure and new records of *Scartella cristata* for northern
   Italy. Cybium 24:359-369.
- Ogorelec, B., Mišič, M., Faganeli, J., 1991. Marine geology of the Gulf of Trieste (Northern Adriatic): Sedimentodological aspects. Mar. Geol. 99:79–92.
- Ogorelec, B., Faganeli, J., Mišič, M., Čermelj, B., 1997. Reconstruction of paleoenvironment in the
  bay of Koper (Gulf of Trieste, Northern Adriatic). Annales Ser. Hist. Nat. 11:187-200.
- Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., Minchin, P.R., O'Hara, R.B., Simpson, G.L.,
   Solymos, P., Stevens, M.H.H., Wagner, H., 2015. vegan: Community Ecology Package. R
- 857 Package Version 2.2-0. http://CRAN.Rproject.org/package=vegan

- Orlando-Bonaca, M., Lipej, L., 2005. Factors affecting habitat occupancy of fish assemblage in the
   Gulf of Trieste (Northern Adriatic Sea). Mar. Ecol. 26:42-53.
- Orlando-Bonaca, M., Lipej, L., 2007. Microhabitat preferences and depth distribution of combtooth
   blennies (Blenniidae) in the Gulf of Trieste (North Adriatic Sea). Mar. Ecol. 28:418-428.
- Orlando-Bonaca, M., Turk, R., Ozebek, B., Lipej, L., 2008. Evaluation of the association with
   *Cystoseira* in the Strunjan Nature Reserve using the fish fauna as indicator. Varstvo narave
   21:61-72.
- Pais, A., Azzurro, E., Guidetti, P., 2007. Spatial variability of fish fauna in sheltered and exposed
  shallow rocky reefs from a recently established Mediterranean Marine Protected Area. Ital.
  J. Zool. 74:277-287.
- Peirano, A., Morri, C., Bianchi, C., Rodolfo-Metalpa, R., 2001. Biomass, carbonate standing stock
  and production of the mediterranean coral *Cladocora caespitosa* (L.). Facies 44:75-80.
- Peirano, A., Morri, C., Mastronuzzi, G., Bianchi, C., 1994. The coral *Cladocora caespitosa* (Anthozoa, Scleractinia) as a bioherm builder in the Mediterranean Sea. Mem. Descr. Carta Geol. d'It. 52:59-74.
- Pérès, J., Picard, J., 1964. Nouveau manuel de bionomie benthique de la Mer Méditerranée. Rec.
  Trav. St. Mar. Endoume 31(47):1-137.
- Pitacco, V., Crocetta, F., Orlando-Bonaca, M., Mavrič, B., Lipej, L., 2017. The Mediterranean
  stony coral *Cladocora caespitosa* (Linnaeus, 1767) as habitat provider for molluscs: colony
  size effect. J. Sea Res., 129:1-11.
- Pitacco, V., Orlando-Bonaca, M., Mavrič, B., Lipej, L., 2014. Macrofauna associated with a bank of
   *Cladocora caespitosa* (Anthozoa, Scleractinia) in the Gulf of Trieste (North Adriatic).
   Annales Ser. Hist. Nat. 24(1):1-14.
- Preston, F.W., 1960. Time and Space and the Variation of Species. Ecology 41:612-627.
- R Core Team, 2015. Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, R Foundation for
   Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Available online at https://www.R-project.org/.
- Reed, J., Mikkelsen, P., 1987. The molluscan community associated with the scleractinian coral
   *Oculina varicosa*. Bull. Mar. Sci. 40:99-131.
- Reichert, K., Ugland, K.I., Bartsch, I., Hortal, J., Bremner, J., Kraberg, A., 2010. Species richness
  estimation: Estimator performance and the influence of rare species. Limnol. Oceanogr.
  Methods 8: 294-303.
- Rodolfo-Metalpa, R, Bianchi, C, Peirano, A, Morri, C, 2005. Tissue necrosis and mortality of the
   temperate coral *Cladocora caespitosa*. Ital. J. Zool. 72:271-276.
- Rosenzweig, M., 1995. Species diversity in space and time. Cambridge University Press. 460 pp.
- Sabetta, L., Barbone, E., Giardino, A., Galuppo, N., Basset, A., 2007. Species–area patterns of
   benthic macro-invertebrates in Italian lagoons. Hydrobiologia 577: 127-139.
- 894 Sarkar, D., 2008. Lattice: Multivariate Data Visualization with R, New York, Springer. 268 pp.
- Schiller, C., 1993. Ecology of the symbiotic coral *Cladocora caespitosa* (L.) (Faviidae,
  Scleractinia) in the Bay of Piran (Adriatic Sea): I. Distribution and biometry, II. Energy
  Budget. Mar. Ecol. 14(3):205-219.
- Schipper, J., Chanson, J.S., Chiozza, F., et al., 2008. The status of the world's land and marine
   mammals: diversity, threat, and knowledge. Science 322:225–230.
- Sciscioli, M., Nuzzaci, G., 1970. Anellidi Policheti associati a *Cladocora caespitosa* (L.) del litorale
   pugliese. Atti Soc. peloritana 16:151-157.
- Smith, F., Witman, J.D., 1999. Species diversity in subtidal landscapes: maintenance by physical
   processes and larval recruitment. Ecology 80 (1):51-69.
- Spearman, C., 1907. Demonstration of Formulae for True Measurement of Correlation. Am. J.
   Psychol. 18 (2):161-169.
- Sswat, M., Gulliksen, B., Menn, I., Sweetman, A.K., Piepenburg, D., 2015. Distribution and composition of the epibenthic megafauna north of Svalbard (Arctic). Polar Biol. 38(6), 861877.

- Stella, J.S., Pratchett, M.S., Hutchings, P.A., Jones, G.P., 2011. Coral-associated invertebrates:
   diversity, ecology importance and vulnerability to disturbance. Oceanogr. Mar. Biol. 49:43 104.
- 912 Trygonis, V., Sini, M., 2012. photoQuad: a dedicated seabed image processing software, and a
  913 comparative error analysis of four photoquadrat methods. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 424:99914 108.
- 915 Turk, R., Lipej, L., 2002. The proposal of the checklist of endangered marine vertebrates and
  916 invertebrates on the basis of the old IUCN categories and the identification of the most
  917 common factors causing vulnerability. Reports MBS 32:1-17 (In Slovenian).
- Ulrich, W., 2005. Predicting species numbers using species-area and endemics-area relations.
   Biodivers. Conserv. 14:3351-3362.
- Veech, J., 2000. A null model for detecting non random patterns of species richness along spatial
   gradients. Ecology 81:1143-1149.
- Witman, J.D., 1985. Refuges, biological disturbance, and rocky subtidal community structure in
   New England. Ecol. Monogr. 55:421-445.
- Yesson, C., Fisher, J., Gorham, T., Turner, C.J., Hammeken Arboe, N., Blicher, M.E., Kemp, K.M.,
  2016. The impact of trawling on the epibenthic megafauna of the west Greenland shelf.
  ICES J. Mar. Sci. 74(3), 866-876.
- 227 Zavodnik, D., 1976. Adriatic echinoderms inhabiting benthic organisms. Thalassia jugoslavica
   228 12:375-380.
- Zibrowius, H., 1980. Les Scléractiniares de la Méditerranée et de l'Atlantique nord-oriental.
  Mémoires de l'Institut océanographique 11: 284pp.
- Zunino, S., Pitacco, V., Mavrič, B., Orlando-Bonaca, M., Kružić, P., Lipej, L., 2018. The ecology
  of the Mediterranean stony coral *Cladocora caespitosa* (Linnaeus, 1767) in the Gulf of
  Trieste (northern Adriatic Sea): a 30-year long story. Mar Biol Res 14(3):307-320.
- Zuur, A., Ieno, E.N., Smith, G.M., 2007. Analysing ecological data. Springer Science and Business
   Media. 672pp.
- 936

#### Highlights

- Cladocora caespitosa is an important habitat builder
- Quantification of its importance varied according to investigation scale, method and target
- Colony size: good predictor of associated taxa richness with Arrhenius model
- Sampled area: good predictor for fish and epibenthic megafauna richness
- Epibenthic megafauna and fish richness is no related with colony density or coverage

A CERTINA