## EFFECTS OF OCEAN ACIDIFICATION ON PREDATOR-PREY INTERACTIONS IN ECHINODERMS

by

Megan Lillian Hatfield Vaughan

Hon. B.Sc., Dalhousie University, 2011

#### A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

#### MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

The Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

(Zoology)

#### THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

(Vancouver)

April 2015

© Megan Lillian Hatfield Vaughan, 2015

#### Abstract

The need to understand future changes in marine ecosystems has become critically important as increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) drives rapid ocean acidification (OA). OA may improve or reduce the performance of marine species, and the relative impacts on interacting species will largely determine changes at the community level. The goal of this thesis was to determine the effects of acidification on predator-prey interactions between red sea urchins (Strongylocentrotus franciscanus) and sunflower stars (Pycnopodia helianthoides), a key predator-prey pair in Northeast Pacific kelp forest ecosystems. I tested this question using laboratory mesocosm experiments. Sea urchins were acclimated to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 7.7) conditions, with or without a caged sea star, for 22 weeks in a recirculating seawater system. In Chapter 2, I investigated the effects of OA on the growth, calcification, and feeding rate of P. helianthoides. High CO<sub>2</sub> had a significant positive effect on sea star growth, but no effect on calcified tissue mass. In addition, the consumption rate of turban snails (Chlorostoma funebralis) by sea stars was significantly higher in the high CO<sub>2</sub> treatment. In Chapter 3, I examined the effects of OA on the responses of S. franciscanus to sea star cues. Predator presence and high CO<sub>2</sub> negatively and additively affected sea urchin growth rates, but did not affect alarm responses to predator cues. Significantly higher grazing rates on kelp (Macrocystis pyrifera) were also observed in the presence of predators. Predators, but not CO<sub>2</sub>, had a significant negative effect on urchin calcified mass. Urchin spine length was also significantly reduced under acidified conditions. Overall, these findings suggest P. helianthoides responds positively to ocean acidification, but S. franciscanus may suffer reduced fitness at seawater  $pCO_2$  levels predicted for the end of the century. Differential effects

of ocean acidification on this predator-prey pair could increase the strength of the trophic interaction and lead to stronger top-down control in the future.

## Preface

Chapters 2 and 3 were conceived by myself in collaboration with Chris Harley. I collected and analyzed the data, and wrote the manuscripts. Chris Harley contributed to interpreting the results and edited the manuscripts. Renee Bechmann at the International Research Institute of Stavanger also contributed to experimental design.

# **Table of Contents**

Abstractii
Prefaceiv
Table of Contents v
List of Tables viii
List of Figuresix
List of Symbols and Abbreviations xi
Acknowledgements xii
Dedication xiv
Chapter 1: Introduction 1
1.1 Ocean Acidification and the Marine Carbonate System
1.2 Effects on Marine Organisms and Implications for Species Interactions
1.2.1 Effects of OA on calcification
1.2.2 Effects of OA on growth
1.2.3 Effects of OA on olfaction
1.3 Thesis Overview and Objectives
1.3.1 Study species
1.3.2 Research questions
Chapter 2: Effects of Ocean Acidification on the Growth, Feeding Rate, and
Calcification of <i>Pycnopodia helianthiodes</i> 11
2.1 Introduction
2.2 Methods
2.2.1 Collection site and experimental set-up

2.2.2 Manipulation and measurement of seawater chemistry
2.2.3 Measurement of sea star growth, calcification, and feeding rate
2.2.4 Statistical analysis
2.3 Results
2.4 Discussion
Chapter 3: Nonconsumptive Effects of a Predatory Sea Star on Red Sea Urchins
(Strongylocentrotus franciscanus) under Acidified Conditions
3.1 Introduction
3.2 Methods
3.2.1 Collection site and experimental set-up
3.2.2 Measurement of sea urchin growth and grazing rate
3.2.3 Measurement of sea urchin alarm response to predator cues
3.2.4 Measurement of sea urchin calcified tissue
3.2.5 Statistical analysis
3.3 Results
3.4 Discussion
Chapter 4: Conclusion
4.1 Summary of Results
4.2 Effects of OA on Predator-Prey Interactions
4.3 Study Limitations
4.4 Recommendations for Future Research
Bibliography 46
Appendices

A.	Seawater Chemistry	55
B.	Chapter 2 Supplementary Figures	60
C.	Chapter 3 Supplementary Figures	63

## **List of Tables**

**2-1.** Cox Proportional Hazards analysis testing the effect of  $CO_2$  treatment (control/high) on the survival of turban snails (*Chlorostoma funebralis*) fed to sunflower stars (*Pycnopodia helianthoides*). Sea star size (diameter) was included as a covariate. The significance of a covariate was tested by comparing the log likelihood of a submodel (excluding the covariate) to the log likelihood of the full model. (\*) indicates a significant effect.

**3-1.** Linear mixed effects models testing the effect of  $CO_2$  treatment (control/high) and predator treatment (absent/present) on A) log final test diameter, B) log calcified mass, C) log spine and jaw mass, and D) mean spine length of red sea urchins (*Stronglyocentrotus franciscanus*). Urchin size (test diameter) is included as a covariate. (\*) = significant effect

**3-2.** Mixed effects logistic regression testing the effect of cue type (seawater sham or predator),  $CO_2$  treatment (control/high), and predator treatment to which the urchins were acclimated (absent/present) on red sea urchin (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*) alarm response. (\*) indicates a significant effect.

## **List of Figures**

**2-1.** Effect of CO<sub>2</sub> manipulation on A) mean diameter (cm) and B) mean relative growth (percent change from initial diameter) of *Pycnopodia helianthoides*. Animals were exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm, pH \sim 8.0; n=6$ ) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm, pH \sim 7.7; n=5$ ) conditions for 22 weeks. Error bars represent 1 standard error (SE) of the mean. The effect of CO<sub>2</sub> was statistically significant (see text for details).

**2-2.** Effect of  $CO_2$  manipulation on A) dry mass (as a percentage of final wet mass) and B) calcified mass (as a percentage of total dry mass) for *Pycnopodia helianthoides* (control: n=6; high: n=5). Error bars represent 1 standard error (SE) of the mean. Neither comparison was statistically significant (see text for details).

**2-3.** Survival curves of turban snails (*Chlorostoma funebralis*; n=55) fed to *Pycnopodia helianthoides* (control: n=6; high: n=5) under ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 7.7) conditions. Error bars represent 1 standard error (SE) of the mean. The effect of CO<sub>2</sub> was marginally non-significant (p = 0.055; see Table 2-1 for details).

**3-1.** Schematic showing A) top and B) three-quarter side views of the Plexiglas experimental arena used for measuring the alarm response of red sea urchins (*Stronglyocentrotus franciscanus*) to waterborne chemical stimuli from a predator.

**3-2.** Effect of CO<sub>2</sub> and predator presence on A) test diameter (mm) over time and B) mean relative growth (percent change from initial diameter) for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus;* N=66). Urchins were exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm, pH \sim 8.0$ ) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm, pH \sim 7.7$ ) conditions for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia helianthoides*). Error bars represent 1 standard error of the mean. The effect was statistically significant for both treatments (see Table 3-1 for details).

**3-3.** Mean kelp eaten per gram urchin for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus;* N=66) exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 7.7) conditions for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia helianthoides*). Error bars represent 1 standard error of the mean. The effect of predator presence, but not CO<sub>2</sub>, was statistically significant (see text for details).

**3-4.** Effect of  $CO_2$  and predator presence on A) total calcified mass (as a percentage of total wet mass) and B) spine and jaw calcified mass (as a percentage of total wet mass) for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus;* N=66) after 22 weeks. Error bars represent 1 standard error of the mean. The effect of predator presence, but not  $CO_2$ , was statistically significant (see Table 3-1 for details).

**3-5.** Mean size-corrected spine length for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus;* N=66) exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 7.7) conditions for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia* 

*helianthoides*). Error bars represent 1 standard error of the mean. The effect of  $CO_2$ , but not predator presence, was statistically significant (see Table 3-1 for details).

**3-6.** Percent avoidance response to seawater and predator chemical cues for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*; N=66) exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 7.7) for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia helianthoides*). Error bars represent 1 standard error of the proportion. There was no effect of either treatment (i.e., acclimation condition) on urchin behaviour, but the effect of cue type was statistically significant (see Table 3-2 for details).

**4-1.** Conceptual diagram of the direct (solid lines) and indirect (dashed line) pathways through which ocean acidification (OA) may affect predator-prey interactions between sunflower stars (*Pycnopodia helianthoides*) and red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*). Nonconsumptive predator effects are indicated by the curved arrow. Circles indicate positive (+), negative (-), or neutral (/) effects. Image credit: Saxby (2005)

# List of Symbols and Abbreviations

~	approximately
[]	concentration
°C	degree Celsius
CaCO <sub>3</sub>	calcium carbonate
cm	centimetre
$CO_2$	carbon dioxide
CO <sub>2[aq]</sub>	aqueous carbon dioxide
$CO_{3}^{2}$	carbonate ion
DIC	dissolved inorganic carbon
HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	bicarbonate ion
$K^*_{sp}$	stoichiometric solubility constant
L	litre
mm	millimetre
OA	ocean acidification
Ω	saturation state
$pCO_2$	partial pressure of carbon dioxide
ppm	parts per million
ppt	parts per thousand
SE	standard error
µatm	microatmosphere

## Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Chris Harley. Chris has been an outstanding advisor and mentor. His enthusiasm for scientific research continues to inspire me and I am immensely grateful for his support and guidance. I would also like to thank my committee members, Mary O'Connor and Colin Brauner, for their thoughtful advice and feedback throughout my degree.

I extend many thanks to the current and former members of the Harley lab who have been incredibly welcoming, supportive, and helpful. In particular, I would like to thank Jessica Shultz, my courageous and dedicated research assistant. Special thanks to Norah Brown for looking after my experiment and providing feedback on manuscripts. Also, thank you to Laura Tremblay-Boyer, Katie Marshall, and Kyle Demes for guidance on statistical analyses.

Field collections would not have been possible without the assistance of Bamfield Marine Science Centre staff. I would especially like to thank Siobahn Gray, Ross Whippo, and Kathryn Anderson for dive support. As well, a big thank you to Julia Lawson for helping me search for sea stars. I am also extremely grateful to my numerous undergraduate volunteers: Austin Ward, Julia Shubert, Queenie Hui, Cody Carlyle, and Jaime Grimm. They spent many long hours helping me in the lab.

Many well-deserved thanks to the Zoology shop staff. Bruce Gillespie, Vince Grant and Pak Chan provided much needed assistance with lab equipment construction and maintenance. I also

xii

extend my appreciation to our wonderful graduate secretary, Alice Liou, and our resident tech guru, Andy LeBlanc.

Finally, a huge and heart-felt thank you to my friends and family. This thesis would not have become a reality without their continued love and support.

My research was partially funded by the Norwegian Research Council and the University of British Columbia.

## Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to my family: Charlotte, Matthew, Judy, and Carri

#### **Chapter 1**

## Introduction

Increasing carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions from human activities, such as deforestation and the burning of fossil fuels, poses a serious threat to biodiversity worldwide (IPCC, 2013). Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations have recently surpassed 400 parts per million (ppm), an increase of more than 100 ppm from pre-industrial levels (Tans and Keeling, 2014; Tyrell, 2007). Although CO<sub>2</sub> levels naturally oscillate between glacial and interglacial periods, the current rate of increase is unprecedented in the fossil record (Caldeira and Wickett, 2003; Pelejero *et al.*, 2010). Emission scenarios from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) predict that, without considerable mitigation, atmospheric concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> will reach 1000 ppm by the end of the century (IPCC, 2013). This pervasive environmental change may have far-reaching and unexpected consequences for marine ecosystems. Approximately one-third of the CO<sub>2</sub> emitted from anthropogenic sources has been absorbed by the ocean (Sabine *et al.*, 2004), which is driving rapid ocean acidification (OA).

#### **1.1** Ocean Acidification and the Marine Carbonate System

The ocean is an important sink for anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub>, accounting for an estimated 30% of fossil-fuel emissions over the past two centuries (Sabine *et al.*, 2004). Carbon fixation and transport from surface waters to the deep ocean is facilitated by marine phytoplankton, which convert dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) to organic carbon through the process of biogenic calcification (Raven *et al.*, 2005). The remains of dead phytoplankton fall through the water column and dissolve or are deposited in marine sediments (Feely *et al.*, 2004). Removal of carbon from surface waters *via* this 'biological pump' is arguably the most significant way in

which anthropogenic  $CO_2$  is naturally sequestered from the atmosphere. However, atmospheric  $CO_2$  is rising faster than the carbon pump can remove it, resulting in a build-up of  $CO_2$  in both the atmosphere and the ocean (Raven *et al.*, 2005).

The accumulation of CO<sub>2</sub> in the ocean is causing a reduction in seawater pH and calcium carbonate (CaCO<sub>3</sub>) saturation state (Orr *et al.*, 2005). Since the start of the industrial revolution, global ocean pH has decreased by 0.1 units, which amounts to an increase in acidity of approximately 30% (IPCC, 2013). Under the worst case climate change scenario from the IPCC, Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 8.5, it is predicted that seawater pH will decrease an additional 0.3-0.5 units by 2100 (IPCC, 2013). When CO<sub>2</sub> dissolves in seawater, it produces carbonic acid (H<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>), which rapidly dissociates into hydrogen ions (H<sup>+</sup>) and bicarbonate (HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>). The ocean has a natural carbonate buffer system, where additional H<sup>+</sup> produced from CO<sub>2</sub> dissolution react with carbonate ions (CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2</sup><sup>-</sup>) to form HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> (Raven *et al.*, 2005). As a result, an increase in the concentration of aqueous CO<sub>2</sub> [CO<sub>2(aq)</sub>] leads to a simultaneous decrease in CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup> concentration *via* the following reaction:

$$CO_2 + CO_3^{2-} + H_2O \leftrightarrow 2HCO_3^{-}$$

Decreased availability of  $CO_3^{2-}$  may impair the ability of shell-forming organisms to build calcium carbonate structures and also increase the rate of dissolution (Orr *et al.*, 2005).

The rates of calcification and dissolution in seawater are functions of the saturation state  $(\Omega)$  of calcium carbonate (Feely *et al.*, 2004). The most commonly occurring forms of marine carbonates include calcite (e.g., coccolithophores and foraminifera), aragonite (e.g., corals and pteropod molluscs), and high-magnesium calcite (e.g., echinoderms and coralline algae) (Doney

*et al.*, 2009). Calcium carbonate saturation state ( $\Omega_{CaCO3}$ ) is estimated by the product of calcium and carbonate ion concentrations divided by the stoichiometric solubility constant ( $K^*_{sp}$ ), at a given temperature, pressure, and salinity (Feely *et al.*, 2004). The rate of dissolution will increase as a function of decreasing CaCO<sub>3</sub> saturation.

$$\Omega_{CaCO_3} = \frac{[Ca^{2+}][CO_3^{2-}]}{K^*_{sp}}$$

Although the ocean is typically supersaturated ( $\Omega > 1$ ) with respect to CaCO<sub>3</sub>, the degree of supersaturation has a direct effect on calcification rate (Kleypas *et al.*, 1999). Depending on the type of calcium carbonate used, important groups of calcifiers, such as phytoplankton and echinoderms, may be particularly vulnerable to the effects of OA as the solubility of aragonite and high-magnesium calcite is nearly double that of calcite in seawater (Mucci, 1983). Declining saturation states may lead not only to reduced calcification rates, but may also cause a shift in competitive dominance toward calcite secretors and non-calcifiers (Smith and Buddemeier, 1992; Connell *et al.*, 2013; Wootton *et al.*, 2008).

Saturation states and pH of the surface ocean vary both spatially and temporally, and are regulated by several biological and physiochemical factors (Raven *et al.*, 2005). The two primary drivers of spatial variation are sea surface temperature and the degree of upwelling. The solubility of CO<sub>2</sub> decreases with temperature and increases with pressure, so deep and high-latitude waters are typically less saturated with calcium carbonate compared to shallow, tropical waters (Feely *et al.*, 2004). Respiration and decomposition of organic matter by organisms below the photic zone can also cause accumulation of DIC and a reduction in pH at depth. In coastal upwelling zones, such as the northeastern Pacific, these corrosive waters are pushed onto the

continental shelf and can cause undersaturation of aragonite in the surface ocean (Feely *et al.*, 2008). The Indian and Pacific Ocean basins are particularly rich in  $CO_2$  due to longer deep-water circulation pathways (Broecker, 2003), resulting in shallower CaCO<sub>3</sub> saturation horizons compared to the Atlantic Ocean. Furthermore, seasonal changes in temperature, productivity, and ocean mixing can also drive temporal variability in the concentration of  $CO_2$  (Bates *et al.*, 1996).

#### **1.2** Effects on Marine Organisms and Implications for Species Interactions

OA can negatively impact a wide range of physiological processes in marine organisms, such as calcification (Ries *et al.*, 2009), metabolism (Portner, 2008), acid-base regulation (Fabry *et al.*, 2008), and neurotransmitter functioning (Nilsson *et al.*, 2012). These mechanisms may underlie a variety of the responses observed under high CO<sub>2</sub> conditions, such as reduced growth and survival (Kroeker *et al.*, 2013a), delayed development (Kurihara, 2008), impaired olfactory cue detection (Leduc *et al.*, 2013), and reduced fertilization success (Havenhand *et al.*, 2008; Parker *et al.*, 2009). However, organismal responses to acidification are varied (Ries *et al.*, 2009), and fitness may be improved or reduced depending on species, population, and life stage (Kroeker *et al.*, 2013a; Parker *et al.*, 2011; Byrne, 2011).

The various pathways by which OA directly impacts marine organisms will likely prompt changes at the community level by altering species interactions. Gaylord *et al.* (2015) identify biotic interactions as a key "pressure point" by which OA may drive ecological change. However, a lack of experimental research testing the effects on species relationships presents a considerable barrier for predicting the potential consequences of rising ocean acidity. Understanding the effects of OA on species interactions may be particularly important in the context of consumer-resource relationships. Changes in predator-prey interactions, for example, could cascade through communities, altering the structure and stability of marine food webs. In the following sections, I address a number of mechanisms by which ocean acidification may modify biotic interactions, and thus govern changes in marine ecosystems.

#### **1.2.1 Effects of OA on calcification**

Decreased rates of calcification in response to a reduction in seawater  $[CO_3^{2-}]$  have now been documented across a broad range of key taxonomic groups (Kroeker et al., 2013a). However, the magnitude of effect varies among taxa, and OA may actually lead to increased calcification in some species (Ries et al., 2009; Findlay et al., 2011). Kroeker et al. (2013) show mean reductions in calcification are greatest in corals, molluscs, and coccolithophores (22-39%), but the responses of echinoderms and crustaceans are largely neutral. Ries et al. (2009) identify a number of mechanisms that may drive this variation in sensitivity to OA. First, calcifying organisms that are able to maintain elevated pH at the site of calcification are typically less negatively affected. In addition, the external layer of organic tissue produced by most calcifiers to protect their shell or skeleton from the surrounding seawater varies considerably in structure, composition, and extent of coverage among species. The solubility of the calcium carbonate mineral (i.e., calcite, aragonite, or high-Mg calcite) used by an organism is also an important driver of variation in sensitivity to OA. Finally, increasing  $pCO_2$  may act as a fertilizer for photosynthesis, increasing the amount of energy available for calcification in some marine algae (Ries et al., 2009).

Reduced calcification or dissolution in response to OA has been shown to decrease the strength and thickness of skeletal tissue (e.g., Holtmann *et al.*, 2013; Melatunan *et al.*, 2013; Gaylord *et al.*, 2011). As the shells and skeletons of marine invertebrates are often important for

protection and defense (e.g., sea urchin spines and pedicellariae; Moitoza and Phillips, 1979), changes in their mechanical integrity will likely impact species interactions. For example, acidification may disrupt the expression of inducible defenses – "phenotypically plastic traits that increase resistance to predators or competitors" (Leonard *et al.*, 1999) – such as shell thickening in response to a predator (Bibby *et al.*, 2007). Reduced morphological defense under acidified conditions could make some calcifying organisms more vulnerable to predators and weaker competitors, although changes in species interactions will likely be highly case-specific. For instance, the intertidal snail *Littorina littorea* is able to compensate for a thinner shell by increasing predator avoidance behaviour (Bibby *et al.*, 2007).

#### **1.2.2** Effects of OA on growth

An increasing number of studies show that ocean acidification leads to a reduction in organismal growth rates, particularly among the more heavily calcified taxa such as corals, molluscs, and echinoderms (Kroeker *et al.*, 2013a). Decreased growth rates likely reflect elevated energetic demands associated with the increased cost of calcification and acid-base regulation (Dupont and Thorndyke, 2014). Conversely, the growth rates of non-calcified groups such as seagrasses and fleshy macroalgae, as well as some modestly calcified species (e.g. sea stars), have been shown to respond positively to high  $CO_2$  exposure (Zimmerman *et al.*, 1997; Koch *et al.*, 2013; Gooding *et al.*, 2009; Dupont *et al.*, 2010b). This variation in performance under high  $CO_2$  may lead to shifts in competitive dominance away from some calcified taxa (e.g. mussels and corallines) towards noncalcareous species (Wootton *et al.*, 2008). In addition, Connell *et al.*, (2013) predict  $CO_2$  enrichment may drive dominance shifts among algal competitors, such as kelp and turf algae. Finally, increased growth rates of predators (e.g., sea

stars) in combination with decreased body size of prey (e.g., calcified herbivores) could result in higher *per capita* predation rates under future ocean conditions (Sanford *et al.*, 2014; Gooding *et al.*, 2009).

#### 1.2.3 Effects of OA on olfaction

Chemical cues play a critical role in both intra- and interspecific communication in aquatic ecosystems, mediating behaviours such as foraging, reproduction, and predator avoidance (Brönmark and Hansson, 2000). Olfactory communication between predators and prey is particularly well studied and can strongly influence predator-prey interactions. Exposure to predator cues can invoke strong morphological and/or behavioural responses in prey (i.e., induced defenses), which serve to reduce vulnerability to predation (Brönmark and Hansson, 2000). Prey detect and assess predation risk *via* a variety of chemical stimuli: (1) predator-specific odours called kairomones, (2) disturbance cues, released from startled prey, (3) damage cues, released from injured conspecifics, and (4) dietary cues, released post-ingestion from predators feeding on conspecifics (Ferrari *et al.*, 2010). Given the importance of chemosensory cues for organism fitness, disruption of olfactory cue detection is likely an important mechanism by which OA could impact marine communities (Leduc *et al.*, 2013; Brönmark and Hansson, 2000).

The majority of research investigating the effects of acidification on olfactory-mediated behaviour has focused on fish (Leduc *et al.*, 2013). For example, a number of studies on larval clownfish (*Amphiprion percula*) show OA impairs detection of olfactory cues from adult habitats (Munday *et al.*, 2009) and predators (Dixson *et al.*, 2010). Chemosensory and cognitive impairment in clownfish exposed to high CO<sub>2</sub> may be a result of interference with neurotransmitter functioning (Nilsson *et al.*, 2012). Research on invertebrates is considerably more limited, but a handful of studies show OA disrupts the detection of food odours in hermit crabs (De la Haye *et al.*, 2012) and also alters behavioural responses to predator cues in muricid snails (Manriquez *et al.*, 2013, Manriquez *et al.*, 2014) and conch snails (Watson *et al.*, 2014). Impaired predator cue detection and response behaviour could lead to increased prey mortality in the future (Nilsson *et al.*, 2012). The effect of OA on predator olfaction is poorly understood, but could lead to decreased feeding activity and prey capture success (Cripps *et al.*, 2011; Allan *et al.*, 2013). Changes in predator-prey interactions under future CO<sub>2</sub> conditions will likely depend on the degree to which both species are affected.

#### **1.3** Thesis Overview and Objectives

As I have described above, organismal responses to ocean acidification are highly varied and often species-specific. This diversity of responses will almost certainly lead to changes in species interactions, and thus govern the larger-scale impacts of OA. However, our understanding of the indirect effects of acidification *via* altered species interactions is very limited. Therefore, predicting the ecosystem-level consequences of environmental change poses a complex challenge to the field of ocean acidification research. In this thesis, I begin to address this question by empirically testing the effects of OA on a key predator-prey pair in British Columbia kelp-forest ecosystems: the red sea urchin (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*) and the sunflower star (*Pycnopodia helianthoides*).

#### **1.3.1** Study Species

Red sea urchins and sunflower stars are common to nearshore benthic habitats from Alaska to Baja, California (Shivji *et al.*, 1983; DFO, 2012). *P. helianthoides* is a voracious predator and scavenger, consuming a wide variety of prey species including mussels, clams, abalone, crabs, sea urchins, and other echinoderms (Shivji *et al.*, 1983; Lambert, 2000). One of the largest and fastest sea stars in the world, it can grow up to 90 cm in diameter and weigh approximately 5 kg (Lambert, 2000). *S. franciscanus* is the largest of five sea urchin species in British Columbia, growing up to 18 cm test diameter (DFO, 2012). It can occur at extremely high densities and consume vast quantities of macroalgae, forming areas known as urchin barrens (Dayton, 1985). *S. franciscanus* is also fished commercially in BC, although landings have been steadily declining since the mid-1990s (DFO, 2012).

Predation by *P. helianthoides* on *S. franciscanus* can play an important role in structuring kelp-dominated communities of the Northeast Pacific. *P. helianthoides* can facilitate algal recruitment by clearing large areas of urchins, which ultimately impacts species richness and primary productivity (Duggins, 1983). In addition, *P. helianthoides* predation can impact red urchin population structure. Tegner and Dayton (1981) found that the size-frequency distributions of *S. franciscanus* populations in southern California are bimodal in the presence of *P. helianthoides*. They suggest *P. helianthoides* preferentially feed on intermediate size classes (5-8 cm test diameter) of red urchins and hypothesize that small juveniles (< 4 cm) are protected by the spine canopies of adults, whereas large adults (> 9 cm) reach a size refuge. Given this size-specific predation by *P. helianthoides*, I used intermediate sized red urchins in this study.

#### **1.3.2** Research questions

The broad research question I ask in this thesis is as follows: What is the effect of ocean acidification on the predator-prey interaction between *S. franciscanus* and *P. helianthoides*? This question can be broken down into three components:

- 1. What are the direct effects of OA on the behaviour, growth, and morphology of *P*. *helianthoides* (Chapter 2) and *S. franciscanus* (Chapter 3)?
- 2. What are the effects of predator presence on the behaviour, growth, and morphology of *S. franciscanus*? (Chapter 3)
- 3. How do OA and predator presence interact? In other words, how does OA modify the effects of *P. helianthoides* on *S. franciscanus*? (Chapter 3)

In answering these questions, I aim to predict how predator-prey relationships may change under future ocean pH conditions, and suggest how these changes may drive shifts in benthic subtidal communities of the Pacific Northwest.

#### Chapter 2

# Effects of Ocean Acidification on the Growth, Feeding Rate, and Calcification of *Pycnopodia helianthoides*

#### 2.1 Introduction

Ocean acidification has emerged as one of the most important environmental changes affecting marine species and ecosystems (Harley *et al.*, 2006). Research on the effects of OA has largely focused on marine calcifiers, such as corals, phytoplankton, molluscs, and echinoderms, as these may be some of the most vulnerable taxa (Kroeker *et al.*, 2010, 2013a). Echinoderms, for example, may be particularly sensitive as they build their skeletons with magnesium calcite, an amorphous and highly soluble form of calcium carbonate (Politi *et al.*, 2004). However, echinoderms show largely mixed responses to acidification. Although the direction of effect is predominately neutral or negative, there is considerable variation across species, life-stages, and biological processes (Dupont *et al.*, 2010a).

In general, the more heavily calcified echinoderms (e.g., sea urchins) tend to be more negatively affected by acidification, particularly at larval and juvenile stages (for review, see Dupont *et al.*, 2010a; Dupont and Thorndyke, 2014). A range of sublethal effects have been documented, such as reduced calcification, slower growth, and delayed development, which could ultimately impact organism fitness (Dupont *et al.*, 2010a). Conversely, some echinoderm species appear less vulnerable to OA, or even do better under high  $CO_2$  conditions (Clark *et al.*, 2009; Dupont *et al.*, 2010b; Gooding *et al.*, 2009; Ries *et al.*, 2009; Schram *et al.*, 2011; Wood *et al.*, 2008). For example, sea stars, which are typically less calcified, appear to be more resilient

to the effects of acidification. Studies have documented increased growth rates at both larval and adult stages (Gooding *et al.*, 2009; Dupont *et al.*, 2010b), as well as increased metabolism and calcification (Wood *et al.*, 2008) in sea stars exposed to high  $CO_2$  conditions. However, responses to acidification are largely species-specific (Dupont *et al.*, 2010a) and variability within the sea star class (Asteroidea) is relatively under-studied. As sea stars can play key roles in structuring marine ecosystems (Paine, 1966), understanding this variation will be particularly important for predicting changes at the ecosystem level.

In this Chapter, I examine the effects of ocean acidification on the growth, feeding rate, and calcification of juvenile sunflower stars (*Pycnopodia helianthoides*). I use laboratory mesocosm experiments to test responses of *P. helianthoides* to long-term OA exposure. This ecologically important predator has relatively low amounts of calcified tissue and may be pre-adapted to OA due to the naturally high variation in pH found throughout its range (Feely *et al.*, 2008). Previous research on another NE Pacific sea star, *Pisaster ochraceus*, suggests *P. helianthoides* may respond positively to OA. Gooding *et al.* (2009) found increased rates of growth and predation on mussels (*Mytilus trossulus*), but decreased calcification, in *P. ochraceus* exposed to high CO<sub>2</sub>. Therefore, I hypothesized that exposure to acidification (high CO<sub>2</sub>/low pH) would have a positive effect on the growth and feeding rate of *P. helianthoides*, but a negative effect on calcification.

#### 2.2 Methods

#### **2.2.1** Collection site and experimental set-up

Juvenile sea stars (15 – 20 cm initial diameter) were hand collected using SCUBA between 5 and 10 m depth from Copper Cove, West Vancouver, British Columbia ( $49^{\circ}22'42''$ N,

123°16'46<sup>°</sup>W) in May 2013. They were transported in coolers to the University of British Columbia and placed in independently recirculating 260 L seawater systems. The tanks were lit with Corallife 65W Actinic Compact Fluorescent bulbs (24") for 14 hours per day. Seawater temperature and salinity were representative of average springtime conditions in southwestern British Columbia (DFO, 2013; see Appendix A, Table A-1 and Figure A-3). The sea stars were acclimated to lab conditions for one week prior to the experiment and fed turban snails (*Chlorostoma funebralis*) ad libitum.

#### 2.2.2 Manipulation and measurement of seawater chemistry

Juvenile sea stars (103.15 g ± 5.69 SE) were randomly assigned to either the control (ambient; n=6) or acidified (high CO<sub>2</sub>/low pH; n=6) seawater treatment. Sea stars were exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 = \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH =  $\sim 8.0$ ) or high CO<sub>2</sub> ( $pCO_2 = \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH =  $\sim 7.7$ ) conditions for 22 weeks. Each treatment was replicated six times with one sea star per replicate (i.e., 260 L tank). Sample size in the acidified treatment was reduced to five due to a seawater system failure. Seawater  $pCO_2$  was manipulated by adding ambient air or air mixed with CO<sub>2</sub> gas to each tank using air stones. Flow rate was adjusted using mass flow controllers. Partial seawater changes were carried out at weeks 8 and 15 to ensure the seawater contained adequate concentrations of key ions (e.g., Ca<sup>2+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, etc.). During week 9, CO<sub>2</sub> scrubbers were installed to help maintain seawater  $pCO_2$  and pH at target levels. Temperature and pH were recorded once per week using an Oakton Acorn pH 5 handheld meter. The potentiometric glass electrode was accurate to ± 0.01 pH units and the ATC probe was accurate to ± 0.05°C. Salinity was measured using a refractometer. Seawater samples were also collected weekly for Dissolved Inorganic Carbon (DIC) analysis and preserved following methods from Dickson *et al.* (2007). A

Dissolved Inorganic Carbon Analyzer (Model AS-C3, Apollo SciTech Inc, Bogart, Georgia, USA) was used to measure DIC. Other carbonate system parameters were calculated using the software program CO2SYS (Pierrot *et al.*, 2006).

#### 2.2.3 Measurement of sea star growth, calcification and feeding rate

Sea star wet mass and maximum diameter were recorded at weeks 0, 13, and 22. Wet mass was measured by weighing the sea stars on a scale after blotting dry with paper towel. Maximum diameter was measured by recording the maximum distance between arm tips on opposite sides of the central disk. Beginning in week 20, sea star feeding rate on C. funebralis was recorded over a 10 day period. Snails of similar size (~6 g; n=55) were randomly assigned to the control or acidified treatment and then placed in 40 x 15 cm plastic containers with mesh sides. The snails (inside the plastic containers) were placed in 260 L tanks without predators and exposed to ambient or high CO<sub>2</sub> conditions for two weeks prior to the experiment. Sea stars were starved for one week prior to feeding experiments to standardize hunger. Individual sea stars were provided with five randomly selected snails at the beginning of the feeding trial and the number of empty shells was recorded every 24 hours. At the end of the experiment, sea stars were blotted dry, weighed, and placed in separate plastic bags. The bags were then stored in a freezer at -20°C to euthanize the sea stars. To measure calcified mass, sea stars were placed in a drying oven at 70°C for 48 hours, weighed, and placed in 6% sodium hypochlorite (bleach) to remove soft tissue. The solution was then vacuum filtered on No. 1 Whatman filter paper. The calcified material was then rinsed with distilled water and dried at 70°C to a constant mass. Samples were weighed using a high precision scale (AB104-S Analytical Balance, Mettler Toledo, Switzerland).

#### 2.2.4 Statistical Analysis

All analyses were carried out using R statistical software. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to determine the effect of acidification on final sea star diameter and final wet mass. Initial diameter and initial wet mass were used as covariates, respectively, to account for differences in sea star size. ANCOVA was also used to determine the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> treatment on both total dry mass and calcified mass, using final wet mass and total dry mass as covariates, respectively. It was determined that model assumptions were met by examining diagnostic plots of the residuals. To assess the effect of acidification on snail mortality due to predation by sea stars, a survival analysis was conducted using the Cox Proportional Hazards Model. The model included sea star size as a covariate. The significance of each variable and 2-way interaction was tested using likelihood ratio tests. Diagnostic checks were performed and it was determined that model assumptions, and non-linearity (in the relationship between the log hazards and the covariates) were not violated.

#### 2.3 Results

Experimentally induced ocean acidification resulted in increased growth and feeding in juvenile *Pycnopodia helianthoides*. There was a significant effect of CO<sub>2</sub> and initial diameter on final sea star diameter (ANCOVA; CO<sub>2</sub>,  $F_{1,7} = 9.15$ , p = 0.01, initial diameter,  $F_{1,7} = 710.33$ , p < 0.0001, interaction,  $F_{1,7} = 0.29$ , p = 0.6). Sea stars exposed to high CO<sub>2</sub> experienced accelerated growth over the 22-week period (Figure 2-1A). The relative growth (change in diameter/initial diameter) of sea stars in high CO<sub>2</sub> treatment was ~ 8 % higher compared to the sea stars in the control (Figure 2-1B). Relative change in wet mass also tended to be higher in the high CO<sub>2</sub> treatment (see Appendix B, Figure B-3), but the CO<sub>2</sub> effect was non-significant (ANCOVA;

CO<sub>2</sub>,  $F_{1,7} = 1.56$ , p = 0.25, initial wet mass,  $F_{1,7} = 253.64$ , p < 0.0001, interaction,  $F_{1,7} = 1.3$ , p = 0.29). Exposure to acidification also had no effect on sea star water content (approximated by the dry mass to wet mass ratio) or calcified tissue (Figure 2-2). There was no significant difference between CO<sub>2</sub> treatments in sea star dry mass (ANCOVA; CO<sub>2</sub>,  $F_{1,7} = 0.63$ , p = 0.45, final wet mass,  $F_{1,7} = 41.47$ , p = 0.0003, interaction,  $F_{1,7} = 0.001$ , p = 0.97) or calcified mass (ANCOVA; CO<sub>2</sub>,  $F_{1,7} = 1.02$ , p = 0.35, total dry mass,  $F_{1,7} = 73.34$ , p < 0.0001, interaction,  $F_{1,7} = 0.18$ , p = 0.69). Body shape (e.g., the diameter-height ratio) varied among individuals, but was not significantly affected by CO<sub>2</sub> (see Appendix B, Figure B-2).



**Figure 2-1.** Effect of CO<sub>2</sub> manipulation on A) mean diameter (cm) and B) mean relative growth (percent change from initial diameter) of *Pycnopodia helianthoides*. Animals were exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH  $\sim 8.0$ ; n=6) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH  $\sim 7.7$ ; n=5) conditions for 22 weeks. Error bars represent 1 standard error (SE) of the mean. The effect of CO<sub>2</sub> was statistically significant (see text for details).



**Figure 2-2.** Effect of  $CO_2$  manipulation on A) dry mass (as a percentage of total wet mass) and B) calcified mass (as a percentage of total dry mass) for *Pycnopodia helianthoides* (control: n=6; high: n=5). Error bars represent 1 standard error (SE) of the mean. Neither comparison was statistically significant (see text for details).

Acidification tended to have a positive effect on sea star feeding rates (Figure 2-3), although statistical support for this effect was marginal (p = 0.055; Table 2-1). A difference between CO<sub>2</sub> treatments in the rate at which *Chlorostoma funebralis* were consumed by sea stars did not appear until day 4 of the predation trial. There was also a significant effect of sea star size, where larger sea stars ate snails more quickly.

**Table 2-1.** Cox Proportional Hazards analysis testing the effect of  $CO_2$  treatment (control/high) on the survival of turban snails (*Chlorostoma funebralis*) fed to sunflower stars (*Pycnopodia helianthoides*). Sea star size (diameter) was included as a covariate. The significance of a covariate was tested by comparing the log likelihood of a submodel (excluding the covariate) to the log likelihood of the full model. (\*) indicates a significant effect.

$CO_2$ 1.4894.8353.6810.055Size0.2140.1064.4910.034* $CO_2 \times Size$ -0.0560.2290.0610.809	Parameter	Est.	SE	Likelihood- ratio χ <sup>2</sup>	df	р
Size $0.214$ $0.106$ $4.49$ $1$ $0.034^*$ $CO_2 \times Size$ $-0.056$ $0.229$ $0.06$ $1$ $0.809$ Full model8.23 $3$ $0.042^*$	$CO_2$	1.489	4.835	3.68	1	0.055
$CO_2 \times Size$ -0.056 0.229 0.06 1 0.809   Full model 8.23 3 0.042*	Size	0.214	0.106	4.49	1	0.034*
Full model 8 23 3 0.042*	$\text{CO}_2 \times \text{Size}$	-0.056	0.229	0.06	1	0.809
Nummour   8.25   5   0.042	Full model			8.23	3	0.042*

 $N_{\text{snails}} = 55$   $N_{\text{seastars}} = 11$ 



**Figure 2-3.** Survival curves of turban snails (*Chlorostoma funebralis*; n=55) fed to *Pycnopodia helianthoides* (control: n=6; high: n=5) under ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 7.7) conditions. Error bars represent 1 standard error (SE) of the mean. The effect of CO<sub>2</sub> was marginally non-significant (p = 0.055; see Table 2-1 for details).

#### 2.4 Discussion

The results were consistent with my hypothesis that ocean acidification would have a positive effect on the growth and feeding rate of *Pycnopodia helianthoides*. However, I found no evidence that high CO<sub>2</sub> had an effect on calcification. This contrasts with the results of Gooding *et al.* (2009), who showed a reduction in relative calcified mass in *Pisaster ochraceus* exposed to high CO<sub>2</sub>. *P. helianthoides* may be less sensitive to acidification as a smaller fraction of their total mass is made up of calcified components (~6%, compared to 10-12% in *P. ochraceus*). However, Appelhans *et al.* (2014) found calcification in *Asterias rubens*, a more heavily calcified species, was not affected by acidification. In addition, highly calcified brittle stars (*Amphiura filiformis*) have been shown to upregulate calcification under acidified conditions, although this is associated with significant muscle wastage (Wood *et al.*, 2008). It is important to note, however, that the heavily calcified endoskeleton found in brittle stars is likely an adaptation for predator defense (Wood *et al.*, 2008). As *P. helianthoides* is a top predator, investment in calcification may be less critical for survival.

Relative growth rate of *P. helianthoides* in the high  $CO_2$  treatment was significantly higher than the control with respect to diameter, but not with respect to wet mass, although a similar trend was observed. Wet mass is likely a less reliable measure of growth due to variability in water absorption, as well as variation in measurement techniques (e.g., the degree to which surface water was removed prior to recording weight). Changes in body shape could be another potential source of variation (M. Vaughan, personal observation), but this did not appear to differ between  $CO_2$  treatments. Increased growth rates in response to high  $CO_2$  have been found in other juvenile sea stars, such as *P. ochraceus* (Gooding *et al.*, 2009) and *Crossaster papposus* (Dupont *et al.*, 2010b). The increase in the growth of *P. helianthoides* may, in part, be a result of higher feeding rates, but  $CO_2$  also has direct effects on physiological processes (Portner, 2008). For example, Dupont *et al.* (2010b) hypothesized that improved performance in *C. papposus* was driven by a direct positive effect on metabolism. In addition, Gooding *et al.* (2009) suggest that acidification may aid in digestion, making feeding less energetically costly. Low levels of environmental stress have also been shown to induce hormetic responses in many organisms, particularly during early life (Costantini, 2010).

Increased feeding rate under acidified conditions is likely driven by a complex interplay between effects on both predator energetic requirements and prey susceptibility (Gaylord *et al.*, 2015). As regulation of calcification and acid-base balance become more costly in the future, sea stars may increase *per capita* consumption in order to meet elevated energetic demands (Sanford *et al.*, 2014). Changes in prey susceptibility due to altered predator avoidance behaviour (Bibby *et al.*, 2007; Watson *et al.*, 2014), impaired cue detection (De la Haye *et al.*, 2012), reductions in tissue mass (Gaylord *et al.*, 2011), and weakened skeletal defenses (Kroeker *et al.* 2014) may also contribute to higher *per capita* predation rate by decreasing search time, handling time, and satiation (Kroeker *et al.*, 2014). However, it may not be possible to maintain higher feeding rates over the long-term, particularly if prey (e.g., calcified herbivores) become less abundant. Gaylord *et al.* (2015) suggest generalist predators may respond to declines in prey abundance or energetic content by shifting prey preference or dietary breadth. These changes in predator-prey dynamics could propagate through marine food-webs, altering species composition and community structure.

The improved performance of juvenile *P. helianthoides* under high  $CO_2$  observed in this study differs from the larger body of work on OA, which suggests species-level responses will be largely neutral or negative (reviewed in Kroeker *et al.*, 2010, 2013a). However, the results shown

20

here, in combination with some other studies (e.g., Dupont *et al.*, 2010b; Gooding *et al.*, 2009), suggest the positive effects of OA may be more pervasive than previously assumed. Still, additional research will be needed to determine how *P. helianthoides* will respond to future ocean conditions. The short-term effects of high CO<sub>2</sub> on sea star growth and feeding could affect longer-term processes related to persistence if they translated to differences in population dynamics or fitness. Elevated growth rates could, for example, indirectly affect population size and recruitment by decreasing time to reproductive maturity. In addition, acidification could potentially impact other stages of the life cycle, such as fertilization and larval development (Gonzalez-Bernat *et al.*, 2013), which could magnify or reverse these short-term positive effects. Future research should investigate how short-term effects on individual performance may translate to changes at the population or community level.

#### Chapter 3

Nonconsumptive Effects of a Predatory Sea Star on Red Sea Urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*) under Acidified Conditions

#### **3.1 Introduction**

The need to predict future changes in marine ecosystems has become critically important as increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) drives rapid ocean acidification (Feely *et al.*, 2004). Declining ocean pH and calcium carbonate (CaCO<sub>3</sub>) saturation states may have major consequences for marine species, particularly calcifying invertebrates (Orr *et al.*, 2005). Our knowledge of the direct effects of OA on species has greatly improved in recent years (reviewed in Kroeker *et al.*, 2010, 2013a). However, research examining the indirect effects of acidification *via* altered species interactions is considerably more limited (Allan *et al.*, 2013; Connell *et al.*, 2013; Keppel *et al.*, 2015; Kroeker *et al.*, 2013b; Landes and Zimmer, 2012; Sanford *et al.*, 2014). Most studies are species-specific, which is not sufficient to predict changes in species interactions and thus the larger-scale impacts of OA (Landes and Zimmer, 2012). The relative impacts of environmental change on interacting species will largely determine changes at the ecosystem level (Harley, 2011; Kroeker *et al.*, 2013b).

Of the many types of species interactions, predator-prey interactions can have a disproportionately large effect on marine community structure (Estes and Palmisano, 1974). The phenomenon of keystone predation, for example, was classically demonstrated in the marine intertidal (Paine, 1966, 1969). In his seminal study, Paine (1966) showed predation by the sea
star *Pisaster ochraceus* on mussels (*Mytilus californianus*) indirectly increases species diversity by allowing inferior competitors, such as barnacles and limpets, to persist in the community. Despite the importance of predator-prey interactions for governing community dynamics, surprisingly little is known about how acidification may drive shifts in these relationships.

The impact of predators on prey populations can take the form of changes in abundance due to direct consumption, as well as changes in prey traits, such as behaviour, growth, and development (i.e., nonconsumptive effects; Peckarsky *et al.*, 2008). Both consumptive and nonconsumptive effects can translate to changes in the community *via* indirect effects on other species (Peckarsky *et al.*, 2008). For example, sea otter predation in kelp forests directly impacts sea urchin populations by reducing abundance, but also drives shifts in distribution by causing urchins to disperse away from damaged conspecifics (Watson, 1993). By altering both urchin abundance and distribution, otters reduce herbivory and indirectly promote kelp recruitment (Estes and Palmisano, 1974). When predators are absent, sea urchins can overgraze kelp and form low-diversity barrens (Dayton, 1985). In this classic example of a trophic cascade, the nonconsumptive effects of predators may be equally important for regulating community structure (Peckarsky *et al.*, 2008; Watson, 1993). Understanding the effects of OA on these nonconsumptive interactions will likely be critical for predicting how predator-prey dynamics may be altered in the future.

There are a variety of pathways by which ocean acidification may alter predator-prey interactions, such as changes in behaviour, energy allocation and demand, olfactory cue detection, skeletal integrity, palatability, predator-prey size ratios, and population sizes (Arnold *et al.*, 2012; Gaylord et al., 2015; Kroeker *et al.*, 2014; Munday *et al.*, 2010; Sanford *et al.*, 2014). In echinoderms, the effects of OA are largely negative (Dupont *et al.*, 2010a; Dupont and

Thorndyke, 2014), although some taxa (e.g., sea stars) appear to be less vulnerable (Gooding *et al.*, 2009; Dupont *et al.*, 2010b; Chapter 2). For example, exposure to acidification has been shown to reduce the growth and feeding rates of adult urchins, likely due to increased maintenance costs associated with acid-base regulation (Dupont and Thorndyke, 2014). In addition, OA may impair calcification of skeletal defense structures, such as spines and pedicillariae (Holtmann *et al.*, 2013). In some invertebrate taxa, ocean acidification has also been shown to disrupt the development of induced defenses (e.g., skeletal thickening in response to predator cues; (Bibby *et al.*, 2007), as well as impair predator cue detection and escape behaviour (De la Haye *et al.*, 2012; Manriquez *et al.*, 2013; Watson *et al.*, 2014), but this remains inadequately tested in echinoderms. As a result of decreased body size, reduced skeletal defense, and impaired predator response, sea urchins may become more vulnerable to predation under high CO<sub>2</sub> conditions. A decrease in predator handling time, search time, and satiation could lead to an increase in *per capita* predation rate (Kroeker *et al.*, 2014).

In this Chapter, I investigate how ocean acidification alters the nonconsumptive effects of sunflower stars (*Pycnopodia helianthoides*) on red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*), an important predator-prey pair in benthic subtidal communities of the Pacific Northwest (Duggins, 1983). I used factorial laboratory mesocosm experiments to test the combined effects of predator presence and acidification on the growth, calcification, and grazing rate of sea urchins exposed to high  $CO_2$ . I also examined the effects of predator presence and OA on urchin behavioural responses to predator cues. I hypothesized that: (1) predator presence and high  $CO_2$  would result in decreased sea urchin growth and grazing rates; (2) the development of defensive traits (i.e., induced defenses) in response to predator cues would be reduced in sea

urchins exposed to acidification; and (3) urchin alarm response to sea star cues would be impaired under acidified conditions.

### **3.2** Methods

#### 3.2.1 Collection site and experimental set-up

Juvenile red sea urchins (4.18 cm  $\pm$  0.11 SE test diameter) were collected near the Bamfield Marine Sciences Centre (BMSC), on the West Coast of Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada (48° 51.141'N, 125° 06.839'W) between May 7<sup>th</sup> - 9<sup>th</sup>, 2013. Collection was carried out by hand using SCUBA at subtidal depths ranging from 5 – 10 m. Urchins were stored in flow-through seawater tables at BMSC during the collection period. They were then placed in coolers with ice packs and damp paper towels and transported to the University of British Columbia (UBC). Juvenile sea stars (15 – 20 cm diameter) were collected subtidally (5 – 10 m) on May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2013 from Copper Cove, West Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada (49°22.706'N, 123°16.783'W) and transported to UBC in coolers. The animals were placed in 24 independently recirculating 260 L seawater systems and allowed to acclimate to laboratory conditions for 1 week.

The sea urchins were divided into groups of four similarly-sized animals, and urchins from within each size-matched group were randomly assigned to one of four treatments: (1) ambient CO<sub>2</sub>, no predator, (2) ambient CO<sub>2</sub>, predator, (3) high CO<sub>2</sub>, no predator, (4) high CO<sub>2</sub>, predator. Each treatment was replicated six times (randomized block design) with three urchins per replicate (N=72). Predator treatments contained one caged sea star (N=12). However, two seawater tanks failed during the experiment (treatments 1 and 4), resulting in a final sample size of 66 urchins and 11 sea stars. Sea urchins were fed dried kelp (*Macrocystis pyrifera*) and sea stars were fed turban snails (*Chlorostoma funebralis*) *ad libitum*. The tanks were lit with Coralife Actinic Fluorescent bulbs (24") for 14 hours per day. Seawater temperature and salinity was representative of average springtime conditions in southwestern British Columbia (DFO, 2013; see Appendix A, Table A-1 and Figure A-3). Urchins were exposed to both control ( $pCO_2 =$ ~500 µatm, pH = ~8.0) and acidified ( $pCO_2 =$  ~1000 µatm, pH = ~7.7) conditions for 22 weeks. Note that the data for Chapters 2 and 3 were collected during the same experiment. For a description of the methods used to manipulate and measure seawater chemistry, refer to section 2.2.2.

#### 3.2.2 Measurement of sea urchin growth and grazing rate

Sea urchin wet mass and test diameter were recorded at weeks 0, 13, and 22. Wet mass was measured by weighing the urchins on a scale after blotting dry with paper towel. Test diameter was measured using calipers. On week 13, urchin grazing rate on *M. pyrifera* was measured. Dried kelp  $(9 \pm 0.2 \text{ g})$  was added to each tank. After 36 hours, the kelp was removed from the tanks, re-dried, and weighed. To test for a potential difference in kelp degradation rate between treatments, an additional 0.1 g of dried kelp, placed in a small plastic container with mesh sides and bottom, was added to each tank.

#### 3.2.3 Measurement of sea urchin alarm response to predator cues

The purpose of this experiment was to measure the alarm response of *S. franciscanus* to waterborne chemical stimuli from a predator, *P. helianthoides*, under both control and high  $CO_2$  conditions. The experimental design was adapted from Hagen *et al.* (2002). I exposed urchins to both a control stimulus (plain seawater) and a predator stimulus. The predator stimulus was

prepared by placing two ~20 cm sea stars in 2 L of seawater for 30 minutes. Urchins from the control treatment were exposed to cues from sea stars acclimated to control conditions, and vice versa for the high CO<sub>2</sub> treatment. The experiment was carried out by placing a single urchin in the center of a test arena (Figure 3-1) containing 5 L of control or high CO<sub>2</sub> seawater. The urchin was allowed to choose a direction of movement (10 cm in either direction) and then the stimulus barrier (5 mL of seawater or predator cue) was applied 5 cm ahead of the moving urchin using a disposable pipette. Urchin behavioural responses were categorized as: (1) response (i.e., stop, reverse, and/or crawl out) or (2) no response (i.e., no change in speed or in direction of movement).



Figure 3-1. Schematic showing **A**) top and **B**) three-quarter side views of the Plexiglas experimental arena used for measuring the alarm response of red sea urchins (*Stronglyocentrotus franciscanus*) to waterborne chemical stimuli from a predator.

#### 3.2.4 Measurement of sea urchin calcified tissue

At the end of the experiment, the ten longest spines were removed from each urchin and air dried. Soft-tissue was then dissolved by submerging the urchins in 6% sodium hypochlorite (bleach). Urchin tests, spines, and jaws were then rinsed with water and dried at 70°C to a constant mass. Test diameter and spine length were measured using calipers. Samples were weighed using a high precision balance (AB104-S Analytical Balance, Mettler Toledo, Switzerland).

#### 3.2.5 Statistical analysis

All analyses were carried out using R statistical software. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test for differences in urchin grazing rate (dry mass of kelp consumed per gram urchin) between the  $CO_2$  and predator treatments. It was determined that model assumptions were met by examining diagnostic plots of the residuals. A linear mixed effects model (LME) was used to determine the effect of  $CO_2$  and predators on final urchin diameter, using initial diameter as a covariate and tank as a nested random effect. LME was also used to determine the effect of  $CO_2$  and predators on total calcified mass, spine and jaw calcified mass, and mean spine length, all using final test diameter as a covariate. Likelihood ratio tests were used in model comparison. Model fit was assessed by examining diagnostic plots of the residuals. Final diameter, total calcified mass, and spine and jaw calcified mass were log transformed in order to meet model assumptions. Differences in urchin responses to predator cues were determined using mixed effects logistic regression. The model included  $CO_2$  treatment, predator presence, and cue type as fixed effects and tank as a random effect.

### 3.3 Results

Sea urchin growth and feeding were affected by acidification and by the presence of a predator. The results suggest that high  $CO_2$  and predator presence have an additive negative effect on urchin growth. Urchin growth rates were significantly reduced in the high  $CO_2$  treatment, compared to the control (Figure 3-2; Table 3-1A). A significant decrease in growth was also observed in urchins exposed to predator cues, but there was no interaction between predator acclimation and  $CO_2$ . In addition, relative growth rates decreased with increasing urchin size (Appendix C, Figure C-1). Conversely, high  $CO_2$  and predator presence had an additive

positive affect on urchin grazing (Figure 3-3). Kelp consumption rate was significantly higher in the presence of a predator, but the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> was not significant (ANOVA; CO<sub>2</sub>:  $F_{1,18} = 2.36$ , p = 0.14, predator:,  $F_{1,18} = 6.09$ , p = 0.02, interaction:  $F_{1,18} = 0.02$ , p = 0.88).



**Figure 3-2.** Effect of CO<sub>2</sub> and predator presence on A) test diameter (mm) over time and B) mean relative growth (percent change from initial diameter) for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*; N=66). Urchins were exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 7.7) conditions for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia helianthoides*). Error bars represent 1 standard error of the mean. The effect was statistically significant for both treatments (see Table 3-1 for details).

Total calcified mass was significantly reduced by the presence of predators, but not by acidification (Figure 3-4A; Table 3-1B). In addition, the results suggest an interaction between predator treatment and urchin size. Smaller urchins had less calcified tissue in the presence of a predator, but this effect decreased with increasing test diameter (Appendix C, Figure C-4). Predators, but not acidification, also had a significant effect on spine and jaw calcified mass (Figure 3-4B; Table 3-1C), but there was no effect of either treatment on calcification in the test (Appendix C, Figure C-6). Mean spine length was significantly shorter in the high  $CO_2$  treatment, but there was no effect of predators (Figure 3-5; Table 3-1D). There was no significant interaction between predator acclimation and  $CO_2$  in any of the above comparisons.



**Figure 3-3.** Mean kelp eaten per gram urchin for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*; N=66) exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 7.7) conditions for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia helianthoides*). Error bars represent 1 standard error of the mean. The effect of predator presence, but not CO<sub>2</sub>, was statistically significant (see text for details).



**Figure 3-4.** Effect of  $CO_2$  and predator presence on A) total calcified mass (as a percentage of total wet mass) and B) spine and jaw calcified mass (as a percentage of total wet mass mass) for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus;* N=66). Error bars represent 1 standard error of the mean. The effect of predator presence, but not  $CO_2$ , was statistically significant (see Table 3-1 for details).



**Figure 3-5.** Mean size-corrected spine length for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus;* N=66) exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 7.7) conditions for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia helianthoides*). Error bars represent 1 standard error of the mean. The effect of CO<sub>2</sub>, but not predator presence, was statistically significant (see Table 3-1 for details).

Exposure to chemical stimuli from *P. helianthoides* elicited a significantly higher avoidance response in *S. franciscanus*, relative to the seawater sham (Figure 3-6; Table 3-2). The percentage of urchins responding tended to decrease with acidification and with prior predator acclimation, but this effect was not significant. There were also no significant interactions between factors.

**Table 3-1.** Linear mixed effects models testing the effect of  $CO_2$  treatment (control/high) and predator treatment (absent/present) on A) log final test diameter, B) log calcified mass, C) log spine and jaw mass, and D) mean spine length of red sea urchins (*Stronglyocentrotus franciscanus*). Urchin size (test diameter) is included as a covariate. (\*) = significant effect

T) Log transformed intal test diameter					
Parameter	Est.	SE	Likelihood- ratio χ <sup>2</sup>	df	Р
$CO_2$	-0.132	0.087	4.196	1	0.041*
Predator	-0.134	0.088	11.276	1	< 0.001*
log(Initial Size)	0.674	0.055	150.64	1	< 0.001*
$\rm CO_2 \times Predator$	-0.008	0.026	0.093	1	0.761
$CO_2 \times log(Initial Size)$	0.077	0.062	1.524	1	0.217
Predator $\times \log(I. \text{ Size})$	0.064	0.061	1.064	1	0.302

A) Log-transformed	final test	diameter
--------------------	------------	----------

#### B) Log-transformed calcified mass

Parameter	Est.	SE	Likelihood- ratio χ <sup>2</sup>	df	Р
$CO_2$	0.102	0.164	0.103	1	0.748
Predator	-0.415	0.166	7.114	1	0.008*
Size	0.050	0.003	183.6	1	< 0.001*
$CO_2 \times Predator$	0.006	0.059	0.012	1	0.915
$CO_2 \times Size$	-0.002	0.003	0.515	1	0.473
Predator $\times$ Size	0.006	0.003	4.029	1	0.045*

#### C) Log-transformed spine and jaw mass

Parameter	Est.	SE	Likelihood- ratio χ²	df	Р
$CO_2$	0.083	0.184	0.560	1	0.454
Predator	-0.437	0.186	8.022	1	0.005*
Size	0.051	0.033	173.01	1	< 0.001*
$CO_2 \times Predator$	0.025	0.065	0.147	1	0.702
$CO_2 \times Size$	-0.002	0.003	0.457	1	0.499
$Predator \times Size$	0.006	0.003	3.153	1	0.076

#### D) Mean spine length

Parameter	Est.	SE	Likelihood- ratio χ <sup>2</sup>	df	Р
$CO_2$	-1.027	4.537	5.889	1	0.015*
Predator	11.427	4.603	0.810	1	0.368
Size	0.901	0.076	111.99	1	< 0.001*
$CO_2 \times Predator$	-0.590	1.516	0.151	1	0.698
$CO_2 \times Size$	-0.014	0.085	0.028	1	0.867
$Predator \times Size$	-0.227	0.085	6.697	1	0.009*

 $N_{urchins} = 66 \qquad \qquad N_{tanks} = 22$ 

**Table 3-2.** Mixed effects logistic regression testing the effect of cue type (seawater sham or predator),  $CO_2$  treatment (control/high), and predator treatment to which the urchins were acclimated (absent/present) on red sea urchin (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*) alarm response. (\*) indicates a significant effect.

Est.	SE	Likelihood- ratio χ <sup>2</sup>	Df	р	odds ratio
-3.21	0.925	35.846	1	< 0.001*	0.040
-0.536	0.788	1.030	1	0.310	0.585
-0.535	0.787	0.451	1	0.502	0.586
0.299	0.984	0.091	1	0.762	1.348
0.893	0.986	0.826	1	0.363	2.442
-0.134	1.021	0.017	1	0.895	0.874
	Est. -3.21 -0.536 -0.535 0.299 0.893 -0.134	Est.         SE           -3.21         0.925           -0.536         0.788           -0.535         0.787           0.299         0.984           0.893         0.986           -0.134         1.021	Est.SELikelihood- ratio $\chi^2$ -3.210.92535.846-0.5360.7881.030-0.5350.7870.4510.2990.9840.0910.8930.9860.826-0.1341.0210.017	Est.SELikelihood- ratio $\chi^2$ Df-3.210.92535.8461-0.5360.7881.0301-0.5350.7870.45110.2990.9840.09110.8930.9860.8261-0.1341.0210.0171	Est.SELikelihood- ratio $\chi^2$ Dfp-3.210.92535.8461<0.001*

 $N_{urchins} = 66$   $N_{tanks} = 22$ 



**Figure 3-6.** Percent avoidance response to seawater and predator chemical cues for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus;* N=66) exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm, pH \sim 8.0$ ) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm, pH \sim 7.7$ ) conditions for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia helianthoides*). Error bars represent 1 standard error of the proportion. There was no effect of either treatment (i.e., acclimation condition) on urchin behaviour, but the effect of cue type was statistically significant (see Table 3-2 for details).

#### 3.4 Discussion

In this study, it was found that ocean acidification and predator presence influenced the performance of *Stronglyocentrotus franciscanus*. However, these two factors did not interact. Contrary to what has been observed in some other systems (e.g., littorinid snails, Bibby *et al.*, 2007), the effect of predator presence was not modified by high CO<sub>2</sub>. Therefore, the hypothesis that OA would impair the development of induced defenses in *S. franciscanus* exposed to sea star cues was rejected. My results show predators and OA have an additive negative effect on urchin size-specific growth rate and calcified mass, but an additive positive effect on grazing rate.

Predator-induced effects on growth rate are well-studied in marine invertebrates (Brönmark and Hansson, 2000). Decreased prey growth rate in response to predation risk is often attributed to changes in behaviour (e.g., reduced foraging activity) or energy allocation (e.g., investment in defensive structures; Brönmark and Hansson, 2000). For example, Appleton and Palmer (1988) show exposure to chemical cues from a predatory crab (*Cancer productus*) induces shell thickening, but slower growth and feeding rates, in a marine gastropod (*Nucella lamellosa*). The precise mechanism by which predator presence affects growth in *S. franciscanus* remains unclear, but does not appear to be a result of reduced grazing or investment in skeletal structures. An alternative explanation could be that decreased growth is a consequence of elevated energetic demand associated with predator-induced physiological stress. Physiological responses to predation risk have been documented across a wide variety of invertebrate taxa, and may include increased cardiovascular activity, respiration, and metabolism (Hawlena and Schmitz, 2010).

The increase in kelp consumption observed in the presence of predators was unexpected as prey typically reduce foraging activity in response to predation risk (Brönmark and Hansson, 2000). Previous research shows predators limit red urchin grazing in nature by altering population spatial distribution (Watson, 1993). In addition, Matassa (2010) used laboratory experiments to show purple sea urchins (*S. purpuratus*) reduce grazing rates in the response to predator cues from spiny lobster (*Panulirus interruptus*). Increased grazing in the presence of predators may be a response to elevated energetic demand, although this does not appear to translate to higher growth rates. It is possible that predator-induced stress reduces the conversion efficiency of ingested food into biomass (Hawlena and Schmitz, 2010). Alternatively, Soto *et al.* (2005) show that nutritional condition affects the foraging strategy of intertidal whelks (*Acanthina monodona*) exposed to a sea star predator. They found that, in the presence of a predator, starved whelks fed faster than satiated whelks, but there was no difference when predators were absent.

Predator exposure resulted in a reduction in urchin calcified mass, which contrasts with expectations that urchins would upregulate calcification of defensive structures. Selden *et al.* (2009) show that *S. droebachiensis* develop thicker skeletons in response to crab cues. However, urchin physiological and behavioural responses are often predator-specific (Scheibling, 1995). Thicker skeletons may be more important for defense against crushing predators like crabs, but provide little protection from sea star predation. However, there was also no evidence of spine growth in response to predators. It is possible that increased investment in skeletal structures is not the most effective strategy for defending against *P. helianthoides*. Additionally, investment in defensive structures may be too energetically costly. *S. franciscanus* has been found to employ

a number of behavioural strategies to minimize predation risk, such as hiding in spatial refuges, aggregation, and nocturnal feeding (Tegner and Levin, 1983).

Decreased growth rates under high  $CO_2$  may represent a physiological trade-off, where elevated metabolic demand associated with the increased cost of calcification and acid-base regulation reduces energy available for growth (Findlay *et al.*, 2011). Decreased urchin growth in the future may have consequences at both the population and community level. Slower-growing urchins spend more time in the vulnerable intermediate size class, which could translate to an increase in predation intensity and a decline in overall population growth (Scheibling, 1995). Reduced growth under acidification may also indirectly affect population size and recruitment by increasing time to reproductive maturity (Neinhuis, 2009).

Elevated  $CO_2$  had no detectable effect on kelp consumption, although a positive trend was observed. This result is consistent with previous research, which suggests that OA does not directly impact mass-specific grazing rates (K. Anderson, personal communication). The positive trend may indicate that urchins are increasing consumption rates in an attempt to mediate higher maintenance costs under acidification. However, an increase in individual urchin grazing rate under high  $CO_2$  may not necessarily translate to a change in *per capita* kelp consumption due to the concomitant decrease in urchin growth. OA may instead drive a decrease in kelp consumption because urchins spend more time smaller size classes (Neinhuis, 2009).

Ocean acidification had no effect on calcified tissue in the test, but urchin spines were significantly shorter in the high  $CO_2$  treatment. Although OA has been shown to decrease calcification in other adult urchins (e.g., *Eucidaris tribuloides*, Ries *et al.*, 2009; *S. droebachiensis*, Holtmann *et al.*, 2013), this response appears to be highly species-specific (Dupont *et al.*, 2010a). The relatively low sensitivity of the test in *S. franciscanus* may be due to

differences in the protective external organic layer (Ries *et al.*, 2009). In addition, urchins have some ability to regulate the acid-base balance of extracellular fluid under acidification (Calosi *et al.*, 2013; Holtmann *et al.*, 2013). The mechanism by which acidification impacts calcification in red urchin spines remains unclear, but Holtmann *et al.* (2013) show acclimation to high  $CO_2$ increases spine dissolution in *S. droebachiensis*. As spines are the primary structure used to defend against *P. helianthoides* in red urchins (Moitoza and Phillips, 1979), increased spine erosion could make urchins less resistant to predation in the future. A reduction in handling time due to weakened prey defense could potentially lead to an increase in *per capita* predation rate.

Chemical cues from *P. helianthoides* elicited a strong alarm response in *S. franciscanus*, but this was not significantly affected by high  $CO_2$  or prior predator exposure. Although a slight trend was observed, where the percent avoidance response declined in urchins acclimated to predators or high  $CO_2$ , variation among individuals was high. OA has been shown to disrupt olfactory cue detection in a number of fish and invertebrate species (Leduc *et al.*, 2013), but this is one of the first studies to demonstrate a largely neutral effect. However, the mechanism by which OA may impact cue detection in sea urchins, if any, remains unclear. These results should be viewed with caution as it is uncertain if the cue concentrations used here are representative of natural settings.

It is important to note that the effects of OA on predators will also play a role in determining changes in predator-prey dynamics. Landes and Zimmer (2012) suggest that predator-prey interactions may not change if both predators and prey are negatively affected by acidification. However, differential effects of high  $CO_2$  on predator-prey pairs could result in altered interaction strength and potentially scale up to changes in community structure (Keppel *et al.*, 2015). For example, the effects of OA on urchin populations could be magnified if the

performance of predators, such as sea stars, is improved (Dupont *et al.*, 2010b; Gooding *et al.*, 2009). Although these complex responses to acidification are largely unexplored in the literature, they may have major consequences for marine communities (Gaylord *et al.*, 2015). Understanding the effects of OA on predator-prey interactions may be particularly important for ecosystems with strong top-down control, such as kelp forests, where changes in the relative abundance of predators and herbivores can lead to dramatic phase shifts in kelp forest communities (Estes and Palmisano, 1974).

## **Chapter 4**

# Conclusion

## 4.1 Summary of Results

There is a growing consensus among researchers that disentangling the effects of ocean acidification on species interactions will be critical for predicting ecosystem-level changes in the future ocean (Gaylord *et al.*, 2015). This thesis sought to determine the effect of OA on a key predator-prey pair in benthic subtidal communities of the Pacific Northwest: the red urchin (Strongylocentrotus franciscanus) and the sunflower star (Pynopodia helianthoides). The data presented in Chapters 2 and 3 provide a number of important insights that help address considerable gaps in our understanding. In Chapter 2, I show that the growth and feeding rates of juvenile *P. helianthoides* increase with long-term exposure to elevated CO<sub>2</sub>, but calcification is not affected. These data suggest P. helianthoides is highly tolerant of OA and per capita predation rate may increase in the future. In Chapter 3, the data suggest predators and OA have an additive negative effect on the growth and calcification of S. franciscanus, but a positive effect on grazing rate. The predator avoidance response, while pronounced, was not affected by either acidification or prior exposure to predator cue. These results suggest both predators and ocean acidification matter for individual urchin performance, but they do not appear to interact at the physiological level. Still, we have yet to explore how they may influence one another via changes in population sizes and *per capita* consumption rates.

## 4.2 Effects of OA on Predator-Prey Interactions

My results show that ocean acidification has direct effects on individual performance in both sunflower stars and red sea urchins, but predator-induced responses do not appear to be modified by high CO<sub>2</sub> (Figure 4-1). Altered pairwise dynamics in this predator-prey system could instead manifest through changes in interaction strength. Although the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> on interaction strength was not directly tested here, there are a few compelling examples from other systems that suggest OA may modify *per capita* consumption. Sanford *et al.* (2014) show that a reduction in the body size of Olympia oysters (*Ostrea lurida*) under elevated CO<sub>2</sub> increases the consumption rate of an OA-tolerant invasive snail. Increased oyster predation by muricid gastropods has also been attributed to weakened shell strength (Amaral *et al.*, 2012). Conversely, Keppel *et al.* (2015) found that the growth rate of the sea star *Asterias rubens* decreased with high CO<sub>2</sub> exposure, but the growth of its prey (blue mussels, *Mytilus edulis*) increased, resulting in a reduction in *per capita* predation rate. Furthermore, Munday *et al.* (2010) show acidification dramatically reduces the survival of larval reef fish due to impaired olfactory cue detection and altered predator avoidance behaviour.

The above examples suggest a number of mechanisms by which OA can modify predator-prey interactions (e.g., increased prey susceptibility, changes in predator and prey growth rates, decreased predator handling time and satiation, etc.). I propose that similar mechanisms may apply to the sea star – urchin relationship, where the differential effects of OA drive an increase in *per capita* interaction strength. Urchins that are smaller and more weakly defended may be more vulnerable to predation by *P. helianthoides*. Increases in consumption rate may also occur if predator energetic demands are elevated under high CO<sub>2</sub>. As *P. helianthoides* is a key predator in benthic subtidal communities (Duggins, 1983), changes in *per* 

*capita* consumption could have a considerable impact on community structure. It is well documented that increased predation pressure can reduce the abundance of herbivores and indirectly promote algal recruitment (Estes and Palmisano, 1974; Dayton, 1985). An important caveat is that *per capita* consumption is highly density-dependent (Holling, 1959) and the strength of trophic interaction may not increase if prey populations decline substantially in the future. Declines in prey abundance or energetic content may also drive shifts in predator diet (Gaylord *et al.*, 2015), causing further community-level change.



**Figure 4-1.** Conceptual diagram of the direct (solid lines) and indirect (dashed line) pathways through which ocean acidification (OA) may affect predator-prey interactions between sunflower stars (*Pycnopodia helianthoides*) and red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*). Nonconsumptive predator effects are indicated by the curved arrow. Circles indicate positive (+), negative (-), or neutral (/) effects. Image credit: Saxby (2005)

## 4.3 Study Limitations

Variation in seawater  $pCO_2$  and pH was relatively high over the course of the experiment, which was a result of fluctuation in ambient CO<sub>2</sub> levels. On week 8 of the experiment,  $pCO_2$  in the acidified treatment increased to almost double target levels (~ 2000 µatm). The implications of this spike in  $pCO_2$  are unclear, but given that my results suggest the effects of OA on calcification are relatively minor, it appears both red urchins and sunflower stars are able to tolerate extreme conditions to some degree. It is possible that experimental variation in seawater chemistry parameters is more representative of natural conditions in coastal ecosystems. For example, a short-term increase in acidity could occur in nature during a seasonal upwelling event (Hoffman *et al.*, 2011). Variation in biological activity and tidal mixing also create heterogeneity in the pH of near-shore habitats (Hoffman *et al.*, 2011). This variability may influence organism physiological responses, resilience, and potential for adaptation.

Longer time scale consideration of adaptation and acclimatization are also important. The 22 week acclimation in this study does not capture the long-term and trans-life-cycle effects of OA. Long-term responses to OA may be very different from those observed over a single generation or life-stage (Dupont *et al.*, 2013). These effects are discussed in more detail in the following section.

#### 4.4 **Recommendations for Future Research**

A number of questions remain as to how OA will impact interactions between *S. franciscanus* and *P. helianthoides*. A key avenue of investigation will be to experimentally test the effect of OA on *per capita* predation rate, which has considerable influence on community structure *via* 

indirect effects on habitat-forming kelp species (Dayton, 1985). Scaling up to multi-species food webs would also provide valuable insight into the complex effects of OA on species interactions.

Population viability and persistence will depend not only on the sensitivity of adults to OA, but also on variation in sensitivity across life-history stages. Early developmental stages are generally considered most vulnerable to changes in seawater acidity (Byrne, 2011; Kroeker *et al.*, 2013a). Studies show acidification can cause delayed larval development and reduced fertilization success in both sea stars and urchins (Kurihara, 2008; Havenhand *et al.*, 2008; Parker *et al.*, 2009; Gonzalez-Bernat *et al.*, 2013, Reuter *et al.*, 2011). In addition, carry-over effects across multiple life-history stages and generations could have serious implications for long term population sustainability (Dupont *et al.*, 2013).

Determining the degree of genetic variation and phenotypic plasticity among populations will also be essential for assessing the potential for adaptation and acclimatization to OA. Due to the naturally variable pH environment found throughout the Pacific Northwest (Feely *et al.*, 2008), *P. helianthoides* and *S. franciscanus* may have a greater capacity to acclimatize and adapt to changing conditions. There is some evidence to suggest green urchins (*S. droebachiensis*) can acclimate to elevated  $CO_2$  over relatively short time spans (Dupont *et al.*, 2013). In addition, Sunday *et al.* (2011) suggest evolutionary responses to rising  $CO_2$  in *S. franciscanus* may be relatively fast due to high levels of both genetic and phenotypic variation, although their study only considered one trait (early larval growth). Understanding long-term adaptation across a suite of genetically-determined traits will require a great deal of additional research.

The simultaneous increase in ocean temperature predicted under current climate change scenarios (IPCC, 2013) also has the potential to affect species interactions. In general, temperature appears to enhance sensitivity to OA, although this effect varies depending on the

44

species or response being tested (Kroeker *et al.*, 2013a). For example, increased temperature stimulates faster arm regeneration in the brittlestar *Ophiocten sericeum*, but this effect is counteracted by acidification (Wood *et al.*, 2011). Understanding the impact of rising ocean  $CO_2$  on predator-prey dynamics will require further research into the interactive effects with warming.

Given the various gaps in our understanding, disentangling the effects of ocean acidification on species interactions presents a formidable challenge. The strong context-dependent nature of responses to OA makes it difficult to form general predictions about future ecological change. However, we may begin to tackle these complex questions through empirical tests of conceptual models. Few studies have taken such an approach to understanding the indirect effects of OA on predator-prey relationships. My thesis demonstrates that the role of biotic stressors should not be overlooked when considering organismal responses to high CO<sub>2</sub>.

## **Bibliography**

- Allan, B. J. M., P. Domenici, M. I. McCormick, S.-A. Watson, and P. L. Munday. 2013. Elevated CO<sub>2</sub> affects predator-prey interactions through altered performance. *PLoS One*, 8: e58520.
- Amaral, V., H. N. Cabral, and M. L. Bishop. 2012. Effects of estuarine acidification on predatorprey interactions. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 445: 117-127.
- Appelhans, Y. S., J. Thomson, S. Opitz, C. Pansch, F. Melzner, and M. Wahl. 2014. Juvenile sea stars exposed to acidification decrease feeding and growth with no acclimation potential. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 509: 227-239.
- Appleton, R. D., and A. R. Palmer. Water-borne stimuli released by predatory crabs and damaged conspecifics induce more predator-resistant shells in a marine gastropod. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 85: 4387-4391.
- Arnold, T., C. Mealey, H. Leahey, A. W. Miller, J. M. Hall-Spencer, M. Milazzo, and K. Maers. 2012. Ocean acidification and the loss of phenolic substances in marine plants. *PLoS One*, 7: e35107.
- Bates, N.R., A.F. Michaels, and A.H. Knap. 1996. Seasonal and interannual variability of oceanic carbon dioxide species at the US JGOFS Bermuda Atlantic Time-series Study (BATS) site. *Deep Sea Research II*, 43: 347-383.
- Bibby, R., P. Cleall-Harding, S. Rundle, S. Widdicombe, and J. Spicer. 2007. Ocean acidification disrupts induced defences in the intertidal gastropod *Littorina littorea*. *Biology Letters*, 3: 699–701.
- Broecker, W.S. 2003. The oceanic CaCO<sub>3</sub> cycle. In *The Oceans and Marine Geochemistry*, *Treatise on Geochemistry*, ed. H. Elderfield, pp. 529–49. London: Elsevier
- Brönmark, C. and L-A. Hansson. 2000. Chemical communication in aquatic systems: an introduction. *Oikos*, 88: 103-109.
- Byrne, M. 2011. Impact of ocean warming and ocean acidification on marine invertebrate life history stages: vulnerabilities and potential for persistence in a changing ocean. *Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review*, 49: 1-42.
- Caldeira, K. and M. E. Wickett. 2003. Anthropogenic carbon and ocean pH. Nature, 425: 365.
- Calosi, P., S.P.S. Rastrick, M. Graziano, S.C. Thomas, C. Baggini, H.A. Carter, M. Milazzo, and J.I. Spicer. 2013. Distribution of sea urchins living near shallow water CO vents is dependent upon species acid–base and ion-regulatory abilities. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 73: 470-484.

- Clark, D., M. Lamare, and M. Barker. 2009. Response of sea urchin pluteus larvae (Echinodermata: Echinoidea) to reduced seawater pH: a comparison among a tropical, temperate, and a polar species. *Marine Biology*, 156: 1125–1137.
- Connell, S. D., K. J. Kroeker, K. E. Fabricius, D. I. Kline, and B. D. Russell. 2013. The other ocean acidification problem : CO2 as a resource among competitors for ecosystem dominance. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 368: 20120442
- Costantini, D. 2010. Ecological processes in a hormetic framework. *Ecology Letters*, 13: 1435-1447.
- Cripps, I.L, P. L. Munday, and M. I. McCormick. 2011. Ocean acidification affects prey detection by a predatory reef fish. *PLoS One*, 6: e22736.
- Dayton, P.K. 1985. Ecology of kelp forest communities. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 16: 215-245.
- De la Haye, K. L., J. I. Spicer, S. Widdicombe, and M. Briffa. 2012. Reduced sea water disrupts chemo-responsive behaviour in an intertidal crustacean. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 412: 134-140.
- DFO. 2012. Pacific Region Red Sea Urchin Integrated Fisheries Management Plan 2012/13. Fisheries and Oceans Canada.
- DFO. 2013. Data from BC Lighthouses 1956-1991 (Amphitrite Point). British Columbia Shore Station Oceanographic Program (BCSOP). Fisheries and Oceans Canada.
- Dickson, A.G., Sabine, C.L. and Christian, J.R. (Eds.). 2007. *Guide to best practices for ocean CO*<sub>2</sub> *measurements*. PICES Special Publication 3, 191 pp.
- Dixson, D. L., P. L. Munday, and G. P. Jones. 2010. Ocean acidification disrupts the innate ability of fish to detect predator olfactory cues. *Ecology Letters*, 13: 68-75.
- Doney, S. C., V. J. Fabry, R. A. Feely, and J. A. Kleypas. 2009. Ocean acidification: the other CO<sub>2</sub> problem. *Annual Review of Marine Science*, 1: 169-192.
- Duggins, D. O. 1983. Starfish predation and the creation of mosaic patterns in a kelp-dominated community. *Ecology*, 64: 1610-1619.
- Dupont, S., O. Ortega-Martinez, and M. Thorndyke. 2010a. Impact of near-future ocean acidification on echinoderms. *Ecotoxicology*, 19: 449-462.
- Dupont, S., B. Lundve, and M. Thorndyke. 2010b. Near future ocean acidification increases growth rate of the lecithotrophic larvae and juveniles of the sea star *Crossaster papposus*. *Journal of Experimental Zoology Part B: Molecular and Developmental Evolution*, 314: 382–389.

- Dupont, S. T., and M. S. Thorndyke. 2014. Direct impact of near future ocean acidification on sea urchins. Pages 461–485 *in* J. M. Fernández-Palacios, L. de Nascimento, J. C. Hernández, S. Clemente, A. González, and J. P. Díaz-González, editors. Climate change perspective from the Atlantic: past, present and future.
- Dupont, S., N. Dorey, M. Stumpp, F. Melzer, and M. Thorndyke. 2013. Long-term and trans-life cycle effects of exposure to ocean acidification in the green sea urchin *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis. Marine Biology*, 160: 1835-1843.
- Estes, J. A., and J. F. Palmisano. 1974. Sea otters: Their role in structuring nearshore communities. *Science*, 185: 1058–1069.
- Fabry, V. J., B. A. Seibel, R. A. Feely, and J. C. Orr. 2008. Impacts of ocean acidification on marine fauna and ecosystem processes: 414–432.
- Feely, R., C. L. Sabine, J. M. Hernandez-Ayon, D. Ianson, and B. Hales. 2008. Evidence for upwelling of corrosive acidified water onto the continental shelf. *Science*, 320: 1490-1492.
- Feely, R., C. L. Sabine, K. Lee, W. Berelson, J. Kleypas, V. J. Fabry, and F. J. Millero. 2004. Impact of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> on the CaCO<sub>3</sub> system in the oceans. *Science*, 305: 362-366.
- Ferrari, M. C. O., B. D. Wisenden, and D. P. Chivers. 2010. Chemical ecology of predator-prey interactions in aquatic ecosystems: a review and prospectus. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 88: 698-724.
- Findlay, H.S., H. L. Wood, M. A. Kendall, J. I. Spicer, R.J. Twitchett, and S. Widdicombe. 2011. Comparing the impact of high CO2 on calcium carbonate structures in different marine organisms. *Marine Biology Research*, 7: 565-575.
- Gaylord, B., T. M. Hill, E. Sanford, E. A. Lenz, L. A. Jacobs, K. N. Sato, A. D. Russell, and A. Hettinger. 2011. Functional impacts of ocean acidification in an ecologically critical foundation species. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 214: 2586-2584.
- Gaylord, B., K. J. Kroeker, J. M. Sunday, K. M. Anderson, J. P. Barry, N. E. Brown, S. D. Connell, S. Dupont, K. E. Fabricius, J. M. Hall-Spencer, T. Klinger, M. Milazzo, P. L. Munday, B. D. Russell, E. Sanford, S. J. Schreiber, V. Thiyagarajan, M. L. H. Vaughan, S. Widdicombe, and C. D. G. Harley. 2015. Ocean acidification through the lens of ecological theory. *Ecology*, 96: 3-15.
- Gonzalez-Bernat, M.J., M. Lamare, and M. Barker. 2013. Effects of reduced seawater pH on fertilisation, embryogenesis and larval development in the Antarctic seastar *Odontaster validus*. *Polar Biology*, 36: 235–247.

- Gooding, R. A., C. D. G. Harley, and E. Tang. 2009. Elevated water temperature and carbon dioxide concentration increase the growth of a keystone echinoderm. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106: 9316-9321.
- Hagen, N. T., A. Anderson, and O. B. Stabell. 2002. Alarm responses of the green sea urchin, *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis*, induced by chemically labelled durophagous predators and simulated acts of predation. *Marine Biology*, 140: 365-374.
- Harley, C. D. G., A. R. Hughes, K. M. Hultgren, B. G. Miner, C. J. B. Sorte, C. S. Thornber, L. F. Rodriguez, L. Tomanek, and S. L. Williams. 2006. The impacts of climate change on coastal marine systems. *Ecology Letters*, 9: 228-241.
- Harley, C. D. G. 2011. Climate change, keystone predation, and biodiversity loss. *Science*, 334: 1124–1127.
- Havenhand, J. N., F-R. Buttler, M. C. Thorndyke, and J. E. Williamson. 2008. Near future levels of ocean acidification reduce fertilization success in a sea urchin. *Current Biology*, 18: R651-R652.
- Hawlena, D., and O. J. Schmitz. 2010. Physiological stress as a fundamental mechanism linking predation to ecosystem functioning. *The American Naturalist*, 176: 537-556.
- Hoffman, G. E., Smith, J. E., Johnson, K. S., Send, U., Levin, L. A., Micheli, F., Paytan, A., Price, N. N., Peterson, B., Takeshita, Y., Matson, P. G., Crook, E. D., Kroeker, K. J., Gambi, M. C., Rivest, E. B., Freider, C. A., Yu, P. C., and Martz, T. R. 2011. Highfrequency dynamics of ocean pH: a multi-ecosystem comparison. *PLoS One*, 6: e28983.
- Holling, C.S. 1959. The components of predation as revealed by a study of small-mammal predation of the European pine sawfly. *The Canadian Entomologist*, 91: 293-320.
- Holtmann, W. C., M. Stumpp, M. A. Gutowska, S. Syré, N. Himmerkus, F. Melzner, and M. Bleich. 2013. Maintenance of coelomic fluid pH in sea urchins exposed to elevated CO<sub>2</sub>: the role of body cavity epithelia and stereom dissolution. *Marine Biology*, 160: 2631-2645.
- IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2013. Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Keppel, E. A., R. A. Scrosati, and S. C. Courtenay. 2015. Interactive effects of ocean acidification and warming on subtidal mussels and sea stars from Atlantic Canada. *Marine Biology Research*, 11: 337-348.
- Kleypas J.A., R. W. Buddemeier, D. Archer, J.P. Gattuso, C. Langdon, and B.N. Opdyke. 1999. Geochemical consequences of increased atmospheric carbon dioxide on coral reefs. *Science*, 284:118-20.

- Koch, M., G. Bowes, C. Ross, and X. Zhang. 2013. Climate change and ocean acidification effects on seagrasses and marine macroalgae. *Global Change Biology*, 19: 103-132.
- Kroeker, K. J., R. L. Kordas, R. N. Crim, and G. G. Singh. 2010. Meta-analysis reveals negative yet variable effects of ocean acidification on marine organisms. *Ecology Letters*, 13: 1419-1434.
- Kroeker, K. J., R. L. Kordas, R. N. Crim, I. E. Hendriks, L. Ramajo, G. G. Singh, C. M. Duartes, and J-P. Gattuso. 2013a. Impacts of ocean acidification on marine organisms: quantifying sensitivities and interactions with warming. *Global Change Biology*, 19: 1884-1896.
- Kroeker, K. J., F. Micheli, and M. C. Gambi. 2013b. Ocean acidification causes ecosystem shifts via altered competitive interactions. *Nature Climate Change*, 3: 156-159.
- Kroeker, K. J., E. Sanford, B. M. Jellison, and B. Gaylord. 2014. Predicting the effects of ocean acidification on predator-prey interactions: A conceptual framework based on coastal molluscs. *Biological Bulletin*, 226: 211-222.
- Kurihara, H. 2008. Effects of CO<sub>2</sub>-driven ocean acidification on the early developmental stages invertebrates. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 373: 275-284.
- Landes, A. and M. Zimmer. 2012. Acidification and warming affect both a calcifying predator and prey, but not their interaction. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 450: 1-10.
- Lambert, P. 2000. Sea Stars of British Columbia, Southeast Alaska and Puget Sound. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Leduc, A. O. H. C., Munday, P. L., Brown, G. E., Ferrari, M. C. O. 2013. Effects of acidification on olfactory-mediated behaviour in freshwater and marine ecosystems: a synthesis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 368: 20120447.
- Leonard, G. H., M. D. Bertness, and P. O. Yund. 1999. Crab predation, waterborne cues, and inducible defenses in the blue mussel, *Mytilus edulis*. *Ecology*, 80: 1-14.
- Manriquez, P. H., M. E. Jara, M. L. Mardones, J. M. Navarro, R. Torres, M. A. Lardies, C. A. Vargas, C. Duarte, S. Widdicombe, J. Salisbury, and N. A. Lagos. 2013. Ocean acidification disrupts prey responses to predator cues but not net prey shell growth in *Concholepas concholepas* (loco). *PLoS One*, 8: e68643.
- Manriquez, P. H., M. E. Jara, M. L. Mardones, R. Torres, J. M. Navarro, M. A. Lardies, C. A. Vargas, C. Duarte, and N. A. Lagos. 2014. Ocean acidification affects predator avoidance behaviour but not prey detection in the early ontogeny of a keystone species. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 502: 157-167.

- Matassa, C. M. 2010. Purple sea urchins *Stronglyocentrotus purpuratus* reduce grazing rates in response to risk cues from the spiny lobster *Panulirus interruptus*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 400: 283-288.
- Melatunan, S., P. Calosi, S.P. Rundle, S. Widdicombe, and A. J. Moody. 2013. Effects of ocean acidification and elevated temperature on shell plasticity and its energetic basis in an intertidal gastropod. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 472:155-168.
- Moitoza, D. J., and D. W. Phillips. 1979. Prey defense, predator preference, and nonrandom diet: the interactions between *Pycnopodia helianthoides* and two species of sea urchins. *Marine Biology*, 53: 299–304.
- Mucci, A. 1983. The solubility of calcite and aragonite in seawater at various salinities, temperatures, and one atmosphere total pressure. *American Journal of Science*, 283: 780-799.
- Munday, P.L., D. L. Dixson, J. M. Donelson, G. P. Jones, M. S. Pratchett, G. V. Devitsina, K. B. Døving. 2009. Ocean acidification impairs the olfactory discrimination and homing ability of a marine fish. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106: 1848-1852.
- Munday, P.L., D. L. Dixson, M. I. McCormick, M. Meekan, M. C. O. Ferrari, and D. P. Chivers. 2010. Replenishment of fish populations threatened by ocean acidification. *Proceedings* of the National Academy of Sciences, 107: 12930-12934.
- Neinhuis, S. B. 2009. Multiple impacts of ocean acidification on calcifying marine invertebrates. Dissertation. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- Nilsson, G. E., D. L. Dixson, P. Domenici, M. I. McCormick, C. Sørensen, S. Watson, and P. L. Munday. 2012. Near-future carbon dioxide levels alter fish behaviour by interfering with neurotransmitter function. *Nature Climate Change*, 2: 201-204.
- Orr, J. C., V. J. Fabry, O. Aumont, L. Bopp, S. C. Doney, R. a Feely, A. Gnanadesikan, N. Gruber, A. Ishida, F. Joos, R. M. Key, K. Lindsay, E. Maier-Reimer, R. Matear, P. Monfray, A. Mouchet, R. G. Najjar, G.-K. Plattner, K. B. Rodgers, C. L. Sabine, J. L. Sarmiento, R. Schlitzer, R. D. Slater, I. J. Totterdell, M.-F. Weirig, Y. Yamanaka, and A. Yool. 2005. Anthropogenic ocean acidification over the twenty-first century and its impact on calcifying organisms. *Nature*, 437: 681-686.
- Paine, R. T. 1966. Food web complexity and species diversity. American Naturalist. 100: 65–75.
- Paine, R. T. 1969. A note of tropic complexity and community stability. *American Naturalist*. 103: 91-93.

- Parker, L. M., P. M. Ross, and W. A. O'Connor. 2009. The effect of ocean acidification and temperature on the fertilization and embryonic development of the Sydney Rock Oyster *Saccostrea glomerata* (Gould 1850). *Global Change Biology*, 15: 2123-2136.
- Parker, L. M., P. M. Ross, and W. A. O'Connor. 2011. Populations of the Sydney rock oyster, Saccostrea glomerata, vary in response to ocean acidification. Marine Biology, 158: 689-697.
- Peckarsky, B. L., P. A. Abrams, D. I. Bolnick, L. M. Dill, J. H. Grabowski, B. Luttbeg, J. H. Orrock, S. D. Peacor, E. L. Preisser, O. J. Schmitz, and G. C. Trussel. 2008. Revisiting the classics: considering the nonconsumptive effects in textbook examples of predator-prey interactions. *Ecology*, 89: 2416–2425.
- Pelejero, C., E. Calvo, and O. Hoegh-Guldberg. 2010. Paleo-perspectives on ocean acidification. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 25: 332-344.
- Pierrot, D., E. Lewis, and D. W. R. Wallace. 2006. MS Excel Program Developed for CO2 System Calculations. ORNL/CDIAC-105a. Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.
- Politi, Y., A. Talmon, E. Klein, S. Weiner and L. Addadi. 2004. Sea urchin spine calcite forms via a transient amorphous calcium carbonate phase. *Science*, 306: 1161-1164.
- Portner, H. O. 2008. Ecosystem effects of ocean acidification in times of ocean warming: a physiologist's view. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 373: 203-217.
- Raven, J. A., *et al.* 2005. Ocean acidification due to increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide. The Royal Society, London. 68 p.
- Reuter, K. E., K. E. Lotterhos, R. N. Crim, C. A. Thompson, and C. D. G. Harley. 2011. Elevated  $pCO_2$  increases sperm limitation and risk of polyspermy in the red sea urchin *Strongylocentrotus franciscanus. Global Change Biology*, 17: 163-171.
- Ries, J. B., A. L. Cohen, and D. C. McCorkle. 2009. Marine calcifiers exhibit mixed responses to CO2-induced ocean acidification. *Geology*, 37: 1057-1152.
- Sabine, C. L., R. a Feely, N. Gruber, R. M. Key, K. Lee, J. L. Bullister, R. Wanninkhof, C. S. Wong, D. W. R. Wallace, B. Tilbrook, F. J. Millero, T.-H. Peng, A. Kozyr, T. Ono, and A. F. Rios. 2004. The oceanic sink for anthropogenic CO2. *Science*, 305:367–71.
- Sanford, E., B. Gaylord, A. Hettinger, E. A. Lenz, K. Meyer, and T. M. Hill. 2014. Ocean acidification increases the vulnerability of native oysters to predation by invasive snails. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 281: 20132681.

- Saxby, T. 2005. Illustration of *Pycnopodia helianthoides* (Sunflower Seastar). Integration and Application Network, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science (ian.umces.edu/imagelibrary/)
- Scheibling, R. E. 1995. The role of predation in regulating sea urchin populations in eastern Canada. *Oceanologica Acta*, 19: 421-430.
- Schram, J. B., J. B. McClintock, R. A. Angus, and J. M. Lawrence. 2011. Regenerative capacity and biochemical composition of the sea star *Luidia clathrata* (Say) (Echinodermata: Asteroidea) under conditions of near-future ocean acidification. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 407: 266-274.
- Selden, R., A. S. Johnson, and O. Ellers. 2009. Waterborne cues from crabs induce thicker skeletons, smaller gonads and size-specific changes in growth rate in sea urchins. *Marine Biology*, 156: 1057–1071.
- Shivji, M., D. Parker, B. Hartwick, M. J. Smith and N. A. Sloan. 1983. Feeding and distribution study of the sunflower sea *star Pycnopodia helianthoides* (Brandt, 1985). *Pacific Science*, 37: 133-140.
- Smith, S. V., and R. W. Buddemeier. 1992. Global change and coral reef ecosystems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 23:89–118
- Soto, R. E., J. C. Castilla, and F. Bozinovic. 2005. The impact of physiological demands on foraging decisions under predation risk: a test with the whelk *Acanthina mododon*. *Ethology*, 111: 1044-1049.
- Sunday, J. M., R. A. Crim, C. D. G. Harley, and M. W. Hart. 2011. Quantifying rates of evolutionary adaptation in response to ocean acidification. *PLoS One*, 6: e22881.
- Tans, P. and R. Keeling. 2014. Trends in atmospheric carbon dioxide. Earth Systems Research Laboratory: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Website accessed December 2014, http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends/
- Tegner, M. J. and P. K. Dayton. 1981. Population structure, recruitment and mortality of two sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus* and *S. purpuratus*) in a kelp forest. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 5: 255-268.
- Tegner, M. J., and L. A. Levin 1983. Spiny lobsters and sea urchins: analysis of a predator-prey interaction. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 3: 125-150.
- Tyrell, T. 2007. Calcium carbonate cycling in future oceans and its influence on future climates. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 30: 141-156.

- Watson, J. 1993. The effects of sea otter (*Enhydra lutris*) foraging on shallow rocky communities off northwestern Vancouver Island, British Columbia. Dissertation. University of California, Santa Crus, California, USA.
- Watson, S-A., S. Lefevre, M. I. McCormick, P. Domenici, G. E. Nilsson, and P. L. Munday. 2014. Marine mollusc predator-escape behaviour altered by near-future carbon dioxide levels. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 281: 20132377.
- Wood, H. L., J. I. Spicer, and S. Widdicombe. 2008. Ocean acidification may increase calcification rates, but at a cost. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 275: 1767-1773.
- Wood, H. L., J. I. Spicer, M.A. Kendall, D.M. Lowe, and S. Widdicombe. 2011. Ocean warming and acidification; implications for the Arctic brittlestar *Ophiura sericeum*. *Polar Biology*, 34: 1033-1044.
- Wootton, J. T., C. A. Pfister, and J. D. Forester. 2008. Dynamic patterns and ecological impacts of declining ocean pH in a high-resolution multi-year dataset. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105: 18848-18853.
- Zimmerman, R.C., D. G. Kohrs, D. L. Stellar, and R. S. Alberte. 1997. Impacts of CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment on productivity and light requirements of eelgrass. *Plant Physiology*, 115: 599-607.

# Appendices

# A. Seawater Chemistry

**Table A-1.** Seawater chemistry parameters (mean ± SE) measured or calculated for control and acidified treatments. Temperature, salinity, pH, and dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) were measured. Parameters identified with an asterisk (\*) – total alkalinity (TA), CO<sub>2</sub> partial pressure ( $pCO_2$ ), CO<sub>2</sub> fugacity ( $fCO_2$ ), bicarbonate and carbonate ions concentration ([HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>] and [CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup>]), calcite and aragonite saturation ( $\Omega_{calc}$  and  $\Omega_{arag}$ ) – were calculated using CO2SYS (Pierrot *et al.*, 2006).

Parameter	Control	Acidified
Temperature (°C)	$12.80 \pm 0.05$	$12.74 \pm 0.04$
Salinity (ppt)	$32.8 \pm 0.1$	$32.6 \pm 0.1$
pH	$7.96 \pm 0.01$	$7.68 \pm 0.01$
DIC ( $\mu$ mol kg <sup>-1</sup> )	$1569.28 \pm 14.25$	$1652.91 \pm 11.35$
TA ( $\mu$ mol kg <sup>-1</sup> ) *	$1664.59 \pm 14.87$	$1676.08 \pm 11.44$
$pCO_2(\mu atm) *$	$511.50 \pm 10.88$	$1052.81 \pm 26.18$
$fCO_2$ (µatm) *	$510.30 \pm 10.77$	$1048.89 \pm 26.08$
$CO_3^{2-}$ (µmol kg <sup>-1</sup> ) *	$69.36 \pm 1.33$	$39.56 \pm 0.91$
$HCO_3^{-1}$ (µmol kg <sup>-1</sup> ) *	$1479.17 \pm 13.45$	$1570.60 \pm 10.77$
$\Omega_{ m calc}$ *	$1.67 \pm 0.03$	$0.95\pm0.02$
$\Omega_{ m arag}$ *	$1.06\pm0.02$	$0.61 \pm 0.01$



**Figure A-1.** Mean  $pCO_2$  (µatm) measured weekly in laboratory mesocosms airated with ambient (~500 µatm) and elevated (~1000 µatm) levels of CO<sub>2</sub>. Partial seawater changes were carried out at weeks 8 and 15. The increase in  $pCO_2$  from weeks 5-8 was a result of high ambient CO<sub>2</sub> levels in the laboratory. The effect of ambient air on seawater  $pCO_2$  was mitgated by installing CO<sub>2</sub> scrubbers on week 9. Error bars represent standard error of the mean.



**Figure A-2.** Mean pH measured weekly in laboratory mesocosms airated with ambient (~500  $\mu$ atm) and elevated (~1000  $\mu$ atm) levels of CO<sub>2</sub>. Partial seawater changes were carried out at weeks 8 and 15. The decrease in pH from weeks 5-8 was a result of high ambient CO<sub>2</sub> levels in the laboratory. The effect of ambient air on seawater pH was mitgated by installing CO<sub>2</sub> scrubbers on week 9. Error bars represent standard error of the mean.



**Figure A-3.** Mean temperature (°C) measured weekly in laboratory mesocosms airated with ambient (~500  $\mu$ atm) and elevated (~1000  $\mu$ atm) levels of CO<sub>2</sub>. The spike in temperature at week 15 occurred due to a mechanical failure in the air conditioning system, but had no observable effect on the experimental animals. Error bars represent standard error of the mean.


**Figure A-4.** Mean salinity (ppm) measured weekly in laboratory mesocosms airated with control (~500  $\mu$ atm) and high (~1000  $\mu$ atm) levels of CO<sub>2</sub>. Partial seawater changes were carried out at weeks 8 and 15. Error bars represent standard error of the mean.

## **B.** Chapter 2 Supplementary Figures



**Figure B-1.** Scatterplot of final wet mass (g) by initial wet mass (g) of *Pycnopodia helianthoides* (n=11) exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 7.7). Lines represent linear regressions. There was no significant difference between CO<sub>2</sub> treatments (ANCOVA; CO<sub>2</sub>,  $F_{1,7} = 1.55$ , p = 0.25, initial wet mass,  $F_{1,7} = 253.64$ , p < 0.0001, interaction,  $F_{1,7} = 1.30$ , p = 0.29).



**Figure B-2.** Scatterplot of final diameter (cm) by dry mass (g) of *Pycnopodia helianthoides* (n=11) exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 7.7) conditions for 22 weeks. Lines represent linear regressions. There was no significant difference between CO<sub>2</sub> treatments (ANCOVA; CO<sub>2</sub>,  $F_{1,7} = 1.06$ , p = 0.34, diameter,  $F_{1,7} = 19.87$ , p = 0.003, interaction,  $F_{1,7} = 1.69$ , p = 0.24).



**Figure B-3.** Effect of CO<sub>2</sub> manipulation on A) mean wet mass (g) and B) mean relative growth (percent change from initial wet mass) of *Pycnopodia helianthoides* (n=11). Sea stars were exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 7.7) conditions for 22 weeks. Error bars represent 1 standard error (SE) of the mean. The effect of initial size, but not CO<sub>2</sub>, on final sea star wet mass was statistically significant (ANCOVA; CO<sub>2</sub>,  $F_{1,7} = 1.56$ , p = 0.25, initial wet mass,  $F_{1,7} = 253.64$ , p < 0.0001, interaction,  $F_{1,7} = 1.3$ , p = 0.29).

## C. Chapter 3 Supplementary Figures

**Table C-1.** Linear mixed effects model testing the effects of  $CO_2$  treatment (control/high) and predator treatment (absent/present) on log final wet mass (g) of red sea urchins (*Stronglyocentrotus franciscanus*). Urchin size (test diameter) is included as a covariate. (\*) indicates a significant effect.

Parameter	Est.	SE	Likelihood- ratio χ <sup>2</sup>	df	р
$CO_2$	-0.272	0.138	3.583	1	0.058
Predator	-0.454	0.138	5.352	1	0.021*
log(Size)	0.661	0.034	190.18	1	< 0.001*
$\rm CO_2 \times Predator$	0.029	0.062	0.216	1	0.642
$\overline{\text{CO}_2} \times \log(\text{Size})$	0.056	0.039	2.142	1	0.143
Predator $\times \log(Size)$	0.109	0.039	7.055	1	0.008*

 $N_{urchins} = 66$   $N_{tanks} = 22$ 

**Table C-2.** Linear mixed effects model testing the effects of  $CO_2$  treatment (control/high) and predator treatment (absent/present) on log test calcified mass of red sea urchins (*Stronglyocentrotus franciscanus*). Urchin size (test diameter) is included as a covariate. (\*) indicates a significant effect.

Parameter	Est.	SE	Likelihood- ratio χ <sup>2</sup>	df	р
$CO_2$	0.136	0.161	0.260	1	0.610
Predator	-0.380	0.162	3.240	1	0.072
Size	-0.050	0.003	179.94	1	< 0.001*
$CO_2 \times Predator$	-0.024	0.061	0.156	1	0.693
$CO_2 \times Size$	0.002	0.003	0.484	1	0.487
Predator × Size	0.006	0.003	4.450	1	0.035

 $N_{urchins} = 66 \qquad \qquad N_{tanks} = 22$ 



**Figure C-1.** The relationship between test diameter (mm) and relative growth (percent change from initial diameter) for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus;* N=66) exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm, pH \sim 8.0$ ) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm, pH \sim 7.7$ ) conditions for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia helianthoides*). The effect was statistically significant for both treatments (see Table 3-1 for details).



**Figure C-2.** Mean relative growth (percent change from initial wet mass) for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus;* N=66) exposed ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm, pH \sim 8.0$ ) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm, pH \sim 7.7$ ) conditions for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia helianthoides*). Error bars represent 1 standard error of the mean. There was a statistically significant effect of predator presence, but the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> was marginally non-significant (see Table C-1 for details).



**Figure C-3.** The relationship between wet mass (g) and relative growth (percent change from initial wet mass) for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*; N=66) exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu$ atm, pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu$ atm, pH ~ 7.7) conditions for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia helianthoides*). There was a statistically significant effect of predator presence, but the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> was marginally non-significant (see Table C-1 for details).



**Figure C-4.** The relationship between test diameter (mm) and calcified mass (as a percentage of total wet mass) for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus;* N=66) exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm, pH \sim 8.0$ ) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm, pH \sim 7.7$ ) conditions for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia helianthoides*). The effect of predators, but not CO<sub>2</sub>, was statistically significant. There was also a significant interaction between size and predator presence (see Table 3-1 for details).



**Figure C-5.** The relationship between test diameter (mm) and mean length (mm) of the longest spine (n=10 spines per urchin) for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*; N=66) exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 8.0) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm$ , pH ~ 7.7) conditions for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia helianthoides*). The effect of CO<sub>2</sub>, but not predator presence, was statistically significant (see Table 3-1 for details).



**Figure C-6.** Test calcified mass (as a percentage of total wet mass) for red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus;* N=66) exposed to ambient ( $pCO_2 \sim 500 \mu atm, pH \sim 8.0$ ) or acidified ( $pCO_2 \sim 1000 \mu atm, pH \sim 7.7$ ) conditions for 22 weeks, with and without a caged predator (sunflower star, *Pycnopodia helianthoides*). Error bars represent 1 standard error of the mean. There was no significant effect of either treatment (see Table C-2 for details).