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In situ experiments were carried out on natural cockle beds in the Western Scheldt in autumn, spring and summer, using a Benthic Ecosystem Tunnel. From this tunnel, inflowing and outflowing water was sampled at regular intervals and analyzed for seston, POC, PON, POP, chlorophyll-a, phaeophytin-a and dissolved inorganic nutrients. In two cases, significant uptake of chlorophyll-a and release of ammonium and phosphate have been observed in tunnel experiments, but in general differences between inflow and outflow were not significant and uptake and release alternated. Filtration rates were comparable under field and laboratory conditions. However, improvements are required on the measuring devices to achieve more accurate flux measurements. Preliminary budget calculations of benthic-pelagic coupling for cockles in relation to benthic and pelagic algae were done with literature data. It is shown that in spring, cockles may have a limited impact on phytoplankton in the Western Scheldt, but that in autumn this impact may be large due to lower primary production and increased cockle biomass. Cockles may ingest a substantial portion of benthic diatom daily production, when benthic diatoms are suspended and available for filtration.

## 1 Introduction

Bivalve filter feeders are dominant organisms in many estuaries, and can have a profound influence on biological processes (e.g. Cloern 1982). Bivalve species occurring in high densities have the potential to filter the total water volume of an estuary at a rate comparable to the water residence time (Smaal and Prins 1993). Already in 1952, Verwey pointed at the important role of cockles and mussels in organic matter transport in the Wadden Sea. Since then, a growing number of experiments has been carried out which show substantial rates of uptake and release of material on beds of bivalve filter feeders. Experiments were done in mesocosms (e.g. Doering and Oviatt 1986), by taking water samples over a bivalve bed (Fréchette and Bourget 1985a, 1985b, Fréchette et al. 1989, Smaal et al. 1986, Peterson and Black 1991, Muschenheim and Newell 1992) or with various kinds of flumes placed on bivalve beds (Dame et al. 1984, Dame and Dankers 1988, Dame et al. 1991, Prins and Smaal 1990, Prins and Smaal in press, Asmus and Asmus 1991, Zurburg 1993). Postma (1954) was the first to indicate the importance of phosphate excretion by bivalves. Release of other nutrients from bivalve beds, notably ammonium and silicate, has been reported later (e.g. Dame et al. 1984, Prins and Smaal 1990). When these nutrients are released through direct bivalve excretion or bacterial mineralization of faeces and pseudofaeces, they can be recycled by phytoplankton in the water column. This process is an aspect of benthic-pelagic coupling (Dame et al. 1980, Prins and Smaal 1990, for a review of benthic-pelagic coupling in general, see Graf (1992)). Some model calculations show that, in some estuaries, bivalve filter feeders can act as a euthrophication control via benthic-pelagic coupling (Officer et al. 1982, Loo and Rosenberg 1989, Herman and Scholten 1990). In this view, filter feeders increase the turnover of phytoplankton by excreting nutrients, but keep phytoplankton at a low level even in bloom situations by high feeding rates.

In this study the focus is on the common cockle Cerastoderma edule L., a bivalve filter feeder. In the Western Scheldt Estuary, cockles occur in densities of up to $7400 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ with biomass maxima of $340 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AFDW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ on intertidal mudflats, and dominate the macrobenthos biomass in the marine part of the estuary (Ysebaert and Meire, 1991). Commercial fishery on cockles is extensive in the area. The Western Scheldt is the estuary of the River Scheldt, and has a total surface of ca $300 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$, of which tidal flats comprise $80 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$. The estuary has a
tidal discharge of $44,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ at Vlissingen, while the river input is only $100 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$. Nutrient levels, especially of N and P , are high, due to waste water discharge along the River Scheldt. Phytoplankton is dominated by diatoms, although in spring, a bloom of the flagellate Phaeocystis sp. may occur (Koeman et al. 1992). On the surface of intertidal mudflats, benthic diatoms grow abundantly (Sabbe and Vyverman 1991, D. de Jong, unpubl. data, and own obs.) For other estuaries it has been reported that benthic diatoms can be suspended in the water column and thus become available as food for filter feeders (de Jonge 1992, de Jonge and van Beusekom 1992, Muschenheim and Newell 1992).

The aim of this study was to test the suitability of a flume method, the Benthic Ecosystem Tunnel (see section 2.1), for measuring uptake and release of material by a natural cockle bed in the Western Scheldt. For comparison, clearance rates of individual cockles taken from the tunnel were determined in the laboratory. The results of the first three experiments were used (1) to compare clearance rates of cockles in the field and individual cockles held in the laboratory, (2) to compare nutrient release from a natural cockle bed and rates extrapolated from individual excretion rate measured in the laboratory, and (3) to estimate the influence of cockles on material fluxes in the Western Scheldt estuary. Some preliminary results of diatom composition of near-bottom water and stomach contents of cockles will also be presented. The research fits into a framework of studies by the National Institute of Coastal and Marine Management into carrying capacity and sustainable use of water systems. Ultimate goal of the experiments on cockle beds is to quantify the influence of the cockle population of the Western Scheldt on $C$ and $N$ cycles in the estuarine ecosystem. For this purpose some budget calculations were done with literature data.


Figure 1 Map of the Western Scheldt. The experimental site is designated by a black dot.

### 2.1 Benthic Ecosystem Tunnel experiments

Three experiments were carried out on Molenplaat, an intertidal mudflat in the Western Scheldt (see fig. 1), where cockles occur in fairly high densities (up to $1384 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$, Ysebaert and Meire 1991). In September 1992 a site alongside a tidal channel was used, lying 75 cm below mean water level, emerged for about 4.5 h per tide. In April and June/July 1993 experiments were carried out on a higher part in the middle of the mudflat, at 24 cm below NAP, emerged for about 6 h per tide. Dates of experiments were within a few days of neap tide. Experiments were done with a Benthic Ecosystem Tunnel (BEST), a device for measuring in situ uptake and release of material on a bivalve bed by sampling water flowing in and out of the tunnel. The tunnel is aligned to the mean current direction. For all three experiments, a BEST of 12 x 0.8 m was used (fig. 2), with 10 m between the two sampling points. It consists of 25 cm high stainless steel side plates, pushed about 5 cm into the sediment, and covered by perspex $U$-shaped segments. The side plates are fastened with bolts to iron poles, driven ca. 60 cm deep into the sediment. Height of the perspex roof above the bottom was ca. 40 cm , cross-sectional area was about $0.308 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$, and $7.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of cockle bed was covered between sampling points. For the June 1993 experiment, the BEST of the IBN-DLO served as a control. This tunnel has a cross-sectional area of about $0.225 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$, and covers a surface of $8.3 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ between sampling points. Samples of in- and outflowing water were taken with batterydriven pumps. Current velocity in the tunnels was measured with electro-magnetic induction current meters (Marsh-McBirney and NSW Meerestechnik) mounted inside the tunnel halfway between sampling points. Current velocity outside the tunnel was measured in 1993 with a meter mounted outside the tunnel. These devices were operated from a small boat anchored alongside the tunnel. Because of low natural densities, cockles from the surrounding area were added on the experimental site, two weeks in advance of an experiment. In April, several thousands of cockles from the Sloe harbour area were bought from a cockle fisher and also added to the natural population, two weeks in advance of the experiment. In the control tunnel, in June/July 1993, cockles were removed from the sediment. In April and June/July 1993, current velocity in the tunnels was reduced by placing five iron rods of 1 cm diameter into the sediment at the entrance of the tunnel, at equal distances. Reduced water flux through the tunnel enhanced the possibility of detection of material fluxes.


[^0]Experiments lasted two subsequent tidal cycles. Sampling started when water level above the mudflat reached ca. 1 m . Samples of in- and outflowing water were taken at 30 min (1992) or 20 min (1993) intervals and sampling stopped when water level dropped below 1 m with the receding tide. Samples were transported in 11 polythene bottles to the laboratory and filtered within a few hours, and stored before further analysis took place. After each experiment, cockle density and frequency distribution in the tunnel were determined by taking 10 bottom cores of $1 / 16 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. Samples were stored at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Shell length was measured to the nearest 0.1 mm with callipers, along the longest axis of the shell. The soft parts were excised from the shell, and DW and AFDW were determined by respectively drying for 48 h at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and combusting for 2 h at $450^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

### 2.2 Sample analysis

Number of particles with equivalent spherical diameter $>3 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ in each sample was determined with a Coulter counter. Seston was determined by filtering 500 ml of sampled water over a pre-weighed, ashed whatman GF/C glass fiber filter, rinsing with about 100 ml distilled water, drying the filter for 24 h at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and weighing. Particulate organic carbon (POC) was determined as weight loss after ashing of the seston filter. Particulate organic nitrogen (PON) and phosphorus (POP) were determined by filtering 500 ml of sampled water over a Whatman GF/C filter, rinsing with sea-water isotonic salt solution ( $30 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NaCl} . \mathrm{l}^{-1}$ ) and combusting the filter in a Carlo Erba analyser. Chlo-rophyll-a and phaeophytin-a were determined by HPLC after filtering 1 (September 1992 and April 1993) or 500 ml (June/July 1993) of sampled water over a Whatman GF/C filter, adding some $\mathrm{MgCO}_{3}$ solution, and rinsing with sea-water isotonic salt solution. Dissolved inorganic nutrients were determined by autoanalyzer in the filtrate obtained after filtering over a Whatman GF/C filter.

### 2.3 Calculation of mass fluxes

Mass fluxes of material were calculated by multiplying the difference in concentration between inflow and outflow by the water flux through the tunnel at sampling time. Figure 3 illustrates this procedure. Water flux was calculated from current velocity measurements multiplied by 0.85 to correct for shear on the bottom and at the tunnel sides. Only samples at current velocities $>2 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}$ were used for analysis, we assumed water in the tunnel to be well mixed at these speeds (Prins et al., in prep.). A positive sign is used for influx, and a negative sign for flux out of the sediment.

### 2.4 Calculation of clearance rate in the tunnel

Clearance rate of a standard cockle of 1 g DW in the tunnel can be calculated from chlorophyll-a concentrations in the following way (after Coughlan, 1969):
$\mathrm{CR}_{\text {bed }} \quad=\quad \frac{\mathrm{Q} \ln \left(\mathrm{C}_{\text {in }} / \mathrm{C}_{\text {out }}\right)}{\mathrm{in} \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{m}^{2} \cdot \mathrm{~h} .}$
A
where $\mathrm{CR}_{\text {bed }}$ is clearance rate of the cockle bed, $Q$ is water flux ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{h}$ ) through the tunnel, $C_{i n}$ is chlorophyll-a concentration ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{I}$ ) in the inflowing water, $\mathrm{C}_{\text {out }}$ is chlorophyll-a concentration ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{l}$ ) in the outflowing water, and A is
the surface $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ of the cockle bed between sampling points. Clearance rate is then converted to rate per standard animal of 1 g DW by dividing $\mathrm{CR}_{\text {bed }}$ by the metabolic biomass in the tunnel, $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{m}}$ :

$$
\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{m}} \quad=\quad \Sigma\left(\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{~W}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{b}}\right) \quad \text { in } \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{2}
$$

where $n_{i}$ is the number of cockles of size class $i, W_{i}$ is $D W$ of a cockle of size class $i$, and $b$ is the weight exponent of the allometric function $C R=$ $a W^{b}$. A value of 0.556 was chosen for $b$ in this study (Newell and Bayne 1980).

Cockle Tunnel


Figure 3 Example of procedure for computation of mass fluxes from current velocity measurements and concentrations of, in this case, ammonia in inflow and outflow of the tunnel. The three graphs in the left column are for tunnel with cockles, right three graphs are for control tunnel. The graphs in the top row give current velocity at each water sampling time, while graphs in the middle row give ammonia concentrations for inflow and outflow of the tunnels at each sampling time. The lower row of graphs shows the fluxes of ammonia at each sampling time, calculated from concentration differences between inflow and outflow (middle row) and current velocity (top row) converted to water flux through the tunnel. Example for June/July 1993 experiment, second tidal cycle.

### 2.5 Laboratory measurements of clearance rate

A subsample of cockles was taken from the tunnel immediately after a BEST experiment. The animals were transported to the laboratory and placed in a raceway onto sediment taken from the tunnel, and provided with running sea water from the Eastern Scheldt. Measurements were done within a week after the BEST experiment. Clearance rate was measured with natural Eastern Scheldt water. 14 Cockles were put into small cups with silicious sand (median grain size of $210 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ) and placed in individual flow-through chambers of ca. 600 ml . Two control chambers contained a cup of sand without a cockle. A water flow of ca. $41 / h$ was maintained trough the chambers with a Watson-Marlow 503 s or 504 s peristaltic pump. Water in the chambers was mixed gently with magnetic stirrers. Samples of outflowing water were taken after a 16 h acclimatizing period, and analyzed with a Coulter counter. Particles with equivalent spherical diameter $>3 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ were counted. Clearance rate for each individual cockle was calculated with the following formula, using the outflow of the control chamber as the inflow value, to correct for sedimentation in chambers or tubing:
$C R=Q *\left(C_{\text {in }}-C_{\text {out }}\right) / C_{\text {in }}$,
where $C R=$ clearance rate in $1 / h, Q$ is flow through the chamber in $1 / h, C_{i n}=$ number of particles $>3 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ per ml in outflow of control chamber, and $\mathrm{C}_{\text {out }}=$ number of particles $>3 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ per ml in outflow of chamber with cockle. After the experiment, cockle length, DW and AFDW were determined as described in 2.1.

### 2.6 Diatom composition of cockle stomachs and near-bottom water

To obtain stomach contents, cockles were stored on ice after sampling. Dissection took place within 2 hours after sampling, using a stereo microscope, cold light source, small scissors and a 1 ml syringe. Stomach contents were stored in 10 ml of Lugol's solution. Near-bottom water was collected with the normal sampling tubes from the tunnel, taking 11 and storing it with 4 ml concentrated Lugol's solution. To determine diatom composition, 5 ml of sample was taken and put into a 10 ml cuvette. 200 Diatom cells were counted at 400 x magnification under an inverted microscope (Zeiss) after at least 24 h settling time. Distinction was made between pennate (mostly benthic, Hummel 1985, p.61), and centric (unicellular or chain-forming, mostly pelagic in origin, Hummel 1985, p.61) diatoms.

### 2.7 Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis of the data was done using Statistix 4.0 and Systat 5.0 statistical packages. Significance of a mass flux was determined over one tidal cycle at a time, comparing pairs of inflow and outflow data by a Wilcoxon signed ranks test. For the June/July 1993 experiments, fluxes in the control and cockle tunnel were compared per tidal cycle using a Mann-Whitney U-test.

## 3 Results

Cockle density and biomass in the tunnel are given in table 1 for each experiment. Density and biomass were higher in 1993 than in 1992 because more cockles were added to the tunnel site. Other macrobenthos species were scarcely observed in cores from the tunnel in all experiments, and biomass is supposed to have been negligible as compared to cockle biomass. This has been quantified in June/July 1993 (Table 1). Length distributions of cockles in the tunnel are shown in figure 4. The large cockles present in September had presumably been fished after the experiment, and in April only small animals of around 10 mm were left over. In April we added a large amount of $30-40 \mathrm{~mm}$ cockles originating from a mudflat in the mouth of the Western Scheldt on the site, while in June/July somewhat smaller cockles from the surrounding mudflat area were added.

Table 1 Cockle densities and AFDW per $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ in the tunnel for three BEST experiments. Means $\pm$ s.e., 10 cores in September 1992 and April 1993, 5 cores in June/July 1993

| experiment | $\# / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | g AFDW $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | other benthos AFDW $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $23 / 24$ September 1992 | $232 \pm 69$ | $85 \pm 14$ | not determined |
| $14 / 15$ April 1993 | $1133 \pm 120$ | 194 | not determined |

30 June / 1 July 1993:
Cockle tunnel
$1680 \pm 130 \quad 200 \pm 16$
$4 \pm 1$
Control tunnel $64 \pm 11 \quad 5 \pm 1 \quad$ not found


Figure 4 Length distribution of cockles in the tunnel for the three experiments. One class per mm length. Mean frequency in percent of mean total per core of $1 / 16 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.
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Figure 5 Current velocity measurements for the three experiments, plotted per tidal cycle. Closed dots for tunnel with cockles, open dots for control tunnel (June/July experiment only), open squares for velocity measured outside tunnel.

Current velocity profiles measured in and outside the tunnels are presented in figure 5. On the experimental site in September 1992 a clear reversal of current direction occurred at the turn of the tide. This was not observed on the site used in 1993 experiments. The effect of current velocity reductions (carried out on purpose, see section 2.1) in 1993 experiments was clearly visible. In the control tunnel in June/July 1993, velocity was higher than in the tunnel with cockles (Mann-Whitney U -test, $\mathrm{p}<0.0001$ ). This could be caused by tunnel design differences and effects resulting from the position of the tunnels on the mudflat. However, current velocities at water sampling times did not differ significantly between cockle and control tunnel (MannWhitney $U$-test, $p>0.05$ ). Since fluxes were calculated using only the velocities at water sampling times, there is no effect on further results.

Mean mass fluxes of material for all three experiments are given in tables 2, 3 and 4. Statistical comparison of fluxes in the cockle tunnel and the control tunnel is also listed in table 4. On the whole, ranges of fluxes were large and few fluxes were computed from significant differences in concentration of inflowing and outflowing water. In September, significant outfluxes of seston, POC, POP and phaeophytin-a occurred, no doubt due to the strong SW wind of 6 to 7 Beaufort during the experiment. Under such turbulent conditions it was impossible to measure any influence of cockles on the water flowing through the tunnel. The results of this experiment are therefore not discussed further.

In 1993 weather conditions were more favourable, and chlorophyll-a uptake could be detected, although uptake was only significant in the second tidal cycle of the April experiment (table 3). In June/July, chlorophyll-a uptake was observed in both cockle and control tunnel in the first tidal cycle. In the second tidal cycle, chlorophyll-a uptake occurred in the cockle tunnel, while in the control tunnel an outflux of chlorophyll-a occurred, possibly due to suspension of benthic diatoms. The difference in mean chlorophyll-a fluxes between the tunnels was not significant (Table 4). Phaeophytin-a fluxes showed no clear pattern. In the second tidal cycle in June/July a significant uptake of phaeophytin-a occurred, while release occurred in the control tunnel. The difference in fluxes between the tunnels was not significant (Table 4). No significant differences were found between inflow concentrations of all parameters and between water fluxes for cockle and control tunnel in June/July 1993 (Mann-Whitney U test).

Large variations in seston flux were found in both 1993 experiments. In April and in June/July in the first tidal cycle, seston was transported out of the tunnel. Only during the second cycle in June/July seston uptake occurred, twice as much in the cockle tunnel relative to the control tunnel. But the difference between the tunnels was not significant (Table 4). We never observed significant differences in particulate $C, N$ and $P$ between inflow and outflow of the tunnel.

For dissolved inorganic nutrients, flux data do not show a clear pattern. In April, trends for uptake of all nutrients (except for nitrate) occurred, but only for phosphate this uptake was significant. In June/July, release of nutrients nearly allways occurred in the control tunnel, sometimes being significant. In the cockle tunnel, uptake seemed to occur during the day in the first tidal cycle, while release was found at night during the second tidal cycle. This trend was reversed for nitrate. Significant differences between fluxes in cockle and control tunnel were found for ammonium (release in cockle tunnel relative to control tunnel), phosphate (at day more uptake, at night more release from cockle tunnel relative to control tunnel) and silicate (uptake in cockle tunnel at day relative to control tunnel).

Table 2 BEST September 23 and 24, 1992 Molenplaat Western Scheldt. Mean fluxes $\pm$ s.e., range in parentheses. Particulate fluxes in $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{2} . \mathrm{h}$, chlorophyll-a and phaeophytin-a fluxes in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{2} . \mathrm{h}$, dissolved material fluxes in mmol/ $\mathrm{m}^{2} . \mathrm{h}$. Positive flux means uptake in the tunnel, negative flux means release from the tunnel. Differences between inflow and outflow concentrations tested with Wilcoxon signed ranks test, significance denoted by asterisks:

* $\mathrm{p}<.05$, ** $\mathrm{p}<.01$

|  | cycle 1 | (day,$n=12)$ | cycle $2(n i g h t, n=12)$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| seston | $-1 \pm 100$ | $(-680 / 870)$ | $-240 \pm 9)^{* * *}$ | $(-990 / 65)$ |
| POC | $2.3 \pm 1.6$ | $(-5.9 / 13)$ | $-2.0 \pm 0.9 *$ | $(-11 / 0.3)$ |
| PON | $0.1 \pm 0.11$ | $(-0.48 / 1.3)$ | $0.07 \pm 0.04 *$ | $(-0.11 / 0.41)$ |
| POP | $0.02 \pm 0.07$ | $(-0.41 / 0.65)$ | $-0.14 \pm 0.09 *$ | $(-1.2 / 0.08)$ |
| chlorophyll-a | $0.5 \pm 0.9$ | $(-7.8 / 5.2)$ | $-2.2 \pm 2.2$ | $(-27 / 6.0)$ |
| phaeophytin-a | $0.21 \pm 0.12$ | $(-0.15 / 1.2)$ | $-0.51 \pm 0.40 *$ | $(-3.7 / 3.4)$ |
| ammonia | $3.6 \pm 1.8$ | $(-4.5 / 15)$ | $1.7 \pm 2.6$ | $(-11 / 23)$ |
| nitrite | $3.4 \pm 2.1$ | $(-5.6 / 20)$ | $1.4 \pm 2.3$ | $(-15 / 14)$ |
| nitrate | $82 \pm 50$ | $(-140 / 460)$ | $42 \pm 57$ | $(-300 / 350)$ |
| phosphate | $3.4 \pm 2.9$ | $(-11 / 25)$ | $4.2 \pm 1.9 *$ | $(-4.5 / 15)$ |
| silicate | $20 \pm 12$ | $(-250 / 110)$ | $8.6 \pm 12$ | $(-80 / 70)$ |

Table 3 BEST April $14 \& 15,1993$ Molenplat Western Scheldt. Mean fluxes $\pm$ s.e., range in parentheses. Particulate fluxes in $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{2} . \mathrm{h}$, chlorophyll-a and phaeophytin-a fluxes in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{2} . \mathrm{h}$, dissolved material fluxes in $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m}^{2} . \mathrm{h}$. Positive flux means uptake in the tunnel, negative flux means release from the tunnel. Differences between inflow and outflow concentrations tested with Wilcoxon signed ranks test, significance denoted by asterisks: * $\mathrm{p}<.05$, ** $\mathrm{p}<.01$

|  | cycle 1 | (night, $n=6)$ | cycle $2($ day, $n=11)$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| seston | $-63 \pm 53$ | $(-328 / 57)$ | $-27 \pm 23$ | $(-146 / 141)$ |
| POC | $-1.5 \pm 1.1$ | $(-4.8 / 2.8)$ | $0.1 \pm 0.8$ | $(-5.7 / 4.9)$ |
| PON | $-0.22 \pm 0.13$ | $(-0.59 / 0.14)$ | $0.18 \pm 0.10$ | $(-0.08 / 1.2)$ |
| FOP | $-0.02 \pm 0.03$ | $(-0.15 / 0.06)$ | $0.02 \pm 0.02$ | $(-0.04 / 0.18)$ |
| chlorophyl1-a | $5.0 \pm 4.3$ | $(-13 / 20)$ | $3.1 \pm 1.8 *$ | $(-6.6 / 17)$ |
| phaeophytin-a | $-0.06 \pm 0.44$ | $(-2.2 / 1.2)$ | $-0.19 \pm 0.30$ | $(-3.2 / 0.61)$ |
| ammonia | $3.0 \pm 1.6$ | $(-2.5 / 9.6)$ | $1.2 \pm 0.8$ | $(-2.0 / 5.1)$ |
| nitrite | $0.3 \pm 0.5$ | $(-1.0 / 2.2)$ | $0.7 \pm 1.0$ | $(-5.0 / 7.0)$ |
| nitrate | $-20 \pm 25$ | $(-140 / 69)$ | $130 \pm 86$ | $(-290 / 680)$ |
| phosphate | $1.1 \pm 0.3^{*}$ | $(-0.2 / 1.9)$ | $3.0 \pm 0.8 *$ | $(0.1 / 7.7)$ |
| silicate | $13 \pm 7$ | $(-15 / 34)$ | $8 \pm 16$ | $(-73 / 120)$ |

Table 4 BEST June 30 \& July 1, 1993 Molenplaat Western Scheldt. Mean fluxes $\pm$ s.e., range in parentheses. Particulate fluxes in $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{2} . \mathrm{h}$, chlorophyll-a and phaeophytin-a fluxes in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{2} . \mathrm{h}$, dissolved material fluxes in mmol/ $\mathrm{m}^{2} . \mathrm{h}$. Positive flux means uptake in the tunnel, negative flux means release from the tunnel. Differences between inflow and outflow concentrations tested with Wilcoxon signed ranks test. Mann-Whitney U-test for comparing fluxes from cockle and control tunnel. Significance denoted by asterisks: $* p<.05, * * p<.01$

|  | cockle tunnel |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

tidal cycle 2 (night, $n=12$ )
cockle tunnel
control tunnel
tunnels
compared

| seston | $27 \pm 51$ | (-460/340) | $14 \pm 36$ | $(-210 / 330)$ | n.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POC | $0 \pm 3$ | $(-22 / 15)$ | $0.2 \pm 0.7$ | $(-3.8 / 5.3)$ | n.s. |
| PON | $0.2 \pm 0.4$ | $(-2.6 / 3.1)$ | $-0.0 \pm 0.2$ | $(-1.7 / 1.0)$ | n.s. |
| POP | no data |  |  |  |  |
| chlorophyl1-a | $32 \pm 30$ | (-68/350) | $-10 \pm 20$ | (-230/57) | n.s. |
| phaeophytin-a | $1.2 \pm 0.7 *$ | $(-0.4 / 7.8)$ | $-0.2 \pm 1.0$ | (-10/4.1) | n.s. |
| ammonia | $-3.9 \pm 1.1^{\text {\%* }}$ | (-13/0.8) | $-0.4 \pm 1.3$ | (-12/3.9) | ** |
| nitrite | $-0.1 \pm 0.2$ | $(-2.0 / 1.2)$ | $-1.4 \pm 1.8$ | (-21/4.1) | n.s. |
| nitrate | $4.8 \pm 2.2$ | (-9.5/15) | $-8.3 \pm 19$ | (-210/79) | n.s. |
| phosphate | $-1.3 \pm 0.3 \% *$ | (-3.4/0.0) | $0.2 \pm 0.3$ | (-1.9/2.2) | ** |
| silicate | $-1.1 \pm 0.6{ }^{\text {\% }}$ | (-6.4/1.2) | $-3.3 \pm 1.9 *$ | (-22/1.6) | n.s. |



Figure 6 Seston composition of inflowing water in all three experiments. Upper row, percentage of poc, middle row, percentage of chlorophyll-a, and lower row, POC/PON ratio versus seston concentration. Note that in the middle row, printed scales on the $Y$-axis for September 1992 and April 1993 are 10 times smaller than the scales for June/July 1993.

Seston concentrations in inflowing water were high in all experiments (fig. 6) (September $60 \pm 10 \mathrm{mg} / 1$; range $20-304 \mathrm{mg} / 1$, April $43 \pm 3 \mathrm{mg} / 1$; range $20-80 \mathrm{mg} / 1$, June/July $51 \pm 5 \mathrm{mg} / 1$; range $7-150 \mathrm{mg} / 1$ ), while chlorop-hyll-a and POC content (in percent of total seston) decreased with increasing seston concentration. However, $C / N$ ratio (as POC/PON) showed no relation with seston concentration in 1993 experiments, but a positive relation in September 1992. Still, mean $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}$ ratio remained low (September; $11 \pm 0.37$, April; POC/PON $=7.08 \pm 0.16$, June/July; $\mathrm{POC} / \mathrm{PON}=7.19 \pm 0.07$ ), indicating food of high quality for filter feeders (Navarro et al. 1993). Organic material in the water will have consisted mainly of algae with typical $C / N$ ratios of 5 to 8 (Fenchel and Jørgensen 1976), while detritus, with higher $C / N$ ratios of 10 to 35 (Rus-sel-Hunter 1970), made up only a minor part.

Clearance rates measured from chlorophyll-a uptake in the tunnels, recalculated per $g$ AFDW, were similar to values found in the laboratory with cockles taken from the tunnel after a field experiment. Clearance rates for laboratory and tunnel respectively, in $1 / \mathrm{g}$ DW.h, for April were $1.28 \pm 0.32$ ( $\mathrm{n}=6$ ) and 1.68 , and for June/July $2.70 \pm 0.46(\mathrm{n}=7)$ and 2.98 . Clearance rate measured in the laboratory was significantly lower in April than in June/July (Mann-Whitney U-test, $p=0.0321$ ).

Diatom counts of water samples from the tunnel show that up to $50 \%$ of the diatoms can be of benthic origin (fig. 7), showing that resuspension of surface sediment was important during those experiments. No clear change in diatom composition seems to take place in the course of a tidal cycle. Diatom counts of cockle stomach contents showed the same distribution (fig. 8) as found for the water in April. In June/July 1993, Phaeocystis sp. colonies were also present in the water. No stomach samples were taken in June/July.


Figure 7 Diatom composition of water samples from the tunnel from April and June/July 1993 experiments. Relative abundance of diatom groups (pennate, unicellular centric and chain-forming centric diatoms, and Phaeocystis) in percentage of 200 cells counted per sample at start of experiment, high water and end of experiment, for day and night cycles.
diatom composition in stomachs of eight cockles from the tunnel, April 1993


Figure 8 Diatom composition in stomachs of cockles sampled during the April 1993 tunnel experiment. Relative abundance of diatom groups (pennate, unicellular centric and chain-forming centric diatoms) in percentage of 200 cells counted per stomach sample.

## 4 Discussion

Large variations were found in mass fluxes in tunnels with cockles in all three experiments, and also in the control tunnel. It is difficult to draw conclusions from these results. We will discuss results for cockle and control tunnel in the June/July 1993 experiment, the only experiment in which a control tunnel was used. Notwithstanding the current velocity reduction measures taken, a trend for net export of particular and dissolved material - significant in only one case - took place in the control tunnel (table 4). When fluxes in the cockle tunnel are corrected for flux occurring in the control tunnel, a trend for net import of particulate material emerges. For dissolved inorganic nutrients, a trend for uptake prevailed during the day, while release occurred at night. This pattern could be caused by benthic diatoms growing in the cockle tunnel, utilizing nutrients released by the cockles at day. At night no benthic diatom primary production takes place, and cockle release products leave the tunnel. But then uptake of dissolved inorganic nutrients should have taken place during the day by benthic diatoms in the control tunnel too, which we did not find. The chlorophyll-a concentrations of the sediment in cockle and control tunnel were $13.36 \pm 2.68 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{g}$ and $16.20 \pm 2.55 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{g}$ respectively, indicating that benthic diatoms were present indeed. These chlo-rophyll-a concentrations are in the range normally found on the Molenplat in June and July (D. de Jong, unpubl. data). Concentrations did not differ significantly between cockle and control tunnel (Mann-Whitney U-test, $p=0.43$ ). Suspension of these benthic diatoms could also have caused some of the variation in chlorophyll-a fluxes measured in the tunnels.

Cockle clearance rates measured in the laboratory did not differ from those measured for cockles in the tunnel, and were comparable to a literature value of Prins and Smaal (1989) (fig. 9). Ammonium and phosphate releases are compared to literature data in table 5, since excretion was not measured in the laboratory for individual Western Scheldt cockles in this study. Contrary to expectation, releases we found are high in relation to values found in a BEST experiment in the Eastern Scheldt (Prins and Pouwer 1990) and in a


Figure 9 Cockle clearance rates compared for laboratory and field. Values measured in same month are comparable. Laboratory clearance rates with s.e., tunnel clearance rates calculated (see material and methods section).

Table 5 Ammonium and phosphorus releases of the experiment in June/July 1993, second tidal cycle (Table 4 lower panel) compared to other experimental data on cockles. A BEST experiment on a mussel bed is selected for comparison.

| study | biomass <br> g AFDW/m ${ }^{2}$ | ammonia flux $\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{m}^{2} . \mathrm{h}$ | phosphate flux $\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. h |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEST, Cockle bed, Eastern Scheldt ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | 580 | 90 |
| Cockles in aquarium ${ }^{b}$ | 130-170 g DW | 84 | 2.3 |
| BEST, Cockle bed, Western Scheldt ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | 3400 | 1100 |
| BEST, Mussel bed, Eastern Scheldt ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 1448 | 6700 | 709 |

[^1]laboratory study where cockles were kept in aquaria (Lindström Swanberg 1991). Ammonium release on the cockle bed is half of ammonium release on a mussel bed in the Eastern Scheldt in the same month, while phosphate release is in the same order of magnitude in both experiments. But the validity of releases on the cockle bed is highly questionable since they were only observed during one out of four tidal cycles. For ammonium, the quantitatively most important nutrient excreted (Prins and Smaal 1990), out of four tidal cycles, significant efflux was measured only one time, while mean influx occurred in the other three cycles. It is difficult to find feasible explanations for the alternations of influx and outflux also found for other dissolved inorganic nutrients in the 1993 experiments. In addition, the range in magnitude of fluxes during one tidal cycle is large for all parameters measured, so few fluxes were significantly different from zero flux.

An evaluation of field conditions during the experiments could help in understanding these results. Weather conditions were bright with low wind speeds for both 1993 experiments. Still, current velocity reduction was needed to enhance the possibility of detecting the influence of the cockles on the water flowing through the tunnel (fig. 5). In April, sediment was eroded alongside the tunnel, leaving holes under the side plates, so that water could enter the tunnel halfway between the sampling points. Effects of water processing by cockles are possibly masked by such an influx of water into the tunnel. It could also explain release of seston, POC, POP and phaeophytin-a in the second cycle of the April experiment. In the June/July experiment we prevented erosion almost completely by protecting both sides of the two tunnels with sand bags.

Mean seston concentrations of $40-60 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ we found in inflowing water were high as compared to mean values for other systems (e.g. Western Wadden Sea 5 - $20 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ (Prins et al. in press), Eastern Scheldt 20 - $30 \mathrm{mg} / 1$ (Smaal et al. 1986)). Clearance rate is negatively correlated with seston concentration in the cockle (Foster-Smith 1975, Prins et al. 1991), and cockles in the tunnel will have pumped with reduced clearance rates at the high seston concentrations prevailing. This also reduced their impact on water flowing
through the tunnel, and thus detection of that impact will be even more difficult. Another possible problem lies in cockle biomass attained in the tunnel, which was low when compared to experiments with mussels Mytilus edulis where biomasses of $>1000 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AFDW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ can be attained. It will be difficult to get a higher cockle biomass in the tunnel, since cockles are infaunal bivalves and cannot be piled on top of each other like (epifaunal) mussels. Densities
reached in the tunnel in our experiments are near the maximum possible. Summarizing we can say that the BEST method, that yielded good results with mussels (Dame and Dankers 1988, Prins and Smaal 1990, Prins and Smaal in press) and oysters Crassostrea virginica (Dame et al. 1984, 1992) in low seston, low current velocity environments, meets serious problems when applied on cockle beds in the Western Scheldt. Zurburg (1993) met similar problems when operating the tunnel with oysters Crassostrea gigas in the Bay of Marennes-Oléron (France). It may be possible that improvements on the tunnel equipment solve these problems, but other field methods need also be considered.

The results of diatom composition in cockle stomachs and near-bottom water (fig. 7, 8) indicate that cockles ingest all kinds of diatoms present in the water. These results are supported by work of Kamermans (1992), who studied algal composition of water and stomach contents of the bivalve filter feeders Cerastoderma edule, Mya arenaria and Mytilus edulis in the Western Wadden Sea. For all species, algal composition of stomach contents and overlying water showed high correlations. She also found suspended benthic diatoms in near-bottom water, to a percentage of around $30 \%$ of all algae present.

To evaluate the influence of cockles on material fluxes in the Western Scheldt estuary, simple budget calculations were done using clearance rate values and literature data (see Appendix for details on calculations). Cockle biomass of the May 1992 census was used, including the estimation of September 1992 biomass (Kesteloo - Hendrikse and van Stralen 1992). Benthic diatom data for 1989 - 1992 were taken from Frandzel (1993), while for other factors averaged monthly values over 1980-1985 were used from MOSES, a model of the Scheldt Estuary (Soetaert et al. 1992). Benthic diatom primary production can occur year-round (Cadée and Hegeman 1974), and for calculations we used the same average yearly level for July and September. In the Wadden Sea, Cadée and Hegeman (1974) found production to be in the same order of magnitude in July and September. Results are presented in diagram form for 'July 1992' and 'September 1992' in figure 10. The term 'available algae' is used to describe the mixture of pelagic and suspended benthic algae that is available to cockles in near-bottom water on the mudflats. Since data for the Western Scheldt are still poor, no benthic/pelagic ratio of some sort was used in the budget calculations. In July (fig. 9, left) phytoplankton primary production is high, and cockles could filter less than $10 \%$ of daily production. Filtration capacity would be nearly $50 \%$ of benthic diatom daily production, and could be limiting benthic diatom stock, if substantial suspension occurs. In September (fig. 9, right), phytoplankton primary production is much lower than in July, and now the cockles, which have grown in summer, and thus have higher clearance rates, could ingest the entire daily production. Absolute ingestion is lower than in July, because algal concentration in the water is lower and clearance rate remained the same in the calculations (although it varies seasonally, Newell and Bayne 1980). Effect on benthic diatoms could be more important than in July, because autumn storms can intensify wind-driven suspension. Ammonium excretion by cockles is insignificant to the $N$ pool in both July and September, as is the need of $N$ for primary production. From these calculations, it is not probable that cockle excretion is important to phytoplankton in the Western Scheldt. Also, it seems that cockles could not act as


Figure 10 Budget calculations for the marine part of the Western Scheldt for July (left) and September (right). All values are in mg per $\mathrm{m}^{3}$, except for N excretion, $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Average biomass for cockles was 3.9 g AFDW $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ in July and 7.7 g AFDW $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ in September. For benthic diatoms, yearly averaged biomass was $4.36 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$, production was $0.37 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. See Appendix for calculations.
a eutrophication control, able to control algal blooms, as suggested in calculations for other systems (Officer et al. 1982, Loo and Rosenberg 1989, Herman and Scholten 1990, Smaal and Prins 1993). But in autumn and winter, periods with low and even negative net phytoplankton primary production (Soetaert et al. 1992), cockles could have an important effect on phytoplankton, as long as temperatures are high enough for filtration activity to take place (Newell and Bayne 1980). Ingestion of benthic diatoms by cockles could be important in all seasons, depending on the amount of suspension taking place. Investigations on the diatom composition of near-bottom water will have to be done to elucidate the importance of this process.

## 5 Conclusions

In two cases, significant uptake of chlorophyll-a and release of ammonium and phosphate have been observed in tunnel experiments, but in general fluxes were not significant and varied between influx and outflux. Filtration rates though are comparable under field and laboratory conditions. However, improvements are required on the tunnel equipment to achieve more accurate flux measurements. Preliminary budget calculations show that cockles may have a limited impact on phytoplankton in the Western Scheldt in July, but that in September this impact may be large due to lower primary production and increased cockle biomass through growth. Depending on the amount of resuspended benthic diatoms available for filtration, cockles may ingest a substantial portion of benthic diatom daily production. The availability of benthic versus pelagic algae to cockles in different seasons is subject of further research.
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```
Appendix 1 - Calculation of budgets for the Western Scheldt
```

Basic data for MOSES compartments nrs 7-13 (Soetaert et al. 1992), where cockles occur according to Kesteloo-Hendrikse and van Stralen (1992).
total water volume at mid-tide

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =1 / 2 *(\text { mean } \mathrm{HW} \text { volume }+ \text { mean } \mathrm{LW} \text { volume }) \\
& =2.545 * 10^{9} \mathrm{~m}^{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

total surface of tidal flats
$=8.433 * 10^{7} \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (Kesteloo-Hendrikse and van Stralen 1992)
mean water depth $=$ volume at mid-tide / surface at HW (MOSES)

$$
=\quad 10 \mathrm{~m}
$$

Cockle biomass in Western Scheldt in 1992 (Kesteloo-Hendrikse and van Straalen 1992):

```
May 1992 September 1992 (estimate)
7834 ton fresh + shell }15437\mathrm{ fresh + shell
4 1 0 \text { ton DW (5.2\% of fresh) 800 ton DW}
330 ton AFDW (4.2% of fresh) 650 ton AFDW
4.9 g DW or 3.9 g AFDW per m}\mp@subsup{m}{}{2}\quad9.5\textrm{g DW}\mathrm{ or 7.7 g AFDW per m}\mp@subsup{}{2}{2
0.16 g DW or 0.13 g AFDW per m}\mp@subsup{\textrm{m}}{}{3}\quad0.31\textrm{g}\mathrm{ DW or 0.26 g AFDW per m
```

Phytoplankton monthly average for 1980 - 85 period (MOSES)
July September
phytoplankton biomass
0.519 g Phytoplankton-C/m $\quad 0.201 \mathrm{~g}$ Phytoplankton- $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$
5.2 g phyto- $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{2} \quad 2.0 \mathrm{~g}$ phyto- $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$
netto primary production (corrected for phytoplankton respiration)
$0.0489 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. day $\quad 0.00169 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. day

Nitrogen pool in monthly averages for $1980-85$ period (MOSES)

|  | July | September |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N as $\mathrm{NH}_{4}$ | $0.264 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ | $0.165 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |
| N as $\mathrm{NO}_{3}$ or $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ | $2.547 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ | $2.012 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |
| total N | $2.8 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ | $2.2 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |

Nitrogen demand for phytoplankton primary production ( $N / C=0.104$, MOSES)
July
$0.0489 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. day $* 0.104=0.0051 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. day
September
$0.00169 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. day $* 0.104=0.00017 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. day

Benthic diatoms (Frandzel 1993), average 1989-1993 over all tidal flats
Biomass (yearly average)
109 mg chlorophyll-a/m2 and C/chlorophyll-a ratio of 40
$4.36 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$
Area with benthic diatoms is $6.33 * 10^{7} \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (Frandzel 1993), 280 ton Cor total Western Scheldt, $110 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$

Gross production (de Jong et al. in press, after Cadée and Hegeman 1977)
Production $=1.22 *$ Biomass +1.77 in $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. year
$=1.22 * 109 \mathrm{mg}$ chlorophyll $1-a / \mathrm{m}^{2}+1.77$
$=135 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. year
$=0.37 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. day
23 ton C/day for total Western Scheldt, $9 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. day

Cockles filter at $0.003 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{g}$ DW.h in both months (assumption)
July
$0.003 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{g}$ DW.h * $4.9 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{DW} / \mathrm{m}^{2} * 20$ hours/day $* 0.519 \mathrm{~g}$ phyto $-\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$
$=0.15 \mathrm{~g}$ phyto $-\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. day ( $0.29 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. day)
or per $\mathrm{m}^{3}: 0.003 * 0.16 * 20 * 0.519=0.0050 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. day
this is $10 \%$ of phytoplankton daily production in July
September
$0.003 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{g}$ DW.h $* 9.5 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{DW} / \mathrm{m}^{2} * 20$ hours $/$ day $* 0.201 \mathrm{~g}$ phyto $-\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$
$=0.11 \mathrm{~g}$ phyto $-\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. day ( $0.57 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. day)
or per $\mathrm{m}^{3}: 0.003 * 0.31 * 20 * 0.201=0.0037 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. day
this is $220 \%$ of daily phytoplankton production in September

Excretion of ammonia by cockles
$1.6 \mu \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NH} / \mathrm{g}$ AFDW.h (Prins and Smaal, 1989) used in both months.
July
$1.6 \mu \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NH} 4 / \mathrm{g}$ AFDW.h $* 24 \mathrm{~h} * 3.9 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AFDW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}=150 \mu \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NH} 4 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. day or per $\mathrm{m}^{3}: 1.6 * 24 * 0.13 \mathrm{~g}$ AFDW $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}=5.0 \mu \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NH} / \mathrm{N}_{4} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. day

September
$1.6 \mu \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NH} / \mathrm{g}$ AFDW.h $* 24 \mathrm{~h} * 7.7 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AFDW} / \mathrm{m}^{2}=300 \mu \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NH} / \mathrm{N}_{4} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. day or per $\mathrm{m}^{3}: 1.6 * 24 * 0.26=10 \mu \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NH} / \mathrm{N}_{4}$. day

高苞










| BEST Sept | ber 23 \& | 1992, | enpla | Western |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sample | dp in | dp out | po4 in | po4 out | poc in |
| number | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | mg/l | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ |
| 1 | 0.269 | 0.271 | 0.182 | 0.245 | 1.1 |
| 2 | 0.255 | 0.271 | 0.226 | 0.254 | 0.98 |
| 3 | 0.248 | 0.295 | 0.226 | 0.238 | 7.61 |
| 4 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.193 | 0.211 | 2.88 |
| 5 | 0.246 | 0.239 | 0.221 | 0.187 | 2.29 |
| 6 | 0.278 | 0.229 | 0.239 | 0.21 | 2.66 |
| 7 | 0.233 | 0.198 | 0.183 | 0.178 | 2.96 |
| 8 | 0.237 | 0.23 | 0.152 | 0.198 | 1.91 |
| 9 | 0.25 | 0.248 | 0.172 | 0.221 | 1.73 |
| 10 | 0.249 | 0.247 | 0.215 | 0.204 | 1.67 |
| 11 | 0.242 | 0.231 | 0.141 | 0.17 | 1.65 |
| 12 | 0.241 | 0.237 | 0.206 | 0.198 | 1.5 |
| 13 | 0.245 | 0.244 | 0.214 | 0.2 | 1.3 |
| 14 | 0.246 | 0.238 | 0.18 | 0.211 | 1.21 |
| 20 | 0.273 | 0.283 | 0.249 | 0.25 | 0.75 |
| 21 | 0.281 | 0.255 | 0.235 | 0.2 | 0.79 |
| 22 | 0.266 | 0.24 | 0.239 | 0.222 | 0.92 |
| 23 | 0.24 | 0.206 | 0.216 | 0.202 | 1.99 |
| 24 | 0.233 | 0.207 | 0.209 | 0.189 | 1.89 |
| 25 | 0.227 | 0.23 | 0.192 | 0.156 | 1.39 |
| 26 | 0.211 | 0.211 | 0.197 | 0.182 | 1.17 |
| 27 | 0.235 | 0.223 | 0.204 | 0.218 | 3.75 |
| 28 | 0.221 | 0.227 | 0.211 | 0.226 | 1.84 |
| 29 | 0.234 | 0.24 | 0.228 | 0.223 | 1.65 |
| 30 | 0.242 | 0.232 | 0.175 | 0.194 | 1.12 |
| 31 | 0.245 | 0.232 | 0.2 | 0.231 | 2.53 |
| 32 | 0.248 | 0.232 | 0.201 | 0.192 | 1.76 |
| 33 | 0.229 | 0.223 | 0.213 | 0.216 | 1.84 |


| sample number | $\begin{aligned} & \text { currer } \\ & \mathrm{cm} / \mathrm{s} \end{aligned}$ | flow Q $\mathrm{m} 3 / \mathrm{m} 2$.h | chl flux $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m} 2 \mathrm{~h}$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ | $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m} 2$. | din flux $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ |  |  | no3 flux $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ | don flux $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ |  | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ | g/m2.h |  | 04 flux $\mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ | dop flux $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ | flux $\mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{m} 2$.t | $\begin{aligned} & u x \\ & 2 . h \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2.369 | 22.32735 | -1.78618 | -0.26792 | 0.014459 | -0.10270 | -0.00255 | -0.00340 | -0.09675 | 0.117165 | 0.893094 | -0.04465 | -0.04167 | -0.00019 | -0.00604 | 0.005857 | -0.02317 | 20.838 |
| 2 | 1.652 | 15.56976 | -1.14178 | -0.14531 | -0.05071 | -0.04893 | -0.00177 | -0.00177 | -0.04537 | -0.00177 | -1.45317 | -0.09341 | -0.07888 | -0.00107 | -0.00187 | 0.000803 | -0.00978 | -60.203 |
| 3 | 4.931 | 46.47368 | 2.664491 | 1.239298 | -0.26113 | -0.03452 | 0.011065 | -0.00132 | -0.04426 | -0.22661 | 12.64084 | 0.334610 | 0.464736 | -0.00939 | -0.00239 | -0.00699 | 0.007745 | 873.705 |
| 4 | 14.69 | 138.4503 | 0.553801 | 0 | -0.01450 | 0.005274 | -0.00263 | 0 | 0.007911 | -0.01977 | 14.39883 | 1.255282 | 0.64610 | -0.00595 | -0.01071 | 0.004763 | 0.004615 | 36.92008 |
| 5 | 9.26 | 87.27 | 4.0 | 30918 | 0.0 | 0.265145 | 0.009974 | 0.010805 | 0.2443 | -0.26 | 4.18 | 0.08145 | -0.04 | 0.00262 | 012762 | 0.01013 | 62 |  |
| 6 | 1.823 | 17.18141 | -1.92431 | 0.526896 | 0.017999 | -0.01276 | 0.000981 | -0.00032 | -0.0134 | 0.030762 | 0.320 | 0.022908 | -0.00687 | 0.003621 | 0.002143 | 0.001477 | 0.001227 |  |
| 7 | -4.055 | 38.21 | 4.382280 | 0.203827 | -0.17470 | 0.016378 | 0.001455 | 0.001091 | 0.013 | -0.19 | -5.860 | -0.35160 | -0.4127 | -0.00575 | -0.00082 | -0.00493 | -0.00673 |  |
| 8 | -9.4 | 88.8 | 5.214050 | 0.474004 | 0.0 | . 31 | 0.007617 | 0.01 | 0.29 | -0.4 | 3.555034 | 0.308102 | . 02 | 0.0026 | 01 | 0.02025 | 0.070677 |  |
| 9 | -12.85 | 121.1086 | 0.161478 | 0.322956 | 0.031142 | 0.495968 | 0.012687 | 0.019608 | 0.463673 | -0.46482 | 8.881303 | -0.48443 | 0.096886 | -0.00104 | 0.025523 | -0.02656 | 0.115918 |  |
| 10 | -12.54 | 18. | 2.83648 | 0 | -0.01350 | -0.03827 | 0 | -0.00225 | -0.03601 | 0.024762 | -1.57582 | 0 | -0.26789 | -0.00101 | -0.00559 | 0.004574 | -0.02982 | -456.989 |
| 11 | -10.61 | 99.99712 | -2.53326 | 0.266659 | -0.11333 | 0.352370 | 0.015237 | 0.015237 | 0.321895 | -0.46570 | -1.99994 | -0.03999 | -0.10666 | -0.00473 | 0.012472 | -0.01720 | 0.071902 | -14 |
| 12 | -6.287 | 59.2 | 1.422089 | -0.15800 | -0.0 | -0.14728 | -0.00451 | -0.00564 | -0.13713 | 0.103835 | -1.81711 | -0.01580 | -0.08690 | -0.00101 | -0.00203 | 0.001019 | -0.02454 | -94.80 |
| 13 | -3.578 | 33.72193 | -1.66361 | -0.13488 | 0.029867 | -0.03789 | 0.000321 | -0.00160 | -0.03661 | 0.067765 | -1.57369 | -0.02248 | -0.01348 | -0.00014 | -0.00203 | 0.001885 | -0.01140 | -5 |
| 14 | -7.59 | 71.53423 | -7.82107 | - | -0.02384 | 0.166231 | 0.001362 | 0.004768 | 0.160100 | -0.19007 | 0.095378 | -0.07630 | -0.04768 | -0.00246 | 0.009537 | -0.01199 | 0.058930 | -9 |

46.11868
65.15678
0
-94.4591
-0.85954
-51.3023
-150.394
-871.479
-602.408
-313.506
-19.1260
-986.135
-177.161
-324.715
$\begin{array}{lll}-0.00555 & 0.019583 & -3.99889 \\ 0.002559 & 0.011617 & 9.49916\end{array}$
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0 0.328887

-0.04763 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 0 | 9 |
|  | 0 |  |
| 0 | 0 |  |
| 0 | 0 |  |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | $-0.21984$ .270805

2.514913
1.64355
0.39508
1.010966
5.66028
4.94802
1.726661
0.53983
0.73759
0.75696


 $\begin{array}{rr}-27.4726 & 0.067094 \\ 23.02834 & 0.766766\end{array}$ -63.1947
53.30489
-27.4726
23.02834 g/m2.h

$\left.\begin{array}{lllll}N & 0 & \sim & 0 & N\end{array}\right)$ 3.002621
1.572827
 .257910
.458419 $\begin{array}{lll}13.03081 & -19.5888 & -0.01882 \\ 6.725045 & 25.31369 & 0.026867\end{array}$

 16.18046 .076345
0.311864
 0.179458
0.103792
 10.95766
1.495515
8.59
1.644244
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BEST June 30 \＆July 1，1993，Molenplaat Western Scheldt DGW tunnel（with cockles）concentrations no3 in no3 out pop in pop out dn in number $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ N


 한 0.024
0.018
0.023
0.101
0.156
0.116
0.058
0.045 mg／l
 혿





|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ine } 3 \\ & \text { el (co } \\ & \text { se } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { July } \\ & \text { d) } \end{aligned}$ in | 3, Mo | lenplaat <br> poc in mg/l | Western Sch <br> poc out $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | heldt <br> pon in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | pon out $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{I}$ | no2 in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | no2 out mg/l | nh4 in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | nh4 out $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | po4 in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | po4 out mg/l | si in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | si out $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 16 | 21 | 0.74 | 0.67 | 0.097 | 0.082 | 0.133 | 0.136 | . 0.106 | - 0.104 | - 0.171 | 0.172 | 0.36 | 0.337 |
|  | 2 | 9 | 9 | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.059 | 0.059 | 0.113 | 0.124 | 0.1 | 0.112 | 0.153 | 0.162 | 0.222 | 0.253 |
|  | 3 | 10 | 20 | 0.64 | 0.76 | 0.088 | 0.102 | 0.114 | 0.115 | 0.098 | 0.105 | 0.145 | 0.15 | 0.18 | 0.193 |
|  | 4 | 106 | 83 | 4 | 3.23 | 0.519 | 0.941 | 0.111 | 0.111 | 0.094 | 0.087 | 0.145 | 0.146 | 0.156 | 0.159 |
|  | 5 | 129 | 205 | 5.21 | 6.41 | 0.649 | 0.869 | 0.106 | 0.106 | 0.086 | 0.086 | 0.138 | 0.14 | 0.141 | 0.146 |
|  | 6 | 88 | 90 | 3.68 | 2.91 | 0.541 | 0.394 | 0.105 | 0.104 | 0.09 | 0.091 | 0.137 | 0.137 | 0.131 | 0.132 |
|  | 7 | 43 | 89 | 1.75 | 2.27 | 0.246 | 0.318 | 0.086 | 0.102 | 0.08 | 0.089 | 0.115 | 0.135 | 0.102 | 0.121 |
|  | 8 | 23 | 32 | 1.41 | 1.47 | 0.206 | 0.209 | 0.099 | 0.1 | 0.094 | 0.087 | 0.133 | 0.134 | 0.125 | 0.129 |
|  | 9 n |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 10 | 84 | 73 | 2.89 | 2.25 | 0.392 | 0.277 | 0.111 | 0.115 | 0.088 | 0.081 | 0.144 | 0.148 | 0.147 | 0.157 |
|  | 11 | 75 | 74 | 3.33 | 2.66 | 0.472 | 0.425 | 0.112 | 0.109 | 0.075 | 0.076 | 0.142 | 0.141 | 0.11 | 0.116 |
|  | 12 | 63 | 66 | 2.42 | 2.17 | 0.363 | 0.3 | 0.107 | 0.11 | 0.077 | 0.076 | 0.138 | 0.141 | 0.121 | 0.129 |
|  | 13 | 42 | 59 | 1.64 | 1.58 | 0.237 | 0.233 | 0.109 | 0.112 | 0.087 | 0.087 | 0.145 | 0.146 | 0.136 | 0.135 |
|  | 14 | 29 | 51 | 1.21 | 1.25 | 0.171 | 0.181 | 0.115 | 0.114 | 0.087 | 0.08 | 0.149 | 0.144 | 0.143 | 0.132 |
|  | 15 n |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 21 | 132 | 118 | 3.72 | 2.62 | 0.42 | 0.315 | 0.141 | 0.141 | 0.105 | 0.098 | 0.18 | 0.179 | 0.31 | 0.306 |
|  | 22 | 41 | 53 | 0.99 | 1.19 | 0.136 | 0.151 | 0.126 | 0.125 | 0.177 | 0.204 | 0.21 | 0.219 | 0.507 | 0.564 |
|  | 23 | 34 | 31 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.119 | 0.104 | 0.127 | 0.127 | 0.109 | 0.105 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.234 | 0.243 |
|  | 24 | 44 | 38 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.124 | 0.124 | 0.124 | 0.125 | 0.102 | 0.103 | 0.162 | 0.162 | 0.188 | 0.187 |
|  | 25 | 124 | 136 | 4.69 | 4.91 | 0.584 | 0.683 | 0.097 | 0.114 | 0.094 | 0.094 | 0.144 | 0.14 | 0.121 | 0.156 |
|  | 26 | 150 | 126 | 3.45 | 3.06 | 0.464 | 0.389 | 0.111 | 0.108 | 0.086 | 0.085 | 0.131 | 0.132 | 0.139 | 0.137 |
|  | 27 | 38 | 41 | 1.68 | 1.44 | 0.258 | 0.223 | 0.104 | 0.103 | 0.09 | 0.087 | 0.132 | 0.129 | 0.137 | 0.145 |
|  | 28 | 28 | 19 | 1.29 | 1.19 | 0.166 | 0.165 | 0.103 | 0.096 | 0.092 | 0.089 | 0.13 | 0.125 | 0.136 | 0.132 |
|  | 29 n |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 30 | 50 | 10 | 1.62 | 0.81 | 0.224 | 0.122 | 0.114 | 0.118 | 0.111 | 0.096 | 0.142 | 0.148 | 0.156 | 0.171 |
|  | 31 | 31 | 34 | 1.32 | 1.5 | 0.195 | 0.203 | 0.113 | 0.111 | 0.107 | 0.097 | 0.142 | 0.141 | 0.132 | 0.134 |
|  | 32 | 20 | 16 | 1.13 | 0.96 | 0.192 | 0.132 | 0.106 | 0.111 | 0.096 | 0.116 | 0.139 | 0.142 | 0.122 | 0.129 |
|  | 33 | 14 | 16 | 0.88 | 0.75 | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.106 | 0.109 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.145 | 0.14 | 0.131 | 0.124 |
|  | 34 | 24 | 44 | 1.2 | 1.67 | 0.163 | 0.224 | 0.111 | 0.112 | 0.1 | 0.095 | 0.141 | 0.141 | 0.13 | 0.138 |
|  | 35 n |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## BEST June 30 \& July 1, 1993 , Molenplaat Western Scheldt

 $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { IBN tunnel (control) } & \text { concentrations } & & & \\ \text { sample } & \text { no3 in } & \text { no3 out } & \text { pop in } & \text { pop out } & \mathrm{dn} \text { in } \\ \text { number } & \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l} & \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l} & \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l} & \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l} & \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}\end{array}$
BEST June 30 \＆July 1，1993，Molenplaat Western Scheldt 융
 $\frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{W}}$ $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$
-1.66415
7.424049
0
0
-3.45396
6.082137
-0.80155
0
0.679483
-0.79617
1.174060
0
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0
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0
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0.345306 po 4 ibn
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 sample
number
average
cycle 1
s．e．
cycle 2
s．e．
BEST June 30 \& July 1, 1993, Molenplaat Western Scheldt

| sample number |  | si dgw mmol/m2.h | si ibn $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m} 2$. h | no3 dgw $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ | no3 ibn $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ | pop dgw g/m2.h | pop ibn $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ | dn dgw $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ | dn ibn $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ | dp dgw $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ | dp ibn $\mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ | chla dgw mg/m2.h | chla ibn mg/m2.h | feo dgw $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ | feo ibn $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m} 2 . \mathrm{h}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 22.83584 | 2.262214 | -57.8754 | -7.86857 | 0.010354 | -0.01101 | 0.051588 | 0.008655 | 0.004425 | 0.000177 | -6.05750 | -3.27726 | 0.181207 | - |
|  | 2 | 16.91033 | -8.13085 | 37.12024 | -113.307 | -0.01154 | 0.044064 | 0.229320 | -0.12117 | 0.000745 | -0.00023 | -24.3673 | 13.2192 | -2.42518 | 0.29376 |
|  | 3 | 6.936652 | -6.81942 | -6.93665 | -17.8354 | -0.01387 | -0.01468 | -0.02774 | -0.05035 | 0 | 0 | 24.13955 | 35.39808 | 0 | 1.61568 |
|  | 4 | 6.979737 | -1.57371 | -15.1227 | -35.6708 | 0.846874 | 0.411264 | -0.18728 | 0.625289 | -0.00052 | 0.004738 | 75.89301 | 110.4537 | 6.188700 | 14.10048 |
|  | 5 | 3.885710 | -2.13107 | -71.6697 | 2.557285 | 0.338488 | -0.21481 | -0.52932 | -0.01875 | -0.01598 | 0.000384 | 21.03464 | -10.0245 | 2.780441 | -3.22218 |
|  | 6 | 3.909945 | -0.39342 | 72.98565 | -0.78685 | -0.12164 | 0.066096 | -0.05300 | -0.20458 | -0.00156 | -0.00533 | -10.2179 | 1.98288 | -0.60821 | 2.31336 |
|  | 7 | 2.003892 | -4.98342 | -12.8249 | -136.388 | 0.033665 | -0.05875 |  |  |  |  | 26.14678 | -2.86416 | 0.336653 | 0.3672 |
|  | 8 | 0 | -1.04914 | -0.62921 | 1.049142 | 0.052854 | -0.01468 |  |  |  |  | -10.4827 | -17.0380 | -0.61663 | -1.02816 |
|  | 22 | -6.45509 | -13.0815 | 12.91018 | 5.049 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.426914 | 0.89964 | 0 | -0.3213 |
|  | 23 | -0.39808 | -2.95071 | 5.573198 | 3.934285 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.780247 | 10.0062 | 0.222927 | 0.3672 |
|  | 24 | 1.174060 | 0.590142 | 15.26279 | -17.7042 |  |  |  |  |  |  | -16.4368 | 12.22776 | -0.16436 | 0.16524 |
|  | 25 | 0 | -21.8025 | 8.180726 | -205.566 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 119.4386 | -228.839 | 7.853497 | -10.8140 |
|  | 26 | -1.51739 | 0.983571 | 0 | 3.934285 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 348.6766 | 57.6963 | 4.815193 | 4.131 |
|  | 27 | 0 | -2.62285 | 14.48098 | 9.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.15411 | 19.278 | 0.954041 | 2.295 |
|  | 28 | -4.58628 | 1.180285 | 10.00644 | 40.12971 |  |  |  |  |  |  | -6.30406 | 3.80052 | 0.583709 | 0.8262 |
|  | 30 | -0.47124 | -0.98357 | -3.76992 | -10.098 |  |  |  |  |  |  | -41.3984 | 0.16524 | -0.36285 | 0.20196 |
|  | 31 | -0.43111 | -0.39342 | 7.472699 | 5.114571 |  |  |  |  |  |  | -68.2429 | 6.0588 | 0.201188 | 0.66096 |
|  | 32 | -0.31900 | -1.1475 | 0.638014 | -20.3271 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.932197 | -2.0655 | 0.223304 | 0.0459 |
|  | 33 | -0.44404 | 1.6065 | -9.47291 | 79.407 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.288797 | 9.57474 | 0.165775 | 0.25704 |
|  | 34 | 0 | -1.57371 | -4.14368 | 7.081714 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.60230 | -5.34276 | 0.145028 | -0.77112 |
| average |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cycle 1 |  | 7.932764 | -2.85235 | -6.86910 | -38.5314 | 0.141896 | 0.025933 |  |  |  |  | 12.01104 | 15.98123 | 0.729620 | 1.805017 |
| s.e. |  | 2.607803 | 1.157540 | 15.43896 | 18.21046 | 0.103821 | 0.058659 |  |  |  |  | 10.57651 | 13.69207 | 0.870972 | 1.733771 |
| cycle 2 |  | -1.12068 | -3.34960 | 4.761543 | -8.32210 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 32.24312 | -9.71167 | 1.219786 | -0.24633 |
| s.e. |  | 0.601948 | 1.932232 | 2.224761 | 18.70605 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30.13146 | 19.60763 | 0.690244 | 0.988250 |




[^0]:    Figure 2 Schematic representation of Benthic EcoSystem Tunnel

[^1]:    a Prins and Pouwer (1990); July, b Lindström Swanberg 1991; laboratory in March, ${ }^{\text {c }}$ this study; June/July 1993, d Prins and Smaal 1990; June 29, 1988.

