Copyright © 2019 by The Society for Freshwater Science. All rights reserved. Published by The University of Chicago Press for The Society for Freshwater Science. https://doi.org/10.1086/704751. Accepted for publication by Freshwater Science on 23 October 2018. See https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/cont/jrnl\_rights.

FWS MS 18-004



 **Abstract:** Food webs in groundwater ecosystems are dominated by only a few top-level consumers, mainly crustaceans. These obligate groundwater dwellers–or stygobites–clearly interact with groundwater biofilm, but it is uncertain whether they affect the abundance and structure of biofilm assemblages. We hypothesized that crustacean stygobites would reduce bacteria and protozoan abundance and alter biofilm assemblage structure. We also hypothesized that high densities of stygobites would remove more bacteria and protozoa than would low densities, and that this difference would become more pronounced over time. First, we established that the amphipods *Niphargus fontanus* and *Niphargus kochianus* both ingest biofilm by examining their gut contents. We then conducted two microcosm experiments. The first experiment showed that both *N. fontanus* and the isopod *Proasellus cavaticus* increased protozoan abundance but that bacterial abundance was only slightly reduced in the presence of *P. cavaticus*. In the second experiment, we determined how zero, low, and high densities of *N. kochianus* affected the biofilm. The high-density treatment of *N. kochianus* had significantly higher protozoan abundance than the control and the low-density treatment, and high densities of *N. kochianus* significantly increased the relative proportions of small and medium-sized bacteria over time compared with controls. Our controlled microcosm experiments demonstrate that macroinvertebrate stygobites can influence groundwater biofilm assemblages, although the exact mechanisms are not clear. These results support the hypothesis that stygobites influence essential ecosystem services supplied by groundwater ecosystems.

 **Keywords:** protozoa, microcosms, bacteria, biofilm, flow cytometer, stygobite, *Niphargus*, *Proasellus*.

 Groundwater is a critical resource for the ~2 billion people worldwide who depend on it for drinking water (Morris et al. 2003). Moreover, many terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems rely wholly or partially on access to groundwater (Boulton 2005). Biotic communities within groundwater contribute to the maintenance of groundwater quality via the breakdown of organic matter, nutrients, and contaminants (e.g. Kota et al. 1999, Gibert and Deharveng 2002, Tomlinson & Boulton 2008) providing vital ecosystem services (Griebler and Avramov 2015). Many of the resident animals (called stygobites) are groundwater obligates (Gibert et al. 1994), and they uniquely contribute to global biodiversity. Stygobite species often have restricted distributions (Gibert et al. 2009), which make them especially vulnerable to anthropogenic pressures such as pollution (Boulton et al. 2003). Food webs in groundwater ecosystems are also unique in that they are truncated and far less complex than their surface water counterparts. Their simplicity is associated with the negligible primary production in most groundwater ecosystems, which are largely dependent on scarce allochthonous energy sources to fuel community biomass and production (Gibert et al. 1994, Gibert and Deharveng 2002). Organic matter is the basal component of these food webs; prokaryotes, single-celled eukaryotes (protozoans); and microscopic metazoans are primary consumers; and macroinvertebrates (principally crustaceans) or cavefish are top- level consumers. In comparison with their surface water counterparts, stygobites have a reduced metabolism and low growth and reproduction rates – adaptations to the limited energy and constant temperature in the groundwater environment (Spicer 1998). Other stygobite adaptations include lack of eyes and pigmentation and resistance to hypoxia and starvation (Hervant et al. 1995, Hervant et al. 1999). Groundwater food web interactions, especially those between micro- and macroorganisms, are poorly understood (Griebler and Avramov 2015, but see Boulton et al.

2008). Few experimental studies with appropriate replication have been conducted.

 Conflicting evidence exists for whether or not stygobitic crustaceans cause top-down control in groundwater food webs. Cooney and Simon (2009) found that *Gammarus minus*, a cave amphipod, reduces bacterial activity, whereas other studies demonstrated that bacteria are more abundant and active when grazed by *G. minus* or *Caecidotea tridentata*, a subterranean isopod (Edler and Dodds 1996, Kinsey et al. 2007). Other studies have found no consumptive effects of stygobites (Foulquier et al. 2010, 2011). Researchers mainly attributed this lack of effect to low metabolic rates and low abundances of top-level consumers in energy-limited environments (Foulquier et al. 2010, 2011). It seems likely that grazer density and feeding time are important predictors to consider when investigating the effects of stygobites on groundwater assemblages. Similarly, there is contradictory evidence for bottom-up control of 86 groundwater food webs. Foulquier et al. (2010, 2011) found that bacterial assemblages were more abundant and active at higher levels of dissolved organic carbon (DOC). However, Weitowitz (2017) found that higher nutrient concentrations did not result in higher bacterial abundances.

 Trophic relationships in surface water ecosystems have received considerable attention in recent decades (e.g. Sih et al. 1985, Billen and Servais 1990, Muylaert et al. 2002, Shurin et al. 2012). These studies clearly show that both bottom-up and top-down forces are important in structuring biological communities (McQueen et al. 1989, Menge 2000). Macrofaunal isopod and amphipod crustaceans such as *Gammarus* spp. and *Asellus*  spp. are known to play a critical role in surface waters both as food for higher trophic levels and as decomposers of organic material (Graca et al. 1994a, 1994b). These taxa can also affect biofilm groups such as small metazoans (Rosemond et al. 2001) and algae (Duffy and Hay 2000, Bruno et al. 2008), but they are not known to purposefully predate on protozoans. However, surface water protozoans can strongly influence bacterial populations in both positive and negative ways (e.g. Wey et al. 2012, Huws et al. 2005, Humphreys 2009). Given

 the importance and strength of consumer-mediated interactions in surface waters it is likely that such interactions also occur in groundwater ecosystems.

 In addition to feeding interactions, aquatic invertebrates can have indirect effects on the microbial food web and ecosystem functioning. For example, macrofauna are known to both bioturbate sediments and compact fine sediments into fecal pellets (Boulton et al., 2008). Furthermore, interstitial bacterial activity can be stimulated by invertebrate bioturbation in sediments (Mermillod-Blondin et al. 2000), and microbial activity can be enhanced through nutrients provided by hyporheic invertebrates in the form of fecal pellets (Boulton 2000, Marshall and Hall 2004). Macrofaunal invertebrate stygobites are the top consumers in many groundwater ecosystems. However, amphipods and isopods move and appear to acquire food differently. The amphipods *N. fontanus* (Bate 1859) and *N. kochianus* (Schellenberg 1932) preferentially use their gnathopods to pick up, manipulate and ingest pieces of sediment. The isopod *P.*

*cavaticus* (Leydig 1871), however, is a bottom crawler, directly grazing on sediment surfaces

(personal observation). Previous authors showed that sedimentary biofilm provides up to 83%

of the diet for *P. cavaticus* (e.g. Francois et al. 2016). However, the evidence is less clear for

*Niphargus* spp., which have been described as being both polyphagus (Fiser et al. 2008,

Arnscheidt et al. 2012) and predatory (Knight and Johns 2015).

 In this study, we tested two hypotheses: (1) The presence of stygobites will significantly reduce bacterial and protozoan abundances and alter biofilm assemblage structure. *Proasellus cavaticus* will exert a stronger effect than *N. fontanus* because of its scraping 'lawn mower' feeding strategy, which has also been observed in some surface isopods (Naylor 1955, Jones 1972). (2) High stygobite densities will remove more bacteria

 and protozoans than low densities, and this effect will become more pronounced over time as fewer and fewer reproductive bacteria and protozoa remain in the system.

## **METHODS**

 To test our hypotheses, we first quantified the diets of the 3 target species. We then conducted 2 manipulative experiments.

**Study species**

 All 3 target species are 8 – 11 mm long and commonly occur in the UK. *Niphargus kochianus* (Fig. 1A) is the most abundant and widespread amphipod species in UK chalk aquifers (Maurice et al. 2016). The isopod, *P. cavaticus* (Fig. 1B), occurs mainly in carbonate aquifers (Johns et al. 2015). *N. fontanus* (Fig. 1C) is found in a wide range of groundwater habitats in the UK (Johns et al. 2015).

## **Gut content study**

 We conducted a preliminary study to confirm that the *Niphargus* species used in our study feed on and ingest sedimentary biofilm. We collected 45 individuals of *N. kochianus* and 2 *N. fontanus* from a chalk borehole (Berkshire, UK) and then starved the animals in ultrapure water for 14 days to promote gut clearing. We then incubated individuals (one per microcosm) with a biofilm-coated stone tile (Fiji, B&Q, dimension - 3.1 x 1.4 x 0.8 cm) at 11 <sup>o</sup>C in the dark for 96 h. These tiles were previously exposed to groundwater for 4 weeks to allow the natural colonization of biofilm. Tiles were placed in the same chalk borehole used 146 to source the stygobite amphipods. Individuals were then stored in  $> 98$  % ethanol. Those that had expelled their guts on preservation were discarded. We followed the approach of Navarro-Barranco et al. (2013) to better observe gut contents. Specimens were placed in vials of Hertwig's liquid (270 g of chloral hydrate, 19 mL of 1N chloric acid, 60 mL of

150 glycerine, and 150 mL of distilled water) in an oven at 65  $\degree$ C for 4 hours. Individuals were then mounted on a slide and the contents of the foregut (we were only interested in food intake over the last 96 hours) studied under an Olympus BX53 microscope and photographed at x400 magnification.

# **Experiment 1. Testing the hypothesis that stygobite presence will reduce bacterial and protozoan abundances and alter biofilm assemblage structure.**

*Experimental setup and design* Nine *N. fontanus* and 9 *Proasellus cavaticus* were

collected over 2 days in November 2013 from a cave system in Wales (Elm Hole; latitude

51.81, longitude -3.14) and kept in the dark in containers of cave water at 11 ℃.

 We exposed stone tiles in a borehole (chalk, Berkshire, UK) to obtain natural groundwater biofilms. Stone tiles of equal size (Fiji, B&Q, dimension - 3.1 x 1.4 x 0.8 cm) were autoclaved and washed in ultrapure water, placed in mesh nets with a mesh diameter of 500 µm, and suspended in the borehole for 3 weeks to colonize. Griebler et al. (2002) showed that numbers of attached bacteria on sediment in similarly clean groundwater near Salzburg, 165 Austria reached 500  $*$  10<sup>5</sup> cells per cm<sup>3</sup> within 4 weeks of exposure. On retrieval, tiles were transported to the laboratory in a cool box and stored in unfiltered groundwater in the dark at 11 ℃(the same temperature as water in the borehole) for four weeks until the start of the experiment, which allowed for further growth of the biofilm.

 For this experiment, we used 3 treatments (consumer *N. fontanus,* consumer *P. cavaticus*, and a control) each with 27 replicates (3\*27=81 microcosms). We used a block design running 6 replicates on days 0 to 4 (Run 1), another 6 replicates on days 8 to 12 (Run 2), and another 6 on days 16 to 20 (Run 3). For the last block, we ran nine replicates on day 24 (Run 4) (see Table S1). We employed this design because we had to 're-use' individuals to obtain a high replication. This temporal block design enabled us to statistically account for

 any differences in starting conditions such as the condition of the biofilm tiles (Bailey and Reiss 2014). One individual represented one replicate in each of the 4 runs (e.g. *N. fontanus* individuals 1 to 6 and *P. cavaticus* individuals 1 to 6 were used for day 0-4 (see Table S1). All individuals were used 3 different times—twice in the 4-day trials (runs 1-3) and once in run 4).

 Prior to each experimental run, the crustaceans were starved in filtered groundwater for 4 days to allow them to empty most of their intestines. Only animals with empty foreguts were used in the experiments. Microcosms were set up in 50 mL glass beakers containing 20 183 mL of filtered and autoclaved borehole water and were kept at 11 °C in darkness to mirror groundwater conditions. One tile was placed in each microcosm to provide a food source for the stygobites, and 1 individual of each species was introduced into the respective treatments. Stygobites were checked for mortality every 24 h (two died during the experiment and were replaced with an individual of equal size on discovery).

 Each run was terminated after 96 h. We then retrieved crustaceans from the microcosms, measured the abundance of bacteria and protozoa on the tiles, and assessed the structure of each biofilm community.

 *Response variables* We used a toothbrush to brush **t**he biofilm on each tile into 10 mL of 0.25 µm filtered, autoclaved water, a widely used method to detach biofilm from various substrates (see Wipfli et al. 1998, Cardinale et al. 2002, Bouletreau et al. 2006, Vercraene- Eairmal et al. 2010). We used 10 standardized downstrokes on each side of the tiles. We then homogenized the samples with a magnetic stirrer before further processing.

 To assess the protozoa, we fixed two 500-µl subsamples of the homogenate for microscopic analysis in 2% glutaraldehyde. We used a gridded Sedgwick Rafter cell to count and measure protozoa in each sample under an Olympus CX 21 microscope at x400

 magnification. We followed Adl et al. (2006) to assign all protozoan cells to 10 morphotype categories, including different types of ciliates, flagellates, and testate amoebae. We used Foissner and Berger (1996) to aid in protozoan identification and morphotype assignments. For the bacterial analysis, we poured a 1 mL subsample of the initial homogenate through a 40-µm filter. We used a C6 flow cytometer (BD Technologies, North Carolina) to analyze 495-µl of this filtrate. Preliminary trials in which samples were both sonicated and homogenized resulted in significantly higher counts of non-bacterial debris but did not significantly increase bacterial counts (Weitowitz 2017). We therefore chose not to use sonification to further separate clumps of bacterial cells. Preliminary trials (Weitowitz 2017) also helped us determine the best possible threshold level to identify bacteria and exclude noise. The primary threshold was set at SSC-H (side scatter) 4000 and a secondary threshold at FSC-H (forward scatter) 8000. A dual threshold applies more stringent conditions before counting a particle and excludes more potential noise (BD Biosciences, 2011, p. 5). We used SYTO-9 (Molecular Probes, Life Technologies; Massachusetts) to stain bacteria and distinguish them from soil particles (Lebaron et al. 1998, Gasol and Del Giorgio 2000). After preliminary staining trials (Weitowitz 2017), we selected a final SYTO-9 216 concentration of 5  $\mu$ M (see also Lebaron et al. 1998). We mixed 495  $\mu$ l of microcosm 217 homogenate with 5 µl of SYTO-9 stock solution resulting in a total volume of 500 µl for flow cytometric analysis. After adding stain, we incubated the samples in the dark at room temperature for 15 minutes to allow the stain to bind to the DNA. Before counting bacteria, we gated out noise caused by the applied electrical voltage and the running of filtered water using FSC-H vs FL-1 (green fluorescence) dot plots (Troussellier et al. 1999). We kept these bacterial gates constant throughout the experiment. Different bacterial size groups were identified according to their clustering along the FL-1 fluorescence axis, allowing for a discrimination of different bacterial populations (see

```
225 Troussellier et al. 1999). We then ran each 500 µl sample for 1 minute at slow flow to 
226 minimize doublet counts.
```
 **Experiment 2. Testing the hypothesis that high densities will remove more bacteria and protozoans than low densities and that this effect will become more pronounced over time.**

*Experimental setup and design* For the second experiment, we collected 250 individuals of *N. kochianus* from two boreholes in the Berkshire Chalk aquifer. Collected animals were transported to the laboratory in a cool box filled with groundwater that was maintained at 11 234 °C. In one of the boreholes we suspended 2 tile sizes (Fiji, B&O, large =  $3.1 \times 1.4 \times 0.8$  cm, 235 small =  $1.5 \times 1.5 \times 1$  cm) in mesh bags to allow groundwater biofilm to colonize over a period of 5 wk. Next the tiles were stored for 4 wk in the dark at 11 ℃ until the start of the experiment. This storage period allowed additional growth of the biofilm.

 This experiment featured 3 treatments: ungrazed biofilm as a control, 'low *Niphargus* density' and 'high *Niphargus* density'. We used nine *N. kochianus* for the low-density treatment and 18 individuals for the high-density treatment. The densities were based on invertebrate sampling (standardized net hauls) conducted in the same chalk aquifer (Weitowitz 2017). Each treatment had 10 replicates, resulting in 30 microcosms (Table S2). To create the microcosms, we filled 250-mL glass beakers with 100 mL of filtered and autoclaved groundwater. We placed 2 large rectangular tiles for bacterial analysis and six small tiles for protozoan analysis in PARAFILM-sealed microcosms. A single control tile in

control, which the crustaceans were not able to access. This tile was used to assess biofilm

246 a mesh bag (mesh size  $0.1 \text{ mm}^2$ ) was suspended in all microcosms of the treatments and

dynamics in the absence of grazing. We then added the stygobites. Over the course of 32

days, we sampled protozoans from 5 random replicates of each treatment on six occasions

 (days 2, 5, 11, 16, 23, 32 for a total of 90 samples). Bacteria were sampled in all replicates on 9 occasions (days 2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 16, 18, 23, 27, 32 for a total of 270 samples).

 *Response variables* We obtained samples for protozoan analysis by sacrificing one small tile on each sampling occasion. We carefully brushed the biofilm on each protozoan tile into 10 mL of autoclaved water by applying 10 standardized downstrokes with a toothbrush. We then fixed samples with glutaraldehyde and counted protozoa under a microscope as in experiment 1.

 We sampled bacteria from two large tiles each marked by a grid of 15 evenly sized (0.6 x 0.4 cm) sections (Weitowitz 2017). On each sampling occasion, we pooled three 200- µl samples directly pipetted from randomly selected sections in each microcosm, and we ensured that no section was sampled more than once. After pipetting, clear patches became visible on the tiles suggesting that biofilm was present and was sampled effectively. The bacterial samples were then thoroughly homogenized in Eppendorff tubes, before being processed in the flow cytometer as in experiment 1. We assigned each counted bacterium to one of 3 body size categories: small, medium and large.

## **Statistical analyses**

 We performed all statistical analyses in the open source statistical environment R (R [Development](http://development/) Core Team 2013). Initially all response variables were checked for normality and homogeneity of variance with the Shapiro-Wilk normality and Levene variance tests. If a response variable violated parametric assumptions, we used the Box-Cox transformation method of package 'MASS' (Venables and Ripley 2002) to identify the best form of power-transformation for the dependent variable.

 For the first experiment, we assessed if differences in protozoan and bacterial abundance occurred between the 3 treatments (see Table 1). Because we reused individuals in this experiment and because the experiment was run in blocks (see Table S1), we analyzed 277 the data with linear mixed effects models (LMMs) in the R package 'lme4' (Bates et al., 278 2015). LMMs are commonly used to analyze ecological data when multiple measurements (e.g. on a single individual) constitute pseudoreplicates (Perkins et al. 2012, Zuur et al.2009). Because we 'reused' individual stygobites three times, we fitted individual ID as a random effect to account for differences in which particular individuals affect the biofilm. We also fitted Block as a predictor in the models, because some of the replicates were run on different 283 days. The R-code for the LMM was:  $lmc(log10(Response) \sim \text{а.} + Block + (1)$  Individual). We used a Tukey post-hoc test to find out which treatments were different from each other. In the second experiment we also used LMMs in the R package 'lme4' (because this

 approach is identical to repeated measures ANOVA) to test for the effect of different stygobite densities, time, and their interaction on bacterial and protozoan response variables. 289 The R-code was: lmer(Response  $\sim$  Treatment\*Day + (1 | Unique ID), where Treatment is high, low, or zero (control) *Niphargus* density, and Unique ID is the microcosm that was measured repeatedly over time, represented by the variable Day. We used a Tukey test for post-hoc comparisons.

## **RESULTS**

**Gut content analyses**

 The gut content analyses established that both *Niphargus* species ingested biofilm. We found a homogeneous mass of recently ingested organic material (e.g. bacteria, protozoans) and sediment particles in the foreguts of the *Niphargus* individuals (Fig 1C-F).

All individuals initially had empty foreguts, indicating that the material found came from

biofilm associated with the tiles. Overall, we detected organic material in 32 of the 45 *N.* 

*kochianus* individuals and both of the *N. fontanus* individuals.

 **Experiment 1**. **Hypothesis: Stygobite presence will reduce bacterial and protozoan abundances and alter biofilm assemblage structure.**

 The presence of both *N. fontanus* and *Proasellus cavaticus* had a significant positive effect on protozoan abundances found on tiles (Table 1, Fig. 2) compared with the control without stygobites. In *N. fontanus* and *P. cavaticus* microcosms, the number of protozoans was double that of the control (Fig. 2). The post-hoc test for protozoan abundance showed that the effects of both species were different from the control (Tukey-test; *Niphargus* vs control, P<0.01 and *Proasellus* vs control, P<0.05). In the LMM, the random effect explained only 1% of protozoan abundance, i.e. the identity of the individual stygobite used was not a significant predictor of the response.

 The effect of stygobites on bacterial abundances was less marked (Table 1). Although *P. cavaticus* seemed to reduce the number of bacteria (Fig. 3), this effect was not significant and variation in bacteria abundance was much greater between blocks (Table 1). Neither stygobite species changed the bacterial assemblage structure in terms of altering the relative proportion of small, medium, and large bacteria (data not shown). Block had a highly significant effect on bacterial abundance (Table 1). For example, bacterial abundance was significantly lower in block 4 than in block 1, indicating that bacterial abundance changed significantly with time. Thus, it was important to fit Block as a predictor in the LMMs. 

 **Experiment 2. Hypothesis: High densities will remove more bacteria and protozoans than low densities and this effect will become more pronounced over time.**

 As in the first experiment, protozoan abundances were significantly affected by the density of *N. kochianus*, by time, and by the interaction between density and time (Table 2). As with the other two stygobites, the presence of *N. kochianus* at high densities resulted in more protozoans than in the control treatment (Fig. 4). In fact, when averaged across all time points and density treatments, protozoan abundances were twice as high when *Niphargus* was present (Fig. 4). However, these differences did not occur during the first part of the experiment. Abundances remained at comparably low levels in all treatments from day 2 to day 16 (Fig. 4). However, from day 23 on, protozoan abundance increased in the high density *N. kochianus treatment* relative to the control (Fig. 4).

 No significant differences in the number of protozoan morphotypes occurred across treatments, but the number of protozoan morphotypes in all treatments increased significantly over time (Table 2, Fig. 4).

 The density treatments did not significantly affect bacterial abundance (Table 2). However, bacterial assemblage structure was significantly affected by *N. kochianus* density*,*  by time, and by the interaction of the two predictors. '*Niphargus* Density' was a significant predictor of the proportion of small and medium bacteria, but not of large bacteria (Fig. 5, Table 2). On day two of the experiment, small bacteria tended to make up a larger proportion of the total bacterial population in the high-density treatment relative to either the low-density or control treatment (Fig. 5). Conversely, the initial relative proportions of medium and large bacteria tended to be higher in the low-density and control treatments (Fig. 5). Throughout the course of the experiment the relative proportions of small, medium, and large bacteria continuously changed. The percentage of small bacteria decreased in the high-density treatment, while the proportion of medium and large bacteria tended to increase (Fig. 5). In the low-density and control treatments, the proportion of medium and large bacterial size

 classes tended to slightly decline over time. By day 32, the proportion of bacterial size classes was very similar between treatments (Fig. 5).

350 On the mesh tiles excluded from stygobite access, bacterial abundance  $(F_{2,243} = 0.5, P$ 351 > 0.05) and the proportion of small (F<sub>2,243</sub> = 0.1, P > 0.05), medium (F<sub>2,243</sub> = 0.02, P > 0.05) 352 and large bacteria ( $F_{2,243} = 0.06$ ,  $P > 0.05$ ) did not differ between treatments.

## **DISCUSSION**

 Our experiments showed that the *Niphargus* species can ingest biofilm and that the presence of each of the three species altered the biofilm. The strength and nature of this effect depended on stygobite density and the duration of exposure to the biofilm.

 Our microcosm experiments offer a unique glimpse of macroinvertebrate stygobite behavior and their influence on primary resources within experimental microcosms. However, our experimental design did not enable us to determine whether these are direct food web effects, facilitation via increased nutrient recycling, or a combination of processes. The role of stygobites in groundwater food webs has been intensely debated in recent years (e.g. Boulton et al. 2008). Despite their widespread prevalence and the absence of other top- level consumers, most studies have attributed little importance to obligate groundwater animals, because of the temporal stability of groundwater ecosystems and the low metabolic rates and perceived low abundance of stygobites (Gibert et al. 1994, Boulton et al. 2003, Wilhelm et al. 2006, Sorensen et al. 2013). However, controlled experiments investigating groundwater food webs are scarce (but see Edler and Dodds 1996, Cooney and Simon 2009, Foulquier et al. 2010).

#### **Effects on Protozoa**

 Both single individuals of *N. fontanus* and *P. cavaticus*, as well as *N. kochianus* at high densities, significantly increased protozoan abundance in our experimental microcosms. As there is currently little information on the role of stygobites in groundwater food webs, the consistency of this effect across all experimental species is noteworthy. It remains to be determined whether the stimulatory link to protozoans is mediated directly by feeding activity or indirectly via excretion or bioturbation.

 Previous studies have shown that microscopically small surface-water crustaceans such as copepods and cladocerans selectively feed on specific protozoan species (Sanders and Wickham 1993, Reiss and Schmid-Araya 2010) and size classes (Stoecker and Capuzzo 1990, Sommer et al. 2001), thus demonstrating that these crustaceans can actively target protozoans. Stygobites are also thought to obtain their nutrients from biofilm coating sediments and rocks, including associated protozoans (Baerlocher and Murdoch 1989, Fenwick et al. 2004, Boulton et al. 2008). However, for our study species, predation on protozoans does not appear to be substantial, given that predators tend to reduce prey abundances (Sih et al. 1985, Mamilov et al. 2000) and protozoan abundance did not decline. It is possible that rapid turnover and recruitment of Protozoa completely compensated for losses due to predation. Another possibility is that stygobites may either bioturbate or graze the biofilm, causing tightly bound biofilm fragments to be dislodged from the substratum (e.g. Gibert et al. 1994). These activities would provide a greater surface area for grazing by bacterivorous protozoans, allowing them to reproduce faster and attain higher abundances. Stygobite presence increased morphotype diversity in experiment 2. Protozoans such as flagellates and ciliates are omnipresent in groundwater (Novarino et al. 1997), so the resting spores (Finlay 2002) of many protozoan species would have been present on the biofilm tiles. However, it seems that when stygobites were absent, the spores remained

 dormant. It is possible that the proliferation of protozoans (caused by stygobites) increased the likelihood that rarer protozoan morphotypes would be detected in our subsamples.

## **Effects on bacteria**

 Only *P. cavaticus* reduced bacterial abundances in experiment 1, and the effect was not strong compared with changes detected for protozoans. The gut contents of both *Niphargus* species show they clearly ingest tile-associated biofilm. This result indicates that bacteria in biofilm are likely to provide at least some of the diet for stygobites (Boulton et al. 2008). However, previous studies have found both strong positive and negative correlations between bacterial responses and stygobite grazing (Griebler et al. 2002, Cook et al. 2007, Foulquier et al. 2010, 2011).

 In experiment 2 we measured respiration rates from 5 replicates of one small tile in all treatments (reported in Weitowitz 2017). We measured respiration both halfway through and at the end of the experiment. The bacterial activity rates were higher in the presence of stygobites, perhaps because either their grazing or bioturbation removed senescent bacteria and enhanced solute uptake by active bacteria. Such effects may explain the relatively small difference in bacterial abundances between stygobite treatments (Weitowitz 2017). The relatively small amount of bacterial biomass removed by invertebrate and protozoan grazing might be offset by the increase in bacterial growth. Other studies in surface waters and terrestrial ecosystems have also shown an effect of higher-order animals on bacterial activity rates across a range of taxa, including collembolans (Hanlon and Anderson 1979), nematodes (Traunspurger et al. 1997), and protozoans (Hahn and Hoefle 2001).

 We also observed time-dependent effects on bacterial assemblage structure. These effects might be a direct result of stygobite grazing, an indirect effect associated with increased protozoan grazing, or both given that protozoans were more abundant in the

 presence of stygobites. In other aquatic systems, protozoan grazing is size-selective (Chrzanowski et al. 1990, Gonzalez et al. 1990, Simek and Chrzanowski 1992) and has been shown to affect bacterial assemblage structure (Hahn and Hoefle 1999, 2001). For example, the uptake efficiency of bacteria by flagellates and ciliates, the dominant protozoans in our biofilm, decreases with prey cell size. No lower uptake limit exists (Hahn and Hoefle 2001). Stygobites consume microbes (Simon et al. 2003, Hallam et al. 2008), so they may also directly affect bacterial assemblage structure. In the presence of stygobites, small and medium-sized bacteria were initially present at lower frequencies than large-sized bacteria, but this pattern quickly disappeared. One explanation for this observation is that the smaller sizes of bacteria responded by increasing their activity and rate of cell division. Such compensatory reactions in response to predation have been observed previously and were attributed to rapid bacterial generation rates (Hanlon and Anderson 1979, Traunspurger et al. 1997).

 Both *N. fontanus* and *P. cavaticus* increased protozoan abundance in the biofilm, but only *P. cavaticus* reduced bacterial abundance and only slightly. These responses may have been at least partly caused by the different feeding strategies of the species, with *P. cavaticus*  harvesting the bacterial 'carpet' more efficiently than *N. fontanus*. However, both species appear to increase the nutrient availability to protozoans, but through different behaviors. *Proasellus cavaticus* may dislodge biofilm by browsing over sediment and scraping off bacteria, whereas *N. fontanus*, an active swimmer, may dislodge biofilm via bioturbation as it passes over and disturbs the sediments.

 The relationships between components in groundwater food webs are not limited to organismal interactions. Stygobites also provide food directly to microbes and protozoa by excreting feces or producing pellets of fine interstitial materials (Boulton et al. 2008). We observed these activities in our experimental microcosms. Bacteria are known to process

 fecal pellets in aquatic habitats (e.g. Yoon et al. 1996, Wotton and Malmqvist 2001), and this activity may partly explain how the bacteria overcame increased grazing pressure. In the control microcosms, however, the nutrient-poor conditions in combination with the reduced nutrient cycling likely provided unfavorable conditions for bacterial reproduction. Aquifers and their associated organisms, particularly protozoa and bacteria, support important ecosystem services such as nutrient (e.g. denitrification, nitrification) and contaminant transformation (e.g. biodegradation) (Mattison et al. 2002, 2005, Tomlinson and Boulton 2008). They also maintain carbon flux through food webs. The effect of stygobites on groundwater biofilm demonstrated here could have important implications for these services, and stygobytes may also play a significant role in maintaining clean drinking water. Future studies should address these important issues.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

 Our experiments suggest that stygobites can increase abundances of protozoa and alter the structure of both protozoa and bacteria assemblages. As for species from surface ecosystems, their impact is likely to depend on their abundance in the systems. To date, however, estimates of stygobite abundance in aquifers are rare (Maurice and Bloomfield 2012, Sorensen et al. 2013).

 Maintaining groundwater ecosystem functionality and stability is becoming increasingly important in the face of environmental pollution and global climate change. Groundwater biota, and particularly stygobites, are adapted for the constant temperature and low-nutrient conditions in groundwater. A change in groundwater temperatures or nutrient levels could therefore lead to the disappearance of whole functional groups of organisms in these simple systems, leading to ecosystem destabilization (Avramov et al. 2013). Further experiments are needed to identify the mechanisms by which stygobites affect groundwater

 biofilms and influence ecosystem services, and thus build a foundation for an informed approach to the conservation of these systems.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

 Author contributions. DW, JR and ALR conceived the study and designed the experiments. DW carried out the experiments and processed the laboratory samples. DW and JR carried out the statistical analysis. DW wrote the manuscript with significant contributions from JR, ALR, LM and JB.

 DW was supported by a joint studentship from the National Environment Research Council (NERC) and the University of Roehampton, London. LM and JB publish with the permission of the Executive Director of the British Geological Survey (UKRI). We are indebted to Lee Knight for organizing caving trips and assisting in the collection of stygobite individuals. We would also like to thank Tim Johns from the Environment Agency for organizing access to the chalk boreholes. Additional thanks goes to Professor Rosemary Bailey for statistical help, the University of Roehampton technical staff for providing assistance during the lab work, and to Dr. Robert Busch for the provision of theoretical and practical training on the BD C6 flow cytometer. Szymon Szary, lab technician at the University of Roehampton, contributed valuable ideas in numerous fruitful discussions. We thank the four anonymous reviewers whose comments improved the manuscript.

## **LITERATURE CITED**

 Adl, S. M., D. C. Coleman and F. Read. 2006. Slow recovery of soil biodiversity in sandy loam soils of Georgia after 25 years of no-tillage management. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 114: 323-334.



- Boulton, A.J., W.F. Humphreys and S.M. Eberhard. 2003. Imperiled subsurface waters in Australia: Biodiversity, threatening processes and conservation. Aquatic Ecosystem
- Health & Management 6:41-54.
- Boulton, A. J., G. D. Fenwick, P. J. Hancock and M. S. Harvey. 2008. Biodiversity,
- functional roles and ecosystem services of groundwater invertebrates. Invertebrate
- Systematics 22:103-116.
- Bruno, J. F., K. E. Boyer, J. E. Duffy and S. C. Lee. 2008. Relative and interactive effects of plant and grazer richness in a benthic marine community. Ecology 89:2518-2528.
- Cardinale B. J., M. A. Palmer, C. M. Swan, S. Brooks, N. LR. Poff. 2002. The influence of
- substrate heterogeneity on biofilm metabolism in a stream ecosystem. Ecology 83:412-
- 422.
- Chrzanowski, T. H. and K. Simek. 1990. Prey-size selection by freshwater flagellated protozoa. Limnology & Oceanography 35:1429-1436.
- Cook, P., B. Veuger, S. Böer and J. J. Middelburg. 2007. Effect of nutrient availability on
- carbon and nitrogen incorporation and flows through benthic algae and bacteria in near-
- shore sandy sediment. Aquatic Microbial Ecology 49: 65-180.
- Cooney, T. J., and K. S. Simon. 2009. Influence of dissolved organic matter and invertebrates
- on the function of microbial films in groundwater. Microbial Ecology 58:599-610.
- Crowder, L. B., D. D. Squires and J. A. Rice. 1997. Nonadditive effects of terrestrial and aquatic predators on juvenile estuarine fish. Ecology 78:1796-1804.
- Duffy, J. E. and M. E. Hay. 2000. Strong impacts of grazing amphipods on the organization of a benthic community. Ecological Monographs 70:237-263.
- Edler, C. and W. Dodds. 1996. The ecology of a subterranean isopod, *Caecidotea tridentata*.
- Freshwater Biology 35:249-259.
- Field, A. 2013. Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics. Sage Publications, London, United Kingdom.
- Finlay, B.J. 2002. Global dispersal of free-living microbial eukaryote species. Science 296:1061-1063.
- Fiser, C., B. Sket, P. Trontelj. 2008. A phylogenetic perspective on 160 years of troubled

taxonomy of *Niphargus* (Crustacea: Amphipoda). Zoologica Scripta 37:665-680.

Foissner, W., and H. Berger. 1996. A user‐ friendly guide to the ciliates (Protozoa,

 Ciliophora) commonly used by hydrobiologists as bioindicators in rivers, lakes, and waste waters, with notes on their ecology. Freshwater Biology 35:375-482.

Foulquier, A., F. Mermillod-Blondin, F. Malard and J. Gibert. 2011. Response of sediment

biofilm to increased dissolved organic carbon supply in groundwater artificially

recharged with stormwater. Journal of Soils and Sediments 11:382-393.

Foulquier, A., L. Simon, F. Gilbert, F. Fourel, F. Malard and F. Mermillod‐ Blondin. 2010.

Relative influences of DOC flux and subterranean fauna on microbial abundance and

activity in aquifer sediments: New insights from 13C‐ tracer experiments. Freshwater

Biology 55:1560-1576.

Francois, C. M., F. Mermillod-Blondin, F. Malard, F. Fourel, C. Lecuyer, C. J. Douady, L.

 Simon. 2016. Trophic ecology of groundwater species reveals specialization in a low-productivity environment. Functional Ecology 30:262-273.

Gasol, J. M. and P. A. Del Giorgio. 2000. Using flow cytometry for counting natural

- planktonic bacteria and understanding the structure of planktonic bacterial
- communities. Scientia Marina 64:197-224.
- Gibert, J., D. C. Culver, M. Dole‐ Olivier, F. Malard, M. C. Christman and L. Deharveng.

2009. Assessing and conserving groundwater biodiversity: Synthesis and perspectives.

Freshwater Biology 54:930-941.

- Gibert, J., D. L. Danielopol and J. A. Stanford. 1994. Groundwater ecology. Academic Press, San Diego, California.
- Gibert, J. and L. Deharveng. 2002. Subterranean ecosystems: A truncated functional biodiversity. BioScience 52:473-481.
- Gonzalez, J. M., E. B. Sherr, B. F. Sherr. 1990. Size-selective grazing on bacteria by natural
- assemblages of estuarine flagellates and ciliates. Applied and Environmental

Microbiology 56:583-589.

- Graca, M., L. Maltby and P. Calow. 1994a. Comparative ecology of *Gammarus pulex* (L.)
- and *Asellus aquaticus* (L.) I: Population dynamics and microdistribution. Hydrobiologia 281:155-162.
- Graça, M., L. Maltby and P. Calow. 1994b. Comparative ecology of *Gammarus pulex* (L.) and *Asellus aquaticus* (L.) II: Fungal preferences. Hydrobiologia 281:163-170.
- Griebler, C. and M. Avramov. 2015. Groundwater ecosystem services: A review. Freshwater 581 Science 34:355-367.
- Griebler, C., , B. Mindl, D. Slezak, M. Geiger-Kaiser. 2002. Distribution patterns of attached
- and suspended bacteria in pristine and contaminated shallow aquifers studied with an

*in-situ* sediment exposure microcosm. Aquatic Microbial Ecology 28:117-129.

- Hahn, M. W. and M. G. Hofle. 1999. Flagellate predation on a bacterial model community:
- Interplay of size-selective grazing, specific bacterial cell size, and bacterial community composition. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 65:4863-4872.
- Hahn, M. W. and M. G. Hofle. 2001. Grazing of Protozoa and its effect on populations of
- aquatic bacteria. FEMS Microbiology Ecology 35:113-121.
- Hallam, F., M. Yacoubi-Khebiza, K. Oufdou, M. Boulanouar. 2008. Groundwater quality in an arid area of Morocco: Impact of pollution on the biodiversity and relationships

- between crustaceans and bacteria of health interest. Environmental Technology 29:1179-1189.
- Hanlon, R. and J. Anderson. 1979. The effects of Collembola grazing on microbial activity in decomposing leaf litter. Oecologia 38:93-99.
- Hervant, F., J. Mathieu, D. Garin and A. Fréminet. 1995. Behavioral, ventilatory, and
- metabolic responses to severe hypoxia and subsequent recovery of the hypogean
- *Niphargus rhenorhodanensis* and the epigean *Gammarus fossarum* (Crustacea:
- Amphipoda). Physiological Zoology 68:223-244.
- Hervant, F., J. Mathieu and H. Barre. 1999. Comparative study on the metabolic responses of
- subterranean and surface-dwelling amphipods to long-term starvation and subsequent
- refeeding. The Journal of Experimental Biology 202:3587-3595.
- Humphreys, W. 2009. Hydrogeology and groundwater ecology: Does each inform the other? Hydrogeology Journal 17:5-21.
- Huws, S., A. McBain and P. Gilbert. 2005. Protozoan grazing and its impact upon population dynamics in biofilm communities. Journal of Applied Microbiology 98:238-244.
- Johns, T., J. I. Jones, L. Knight, L. Maurice, P. Wood and A. Robertson. 2015. Regional-
- scale drivers of groundwater faunal distributions. Freshwater Science 34:316-328.
- Jones, M. 1972. The mouthparts of the members of the *Jaera albifrons* group of species
- (Crustacea: Isopoda). Marine Biology 14:264-270.
- Kinsey, J., T. J. Cooney and K. S. Simon. 2007. A comparison of the leaf shredding ability
- and influence on microbial films of surface and cave forms of *Gammarus minus* Say.
- *Hydrobiologia* 589:199-205.
- Knight, L. R. F. D., T. Johns. 2015. Auto-ecological studies on *Niphargus aquilex*
- (Schioedte, 1855) and *Niphargus glenniei* (Spooner, 1952) (Crustacea: Amphipoda:
- Niphargidae). Cave and Karst Science 42:63-77.

- Kota, S., R. C. Borden, and M. A. Barlaz. 1999. Influence of protozoan grazing on contaminant biodegradation. FEMS Microbiology Ecology 29:179-189
- Lawrence, M.A. 2015. ez: Easy Analysis and Visualization of Factorial Experiments. R package version 4.3. [https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ez.](https://cran.r-project.org/package=ez)
- Lebaron, P., N. Parthuisot and P. Catala. 1998. Comparison of blue nucleic acid dyes for flow
- cytometric enumeration of bacteria in aquatic systems. Applied and Environmental

Microbiology 64:1725-1730.

- Mamilov, A. S., B. Byzov, A. Pokarzhevskii and D. Zvyagintsev. 2000. Regulation of the
- biomass and activity of soil microorganisms by microfauna. Microbiology 69:612-621.
- Marshall, M. C. and R. O. Hall. 2004. Hyporheic invertebrates affect N cycling and
- respiration in stream sediment microcosms. Journal of the North American

Benthological Society 23:416-428.

- Mattison, R., H. Taki and S. Harayama. 2005. The soil flagellate *Heteromita globosa*
- accelerates bacterial degradation of alkylbenzenes through grazing and acetate excretion
- in batch culture. Microbial Ecology 49:142-150.
- Mattison, R. G., H. Taki and S. Harayama. 2002. The bacterivorous soil flagellate *Heteromita*
- *globosa* reduces bacterial clogging under denitrifying conditions in sand-filled aquifer
- columns. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 68:4539-4545.
- Maurice, L. and J. P. Bloomfield. 2012. Stygobitic invertebrates in groundwater A review from a hydrogeological perspective. Freshwater Reviews 5:51-71.
- Maurice, L., A. Robertson, D. White, L. Knight, T. Johns, F. Edwards, M. Arietti, J. P. R.
- Sorensen, D. Weitowitz, B. P. Marchant and J. P. Bloomfield. 2015. The invertebrate
- ecology of the Chalk aquifer in England (UK). Hydrogeology Journal 24:1-16.



Association of the United Kingdom 34:347-355.

- Novarino, G. A., H. Warren, G. Butler, A. Lambourne, J. Boxshall, N.E. Bateman, R.W.
- Kinner, R.A. Harvey and B. Teltsch. 1997. Protistan communities in aquifers: A review. FEMS Microbiology Reviews. 20:261-275.
- Nyström, P. and J. Strand. 1996. Grazing by a native and an exotic crayfish on aquatic macrophytes. Freshwater Biology 36:673-682.
- Perkins, D.M., G. Yvon‐ Durocher, B.O. Demars, Reiss, J., D.E. Pichler, N. Friberg, M.
- Trimmer and G. Woodward. 2012. Consistent temperature dependence of respiration
- across ecosystems contrasting in thermal history. Global Change Biology 18:1300-
- 1311.
- R Development Core Team. 2013. R: A language and environment for statistical computing.
- R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0, URL http://www.R-project.org/.
- Reiss, J. and J. M. Schmid-Araya. 2010. Life history allometries and production of small fauna. Ecology 91: 497-507.
- Rosemond, A. D., C. M. Pringle, A. Ramírez and M. J. Paul. 2001. A test of top-down and bottom-up control in a detritus-based food web. Ecology 82: 2279-2293.
- Sanders, R. W. and S. A. Wickham. 1993. Planktonic Protozoa and metazoa: Predation, food quality and population control. Aquatic Microbial Ecology 7: 197-223.
- Shurin, J. B., J. L. Clasen, H. S. Greig, P. Kratina and P. L. Thompson. 2012 Warming shifts
- top-down and bottom-up control of pond food web structure and function. Philosophical
- Transactions of the Royal Society of London: Series B, Biological Sciences 367: 3008- 3017.
- Sih, A., P. Crowley, M. McPeek, J. Petranka and K. Strohmeier. 1985. Predation,
- competition, and prey communities: A review of field experiments. Annual Review of
- Ecology and Systematics 16: 269-311.

- Simek, K. and T. H. Chrzanowski. 1992. Direct and indirect evidence of size-selective
- grazing on pelagic bacteria by freshwater nanoflagellates. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 58: 3715-3720.
- Simon, K.S., E. F. Benfield, S. A. Macko. 2003. Food web structure and the role of epilithic biofilms in cave streams. Ecological Society of America 84: 2395-2406.
- Sommer, U., F. Sommer, B. Santer, C. Jamieson, M. Boersma, C. Becker and T. Hansen.
- 2001. Complementary impact of copepods and cladocerans on phytoplankton. Ecology Letters 4: 545-550.
- Sorensen, J.P.R., L. Maurice, F. K. Edwards, D. J. Lapworth, D. S. Read, D. Allen, A. S.
- Butcher, L. K. Newbold, B. R. Townsend, P. J. Williams. 2013. Using boreholes as windows into groundwater ecosystems. PLOS One 8: 1-13.
- Spicer, J. I. 1998. Is the reduced metabolism of hypogean amphipods solely a result of food limitation? Hydrobiologia 377: 201-204.
- Stoecker, D. K. and J. M. Capuzzo. 1990. Predation on protozoa: Its importance to

zooplankton. Journal of Plankton Research 12: 891-908.

- Tomlinson, M. and A. Boulton. 2008. Subsurface groundwater dependent ecosystems: A
- review of their biodiversity, ecological processes and ecosystem services. Waterlines Occasional Paper 8: pp89.
- Traunspurger, W., M. Bergtold and W. Goedkoop. 1997. The effects of nematodes on
- bacterial activity and abundance in a freshwater sediment. Oecologia 112: 118-122.
- Troussellier, M., C. Courties, P. Lebaron and P. Servais. 1999. Flow cytometric
- discrimination of bacterial populations in seawater based on SYTO 13 staining of
- nucleic acids. FEMS Microbiology Ecology 29: 319-330.
- Venables, W. N. and B. D. Ripley. 2002. Modern Applied Statistics with S. Fourth Edition.
- Springer, New York. ISBN 0-387-95457-0.



### **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

- Fig. 1. Photos of the stygobite grazer species (A) *Niphargus fontanus*, (B) *Proasellus*
- *cavaticus* and (C) *N. kochianus.* Panels C–F show the gut content of *N. kochianus.*
- These contents are shown at x400 magnification in (E) and (F) and reveal a
- homogeneous mass of organic material and sediment particles.
- Fig. 2. The effect of control, *N. fontanus,* and *P. cavaticus* treatments (one individual per
- replicate) on protozoan abundances (individuals / mL H2O) in feeding microcosms (experiment 1). The box and whisker plots summarize replicates from four different
- distribution of the data. The horizontal line within the box indicates the median and 747 the boundaries of the box indicate the  $25<sup>th</sup>$  and  $75<sup>th</sup>$  percentiles.

experimental time blocks, with individual data points superimposed to visualize the

- 
- Fig. 3. The effect of control, *N. fontanus*, and *P. cavaticus* treatments (one individual per 749 replicate) on bacterial abundances (individuals  $/\mu$ L H<sub>2</sub>O) in feeding microcosms (experiment 1). The box and whicker plots summarize replicates from four different experimental time blocks, with individual data points superimposed to visualize the
- distribution of the data. The horizontal line within the box indicates the median and 753 the boundaries of the box indicate the  $25<sup>th</sup>$  and  $75<sup>th</sup>$  percentiles.
- Fig. 4. The effect of control and different density treatments (low and high) of *N. kochianus*  755 on protozoan abundance (individuals  $/ mL^{-1} H_2O$ ) and number of protozoan morphotypes (number / mL) over time in experiment 2. Different density treatments are symbolized by dotted (control), dashed (low density), and solid (high density)
- lines. Protozoan responses were sampled on six occasions (days 2, 5, 11, 16, 23 and 32).
- Fig. 5. The effect of control and different density treatments (low and high) of *N. kochianus*  on the relative proportion of small, medium, and large bacterial size classes (as % of
- total bacteria) over time in experiment 2. Different density treatments are symbolized
- by dotted (control), dashed (low density), and solid (high density) lines. Bacteria
- responses were sampled on nine occasions (days 2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 16, 18, 23, 27, 32).