**Greater functional similarity in mobile compared to sessile assemblages colonizing
artificial coastal habitats**

Naily Nashira Figueroa¹, Antonio Brante^{1,2}, Frédérique Viard³ and Jean-Charles
Leclerc^{1,2,4,*}

¹Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción, Departamento de Ecología, Facultad de
Ciencias, Concepción Chile

²Centro de Investigación en Biodiversidad y Ambientes Sustentables (CIBAS), Universidad
Católica de la Santísima Concepción, Concepción, Chile

³ISEM, Université de Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, Montpellier, France

⁴Sorbonne Université, CNRS, UMR 7144 AD2M, Station Biologique de Roscoff, Place
Georges Teissier, 29680 Roscoff, France

*Corresponding author: leclercjc@gmail.com

Abstract:

Among anthropogenic habitats built in the marine environment, floating and non-floating structures can be colonized by distinct assemblages. However, there is little knowledge whether these differences are also reflected in the functional structure. This study compared the functional diversity of sessile and mobile invertebrate assemblages that settle over 3 months on floating vs. non-floating artificial habitats, in two Chilean ports. Using morphological, trophic, behavioral, and life history traits, we found differences between mobile and sessile assemblages regarding the effect of the type of habitat on the functional diversity. Compared to sessile assemblages, a greater functional similarity was observed for mobile assemblages, which suggests that their dispersal capacity enables them to balance the reduced connectivity between settlement structures. No traits, prevailing or selected in one or the other habitat type, was however clearly identified; a result warranting for further studies focusing on more advanced stages of community development.

Keywords: artificial structures, functional structure, mobile invertebrate, functional traits, marine urbanization, diversity

Introduction

Increasing anthropogenic coastal activities around the world have resulted in the construction of numerous man-made structures in the marine environment (Firth et al. 2016, Bishop et al. 2017). These structures such as dikes, breakwaters, piers, mariculture lines, offshore platforms, stand for a major driver of change in marine environments by replacing many natural habitats (Airoidi et al. 2009, Bulleri and Chapman 2010, Firth et al. 2016). While the rise of artificial structures in coastal and marine areas degrade, fragment, and deplete natural habitats (Bulleri and Chapman 2010, Bishop et al. 2017), they provide new surfaces available for the settlement, reproduction, and growth of many organisms.

Novel assemblages associated with marine artificial structures however commonly differ from those found in natural habitats, and often include a large proportion of stress-resistant or opportunistic species (Connell 2000, Perkol-Finkel et al. 2006, Aguilera et al. 2014). Because they are embedded in an expanding propagule transport network, much of these species also appear to be non-indigenous or cryptogenic species (Glasby et al. 2007, Dafforn et al. 2009, Johnston et al. 2017, Leclerc et al. 2021). Overall, artificial structures facilitate the dispersal of a range of neocosmopolitan (*sensu* Darling and Carlton 2018) species (Mineur et al. 2012, Adams et al. 2014, Airoidi et al. 2015) contributing to the homogenization of coastal biota at regional and global scales (Villéger et al. 2011, Simberloff et al. 2013, Leclerc et al. 2020b). The physical characteristics of these artificial structures (e.g., material, roughness, structural complexity, inertia vs. movement capacity), and the levels disturbance in their surroundings (Bulleri and Chapman 2010, Airoidi and Bulleri 2011) influence the composition of biotic assemblages (Connell 2000, Glasby and Connell 2001, Holloway and Connell 2002, Firth et al. 2016).

Comparing natural vs. artificial habitats, some studies documented differing species compositions (Connell 2000, Glasby and Connell 2001, Holloway and Connell 2002, Sedano et al. 2020) and contrasting functional patterns between them (Mayer-Pinto et al. 2018, Janiak and Branson 2021). Similarly, among different types of artificial structures, differences in community composition and biotic interactions have also been shown (Connell 2001, Firth et al. 2016, Rogers et al. 2016, Strain et al. 2018, Giachetti et al. 2020). For instance, floating structures, such as buoys, pontoons or floating longlines, present contrasting species assemblages to those found on non-floating structures, such as the pillars of piers or docks (Connell 2001, Glasby 2001, Holloway and Connell 2002), and can differ in their β -diversity across multiple spatial scales (Leclerc et al. 2020a). The various studies that have tried to understand the mechanisms behind these differences have attributed them not only to the aforementioned physical properties of the structures but also to those to which these structures are subjected (e.g., water motion, connectivity with the benthos, exposure to predators and scavengers, disturbance regimes; Glasby 2001, Holloway and Connell 2002, Giachetti et al. 2020). Hence, the differing conditions to which floating *versus* non-floating structures are subjected could act as filters for certain functional traits among the resulting assemblages (see Piola and Johnston 2009, Zhan et al. 2015, Aronson et al. 2016, Johnston et al. 2017). For instance, the establishment of certain species in a given artificial habitat may result from specific traits that favor the recruitment of those species and increase their local fitness in this specific habitat (Beauchard et al. 2017, Córdova and Zambrano 2015). Traits allowing for rapid colonization of novel empty patches (e.g., high reproductive and growth rates, large dispersal ability) may notably be favored on floating structures, which are prone to physical disturbances (among others, Holloway and Connell 2002, Johnston et al. 2017) due to their maintenance and replacement. Conversely, traits favoring competitive and

defensive abilities may rather be favored in non-floating structures, wherein stronger biotic interactions can take place (Leclerc et al. 2020b, López and Freestone 2021).

The communities colonizing these artificial habitats are generally composed of abundant sessile species, including habitat-formers for associated mobile species. Despite the importance of the interactions among these two species groups (Sellheim et al. 2010, Thomsen et al. 2014), only few studies examined the variations in the composition of the mobile species assemblage (e.g., Karalis et al. 2003, Leclerc and Viard 2018, Martínez-Laiz et al. 2019, Carvalho et al. 2013, Sedano et al. 2020). Thus, several questions are still unanswered, such as whether differences in the composition of sessile species and habitat formers are mirrored by changes in the composition of mobile species in the assemblage, and whether these changes are strong enough to be reflected in the functional structure of the resulting community. The few studies available suggest that the diversity and traits of habitat-forming species affect the structure of their associated sessile and mobile species (Yakovis et al. 2008, Sellheim et al. 2010, Leclerc and Viard 2018). However, unlike sessile species, mobile species have the ability to disperse and relocate after settlement to colonize new patches of habitat (e.g. Martins et al. 2017). This ability is advantageous under stressful conditions or in variable environments, as it provides mobile species with a greater plasticity in their use of habitats or micro-habitats. Therefore, variations in the mobile species component, due to habitat types (exposed to differing conditions), are expected to be smaller than in the sessile component of these communities.

The present study examined the species diversity and functional structure of sessile and mobile invertebrate assemblages that settle on floating versus non-floating artificial habitats, off the East Pacific coast, central Chile. Using morphological, trophic, behavioral, and life

history traits of sessile and mobile species, we particularly examined whether the functional differences among sessile taxa between the two habitat types are mirrored among mobile taxa. We predicted that the magnitude of the differences between habitats will be greater in the assemblages of sessile species than in those of mobile species, given the post-settlement dispersal capacity of the latter. To our knowledge, this is the first study dedicated to comparing the functional structure of communities of different types of artificial coastal habitats. The comparison of the composition, abundance, and diversity of functional traits (functional diversity) among the assemblages colonizing these artificial habitats may reveal mechanisms that determine the functional composition of these new arising man-made ecosystems (see Bremner et al. 2006, Mouchet et al. 2010, Beauchard et al. 2017). This knowledge could help predict how assemblages respond to habitat properties and aid conservation managers in the prediction of changes in ecosystem functioning related to coastal human activities.

Materials and methods:

Study area

The study area comprised two ports (separated by 30 linear km) of the Biobío Region, Chile: San Vicente (36.7591° S, 73.1551°W) and Coliumo (36.5377°S, 72.9571°W). As a sidenote, San Vicente is open to international trade, while Coliumo is only open to regional traffic (see Leclerc et al. 2018, 2020b), although maritime traffic was not the scope of our study. These two ports are located in two different bays (San Vicente and Coliumo bays) characterized by distinct biotic compositions in either natural (e.g. for intertidal mollusks; Aldea and Valdovinos, 2005) and artificial habitats, although little is known regarding soft sediment habitats in ports (but see Leclerc et al. 2018 for rapid assessment surveys of conspicuous taxa). Both ports present various types of artificial habitats that are part of the coastal infrastructure, and which were categorized for this study as: (1) non-floating habitats: those attached to the docks by rigid steel foundations/pillars and in direct contact with the benthos; and (2) floating habitats: comprising longlines or buoys that remain in the water column with a weaker, less prominent link to the benthos.

Dataset overview, study design, sampling and species identification

Our study capitalized on the sampling carried out between March and June, 2017, by Leclerc et al. (2020b), who focused on sessile assemblages. In brief, the sampling consisted of the deployment of a series of 15 cm x 15 cm black polypropylene settlement plates, arranged in structures (experimental units) held by PVC tubes (for details, see Leclerc et al. 2020b). The plates were used to have a standardized substrate (surface and material) and new

available surface area (which is a main limiting resource, e.g. Sellheim et al. 2010) to be colonized by sessile and mobile taxa (flora and invertebrates).

In each of the study ports and on the two types of habitats (floating vs. non-floating), two experimental units bearing plates were placed vertically, separated by 20 m to 50 m, and at approximately 3 m to 4 m depth. In the non-floating habitats of both ports, these were placed on the pillars of the pier, while in floating habitats they were attached to buoys (San Vicente) or longline (Coliumo) by ropes. Four plates per experimental unit were removed three months after installation, which is sufficient time for the settlement and growth of the sessile and mobile assemblages to take place on the plates (see Leclerc and Viard 2018, Sellheim et al. 2010). The plates were individually transferred underwater in polypropylene rubble bags (mesh size < 0.5 mm) to minimize the loss of the mobile fauna, and were kept for 4 h in a tank with seawater until they were processed in the laboratory.

In the laboratory, sessile (Leclerc et al. 2020b) and mobile taxa (this study) were identified under a dissecting microscope at the lowest possible taxonomic level. The abundance of the sessile taxa was estimated as the coverage at 100 intersection points in an area of 120 cm × 120 cm, as detailed in Leclerc et al. (2020b), while the abundance of the mobile taxa was estimated by counting the number of individuals per plate. The mobile fauna was sampled, after the identification of the sessile taxa, by washing the plate using a 500 µm mesh sieve. The samples were preserved in 95 % EtOH for later identification. Most mobile taxa were identified morphologically to the genus or family level due to a lack of taxonomic literature for the South East Pacific taxa of many abundant groups (e.g., amphipods).

Functional traits categorization

After identification, the sessile and mobile taxa were classified according to several functional traits related to their life history, behavior, and feeding habits. In this work, sessile taxa were considered to be those species with no or low mobility, those considered as habitat formers, and those which, after their settlement, do not migrate between plates. Their functional traits were subdivided into different modalities as proposed by Bremner et al. (2003) and Beauchard et al. (2017). The information on life history traits of the individual taxa was extracted from different online sources, such as GBIF, NEMESIS, NIMPIS, MarLIN, NAS, MSIP, BIOTIC, Polytraits, as well as bibliographic sources. Each trait was categorized into three to five modalities (e.g., the trait “Larval development” was given three modalities: pelagic planktotrophic, pelagic lecithotrophic or direct benthic) obtaining a total of 11 traits and 46 modalities of traits, as detailed in the table 1. The affinity of each taxon with the modalities of each trait was assigned, so that the "total affinity" of each trait equaled 1 (Chevenet et al. 1994). This fuzzy coding allows a taxon to display modalities of a trait to different degrees (Chevenet et al. 1994). When information about a particular trait in a taxon could not be obtained, the affinity value of a similar taxon within its taxonomic group (genus or family, whichever closest available) was used as a proxy, however only whenever variations of the trait within the taxonomic group chosen had not been reported. Otherwise, an equal affinity value was assigned for all modalities of that trait for the taxon.

Functional trait data was analyzed separately for each assemblage (mobile vs. sessile). From the trait matrix (“Traits-taxon matrix”) of the sessile and mobile assemblages, respectively, an analysis of biological traits was performed (BTA; Bremner et al. 2003, 2006). This was based on combining this matrix with the taxa abundance matrix ("Taxon-

plate matrix") by means of a canonical scalar product that transforms and weights the scores (between 0 and 1 following the fuzzy coding) of each trait modality by the abundance of each taxon. This procedure allowed for the generation of a functional trait abundance matrix ("Traits-plate matrix"), on which the subsequent functional structure analyses were based.

Data analysis

The functional diversity of the community was estimated using the functional diversity indices wFDc and FDc (Petchey and Gaston 2006), based on the Gower similarity matrix of the FDiversity package (Casanoves et al. 2011), in R (R Development Core Team 2010). These indices are estimated by summing the length of the branches of a functional dendrogram of all the species from a cluster analysis, which uses profiles of multiple traits either by including their abundance (wFDc) or excluding their abundance (FDc). At the taxon level, we also estimated the richness (S) and the taxonomic diversity (Hill number $2 : 1 / \lambda$; Hill 1973) of the sessile and mobile assemblages. To compare both the taxonomic and the functional diversities between the factor levels, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed using the same, previously specified design. In addition, the effect size of each factor was estimated using the Omega squared index (ω^2 , Hays 1963). Prior to each ANOVA, normality and homogeneity of variances were checked using Shapiro-Wilk and Levene's tests, respectively. The data were transformed (square root transformation) when these tests resulted significant. These analyzes were performed using R version 4.0.3 (R Core Team 2016).

The relationship between richness and functional diversity can further inform about the functional redundancy of communities (Micheli and Halpern 2005, Córdova and Zambrano

207 2015). Instead of summarizing the associated information in a single index (e.g. van der
208 Linden et al. 2016), we herein characterized these relationships in both habitats and compared
209 them using the Tsutakawa and Hewett Test (Tsutakawa and Hewett 1977) as a substitute for
210 the ANCOVA test due to the non-fulfillment of the assumption of independence between the
211 *Habitat* factor and the covariate richness of the species. This test allows to evaluate the
212 equality of two populations when the observations are bivariate (XY; in this study X:
213 Richness Y: Functional diversity) by determining whether the values of Y given X for one
214 population dominate the other for every value of X (Williams 1977). The test involved fitting
215 a regression line (the one that best fits using the Akaike criterion (AIC); in this case, a linear
216 regression, see results) to the entire data set, and then comparing, through a contingency table
217 analysis (using the χ^2 distribution), the distribution of bivariate data above and below the
218 regression line (Williams 1977, Muñoz and George-Nacimiento 2008). These analyzes were
219 performed using the PAST program, version 3.14 (Hammer et al. 2001).

220 To compare the functional structure between habitats of the sessile and mobile
221 assemblages, Permutational Multivariate Analysis of Variance (PERMANOVA, Anderson
222 2001) was performed with 4999 permutations. A three-way design was applied, considering
223 the following factors: "Habitat" (two fixed levels: floating vs. non-floating), "Port" (two
224 random levels: Coliumo vs. San Vicente), and "Experimental unit" (two random levels nested
225 within "Port" and "Habitat"). Separate analyses were performed for sessile and mobile
226 assemblages to avoid violation of independency, and because abundance was not estimated
227 in the same way. The analyses were based on the Bray-Curtis similarity matrices generated
228 from transformed data in order to downplay the importance of the most abundant traits and
229 homogenize multivariate dispersion. We used the fourth root for the abundance of traits of
230 mobile taxa and the square root for that of sessile taxa. Multivariate trait data were also

analyzed for their composition using a Jaccard's similarity matrix (i.e., presence-absence data). The homogeneity in the dispersion of the data was verified between the levels of the factors “Habitat” and “Port”, using a Permutational Multivariate Dispersion Analysis (PERMDISP; Anderson et al. 2008). Principal coordinate analysis (PCO) and cluster analysis were performed to visualize and determine group similarity, respectively (Anderson et al. 2008). To determine if there are significant differences between the levels of each factor in certain traits of the sessile and mobile assemblages, multivariate PERMANOVAs were performed for each of the traits separately using trait modalities as response variables. The analyzes were based on the Bray-Curtis similarity matrix generated from transformed data using the fourth root for the abundance of traits of mobile taxa, the square root for that of sessile taxa. All of these analyzes were performed using the PRIMER 6 program (Anderson et al. 2008).

Results

Overall assessment of taxonomic diversity and functional traits

A total of 126 taxa were found, including 43 sessile and 83 mobile taxa (Supporting information appendix S1). Sessile taxa were represented by 10 phyla (10 bryozoans, 9 cnidarians, 7 chordates, 6 rhodophytes, 5 mollusks, 2 arthropods, 1 annelid, 1 sponge and 1 chlorophyte, 1 ochrophyte), while mobile taxa comprised 5 phyla (43 arthropods, 24 annelids, 13 mollusks, 2 nemerteans, and 1 echinoderm). Of the sessile taxa, the most represented taxonomic groups in terms of numbers of taxa and coverage were bryozoans (10 taxa, for an average of 31% coverage per plate), followed by hydroids (9 taxa and 27 % of the coverage). Of the mobile taxa, the most represented taxonomic groups in terms of numbers of taxa and abundance were amphipods (29 taxa, for an average of 54 % of the total abundance per plate), followed by polychaetes (23 taxa and 21 % of abundance) and gastropods (13 taxa and 5 % of abundance). Oppositely, copepods, isopods, tanaidaceans, and echinoderms were the least present (only 1 or 2 taxa and less than 8 % of abundance).

The sessile assemblage, regardless of the habitat (non-floating and floating), was mainly dominated in terms of numbers of taxa and cover by suspension-feeders (35 taxa and 97 % of the average total coverage per plate), as compared to autotrophs (8 and 3 %). These assemblages were dominated by colonial taxa (22 taxa and 67 % of cover), erect taxa (23 and 81 %) and smaller than 50 mm taxa (31 and 91 %). These taxa had diverse reproductive modes: asexual (30 taxa and 35 % of cover), sexual with spawning events (23 and 24 %) or broadcasted developing larvae (22 and 41 %). Most larvae were lecithotrophic (35 taxa and 86 % of cover), with a pelagic larval duration most often of less than 1 day (30 and 72 %). The longevity of the taxa was generally less than 1 year (30 taxa and 77 % of cover).

The assemblage of mobile invertebrates was equally distributed by predators (40 taxa and 32 % of the average total abundance per plate), detritivores (49 and 30 %) and filter-feeders (34 and 32 %). Their mobility was either low (46 taxa and 48 % of abundance) or moderate (42 and 42 %) and associated with behavior as burrowing in micro-refuges (42 and 40 %), crawling (44 and 29 %) or crawling-swimming (36 and 30 %). Relatively elongated individuals predominated (68 taxa), with sizes less than 10 mm (49 taxa and 77 % of abundance), with a longevity less than 1 year (33 and 38 %) and 1 to 3 years (77 and 53 %). Different reproductive modes were observed, but most of them (51 taxa and 59 % of abundance) were sexual reproduction with parental egg care and the development of juvenile phases. Most taxa developed directly in the benthos (54 taxa and 62 % of abundance) and of the 38 % with larval development (49 taxa), 24 % had a pelagic larval duration of less than 1 day (18 taxa).

Contrasting effects of the type of habitat (floating vs. non-floating) on the taxonomic and functional diversity according to the assemblages (mobile vs. sessile)

The taxonomic and functional diversity of the two categories of assemblages (i.e., mobile vs. sessile) varied between non-floating and floating habitats, whatever the variable examined, and in the two ports (Fig. 1, Table 2). In sessile assemblages the differences between habitats were contrasting between the two ports, as evidenced by significant interactions (and associated effect sizes) *Habitat* and *Port* for all response variables (Table 2). In San Vicente, sessile richness, diversity and both functional diversity indices were higher in the non-floating habitat, while the opposite was observed in Coliumo (Fig. 1). Conversely, for mobile assemblages, the differences observed between habitats were comparatively far more consistent in the two studied ports. With the exception of wFCD that

showed significant interaction, higher taxonomic and functional diversity (FDc only) of mobile assemblages were observed in floating than in non-floating habitats in both ports (Table 2, Fig. 1).

The functional diversity in non-floating and floating habitats showed a general positive linear relationship with taxa richness for both sessile and mobile assemblages (Fig. 2), although this relationship was better supported for sessile ($r^2 = 0.58$ $p < 0.001$) than for mobile assemblage ($r^2 = 0.16$ $p = 0.023$, Fig. 2). According to the bivariate relationships between taxa richness and functional diversity, a contrasting functional redundancy between habitats for sessile assemblages was supported by the Tsutakawa and Hewett tests ($\chi^2 = 8.33$ $df = 1$; $p = 0.004$). A lower slope for the linear relationships in floating habitats than in non-floating habitats was observed (Fig. 2; non-floating: slope = 0.29, $r^2 = 0.73$, floating: slope = 0.09, $r^2 = 0.73$). On the contrary, for mobile assemblage the bivariate relationships (richness, functional diversity) suggested a similar functional redundancy between habitats ($\chi^2 = 1$ $df = 1$; $p = 0.317$), with a similar slope between floating and non-floating habitats (Fig. 2; non-floating: slope = 0.12, $r^2 = 0.22$, floating: slope = 0.04, $r^2 = 0.01$).

Stronger effects of the type of habitat on the functional structure of sessile assemblages compared to mobile assemblages

The functional compositions (presence-absence) of the sessile and mobile assemblages did not show significant differences between non-floating and floating habitats (Table 3). However, the functional structure weighted by the abundance (wFDc) showed a significant interaction between the factors, *Habitat* and *Port*, in both assemblages (Table 3). The PCO results also showed distinct clusters, for both composition and abundance (Fig. 3). Interestingly, in the sessile assemblages, when compared to the mobile, a greater

differentiation in the functional structure weighted by the abundance was observed between both habitats (cf. similarity thresholds in Fig. 3), as well as a greater similarity within and between the floating habitats of both ports. Likewise, the variation between plates in the abundance of the functional traits of the sessile assemblage was significantly greater in non-floating habitats than in floating habitats (PERMDISP $F = 32.69$ $p < 0.001$). In addition, nested within habitat categories, experimental units display significant (and sizable) effects only for the sessile assemblages, in their (functional composition and abundance structure; Table 3). Overall, the mobile assemblages presented higher similarity in their composition and functional abundance than the sessile assemblages, regardless of the habitat or port (80 % similarity, Fig. 3).

When analyzing the functional traits of the sessile assemblage separately, no effect of the *Habitat* factor was detected on the functional structure of the traits. However, significant interactions between *Habitat* and *Port* were observed for five (out of nine examined) traits, namely body form, individual/colony size, lifespan, reproductive mode, and pelagic larval duration (Table 4). It is also noteworthy that for the feeding trait (represented by two modalities), the factor *Habitat* had a high effect size in the multivariate analysis. Although a dominance of filter-feeders was observed in both habitats and ports (Fig. 4), their absolute coverage on the plates was greater in floating habitats than in non-floating ones (Fig. S1). Among the other functional traits evaluated, although the proportions of modalities varied between habitats, the differences were not consistent between ports for which these traits did not contribute to any further differentiation between the habitats, floating vs. non-floating (Fig. 4). Consistently with the analysis of functional composition and abundance structure,

significant spatial effects of the experimental units were observed on the modalities, only for the sessile assemblages (Table 4).

For the mobile assemblages, although all the traits had a high effect size of the *Habitat* factor, this effect was only significant in interaction with the factor *Port* (Table 5). This is also illustrated by the modality proportions of abundance within each functional trait across habitats and ports (Fig. 5, Fig. S2), for which variations were observed, although these were not as marked as for the sessile assemblage.

Discussion

The results of our study show that the differences reported by various authors in the community structure between different types of artificial habitats (Connell 2001, Glasby 2001, Firth et al. 2016, Strain et al. 2018), including in the study area (Leclerc et al. 2020b), are also found in the functional structure of sessile and mobile marine assemblages. However, and in accordance with our predictions, these differences were not as noticeable in mobile assemblages as opposed to sessile assemblages. Our results showed that the mobile assemblages, unlike sessile ones, present a compositional structure and abundance of functional traits more similar than that of sessile assemblages, suggesting that the functional structure of these mobile assemblages is less affected by the type of artificial coastal structures (floating vs. non-floating) than that of sessile assemblages.

Floating and non-floating man-made marine structures have the potential to create habitats that attract diverse organisms, including habitat-formers that develop on the empty foundations of these structures (Connell 2000, Holloway and Connell 2002, Leclerc and Viard 2018). These habitat-forming organisms, most often sessile, facilitate the recruitment and the subsequent establishment of diverse sets of other species that use these taxa as a source of food and/or shelter (see Bruno and Bertness 2001, Karalis et al. 2003, Sellheim et al. 2010). Given these biotic interactions, changes in the species composition of sessile assemblages may further determine the composition and changes of the associated mobile assemblages (Sellheim et al. 2010, Sueiro et al. 2011, Leclerc and Viard 2018). For example, on floating structures, Leclerc and Viard (2018) found correlations between the richness and abundance of mobile fauna and the volume of interstices created by the sessile fauna. Other studies in ports however only reported few correlations between the compositions of the

sessile and mobile assemblages (see Birdsey et al. 2011, Lavender et al. 2017), and variables such as habitat cover, identity, and functional diversity of sessile assemblages did not predict the variation of the associated mobile assemblages (Birdsey et al. 2011). In our study, contrasting patterns were observed between sessile and mobile assemblages. In sessile assemblages, the functional structure varied between habitats within each port, and among experimental units (plots), with contrasting abundance of the functional traits. This pattern could be explained because sessile assemblages may be influenced by local settlement dynamics (e.g. Hedge and Johnston 2012, Leclerc et al. 2021), especially where taxa with propagules displaying short pelagic duration (notably lecithotrophic larvae) dominate, as upon our settlement plates. Conversely, in the mobile assemblages, the functional structure was more similar and the modalities of the traits showed similar proportions of abundance in habitats and ports, and seldom varied among experimental plots. Considering the prominent role of species abilities to post-settlement dispersal on the community structure of novel habitats (Palmer et al. 1996, Martins et al 2017), the intrinsic capability of movement among taxa is likely to be a critical factor explaining the observed greater functional similarity between habitats in mobile compared to sessile assemblages.

Moreover, while we observed complex variations in the richness and diversity (taxonomic and functional) of the sessile assemblages between habitats and ports, the mobile assemblages showed more consistent results, with the greatest richness and diversity found in the floating habitats at both ports. This indicates that despite the putative lower connectivity with the benthos of the floating habitats for many groups (especially non-swimming taxa), a substantial dispersal of mobile species towards floating habitats and between them is warranted. Considering that 60 % of the taxa has a direct development in

these habitats, dispersal of these mobile species is likely due to the migration of adults and juveniles. However, larval dispersal and recruitment of post-larval stages, either from nearby benthic habitats or from other artificial habitats (see Susick et al. 2020, Leclerc and Viard 2018) is likely to play an important role for benthic-pelagic or holo-pelagic species (Hudson et al. 2016). In our experiments, the plates were deployed over 3 months, a time long enough for colonization by mobile species (including tube-dwelling taxa) from rocky subtidal habitats, especially during summer (Norderhaug et al. 2002, Waage-Nielsen et al. 2003). Additionally, these mobile assemblages can redistribute after settlement, colonize new patches of habitat in interconnected or nearby areas, becoming more diverse and abundant in areas further away from their source habitat/reef (Virnstein and Curran 1986, Martins et al. 2017).

Floating habitats, being less accessible to non-swimming species, in particular non-swimming predators, show a lower predation pressure (Dumont et al. 2011, Rogers et al. 2016, Leclerc et al. 2020a), which may in turn influence the diversity and structure of the community. For instance, in temperate marinas, low predation pressure by benthic predators in floating habitats had been shown to increase the biotic complexity of sessile assemblages, which in turn could favor colonization by mobile species (Leclerc and Viard 2018). In our study, the sessile assemblage had a 40 % greater coverage on the floating structures than on the non-floating ones, and we also found a higher percentage of empty patches in the settlement plates deployed on the non-floating structures. Although the present dataset does not allow to evaluate the relationship between the richness/diversity of the mobile assemblage and the functional composition of the sessile assemblage, it is likely that a greater coverage of the sessile assemblage favors the associated mobile assemblage of floating

habitats by providing an increased availability of microhabitats and refuges, decreasing predator-prey encounters for mobile species (Grabowski 2004, Scyphers and Powers 2013, Leclerc and Viard 2018). Nonetheless, other mechanisms to the aforementioned, such as differences of the biotic and abiotic stress gradients among habitats, may be responsible for the richer and more functionally diverse mobile fauna we measured on floating structures, for which further investigation is required. It is noteworthy that although remarkable differences in taxonomic diversity and functional richness were found for mobile assemblages between habitats, no difference in the functional structure could be detected when abundances (here the number of individuals) were considered. As suggested elsewhere (e.g. Hillebrand et al 2018, Boyé et al. 2020), this result warrants caution regarding blind uses of diversity metrics and encourages more comprehensive analyses incorporating species identity and the influence of their traits on the system dynamics to detect changes in biodiversity and ecosystem functioning.

Floating habitats differ from their non-floating counterparts in a considerable number of abiotic and biotic conditions (e.g., connection/link with the benthos, exposure to predators and scavengers, orientation to currents, and disturbance regimes). These conditions could act as a filter for certain functional traits (e.g., r-selected traits and/or tolerance to disturbance, see Piola and Johnston 2009, Zhan et al. 2015, Johnston et al. 2017, Leclerc et al. 2020b). When the filters are characteristic to a certain environment, then through similar selective processes, large scale patterns in the composition and functions of the assemblages of these environments may arise (Poff 1997, Statzner et al. 2004). However, among most of the traits considered in this study, more differences were found among structures or harbors than between habitats, and this may suggest that there was no differential selection of particular

traits between the types of habitats studied. However, our results showed a high percentage of taxa with traits characteristics of early successional stages such as small sizes (sessile: 79% <50mm, mobile: 60% <10mm), short longevity (sessile 70% <1 year, mobile: 93% <3 years) and short pelagic larval duration (70% sessile <1 day, mobile 69 % none or <1 day) (Giangrade et al. 1994, Odum 1969). Thus, the early stage of maturity of the study communities or the broad array of putative processes influencing spatial patterns in coastal biodiversity (see Benedetti-Cecchi 2001, Fraschetti et al. 2005, Chang and Marshall 2016) could also generate such results. Hence, considering that a greater complexity of interactions could occur in more advanced successional stages (e.g. Aguilera and Navarrete 2012), evaluating changes in functional traits later during succession may give a better approximation of the functional structure of these communities.

The dissimilarity of the relationships between the functional diversity of sessile taxa and their richness suggests that floating habitats present a functional redundancy superior to that of non-floating ones. Likewise, our results showed a greater functional similarity of the sessile assemblages among the plates of the floating habitats and a greater multivariate dispersion among those of the non-floating habitats. In general, disturbed environments can favor the establishment of species with more similar combinations of traits (Poff 1997, Leibold et al. 2004, Statzner et al. 2004, Valdivia et al. 2017, Leclerc 2018). However, our results do not allow us to know whether or not the environmental conditions in floating habitats, may be responsible for the similarity we found among the traits of these habitats. For example, the greater variability in the composition of traits among the plates of non-floating habitats could possibly be linked to the more intense predation pressure reported in these types of habitats (see Diaz and McQuaid 2011, Valdivia et al. 2017). In these habitats,

important variation in the effect of predation among patches and pillars had been previously reported (Leclerc et al. 2020a). As any other disturbance (Sousa 1984, Connell and Slatyer 1977, Sousa 1979), predation at the microhabitat scale (within a single plate) on the one hand can reduce the richness and abundance of species (and proportionally the functional diversity of the community/assemblage), while on the other hand, the freed space on the plates, caused by predation, can increase the richness and abundance of species by repeatedly opening new patches/substrate available for the colonization by new species.

Likewise, it should be considered that greater similarities in the community structure of sessile assemblages in floating versus non-floating habitats have been reported (Holloway and Connell 2002, Leclerc et al. 2020), including on a regional scale (Leclerc et al. 2020b). According to many authors, floating structures have assemblages of particular species, where there is generally a greater abundance and richness of non-native species compared to non-floating structures (Holloway and Connell 2002, Glasby et al. 2007, Dafforn et al. 2009, Johnston et al. 2017, Leclerc and Viard 2018, Leclerc et al. 2020b). The susceptibility to invasion and to biotic homogenization of these floating structures (Leclerc et al. 2020b) might explain the greater similarity in the functional structure, diversity and redundancy, of the sessile assemblages in floating habitats, a hypothesis to be further tested, for instance by distinguishing native and non-native taxa at broader scales.

To conclude, our data showed that the functional structure of both sessile and mobile assemblages varies between floating and non-floating artificial habitats. However, such variations are minor among mobile assemblages as opposed to sessile ones. Dispersal ability of mobile species is likely to be a major determinant of this pattern. Our results suggest that despite the (almost) absence of any physical link between floating habitats and the benthos,

the dispersal capacity of much mobile species leads to richer and more diverse assemblages than expected in these habitats. In this study, we however did not find a clear suite of functional traits prevailing in one or the other habitat type, in either assemblages. As we only examined functional traits at an early successional state of these communities, we recommend evaluating their composition in more advanced stages of the community's development to evaluate 1) whether the low functional differences in the mobile assemblage are maintained, and 2) whether there is a selection over time of certain functional traits that differs between the types of habitats, floating vs. non-floating.

Acknowledgements

This study is part of Master's thesis in Marine Ecology funded by the Postgraduate Department of the Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción. We are grateful to The Centro de Investigaciones en Biodiversidad y Ambientes Sustentables (CIBAS) for the funding received for processing the samples. We are thankful to Francisco Silva for the support in the barcoding DNA analysis, to Angel Urzúa for his support in the identification of decapod crustaceans, to Oscar Díaz and Nicolás Rozbaczylo of FAUNAMAR for their support in the identification of the polychaetes, to Rodrigo Riera for his guidance with the functional diversity analysis. We also thanks to Mario George-Nacimiento, Patricio Camus and Moises Aguilera for their valuable and helpful comments on this study. This study was based on the samplings carried out under JCL FONDECYT project (n°3160172). This is the ISEM XXXX-XXX SUD publication

Author's contributions

JCL, NF, FV and AB conceived the working hypotheses and designed the study. JCL led the fieldwork, sample collection and conducted the taxonomic analyses of the sessile assemblages. NF realized the taxonomic analyses of the mobile assemblages. NF did literature research to fill in the trait matrices and conducted all data analyses (taxonomic and functional diversities, statistics). NF led the writing, with substantial contributions from the other co-authors. All authors critically revised and edited the manuscript drafts.

Data accessibility

Some of the data are provided in the supplementary material associated with the manuscript. Detailed data will be made publicly available in the Dryad repository.

References

- Adams, T.P., Miller, R.G., Aleynik, D., Burrows, M.T., 2014. Offshore marine renewable energy devices as stepping stones across biogeographical boundaries. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 51, 330–338. <https://doi.org/10/ghmfbj>
- Aguilera, M.A., Navarrete, S.A., 2012. Functional identity and functional structure change through succession in a rocky intertidal marine herbivore assemblage. *Ecology* 93, 75–89. <https://doi.org/10.1890/11-0434.1>
- Aguilera, M.A., Broitman, B.R., Thiel, M., 2014. Spatial variability in community composition on a granite breakwater versus natural rocky shores: lack of microhabitats suppresses intertidal biodiversity. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* <https://doi.org/10/f6n43z>
- Airoidi, L., Bulleri, F., 2011. Anthropogenic Disturbance Can Determine the Magnitude of Opportunistic Species Responses on Marine Urban Infrastructures. *PLoS One* 6, e22985. <https://doi.org/10/bq4gww>
- Airoidi, L., Connell, S.D., Beck, M.W., 2009. The Loss of Natural Habitats and the Addition of Artificial Substrata, In: Wahl, M. (Ed.), *Marine Hard Bottom Communities: Patterns, Dynamics, Diversity, and Change*, Ecological Studies. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 269–280.
- Airoidi, L., Turon, X., Perkol-Finkel, S., Rius, M., 2015. Corridors for aliens but not for natives: effects of marine urban sprawl at a regional scale. *Divers. Distrib.* 21, 755–768. <https://doi.org/10/gkms2t>

531 Aldea, C., Valdovinos, C., 2005. Moluscos del intermareal rocoso del centro-sur de Chile
 532 (36° - 38°s): taxonomía y clave de identificación. Gayana (Concepción) 69, 364–396.
 533 <https://doi.org/10/c7sq4z>

534 Anderson, M., 2001. Permutation tests for univariate or multivariate analysis and
 535 regression. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 58, 626–639. <https://doi.org/10/fscj4n>

536 Anderson, M.J., Gorley, R.N., Clarke, K.R., 2008. PERMANOVA+ for PRIMER: Guide
 537 to Software and Statistical Methods. Plymouth, UK: PRIMER-E

538 Aronson, M.F.J., Nilon, C.H., Lepczyk, C.A., Parker, T.S., Warren, P.S., Cilliers, S.S.,
 539 Goddard, M.A., Hahs, A.K., Herzog, C., Katti, M., La Sorte, F.A., Williams, N.S.G.,
 540 Zipperer, W., 2016. Hierarchical filters determine community assembly of urban species
 541 pools. Ecology 97, 2952–2963. <https://doi.org/10/f9bss6>

542 Beauchard, O., Veríssimo, H., Queirós, A.M., Herman, P.M.J., 2017. The use of multiple
 543 biological traits in marine community ecology and its potential in ecological indicator
 544 development. Ecol. Indic. 76, 81–96. <https://doi.org/10/gbrzw5>

545 Benedetti-Cecchi, L., 2001. Variability in abundance of algae and invertebrates at
 546 different spatial scales on rocky sea shores. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 215, 79–92.
 547 <https://doi.org/10/fsb6tr>

548 Birdsey, E.M., Johnston, E.L., Poore, A.G.B., 2012. Diversity and cover of a sessile
 549 animal assemblage does not predict its associated mobile fauna. Mar. Biol. 159, 551–560.
 550 <https://doi.org/10/bbj8ps>

551 Bishop, M.J., Mayer-Pinto, M., Airoidi, L., Firth, L.B., Morris, R.L., Loke, L.H.L.,
 552 Hawkins, S.J., Naylor, L.A., Coleman, R.A., Chee, S.Y., Dafforn, K.A., 2017. Effects of
 553 ocean sprawl on ecological connectivity: impacts and solutions. *J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol.*, 492,
 554 7–30. <https://doi.org/10/gbn3wg>

555 Boyé, A., Thiébaud, E., Grall, J., Legendre, P., Broudin, C., Houbin, C., Le Garrec, V.,
 556 Maguer, M., Droual, G., Gauthier, O., 2019. Trait-based approach to monitoring marine
 557 benthic data along 500 km of coastline. *Diversity and Distributions* 25,1879-1896.
 558 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12987>

559 Bremner, J., Rogers, S.I., Frid, C.L.J., 2003. Assessing functional diversity in marine
 560 benthic ecosystems: a comparison of approaches. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 254, 11–25.
 561 <https://doi.org/10/b6srw3>

562 Bremner, J., Rogers, S.I., Frid, C.L.J., 2006. Methods for describing ecological
 563 functioning of marine benthic assemblages using biological traits analysis (BTA). *Ecol.*
 564 *Indic.* 6, 609–622. <https://doi.org/10/fh4d23>

565 Bruno, J., Bertness, M. D., 2001. Positive interactions, facilitations and foundation
 566 species. In: Bertness, M.D. Gaines, S. and Hay, M. (eds) *Marine community ecology*. Sinauer
 567 Associates, Inc Publishers, Sunderland, Massachusetts, 201-218.

568 Bulleri, F., Chapman, M.G., 2010. The introduction of coastal infrastructure as a driver
 569 of change in marine environments. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 47, 26–35. <https://doi.org/10/dqnpwc>

570 Carvalho, S., Moura, A., Cúrdia, J., da Fonseca, L. C., and Santos, M. N., 2013. How
 571 complementary are epibenthic assemblages in artificial and nearby natural rocky reefs? *Mar.*
 572 *Environ. Res.* 92, 170–177. <https://doi.org/10/f5jrj>

573 Casanoves, F., Pla, L., Di Rienzo, J.A., 2011. Valoración y análisis de la diversidad
 574 funcional y su relación con los servicios ecosistémicos. Serie técnica, Informe técnico, 384.

575 Chang, C., Marshall, D.J., 2016. Spatial pattern of distribution of marine invertebrates
 576 within a subtidal community: do communities vary more among patches or plots? *Ecol. Evol.*
 577 6, 8330–8337. <https://doi.org/10/f9b8jz>

578 Chevenet, F., Dolédec, S., Chessel, D., 1994. A fuzzy coding approach for the analysis
 579 of long-term ecological data. *Freshw. Biol.* 31, 295–309. <https://doi.org/10/dzbfv6>

580 Connell, J.H., Slatyer, R.O., 1977. Mechanisms of Succession in Natural Communities
 581 and Their Role in Community Stability and Organization. *Am. Nat.* 111, 1119–1144.
 582 <https://doi.org/10/db44n5>

583 Connell, null, 2000. Floating pontoons create novel habitats for subtidal epibiota. *J. Exp.*
 584 *Mar. Bio. Ecol.* 247, 183–194. <https://doi.org/10/dx8z4j>

585 Connell, S.D., 2001. Urban structures as marine habitats: an experimental comparison of
 586 the composition and abundance of subtidal epibiota among pilings, pontoons and rocky reefs.
 587 *Mar. Environ. Res.* 52, 115–125. <https://doi.org/10/fsm97r>

588 Córdova-Tapia, F., Zambrano, L., 2015. La diversidad funcional en la ecología de
 589 comunidades. *Ecosistemas* 24, 78–87. <https://doi.org/10/gkms3h>

590 Dafforn, K.A., Johnston, E.L., Glasby, T.M., 2009. Shallow moving structures promote
 591 marine invader dominance. *Biofouling* 25, 277–287. <https://doi.org/10/cww5b7>

592 Darling, J.A., Carlton, J.T., 2018. A framework for understanding marine
 593 cosmopolitanism in the Anthropocene. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 5, 293.
 594 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2018.00293>

595 Díaz, E.R., McQuaid, C.D., 2011. A spatially explicit approach to trophic interactions
 596 and landscape formation: patchiness in small-scale variability of grazing effects along an
 597 intertidal stress gradient. *J. Ecol.* 99, 416–430. <https://doi.org/10/bmd7qs>

598 Dumont, C.P., Gaymer, C.F., Thiel, M., 2011. Predation contributes to invasion
 599 resistance of benthic communities against the non-indigenous tunicate *Ciona intestinalis*.
 600 *Biol. Invasions* 13, 2023–2034. <https://doi.org/10/djg8fh>

601 Firth, L.B., Knights, A.M., Bridger, D., Evans, A.J., Mieszkowska, N., Moore, P.,
 602 O'Connor, N., Sheehan, E., Thompson, R.C., Hawkins, S.J., 2016. Ocean sprawl: challenges
 603 and opportunities for biodiversity management in a changing world, *Oceanogr. Mar. Biol.*
 604 54, 189-262.

605 Frascchetti, S., Terlizzi, A., Benedetti-Cecchi, L., 2005. Patterns of distribution of marine
 606 assemblages from rocky shores: Evidence of relevant scales of variation. *Mar. Ecol. Ser.* 296,
 607 13–29. <https://doi.org/10/b5wrdf>

608 Giachetti, C.B., Battini, N., Castro, K.L., Schwindt, E., 2020. Invasive ascidians: How
 609 predators reduce their dominance in artificial structures in cold temperate areas. *J. Exp. Mar.*
 610 *Bio. Ecol.* 533, 151459. <https://doi.org/10/gjwdnx>

611   Giangrande, A., Geraci, S., Belmonte, G., 1994. Life-cycle and life-history diversity in
612   marine invertebrates and the implications in community dynamics. *Oceanogr. Mar. Biol.* 32,
613   305-333.

614   Glasby, T.M., 2001. Development of sessile marine assemblages on fixed versus moving
615   substrata. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 215, 37–47. <https://doi.org/10/ch6tnr>

616   Glasby, T.M., Connell, S.D., 2001. Orientation and position of substrata have large
617   effects on epibiotic assemblages. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 214, 127–135.
618   <https://doi.org/10/fn29vg>

619   Glasby, T., Connell, S., Holloway, M., Hewitt, C., 2007. Nonindigenous biota on
620   artificial structures: Could habitat creation facilitate biological invasions? *Mar. Biol.* 151,
621   887–895. <https://doi.org/10/dfsnmz>

622   Grabowski, J.H., 2004. Habitat Complexity Disrupts Predator-Prey Interactions but Not
623   the Trophic Cascade on Oyster Reefs. *Ecology* 85, 995–1004. <https://doi.org/10/cqkqxv>

624   Hammer, O., Harper, D., Ryan, P., 2001. PAST: Paleontological Statistics Software
625   Package for Education and Data Analysis. *Palaeontol. Electron.* 4, 1–9.

626   Hays, W.L., 1963. *Statistics for Psychologists*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

627   Hedge, L.H., Johnston, E.L., 2012. Propagule pressure determines recruitment from a
628   commercial shipping pier. *Biofouling* 28:73-
629   85.<https://doi.org/10.1080/08927014.2011.652622>.

630 Hill, M., 1973. Diversity and Evenness: A Unifying Notation and Its Consequences.
 631 Ecology 54, 427–432. <https://doi.org/10/d42q4v>

632 Holloway, M.G., Connell, S., 2002. Why do floating structures create novel habitats for
 633 subtidal epibiota? Mar. Ecol. Ser. - Mar Ecol-Progr Ser 235, 43–52. <https://doi.org/10/dvrprz>

634 Hudson, J., Viard, F., Roby, C., Rius, M., 2016. Anthropogenic transport of species across
 635 native ranges: unpredictable genetic and evolutionary consequences. Biol. Lett. 12,
 636 20160620. <https://doi.org/10/gkms3x>

637 Janiak, D.S., Branson, D., 2021. Impacts of habitat and predation on epifaunal
 638 communities from seagrass beds and artificial structures. Mar. Environ. Res. 163, 105225.
 639 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2020.105225>

640 Johnston, E.L., Dafforn, K.A., Clark, G.F., Rius, M., Floerl, O., 2017. Anthropogenic
 641 activities promoting the establishment and spread of marine non-indigenous species post-
 642 arrival, In: Hawkins, S.J., Evans, A.J., Dale, A.C., Firth, L.B., Hughes, D.J., Smith, I.P.
 643 (Eds.), Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review. CRC Press, pp. 389–419.

644 Karalis, P., Chryssanthi, A., Chintiroglou, C., 2003. Structure of the artificial hard
 645 substrate assemblages in ports Thermaikos Gulf (North Aegean Sea). Enzym. Microb.
 646 Technol. 26, 215–224. <https://doi.org/10/bkg978>

647 Lavender, J.T., Dafforn, K.A., Bishop, M.J., Johnston, E.L., 2017. Small-scale habitat
 648 complexity of artificial turf influences the development of associated invertebrate
 649 assemblages. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 492, 105–112. <https://doi.org/10/gbn3kv>

650 Leclerc, J.-C., 2018. Patterns of spatial variability between contrasting substrata: a
651 boulder-field study. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 597, 23–38. <https://doi.org/10/gdsc26>

652 Leclerc, J.-C., Brante, A., Viard, F., 2021. Rapid recovery of native habitat-builders
653 following physical disturbance on pier pilings offsets colonization of cryptogenic and non-
654 indigenous species in a Chilean port. *Mar. Environ. Res.* 163, 105231.
655 <https://doi.org/10/gkms5c>

656 Leclerc, J.-C., Viard, F., Brante, A., 2019. Experimental and survey-based evidences for
657 effective biotic resistance by predators in ports. *Biol. Invasions.* <https://doi.org/10/gg3k4w>

658 Leclerc, J.-C., Viard, F., González Sepúlveda, E., Díaz, C., Neira Hinojosa, J., Pérez
659 Araneda, K., Silva, F., Brante, A., 2018. Non-indigenous species contribute equally to
660 biofouling communities in international vs local ports in the Biobío region, Chile. *Biofouling*
661 34, 784–799. <https://doi.org/10/gg3k4z>

662 Leclerc, J.-C., Viard, F., Sepúlveda, E., Díaz, C., Hinojosa, J., Araneda, K., Silva, F.,
663 Brante, A., 2020. Habitat type drives the distribution of non-indigenous species in fouling
664 communities regardless of associated maritime traffic. *Divers. Distrib.*
665 <https://doi.org/10/gg3k4v>

666 Leibold, M.A., Holyoak, M., Mouquet, N., Amarasekare, P., Chase, J.M., Hoopes, M.F.,
667 Holt, R.D., Shurin, J.B., Law, R., Tilman, D., Loreau, M., Gonzalez, A., 2004. The
668 metacommunity concept: a framework for multi-scale community ecology. *Ecol. Lett.* 7,
669 601–613. <https://doi.org/10/bkg384>

670   López, D.P., Freestone, A.L., 2021. History of co-occurrence shapes predation effects on
 671 functional diversity and structure at low latitudes. *Functional Ecology* 35, 535-545.
 672 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13725>

673   Martínez-Laiz, G., Ulman, A., Ros, M., Marchini, A., 2019. Is recreational boating a
 674 potential vector for non-indigenous peracarid crustaceans in the Mediterranean Sea? A
 675 combined biological and social approach. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 140, 403–415.
 676 <https://doi.org/10/gkms5d>

677   Martins, G.M., Matias, M.G., Moniz, I., Rius, C., Sanderson, J., Neto, A.I., Jenkins, S.R.,
 678 2017. Post-settlement dispersal ability determines structure of marine benthic
 679 metacommunities. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 569, 15–23. <https://doi.org/10/f97p9m>

680   Mayer-Pinto, M., Cole, V.J., Johnston, E.L., Bugnot, A., Hurst, H., Airoidi, L., Glasby,
 681 T.M., Dafforn, K.A., 2018. Functional and structural responses to marine urbanisation.
 682 *Environ. Res. Lett.* 13, 14009. <https://doi.org/10/gkms5p>

683   Micheli, F., Halpern, B.S., 2005. Low functional redundancy in coastal marine
 684 assemblages. *Ecol. Lett.* 8, 391–400. <https://doi.org/10/bx6qcq>

685   Mineur, F., Cook, E.J., Minchin, D., Bohn, K., MacLeod, A., Maggs, C.A., 2012.
 686 Changing coasts: marine aliens and artificial structures. *Oceanogr. Mar. Biol. an Annu. Rev.*
 687 Vol. 50 189–233.

688   Mouchet, M., Villéger, S., Mason, N., Mouillot, D., 2010. Functional diversity measures:
 689 an overview of their redundancy and their ability to discriminate community assembly rules.
 690 *Funct. Ecol.* 24, 867–876. <https://doi.org/10/d3cknd>

691 Muñoz, S.A., George-Nascimento, M., 2008. The effect of *Anonchocephalus chilensis*
 692 *Riggenbach* (Eucestoda: Bothriocephalidea) on infracommunity patterns in *Genypterus*
 693 *maculatus* Tschudi (Osteichthyes: Ophidiidae). *J. Helminthol.* 82, 221–226.
 694 <https://doi.org/10/b9k4w7>

695 Norderhaug, K., Christie, H., Rinde, E., 2002. Colonisation of kelp imitations by epiphyte
 696 and holdfast fauna; a study of mobility patterns. *Mar. Biol.* 141, 965–973.
 697 <https://doi.org/10/c8z4vv>

698 Odum, E.P., 1969. The Strategy of Ecosystem Development. *Science* 164:262-270

699 Palmer, M.A., Allan, J.D., Butman, C.A., 1996. Dispersal as a regional process affecting
 700 the local dynamics of marine and stream benthic invertebrates. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 11, 322–
 701 326. <https://doi.org/10/fp5bz8>

702 Perkol-Finkel, S., Shashar, N., Benayahu, Y., 2006. Can artificial reefs mimic natural reef
 703 communities? The roles of structural features and age. *Mar. Environ. Res.* 61, 121–135.
 704 <https://doi.org/10/frqz38>

705 Petchey, O., Gaston, K., 2006. Petchey OL, Gaston KJ. Functional diversity: back to
 706 basics and looking forward. *Ecol Lett* 9: 741-758. *Ecol. Lett.* 9, 741–758.
 707 <https://doi.org/10/fvgtw3>

708 Piola, R.F., Johnston, E.L., 2009. Comparing differential tolerance of native and non-
 709 indigenous marine species to metal pollution using novel assay techniques. *Environ. Pollut.*
 710 (Barking, Essex 1987) 157, 2853–2864. <https://doi.org/10/d49g52>

711 Poff, N.L., 1997. Landscape Filters and Species Traits: Towards Mechanistic
 712 Understanding and Prediction in Stream Ecology. *J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* 16, 391–409.
 713 <https://doi.org/10/d2nbw9>

714 R Core Team. 2016. R A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R
 715 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL: <http://www.r-project.org>

716 Rogers, T., Byrnes, J., Stachowicz, J., 2016. Native predators limit invasion of benthic
 717 invertebrate communities in Bodega Harbor, California. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 545.
 718 <https://doi.org/10/f8ftz3>

719 Scyphers, S.B., Powers, S.P., 2013. Context-dependent effects of a marine ecosystem
 720 engineer on predator-prey interactions. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 491, 295–301.
 721 <https://doi.org/10/f5cw7x>

722 Sedano, F., Navarro-Barranco, C., Guerra-García, J.M., Espinosa, F., 2020. From sessile
 723 to vagile: Understanding the importance of epifauna to assess the environmental impacts of
 724 coastal defence structures. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* 235, 106616. <https://doi.org/10/gkms5q>

725 Sellheim, K., Stachowicz, J.J., Coates, R.C., 2009. Effects of a nonnative habitat-forming
 726 species on mobile and sessile epifaunal communities. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 398, 69–80.
 727 <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08341>

728 Simberloff, D., Martin, J.L., Genovesi, P., Maris, V., Wardle, D.A., Aronson, J.,
 729 Courchamp, F., Galil, B., García-Berthou, E., Pascal, M., Pyšek, P., Sousa, R., Tabacchi, E.,
 730 Vilà, M., 2013. Impacts of biological invasions: What’s what and the way forward. *Trends*
 731 *Ecol. Evol.* 28, 58–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2012.07.013>

732 Sousa, W.P., 1979. Experimental Investigations of Disturbance and Ecological
 733 Succession in a Rocky Intertidal Algal Community. *Ecol. Monogr.* 49, 228–254.
 734 <https://doi.org/10/brszvt>

735 Sousa, W. P., 1984. The role of disturbance in natural communities. *Annu. Rev. Ecol.*
 736 *Evol. Syst.* 15, 353–391. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.15.110184.002033>

737 Statzner, B., Dolédec, S., Hugueny, B., 2004. Biological trait composition of European
 738 stream invertebrate communities: Assessing the effects of various trait filter types.
 739 *Ecography (Cop.)*. 27, 470–488. <https://doi.org/10/bvdjwq>

740 Strain, E.M.A., Olabarria, C., Mayer-Pinto, M., Cumbo, V., Morris, R.L., Bugnot, A.B.,
 741 Dafforn, K.A., Heery, E., Firth, L.B., Brooks, P.R., Bishop, M.J., 2018. Eco-engineering
 742 urban infrastructure for marine and coastal biodiversity: Which interventions have the
 743 greatest ecological benefit? *J. Appl. Ecol.* 55, 426–441. <https://doi.org/10/gfsqmx>

744 Sueiro, M.C., Bortolus, A., Schwindt, E., 2011. Habitat complexity and community
 745 composition: relationships between different ecosystem engineers and the associated
 746 macroinvertebrate assemblages. *Helgol. Mar. Res.* 65, 467–477. <https://doi.org/10/fsh7dg>

747 Susick, K., Scianni, C., Mackie, J., 2020. Artificial structure density predicts fouling
 748 community diversity on settlement panels. *Biol. Invasions* 22, 1–22.
 749 <https://doi.org/10/gkms53>

750 Thomsen, M., Byers, J., Schiel, D., Bruno, J., Olden, J., Wernberg, T., Silliman, B., 2014.
 751 Impacts of marine invaders n biodiversity depend on trophic position and functional
 752 similarity. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 495, 39–47. <https://doi.org/10/f5q5kv>

753 Tsutakawa, R.K., Hewett, J.E., 1977. Quick test for comparing two populations with
 754 bivariate data. *Biometrics* 33, 215–219. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529314>

755 van der Linden, P., Marchini, A., Dolbeth, M., Patrício, J., Veríssimo, H., Marques, J.C.,
 756 2016. The performance of trait-based indices in an estuarine environment. *Ecological*
 757 *Indicators*. 61, 378-389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.09.039>

758

759 Valdivia, N., Segovia-Rivera, V., Fica, E., Bonta, C.C., Aguilera, M.A., Broitman, B.R.,
 760 2017. Context-dependent functional dispersion across similar ranges of trait space covered
 761 by intertidal rocky shore communities. *Ecol. Evol.* 7, 1882–1891. <https://doi.org/10/f92rdc>

762 Villéger, S., Blanchet, S., Beauchard, O., Oberdorff, T., Brosse, S., 2011.
 763 Homogenization patterns of the world's freshwater fish faunas. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 108,
 764 18003–18008. <https://doi.org/10/cpm26h>

765 Virnstein, R. W., Curran, M. C., 1986. Colonization of artificial seagrass versus time and
 766 distance from source. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 29, 279-288 <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps029279>

767 Waage-Nielsen, E., Christie, H., Rinde, E., 2003. Short-term dispersal of kelp fauna to
 768 cleared (kelp-harvested) areas. *Hydrobiologia* 503, 77-91.
 769 <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:HYDR.00000008490.51745.a9>

770 Williams, J.S., Tsutakawa, R.K., Hewett, J.E., 1977. Quick test for comparing two
 771 populations with bivariate data. *Biometrics* 33, 215–219.

772   Yakovis, E.L., Artemieva, A. V, Shunatova, N.N., Varfolomeeva, M.A., 2008. Multiple
773   Foundation Species Shape Benthic Habitat Islands. *Oecologia* 155, 785–795.
774   <https://doi.org/10/ddb87r>

775   Zhan, A., Briski, E., Bock, D., Ghabooli, S., MacIsaac, H., 2015. Ascidiens as models for
776   studying invasion success. *Mar. Biol.* 2449–2470. <https://doi.org/10/f724dn>

777

778

Tables

Table 1. Selected biological traits and categories used to describe the functional structure of sessile and mobile invertebrates assemblages in artificial marine habitats, in the Southeast Pacific, Chile; after Bremner et al., (2003) and Beauchard et al., (2017).

Traits		Modality		Traits		Modality	
Feeding Habit		Autotroph	Filter/suspension feeder	Adult mobility		None	Low
		Deposit feeder	Predator			Medium	High
		Opportunist/scavenger	Grazer				
Individual /colonial size		1-10 mm	10-50 mm	Lifespan		<1 year	>1-3 years
		50-100 mm	100-300 mm			3-5 years	>5 years
Body form		Flat	Mound	Reproductive mode		Asexual	Sexual (broadcast spawner)
		Erect	Elongate			Sexual (planktonic larvae)	Sexual (direct-developer)
Sociability		Solitary	Colonial	Larval development		Pelagic planktotrophic	Pelagic lecithotrophic
		None	Behavioral			Direct benthic	
Degree of attachment		Temporary	Permanent	Pelagic larval duration		None	<1 day
		1-7days	7-30 days			>30 days	
Motility		Sessile	Burrower				
		Crawler	Crawler-swimmer				
		Swimmer					

Table 2. Results of the ANOVA for the difference of taxonomic and functional diversity of sessile and mobile invertebrate assemblages associated to artificial marine habitats in two ports of the Southeast Pacific, Chile. The value of F and ω^2 and its significance at $\alpha = 0.05$ in bold (*: $p < 0.05$, **: $p < 0.01$, ***: $p < 0.001$) is given for each factor (*Habitat* vs. *Port*), and their interactions. Tests of homogeneity of variances are summarized by their p values.

Response variable	ANOVA Factor (df, total = 31)						Levene		
	Habitat = H		Port = P		H $\times$ P		Experimental Unit		p
	F	ω^2	F	ω^2	F	ω^2	F	ω^2	
Richness(S)									
Sessile	0.90	0.00	2.92	0.03	34.74***	0.49	1.20	0.05	0,64
Mobile	53.64***	0.63	0.19	0.00	2.04	0.01	0.80	0.03	0,63
Taxa diversity (1/λ)									
Sessile (*)	1.35	0.00	19.02**	0.10	104.9***	0.58	1.27	0.06	0.11
Mobile	45.62***	0.60	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.68	0.02	0.37
Functional diversity (FDc)									
Sessile	1.12	0.00	2.39	0.02	33.08***	0.47	1.78	0.08	0.45
Mobile	32.30***	0.60	0.02	0.00	3.76	0.04	1.62	0.08	0.51
Functional diversity (wFDc)									
Sessile	4.47	0.03	0.23	0.26	91.32***	0.44	7.83	0.14	0.07
Mobile	6.84*	0.41	2.88	0.02	33.84***	0.46	0.66	0.02	0.41

(*) transformation Square-root

793 **Table 3.** PERMANOVA results for the differences in functional structure (composition and abundance) of the sessile and mobile
794 assemblages. The pseudo-F of PERMANOVA and PERMDISP ($H \times P$) are given along with significance at $\alpha = 0.05$ (*: $p < 0.05$, **: $p < 0.01$, ***: $p < 0.001$) and the effect size (ω^2) of each factor.

Assemblage	Sessile						Mobile					
	Composition			Abundance			Composition			Abundance		
Transformation	None			Square-root			None			Fourth-root		
PERMDISP	$F_{1,30} = 1.09$ $p = 0.354$			$F_{1,30} = 34.01$ $p < 0.001$			$F_{1,30} = 8.23$ $p = 0.012$			$F_{1,30} = 7.47$ $p = 0.013$		
Source	df	Pseudo-F	ω^2	df	Pseudo-F	ω^2	df	Pseudo-F	ω^2	df	Pseudo-F	ω^2
Habitat = H	1	0.65	0,05	1	1.01	0,26	1	4.31	0,15	1	1.25	0,39
Port = P	1	3.02**	0,16	1	22.74**	0,50	1	6.97*	0,15	1	12.63*	0,08
$H \times P$	1	1.19	0,05	1	10.87**	0,23	1	1.61	0,01	1	50.17**	0,32
Experimental Unit ($H \times P$)	4	3.17***	0,21	4	5.92***	0,07	4	1.15	0.07	4	1.01	0,02
Res.	24			24			24			24		

796

797

798 **Table 4.** PERMANOVA results for the differences in the modality composition (weighted by abundances) of each functional trait of
799 taxa of the sessile assemblages of artificial marine habitats studied in two ports of the Southeast Pacific, Chile. The pseudo-F of
800 PERMANOVA and t value of PERMDISP ($H \times P$) are given along with significance (in bold) at $\alpha = 0.05$ (*: $p < 0.05$, **: $p < 0.01$, ***:
801 $p < 0.001$) and the effect size (ω^2) of each factor.

Functional traits	PERMANOVA Factor (df, total = 31)								PERMDISP
	Habitat = H		Port = P		H × P		Experimental units		
	Pseudo F	ω ²	Pseudo F	ω ²	Pseudo F	ω ²	Pseudo F	ω ²	
Feeding habit	4.06	0.43	3.72	0.08	4.31	0.10	2.37*	0.09	4.27
Body form	1.31	0.26	7.89*	0.26	6.10*	0.20	6.41***	0.12	8.15**
Body size	0.33	0.16	14.01*	0.22	31.73**	0.49	6.47***	0.06	77.24***
Sociability	4.51	0.25	36.64**	0.60	3.38	0.05	11.86***	0.06	17.85***
Lifespan	0.64	0.14	23.69**	0.48	11.36**	0.23	7.87***	0.07	22.00***
Degree of attachment	7.14	0.59	1.16	0.03	2.44	0.07	5.91***	0.13	0.90
Reproductive mode	1.05	0.35	11.14**	0.17	21.93**	0.33	5.03***	0.06	1.13
Larval development	-	0.24	56.82**	0.68	-	0.03	5.75***	0.05	29.48***
Pelagic larval duration	0.00	0.05	106.37**	0.74	12.47*	0.08	2.30	0.03	44.92**

802 The data were previously transformed (square root transformation) and was used the Bray-Curtis Index to generate the similarity matrix.

803 **Table 5.** PERMANOVA results for the differences the functional structure (weighted by abundances) of each functional trait of the taxa
804 of the mobile assemblages in non-floating and floating habitats. The pseudo-F of PERMANOVA and t value of PERMDISP ($H \times P$) are
805 given along with the respective significance (in bold) at $\alpha = 0.05$ (*: $p < 0.05$, **: $p < 0.01$, ***: $p < 0.001$) and the effect size (ω^2) of
806 each factor.

	PERMANOVA Factor (df, total = 31)								
Functional traits	Habitat = H		Port = P		H × P		Experimental Unit		PERMDISP
	Pseudo F	ω²	Pseudo F	ω²	Pseudo F	ω²	Pseudo F	ω²	
Feeding habit	0.95	0.36	9.41*	0.05	61.68**	0.25	0.97	0.01	0.17
Body form	1.08	0.26	26.98**	0.23	27.23**	0.24	1.05	0.03	0.21
Body size	1.73	0.44	6.49	0.04	34.90*	0.25	0.86	0.02	0.00
Mobility	1.31	0.42	6.60*	0.04	45.86**	0.32	1.07	0.02	7.64**
Adult mobility	0.93	0.34	29.36*	0.12	85.01**	0.28	0.79	0.01	0.77
Lifespan	0.96	0.38	3.30	0.01	52.75*	0.40	1.38	0.02	1.13
Degree of attachment	1.31	0.43	9.08*	0.04	55.93**	0.32	0.96	0.01	3.61
Reproductive mode	1.64	0.46	9.79*	0.05	45.65**	0.27	0.98	0.43	5.79*
Larval development	1.22	0.40	11.21*	0.06	57.85**	0.33	0.96	0.02	4.09*
Pelagic larval duration	0.00	0.38	9.40*	0.07	36.40**	0.30	1.14	0.02	5.43*

807

Figure legends

Figure 1. Indices of taxonomic and functional diversity of the sessile and mobile assemblages associated with non-floating vs floating habitats in the two ports: San Vicente and Coliumo, Southeast Pacific, Chile.

Figure 2. Relationship between functional diversity and taxa richness of sessile and mobile assemblages in non-floating vs. floating habitats. Data are pooled across ports.

Figure 3. Principal coordinates analysis (PCO) of the composition (presence-absence) and abundance of functional features of sessile and mobile assemblages on non-floating vs. floating habitats in two ports (San Vicente vs. Coliumo) in the Southeast Pacific, Chile.

Figure 4. Proportion of the average abundance of each category of functional traits of the sessile assemblages of two types of habitats (NF: non-floating vs. F: floating) in two ports: San Vicente vs. Coliumo, Southeast Pacific, Chile.

Figure 5. Proportion of the average abundance of each category of functional traits of the mobile assemblages of two types of habitats (NF: non-floating vs. F: floating) in two ports: San Vicente vs. Coliumo, Southeast Pacific, Chile.

Sessile

Mobile

Composition

Abundance

Abundance proportion (%)

Feeding Habit

Filter/suspension
Autotroph

Individual /colonial size

1-10mm 10-50mm
50-100mm 100-300mm

Body form

Flat Mound Erect

Sociability

Solitary Colonial

Lifespan

<1 year >1-3 years
3-5 years >5 years

Reproductive mode

Sexual (direct-developer)
Sexual (planktonic larvae)
Sexual (broadcast spawner)
Asexual

Larval development

Direct benthic
Pelagic lecithotrophic
Pelagic planktotrophic

Pelagic larval duration

None <1 day
1-7days 7-30 days
>30 days

Feeding Habit

- Predator
- Filter/suspension
- Deposit feeding
- Opportunist/scavenger
- Grazer

Individual /colonial size

- 1-10mm
- 10-50mm
- 50-100mm
- 100-300mm

Body form

- Mound
- Little elongate/ellipsoid
- Elongate

Motility

- Burrower
- Crawler
- Crawler-swimmer
- Swimmer

Adult mobility

- Low
- Medium
- High

Lifespan

- <1 year
- >1-3 years
- 3-5 years
- >5 years

Reproductive mode

- Sexual (direct-developer)
- Sexual (planktonic larvae)
- Sexual (broadcast spawner)
- Asexual

Larval development

- Direct benthic
- Pelagic lecithotrophic
- Pelagic planktotrophic

Pelagic larval duration

- None
- <1 day
- 1-7days
- 7-30 days
- >30 days

Supplementary material accompanying:

Greater functional similarity in mobile compared to sessile assemblages colonizing distinct artificial coastal habitats

Naily Nashira Figueroa¹, Antonio Brante^{1,2}, Frédérique Viard³ and Jean-Charles Leclerc^{1,2,4,*}

¹Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción, Departamento de Ecología, Facultad de Ciencias, Concepción Chile

²Centro de Investigación en Biodiversidad y Ambientes Sustentables (CIBAS), Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción, Concepción, Chile

³ISEM, Université de Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, Montpellier, France

⁴Sorbonne Université, CNRS, UMR 7144 AD2M, Station Biologique de Roscoff, Place Georges Teissier, 29680 Roscoff, France

*Corresponding author: leclercjc@gmail.com

Table S1. Complete list of sessile and mobile taxa settled on plates

Sessile taxa	
Chlorophyta	<i>Aulacomya atra</i> (Molina, 1782) <i>Mytilus galloprovincialis</i> Lamarck, 1819 <i>Semimytilus algosus</i> (Gould, 1850) <i>Hiatella</i> Bosc, 1801 <i>Crepidatella fecunda</i> (Lamarck, 1822)
<i>Ulva</i> Linnaeus, 1753	
Ochrophyta	Crustacea
Diatoms and Ectocarpales	<i>Austromegabalanus psittacus</i> (Molina, 1788) <i>Balanus laevis</i> Bruguière, 1789
Rhodophyta	Chordata
<i>Antithamnionella</i> Lyle, 1922	<i>Didemnum</i> Savigny, 1816 <i>Diplosoma listerianum</i> (Milne Edwards, 1841) <i>Asterocarpa humilis</i> (Heller, 1878) <i>Ciona robusta</i> Hoshino & Tokioka, 1967 <i>Corella eumyota</i> Traustedt, 1882 <i>Paramolgula</i> Traustedt, 1885 <i>Pyura chilensis</i> Molina, 1782
Calcareous crusts	
<i>Ceramium</i> Roth, 1797	
<i>Polysiphonia</i> Greville, 1823	
Red turf (other)	
Rhodymeniales Schmitz in Engler, 1892	
Porifera	
<i>Leucosolenia</i> Bowerbank, 1864	
Cnidaria	Mobile taxa
<i>Bougainvillia muscus</i> (Allman, 1863)	Annelida
<i>Amphisbetia operculata</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	<i>Chone rosea</i> Hartmann-Schröder, 1965 <i>Perkinsiana magalhaensis</i> (Kinberg, 1867) <i>Nereis callaona</i> (Grube, 1857) Nereididae Blainville, 1818 <i>Pholoe polymorpha</i> (Hartmann-Schröder, 1962) <i>Harmothoe magellanica</i> (McIntosh, 1885) <i>Paleanotus chrysolepis</i> Schmarda, 1861 <i>Syllis pectinans</i> Haswell, 1920 <i>Autolytus</i> Grube, 1850 <i>Autolytus maclearanus</i> McIntosh, 1885 <i>Proceraea micropedata</i> (Hartmann-Schröder, 1962) <i>Sphaerosyllis hystrix</i> Claparède, 1863 <i>Dipolydora socialis</i> (Schmarda, 1861) <i>Polydora rickettsi</i> Woodwick, 1961 <i>Polycirrus multisetigerus</i> Hartmann-Schröder, 1962 <i>Nicolea chilensis</i> (Schmarda, 1861) Terebellini Johnston, 1846 Terebellidae sp1 Johnston, 1846 Terebellidae sp2 Johnston, 1847 <i>Nereiphylla</i> Blainville, 1828 <i>Phyllodoce longipes</i> Kinberg, 1866 <i>Eulalia</i> Savigny, 1822
<i>Coryne eximia</i> Allman, 1859	
<i>Hydractinia</i> Van Beneden, 1844	
<i>Obelia dichotoma</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	
<i>Obelia geniculata</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	
<i>Orthopyxis</i> L. Agassiz, 1862	
<i>Phialella quadrata</i> (Forbes, 1848)	
<i>Plumularia setacea</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	
Bryozoa	
<i>Alcyonidioides mytili</i> (Dalyell, 1848)	
<i>Amathia gracilis</i> (Leidy, 1855)	
<i>Bugula neritina</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	
<i>Bugulina flabellata</i> (Thompson in Gray, 1848)	
<i>Celleporella hyalina</i> (Linnaeus, 1767)	
<i>Chapieria acanthina</i> (Lamouroux, 1825)	
<i>Exochella</i> Jullien, 1888	
<i>Schizoporella maullina</i> Moyano, 1983	
<i>Schizoporella</i> Hincks, 1877	
<i>Scruparia ambigua</i> (d'Orbigny, 1841)	
Annelida	
<i>Spirorbis nordenskjöldi</i> Ehlers, 1900	
Mollusca	

Diplocirrus Haase, 1915
Oligochaeta Grube, 1850

Mollusca

Doto sp1 Oken, 1815
Doto sp2 Oken, 1815

Phidiana lottini (Lesson, 1831)
Hancockia Gosse, 1877
Orienthella trilineata (O'Donoghue, 1921)
Nudibranchia sp1
Nudibranchia sp2
Thecacera darwini Pruvot-Fol, 1950
Tegula Lesson, 1832
Patellidae Rafinesque, 1815
Alia unifasciata (G. B. Sowerby I, 1832)
Mitrella Risso, 1826
Nodilittorina Martens, 1897

Crustacea

Amphilochoidea sp1 Boeck, 1871
Amphilochoidea sp2 Boeck, 1871
Amphilochoidea sp3 Boeck, 1871
Stenothoidae Boeck, 1871
Aora Krøyer, 1845
Aoridae sp1 Stebbing, 1899
Aoridae sp2 Stebbing, 1899
Aoridae sp3 Stebbing, 1899
Aoroides Walker, 1898
Caprella equilibra Say, 1818
Deutella venenosa Mayer, 1890
Thoridae Kingsley, 1879

Pycnogonida Latreille, 1810

Echinodermata

Patiria chilensis (Lutken, 1859)

Monocorophium acherusicum (Costa, 1853)
Corophiidae Leach, 1814
Eurystheus Spence Bate, 1856
Photidae sp1 Boeck, 1871
Photidae sp2 Boeck, 1871
Photidae sp3 Boeck, 1871
Photidae sp4 Boeck, 1871
Photidae sp5 Boeck, 1871
Photidae sp6 Boeck, 1871
Ischyroceridae Stebbing, 1899
Ischyrocerus sp1 Krøyer, 1838
Ischyrocerus sp2 Krøyer, 1838
Ischyrocerus sp3 Krøyer, 1838
Jassa slatteryi Conlan, 1990
Jassa marmorata Holmes, 1905
Jassa justii Conlan, 1990
Elasmopus Costa, 1853
Dexaminidae Leach, 1814
Zeuxoides Sieg, 1980
Copepoda sp1 Milne Edwards, 1840
Copepoda sp2 Milne Edwards, 1840
Janiridae G. O. Sars, 1897
Munnidae G. O. Sars, 1897
Pachycheles Stimpson, 1858
Romaleon setosum (Molina, 1782)
Halicarcinus planatus (J.C. Fabricius, 1775)
Eurynome Leach, 1814 [in Leach, 1813-1815]
Majidae Samouelle, 1819
Pilumnoides perlatus (Poeppig, 1836)
Nauticaris magellanicus (A.Milne-Edwards, 1891)

Nemertea

Nemertea sp1
Nemertea sp2

Figure S1. Absolute coverage of each category of functional traits of the sessile assemblages on two types of habitats (NF: non-floating vs. F: floating) in two ports: San Vicente vs. Coliumo, Southeast Pacific, Chile.

Figure S1. Absolute abundance of each category of functional traits of the mobile assemblages on two types of habitats (NF: non-floating vs. F: floating) in two ports: San Vicente vs. Coliumo, Southeast Pacific, Chile.