

Abstract

 Overfishing, nutrient fueled hypoxia, and habitat destruction have reduced oyster populations to a fraction of their former abundance. Over the last two decades there has been widespread effort to restore oyster reefs and develop oyster aquaculture. Yet it remains unclear how re-introduction of large oyster populations will change coastal biogeochemistry. Of particular interest is whether oysters may help offset excess nitrogen loading, which is responsible for widespread coastal water quality degradation, low oxygen conditions, and biodiversity declines. Here, we used a meta-analysis approach to assess how oysters alter inorganic nutrient cycling, with a focus on nitrogen removal. Additionally, we examined how oysters alter greenhouse gas emissions. We demonstrate that oysters enhance removal of excess nitrogen by stimulating denitrification, promote efficient nutrient recycling, and may have a negligible greenhouse gas footprint. Further, oyster reefs and oyster aquaculture appear to have similar biogeochemical function, suggesting the potential for sustainable production of animal protein alongside environmental restoration.

Approximately 40% of the world's population lives within 100 km of the coast¹. These 33 2.4 billion people exert immense pressure on the ecology of coastal ecosystems, perhaps most 34 dramatically by altering the availability of nitrogen $(N)^{2-4}$, phosphorus $(P)^{5,6}$, and silica $(Si)^{7,8}$. 35 Excess nutrient loading to coastal systems has led to a series of deleterious consequences (e.g., 36 eutrophication^{5,6}, low oxygen conditions⁹, and reduced productivity of valuable fisheries^{6,10}). The 37 negative impacts of excess nutrients have been exacerbated by the decimation of coastal shellfish 38 populations through overharvest¹¹, pollution¹², and disease¹³.

 Historically, oysters were found in large populations in many coastal systems, and 40 sustainably supported human populations for millennia¹⁴. Today over 85% of reefs have been 41 lost globally¹⁵, and less than 1% of wild populations remain in many locations¹⁶. Returning oysters to human dominated coastal systems may help negate some deleterious anthropogenic impacts and achieve Sustainable Development Goal 14 of the United Nations "To conserve and 44 sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development"¹⁷. Specifically, rebuilding large and well managed oyster populations can promote conservation and sustainable use of the seas by creating new habitat and maintaining productivity, cleaning 47 water through removal of suspended particulates and excess nutrients^{18,19}, and providing a source of animal protein for those living in coastal communities with limited access to livestock protein 49 sources, at a low greenhouse gas $cost^{20}$. Additionally, development of the oyster aquaculture industry provides economic benefits for small-scale fishers and coastal communities. Introduction, or re-introduction of oysters to coastal systems may also be associated with negative ecological consequences (e.g. competition for phytoplankton with other filter-feeders, introduction of disease), particularly if a non-native species is used in restoration or 54 aquaculture^{21–23}.

 In this paper, we examine the role oysters play in regulating coastal biogeochemical cycling. In coastal ecosystems, N and P availability is controlled by external (e.g., sewage discharge) and internal (e.g., recycling of nutrients from the sediments to the water column) 58 sources²⁴. Oysters enhance recycling of nutrients by stimulating sediment decomposition 59 processes following deposition of feces and pseudofeces (collectively "biodeposits")¹⁸. Biodeposition can also reduce eutrophication by stimulating N loss through denitrification (the 61 microbial conversion of biologically reactive N to non-reactive dinitrogen (N_2) gas)²⁵. Oysters themselves alter nutrient cycling by excreting N and P and denitrification occurs in their 63 digestive system²⁶.

 Since the 1990s, there have been significant efforts to restore oyster habitat²⁷ and develop the oyster aquaculture industry for economic benefit and to regain lost ecosystem services. For 66 example, New York City is working to return 1 billion oysters to its waters by 2035²⁸, and oyster aquaculture is practiced on every continent except Antarctica. In 2016, global harvest of oysters 68 raised in aquaculture exceeded 5438 million tonnes – an 8% increase since 2014^{29} – and there is 69 still tremendous potential for expansion³⁰. To date, studies of the biogeochemical impact of oysters have focused on denitrification or nutrient regeneration at a single oyster farm or reef, making extrapolation to larger scales difficult. Here, we used a meta-analysis approach to quantify the role oysters play in regulating coastal biogeochemical cycles at a global scale. Specifically, we focused on oyster driven: regeneration of N, P, and Si, N removal via denitrification, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. We then compare the biogeochemical impact of different oyster habitats and species. Finally, we suggest future studies that will advance the field and clarify uncertainties identified in this meta-analysis.

78 **Results & Discussion**

79 Our meta-analysis considered 1012 studies, and after screening included 45 80 (Supplemental Figure 1). Included studies spanned 5 continents and 7 species of oyster, and most 81 (n = 28) were from the Atlantic Coast of North America (Figure 1). In total, 17 studies reported 82 fluxes from oysters^{20,26,31–45} with 626 individual flux measurements, and 31 studies^{20,37,41,46–73} 83 reported fluxes from sediments, providing 4328 individual flux measurements. Below, all effect 84 sizes for sediment fluxes are reported as mean estimated Hedge's $g \pm 95\%$ confidence interval 85 and a p-value for significance. For context, small effect: $g = 0 - 0.2$, medium effect: $g = 0.2 - 0.5$, 86 and a strong effect: $g > 0.5^{74}$. For fluxes from oysters, we report the mean \pm standard error (umol 87 ind⁻¹ hr⁻¹) for market size *Crassostrea virginica*. As oyster fluxes are not compared with a 88 control, no *g* can be calculated.

89

90 **Oyster Regulation ofNutrient Recycling**

 Both the magnitude and ratio of oyster-mediated nutrient regeneration are necessary considerations when discussing how oysters regulate coastal nutrient availability. Enhanced nutrient regeneration maintains a productive ecosystem, but changes in the availability of N 94 relative to P and Si, or NH_4^+ relative to NO_x can lead to a phytoplankton community dominated 95 by dinoflagellates and cyanobacteria^{9,75,76} – groups often associated with harmful algal blooms and less efficient transfer of energy across trophic levels.

97 Sediments beneath oysters return significantly more NH_4^+ to the water column than bare 98 sediments $(g = 0.750 \pm 0.377$ ($p < 0.001$), $n = 25$; Figure 2). In contrast, oysters have a highly 99 variable effect on sediment NO_x fluxes, and one that is not significant across studies ($g = 0.406 \pm 1.00$ 100 1.577 ($p = 0.583$), $n = 12$; Figure 2). NO₃ fluxes were also statistically unchanged in the

101 presence of oysters $(g = 0.012 \pm 0.478$ ($p = 0.956$), $n = 9$). No conclusions could be drawn for 102 oyster effect on NO₂ release due to small sample size $(g = 0.784 \pm 0.927$ (p = 0.059), n = 2), but 103 these limited data suggest it may be enhanced in oyster habitats. Oysters also have a strong effect 104 on sediment PO₄³ regeneration (Figure 2; $g = 0.561 \pm 0.319$ (p = 0.003), n = 12). Oysters may 105 have a net positive effect on sediment Si flux $(g = 0.375 \pm 0.974$ ($p = 0.123$), $n = 2$), but again 106 the data are too limited to draw a definitive conclusion.

107 We can consider the ratio of the calculated *g* values for two sediment nutrient fluxes to 108 determine how oysters may change water column nutrient availability. For example, diatoms 109 require an N:Si ratio ≤ 1 to dominate. A $g(N)$: $g(Si)$ equal to 1 would indicate that oysters 110 stimulate sediment regeneration of N and Si at the same rate, and do not change the ratio of 111 sediment N and Si regeneration. If $g(N)$: $g(Si) > 1$ then oysters drive greater N than Si 112 regeneration relative to bare sediments, and if $g(N)$: $g(Si) < 1$, than Si is regenerated more 113 rapidly than N. Oysters only slightly change the ratio of sediment N and P regeneration $(g(NH₄⁺)$ $114 + NO_x$; $g(PO_4^3) = 1.31$, and likely do not drive either nutrient to become limiting to production. However, oysters may drive greater regeneration of N relative to Si $(g(NH₄⁺ + NO_x);g(Si) =$ 116 2.17), though again only two studies compared sediment Si fluxes between bare sediment and 117 sediment beneath oysters. In areas with large oyster populations, sediments will likely regenerate 118 at least twice as much NH_4 ⁺ as $NO_x (g(NH_4^+):g(NO_x) = 2.38)$. It appears oysters could 119 potentially lead to shifts in phytoplankton community structure that preferentially use NH_4 ⁺ to 120 NO_x , such as dinoflagellates and cyanobacteria^{75,77}.

121 Both oyster reefs ($g = 0.684 \pm 0.428$ ($p = 0.002$), $n = 12$) and aquaculture ($g = 0.742 \pm 0.002$) 122 0.482 ($p = 0.003$), $n = 11$) stimulate sediment NH₄⁺ fluxes, with no statistical difference between 123 the two habitat types (p = 0.860). Similarly, NO_x fluxes were statistically the same (p = 0.706)

124 between reefs ($g = 0.673 \pm 3.043$ ($p = 0.665$), $n = 6$) and aquaculture ($g = 0.077 \pm 0.571$ ($p =$ 125 0.791), $n = 4$). NO₃ fluxes did not differ ($p = 0.063$) between habitat types, despite the 126 appearance of NO₃ uptake by sediments beneath aquaculture $(g = -0.307 \pm 0.616$ ($p = 0.328$), n 127 = 5) and release from sediments adjacent to reefs ($g = 0.316 \pm 0.230$ ($p = 0.007$) n = 4). Too few 128 studies reported NO_2 fluxes to allow for statistical comparison. PO_4^3 fluxes were also no 129 different ($p = 0.863$) from sediments beneath reefs ($g = 0.616 \pm 0.677$ ($p = 0.075$), n = 4) and 130 aquaculture $(g = 0.550 \pm 0.314$ ($p < 0.001$), $n = 8$).

131 Oysters themselves recycle significant quantities of NH_4^+ (5.73 \pm 0.91 µmol NH_4^+ indiv⁻¹ 132 hr⁻¹) and PO_4^3 ⁻ (0.82 \pm 0.1 µmol PO_4^3 - indiv⁻¹ hr⁻¹) to the water column. NO_x fluxes were much 133 more variable $(2.64 \pm 5.74 \text{ SE }\mu\text{mol }NO_x \text{indiv}^{-1} \text{ hr}^{-1})$, with one study reporting high NO_x 134 emission⁴³, and another reporting nearly equivalent NO_x consumption³⁹. NO₃ fluxes were only 135 reported in two studies that met our criteria, but were slightly lower $(0.50 \pm 0.92 \text{ SE } \mu \text{mol } \text{NO}_3)$ 136 indiv⁻¹ hr⁻¹) than NO_x. Three studies reported NO₂ fluxes, and they were lower $(0.11 \pm 0.02 \text{ SE})$ 137 umol NO_2 indiv⁻¹ hr⁻¹) than the sum of NO_x and NO_3 fluxes. We could not locate any studies that report oyster DSi excretion. Other grazing organisms excrete DSi^{78} , so it is possible oysters 139 may too. Unlike sediment nutrient regeneration, N and P excretion from oysters likely drives N 140 to become limiting in the context of the Redfield ratio (16N:1P), with an N:P molar ratio of 6.99 141 NH_4^+ : PO_4^3 .

142 It is clear oyster habitats drive substantial nutrient recycling, though they may increase 143 NH_4^+ :NO_x, with potentially negative consequences. There is a significant body of literature 144 focused on top-down regulation of phytoplankton biomass and community by oysters, but less 145 attention has been paid to how oysters may change phytoplankton community structure from the 146 bottom-up, despite evidence for stimulation of productivity using regenerated nutirents⁷⁹. Future

147 research should address this so we can better understand how larger oyster populations may 148 change the ecology of coastal ecosystems.

149

150 **Removal of Excess Nitrogen by Oysters via Denitrification**

 Stimulation of sediment denitrification and denitrification in oysters can permanently remove excess N from coastal systems, reducing the impact of eutrophication. There are two 153 commonly used methods for measuring rates of denitrification $(N_2/Ar$ technique⁸⁰ and the 154 isotope pairing technique (IPT)⁸¹). The N₂/Ar technique measures net exchange of N₂ between sediment and water column, and the resulting fluxes are either net positive (i.e., denitrification) or net negative (i.e., nitrogen fixation). IPT requires the addition of a tracer and a series of methodological assumptions to calculate sediment denitrification, and IPT rates are generally 158 lower than those measured with the N_2/Ar technique⁸².

159 When we examined denitrification rates measured using the N_2/Ar technique we found 160 that oysters have a strong positive effect on sediment denitrification $(g = 0.682 \pm 0.276)$ ($p <$ 161 0.001), $n = 19$; Figure 3). The effect of oysters on sediment denitrification is greater when 162 measured using the N₂/Ar method ($g = 0.682 \pm 0.284$) relative to the isotope pairing technique 163 (IPT; $g = 0.239 \pm 0.745$ ($p = 0.463$), $n = 7$), likely due to under estimation of denitrification 164 using IPT⁸³. While the magnitude of the effect of oysters on net N₂ fluxes was higher in reef 165 habitats ($g = 0.792 \pm 0.199$ ($p < 0.001$), $n = 11$) than aquaculture ($g = 0.514 \pm 0.220$ ($p < 0.001$), 166 $n = 6$), there was no statistical difference between the two habitats ($p = 0.223$). A possible 167 explanation for this discrepancy is that some studies that measured denitrification in reefs 168 occasionally included the oysters in the incubation chamber. As oysters themselves produce N_2 169 26,37,39,40,42,43 , this would likely increase the measured net N₂ flux.

170 Relative to sediment denitrification measurements made using the N_2/Ar technique (403) individual measurements of net denitrification in sediment beneath oysters), there are only a few 172 measurements of net N_2 from oysters themselves (n = 37). Regardless, it is clear that denitrification proceeds within oysters, with an average denitrification rate from oysters of 4.78 ± 2.46 µmol N₂ indiv⁻¹ hr⁻¹. In dense populations, denitrification in oysters could be a significant 175 pathway for N removal from coastal ecosystems²⁶, perhaps more than doubling total removal of excess N.

 Despite a large number of studies that quantified denitrification from sediments in oyster 178 habitats, every study that used the N_2/Ar method was conducted on either the Atlantic or Gulf Coast of the United States, and used the oyster native to this region (*Crassostrea virginica*). The 180 only study conducted elsewhere used the IPT method⁴¹. While it is unlikely that other oyster species will have different effects than *C. virginica*, it is necessary to collect similar measurements in other locations and with other oyster species.

183 It is important to consider the simultaneous removal and recycling of N in oyster habitats in an ecosystem context. Greater N release from oyster habitats may at first seem to suggest that oysters worsen water quality, but this may not be the case, as any N oysters excrete or that is regenerated from sediments beneath oysters was previously held in phytoplankton and detritus processed by the oysters. Simply, oysters generally do not add new nutrients to the system, and recycled nutrients cannot support more phytoplankton than would be supported by external 189 nutrient loading to the system ¹⁸. Instead, oysters promote a second round of primary production and efficient re-use of nutrients already in the system, while removing some excess N (Figure 6). Specifically, any increase in water column primary productivity likely increases deposition of organic matter to sediments. In turn, because sediment denitrification is positively correlated

193 with organic matter, nitrogen removal is enhanced (Figure $5)^{84-86}$. Simultaneous promotion of N recycling and removal by oysters may not reduce the trophic status of a coastal system – and may in fact increase it through enhanced primary production and carbon fixation – but the presence of oysters in the system may help to reduce the effects associated with cultural eutrophication, such as high phytoplankton biomass, reductions in harvestable fish and shellfish, and decreased water clarity.

Greenhouse Gas Release from Oyster Habitats

201 Oyster biodeposition may promote release of carbon dioxide (CO_2) , methane CH_4), and 202 nitrous oxide (N_2O) from sediments. Oysters can also release these gases during respiration, digestion, and from the metabolism of the biofilm living on their shell. If oysters promote the production of these greenhouse gases, it may offset benefits associated with nutrient recycling and denitrification.

 Very few studies report the impact of oysters on greenhouse gas fluxes. This limited data demonstrates high variability between studies, and no conclusions could be made for the effect 208 of oysters on sediment CO_2 ($g = 0.620 \pm 1.194$ ($p = 0.155$), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($g = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ 209 1.592 ($p = 0.364$), $n = 3$), or N₂O fluxes ($q = -0.771 \pm 2.969$ ($p = 0.469$), $n = 4$). There was not enough data to compare whether oyster reefs or aquaculture have a greater impact on sediment GHG fluxes. Quantifying how oysters may change sediment greenhouse gas production is an important step as aquaculture continues to expand and restoration projects are planned and completed.

214 Only three studies reported CO_2 and CH_4 fluxes from sediments beneath oysters and a control site, and those studies were conducted in two locations. Two were conducted at the same

216 location in Ireland $48,71$ and the other on the Atlantic Coast of North America²⁰. The two studies 217 in Ireland were conducted by building oyster reefs, then destructively sampling them a few 218 months later, effectively creating a perturbation experiment. Ray et al.²⁰ measured sediment 219 GHG fluxes at an oyster farm along a 7-yr chronosequence, and demonstrated an initial 220 stimulation in sediment $CO₂$ and $CH₄$ release after the installation of oyster aquaculture, 221 followed by a return to baseline conditions. Together, these results suggest that oysters may 222 stimulate sediment GHG release, but only for a brief period.

223 Oysters themselves release N₂O (0.00027 \pm 0.00054 µmol indiv⁻¹ hr⁻¹) and CH₄ (0.0057 \pm 224 0.00085 µmol indiv⁻¹ hr⁻¹). Oyster N₂O release is dictated by the availability of dissolved N in 225 the water column, with higher rates of production when DIN concentrations are high, and N_2O 226 consumption in the absence of $DIN⁴⁴$. There are at least two, not mutually exclusive, possibilities 227 as to how N_2O production associated with large oyster populations will interact with enhanced 228 nutrient recycling and denitrification. Enhanced regeneration of dissolved NH_4 ⁺ from sediments 229 followed by transformation to NO_x via water column nitrification may lead to N_2O release. 230 Alternatively, as DIN loading to coastal systems is reduced or removed via denitrification, there 231 will be less N₂O production by oysters. Two of four studies reported enhanced uptake of N₂O in 232 sediments beneath oyster aquaculture which generally occurs in estuarine sediments when nitrate 233 is limiting to denitrification. If site specific conditions influence how oysters alter sediment N_2O 234 fluxes, smart installation of oyster restoration and aquaculture could be an important strategy to 235 help reduce estuarine N_2O emissions, particularly in systems anthropogenically enriched with N. 236 It is unclear what controls oyster CH₄ production and consumption. Oyster respiration of $CO₂$ 237 varies by size, water temperature, and food availability, though when estimating the greenhouse 238 gas footprint of animals in food production systems $CO₂$ release is typically ignored as it is a

239 return of photosynthetically fixed carbon to the atmosphere^{87,88}. Oysters also release some $CO₂$ 240 to the atmosphere during precipitation of calcium carbonate in shell formation^{89,90}.

241 Jackson et al. ⁴³ showed a 1:1 relationship between DIC fluxes in oyster only incubations 242 relative to oyster and sediment incubations, indicating that the majority of $CO₂$ release in oyster 243 reefs comes from the oysters themselves. Oysters may also influence the C budget over space 244 and time. Primary production and $CO₂$ sequestration may be higher downstream of oyster 245 habitats than upstream, driven by enhanced light and nutrient availability⁹¹, that could offset 246 oyster associated $CO₂$ release. As oyster reefs accrete over time, they switch from a net source of 247 C to the atmosphere driven by respiration and shell formation, to a net sink as organic material 248 accumulates in the reef habitat and is buried⁸⁹. It is necessary to consider these spatial and 249 temporal factors alongside direct measurements of $CO₂$ flux from oyster habitats.

250

251 **Comparison Between Oyster Species**

 In some regions native oyster species are used in restoration and aquaculture (e.g. *Crassostrea virginica* on the Atlantic Coast of the United States), and the biogeochemical changes associated with expanding this population may be considered beneficial. In other areas non-native oysters have either invaded, or been introduced. For example, *Crassostrea gigas* has largely replaced *Ostrea edulis* populations in Europe, both in natural habitats and in oyster farms92. *O. edulis* also threatens *Saccostrea glomerate* populations in Australia93 257 . Non-native introductions have been associated with negative consequences, such as reduced ecosystem 259 carrying capacity and alteration of food web structure^{92,94}. It is less clear how non-native oysters may alter biogeochemical function relative to the native species because of a paucity of data. Here we were only able to compare the biogeochemical impacts of *C. gigas* with *C. virginica* on

262 sediment NH_4^+ and PO_4^3 - fluxes as there were not enough studies that met our criteria for other 263 fluxes or species. Nevertheless, this preliminary analysis affords some insight. We found that 264 sediment NH₄⁺ fluxes were higher (p = 0.749) under both *C. gigas* (g = 0.836 ± 0.295 (p < 265 0.001), $n = 5$ and *C. virginica* habitats ($g = 0.742 \pm 0.497$ ($p = 0.003$), $n = 19$). *C. gigas* appears 266 to enhance sediment PO_4^3 -fluxes ($g = 0.847 \pm 0.124$ ($p \le 0.001$), n = 3) more than *C. virginica* (*g* $267 = 0.451 \pm 0.473$ (p = 0.062), n = 7), though the two species were not significantly different in 268 regard to their effect on sediment PO_4^3 -release (p = 0.113).

 There is also limited information for direct fluxes from oysters apart from *C. virginica* (Table 1). For this reason, we could not conduct statistical comparisons, though qualitatively it appears that most fluxes were of a similar range across species. There is a clear need for more studies of the impact of oysters on sediment biogeochemical fluxes as well as direct fluxes from oysters species besides *C. virginica*. With this limited evidence available, we cautiously suggest similar effects of oysters on coastal biogeochemistry across species, consistent with a recent study that reported no significant difference in GHG production by native (*C. virginica*) and non-276 native (*O. edulis*) in the north-eastern United States⁴⁵.

277

278 **Similar Biogeochemistry in Oyster Reefs and Aquaculture**

 O yster reefs and aquaculture had similar effects on sediment NH_4^+ and PO_4^3 - recycling, as well as denitrification. Here we show that – while not identical – oyster aquaculture may have similar value in recovering ecosystem services associated with biogeochemical cycling as oyster 282 reefs. Additionally, oyster reefs and aquaculture provide similar quality habitat^{95–97} and both may 283 help to protect shorelines from storm surge $98,99$. Considering these benefits, we cautiously suggest that financial investment in native oyster aquaculture may provide similar benefits as

 oyster reefs, while also expanding production of a sustainable food resource and enhancing local 286 economies^{29,100}. A recent study suggests oceans can be restored by 2050^{27} , and includes oyster reef restoration as a major step in that effort. Several roadblocks to oyster reef restoration were noted, including poor management of fisheries on remaining reefs and the economic cost of restoration. We propose that promoting oyster aquaculture may allow for these two roadblocks to be side stepped while still achieving similar restoration goals and benefits.

291 Human demand for animal protein is increasing^{101,102}. Oyster aquaculture provides a viable alternative source of animal protein with the added benefit of promoting coastal productivity, and does not require the addition or exploitation of limited resources. Additionally, like other bivalves, oysters have adapted to live in estuarine systems where they experience diurnal, seasonal, and annual patterns of temperature, salinity, pH, and oxygen fluctuations, potentially making adult oysters more resilient to the impacts of a changing climate. Further, oysters are a low greenhouse gas emitting protein source and even a small change in their 298 consumption could lead to a significant reduction in GHG emissions²⁰.

 An important next step in understanding the effect of oysters on coastal biogeochemistry is the development of predictive models that use local environmental characteristics, such as temperature, salinity, water column dissolved nutrient concentrations, and/or sediment physical and chemical properties. To do this, future studies must thoroughly report environmental data associated with flux measurements, and publish full datasets alongside manuscripts and theses.

Methods

Literature Search

 We aggregated studies measuring oyster fluxes and fluxes from sediments beneath oysters and a control site from peer-reviewed studies and non-reviewed literature. Peer-reviewed study identification was finalized on September 23, 2019 using *Web of Science* (Clarivate Analytics) and the following searches and terms: search 1. (oyster) AND (sediment) AND (nitrogen OR denitrification OR phosphorus OR silica OR methane OR nitrous oxide OR carbon dioxide); search 2. (oyster) AND (nitrogen OR denitrification OR phosphorus OR silica OR methane OR nitrous oxide OR carbon dioxide). Together, these searches yielded 998 results (Supplementary Figure 1). In addition to the initial literature search, we added published journal 316 articles, dissertations and theses, and journal articles in review that we were aware of $(n = 14)$ that did not appear in the *Web of Science* search, for a total of 1012 studies.

Study Selection Criteria

 We applied two screening steps to select studies for inclusion in our analysis. In the first step, we read the abstract of each study. If the abstract did not include a flux measurement from oysters or sediment beneath oysters, or indicate that such a measurement might be found in the manuscript, the study was rejected for further analysis. Next, we read all studies that passed the first screening step. If the study did not measure a net-flux from adult oysters, report fluxes from both control sediment and sediment beneath or directly adjacent to oysters, or report sample sizes, standard deviation, or standard error, we excluded it. Studies that manually added organic material or biodeposits to sediments were excluded. If the same data set was reported in multiple studies, only one version of that data set was included (the earliest paper that reported the data). We also excluded published abstracts for conference talks, and studies not published in English.

 In some cases,studies reported sample size, but mean values and standard deviation or error had to be estimated from figures in the paper. These studies were included in the analysis, and the missing values were estimated by extracting them from plots and images embedded within the manuscript using WebPlotDigitizer Version 3.9 software. When the error bar did not pass the edge of the bar (or did not exist), error was calculated as 0, but an SD value of 1 was used in order to calculate *g* values in the meta-analysis. When sample size was reported as a 336 range, we used the median possible sample size (i.e. if the study reported $n = 3-4$, we assigned n a value of 3.5). Following the second extraction step, 45 studies met our criteria for inclusion in the analysis.

Data Analysis – Sediment Fluxes

 When studies reported standard error, we converted it to standard deviation (Equation 1). 342 We converted all flux rates to either μ mol g DTW⁻² hr⁻¹ (oysters) or μ mol m⁻² hr⁻¹ (sediments). If rates were reported seasonally or monthly, but no study mean was reported, we manually calculated a pooled study mean (Equation 2) and variance (Equation 3). In studies that compared two habitat types to one control site, we used the same control site for both habit types. Two 346 studies reported the sample size as " $n = 3$ or 4" for each sampling month. In this case, we assigned an n value of 3.5, and used that while combining monthly mean and error. In all cases, we considered each sediment flux as an independent sample.

 Next, we calculated Hedge's *g* effect size (Equation 4) and variance (Equation 2 and 3; same method as for pooling means and variance within a study, but in this case the mean of 351 sediments beneath oysters (X_E) and control sediments (X_C) for whole studies were pooled as

352 were all variances) using a fixed effects model approach in the *metafor* package¹⁰³ in R 353 Statistical Software version 3.6.0, followed similar methods as Harrer et al¹⁰⁴ and Anton et al¹⁰⁵. 354 The *J* value in Equation 4 controls bias associated with different sample sizes between 355 studies (Equation 5). When interpreting *g*, the value reflects the effect size of the experimental 356 treatment (in this case presence or absence of oysters on sediment net N_2 flux) in terms of 357 number and direction of standard deviations the experimental treatment is from the control. A *g* 358 value between $0 - 0.2$ is typically considered a small effect, 0.2-0.5 a medium effect, 0.5-0.8 a 359 large effect, and >0.8 a very large effect⁷⁴. 360 361 Equation 1: 362 $s. d. = s. e. \times \sqrt{n}$ 363 364 Equation 2: 365 $X_{model} = ((X_a \times n_a) + (X_b \times n_b))/(n_a + n_b)$ 366 367 Equation 3: 368 $s.d._p_{pooled} = \sqrt{((n_a - 1) \times (s.d._a)^2 + (n_b - 1) \times (s.d._b)^2)/(n_a + n_b - 2)}$ 369 370 Equation 4: 371 $q = ((X_F - X_C) \times I)/s$. d_{model} 372 373 Equation 5: $J = 1 - (3/(4 \times (N_E + N_C - 2) - 1))$

 To compare the influence of oysters on sediment fluxes between oyster reefs and oyster aquaculture we used a random effects meta-analysis model via the *dmetar* package¹⁰⁶. In this 378 model we used the Sidik-Jonkman method for determining τ^2 and the Hartung-Knapp 379 adjustment¹⁰⁴. We repeated this approach to compare sediment fluxes in oyster habitats with *C*. *gigas* and *C.virginica*.

 In regard to denitrification, we excluded all studies that used acetylene techniques as this acetylene is known to alter sediment microbial community function and provide inaccurate 383 measurements^{107,108}. While only net N₂ fluxes from sediments and oyster matter in an ecosystem 384 context, we also accepted studies that used the isotope pairing technique $(IPT)^{81}$ in order to 385 compare this direct measurement with a measurement of the net N_2 flux $(N_2/Ar$ technique)⁸⁰ Studies using IPT were not included in the total estimate of oyster effects on sediment denitrification or comparison between habitat types.

Publication Bias – Sediment Fluxes

390 We followed the same methods used by Anton et al.¹⁰⁵ to test for publication bias among sediment flux studies that may distort the results of the meta-analysis. We evaluated bias using Egger's Test, which estimates a regression using standard error of study specific effect sizes, and 393 is considered significant when the model intercept is statistically different from zero . Additionally, we identified outlier studies that may exert substantial influence on the direction of the meta-analysis as those where the upper bound of the study 95% CI was lower than the lower bound of the pooled 95% CI (i.e. an extremely small effect), or the lower bound of the study 95% CI was higher than the upper bound of the pooled 95% CI (i.e. an extremely large effect)¹⁰⁴. 398 Both of these tests are available in the *dmetar* package¹⁰⁶. When Eggers test indicated significant 399 publication bias ($p \le 0.05$) for models that included possible outlier studies in the meta-analysis, we removed them and report results from the newer, outlier free test. We also excluded significant outliers from our habitat comparison. We only had to remove one outlier from the N2/Ar meta-analysis (Supplementary table 12), indicating a generally robust dataset free of publication bias.

Data Analysis – Oysters

Alleq 406 States over the overcere reported in various units. We elected to convert all fluxes to µmol ind- ¹ hr⁻¹, as some studies reported this rate without information about oyster tissue mass. For studies 408 that reported flux as μ mol g^{-1} hr⁻¹, we assigned a value of 2.93 g ind⁻¹ to convert the rates, as this is the dry tissue mass of commercial size oysters where most of the measurements included in this meta-analysis were made (Atlantic Coast of the United States). We opted to report rates in 411 units of umol ind⁻¹ h⁻¹ so that we could maximize the amount of data included in this study and 412 because reporting on a spatial scale (e.g., umol $m² h⁻¹$) is less descriptive than reporting on an individual basis for several reasons. For example, there is and can be high variance in oyster stocking density in reefs and aquaculture dependent on habitat, oyster size, food availability, farm management practices, etc. Additionally, the vertical structure of the reef or oyster aquaculture gear (for example cages in deep water that are several m high can hold several bags 417 of oysters) will have a different oyster density (and flux $m²$) than gear in shallow water with only one bag of oysters. However, this choice also likely introduces some bias as oyster weight and life stage vary across reef and aquaculture communities. To help reduce this bias we specifically excluded juvenile and larval oysters from this meta-analysis. After converting flux

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to NER.

Acknowledgements

 This work was supported by fellowship funding to NER and RWF from the Frederick S. Pardee Center for the Study of the Longer Range Future at Boston University. NER also received support from the Biology Department at Boston University and RWF was supported by a grant from Rhode Island Sea Grant. We are thankful to Emily Moothart and Tim Condon for assistance with creating the map of study sites.

Author Contributions

 NER and RWF conceived and designed the study. NER constructed the dataset and performed statistical analyses. Both authors interpreted the results. NER wrote the manuscript with significant contribution from RWF. NER and RWF edited the manuscript. Both authors take full responsibility for the contents of the manuscript.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

 Figure 1: Location of studies used in this meta-analysis. Map created by Emily Moothart using ArcGIS software with data collected during the literature review.

 Figure 2: Effect size (Hedge's *g*, 95% confidence interval, and random effect meta-analysis 458 model p-value) of oysters on rates of sediment regeneration of the nutrients ammonium $(NH_4^+),$ 459 combined nitrate + nitrite (NO_x) , and phosphate (PO_4^3) , for oysters from aquaculture studies (circles), reef studies (squares), and mesocosm studies (triangles). Effect size describes the 461 magnitude of increase $(g > 0)$ or decrease $(g < 0)$ of a flux beneath oysters relative to bare sediment. All points to the right of the solid line indicate a net positive effect, and points to the left of the solid line indicate a net negative effect. The dashed line indicates the mean effect size 464 (*g*) of all studies together. For context, small effect: $g = 0$ - 0.2, medium effect: $g = 0.2$ - 0.5, and

465 a strong effect: $g > 0.5^{74}$.

- Figure 3: Effect size (Hedge's *g*, 95% confidence interval, and random effect meta-analysis
- 471 model p-value) of oysters on rates of sediment denitrification $(N_2$ flux), for oysters from
- aquaculture studies (circles), reef studies (squares), and mesocosm studies (triangles). Details as in Figure 2.

 Figure 4: Transport of nitrogen (N) through coastal ecosystems with oyster habitats. Oysters consume phytoplankton and move biodeposits containing N to the sediments. Oysters excrete 480 ammonium (NH_4^+) and drive NH_4^+ regeneration from sediments, supporting water column primary production. Oysters also enhance N removal from the system through denitrification 482 (N₂ production) in their digestive system and by stimulating sediment denitrification. A very 483 small amount of nitrous oxide (N_2O) is released from the oyster digestive system, likely due to inefficient denitrification. Larger arrows indicate greater rates. Oyster and phytoplankton symbols courtesy of the Integration and Application Network, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science (ian.umces.edu/symbols).

- Figure 5: Effect size (Hedge's *g*, 95% confidence interval, and random effect meta-analysis
- model p-value) of oysters on rates of sediment production of the greenhouse gases carbon
- 492 dioxide (CO_2) , methane (CH_4) , and nitrous oxide (N_2O) , for oysters from aquaculture studies (circles) and reef studies (squares). Details as in Figure 2.

-
-

497 Table 1: Mean (\pm standard error) flux of dissolved nutrients and gases from various oyster species. All values reported in μ mol ind⁻¹ hr⁻¹, except N₂O and CH₄ fluxes which are in nmol ind⁻¹ hr⁻.

values reported in μ mol ind⁻¹ hr⁻¹, except N₂O and CH₄ fluxes which are in nmol ind⁻¹ hr⁻. N₂ fluxes only report values measured using the N₂/Ar methods. All rates were collected from previous studies,

report values measured using the N₂/Ar methods. All rates were collected from previous studies, and are 500 available in the published dataset accompanying this manuscript. *n.d.* indicates no published rates met our study selection criteria.

study selection criteria.

- References:
- 1. United Nations. Factsheet: People and Oceans. (2017).
- 2. Vitousek, P. M. *et al.* Human alteration of the global nitrogen cycle: sources and consequences. *Ecol. Appl.* **7**, 737–750 (1997).
- 3. Galloway, J. N. *et al.* Transformation of the nitrogen cycle: Recent trends, questions, and potential solution. *Science.* **320**, 889–892 (2008).
- 4. Canfield, D. E., Glazer, A. N. & Falkowski, P. G. The evolution and future of earth's nitrogen cycle. *Science.* **330**, 192–196 (2010).
- 5. Ryther, J. & Dunstan, W. Nitrogen, phosphorus, and eutrophication in the coastal marine environment. *Science.* **171**, 1008–1013 (1971).
- 6. Conley, D. J. *et al.* Controlling eutrophication: Nitrogen and phosphorus. *Science.* **323**, 1014–1015 (2009).
- 7. Downing, J. A., Cherrier, C. T. & Fulweiler, R. W. Low ratios of silica to dissolved nitrogen supplied to rivers arise from agriculture not reservoirs. *Ecol. Lett.* **19**, 1414–1418 (2016).
- 8. Carey, J. C. & Fulweiler, R. W. Human activities directly alter watershed dissolved silica fluxes. *Biogeochemistry* **111**, 125–138 (2012).
- 9. Turner, R. E. *et al.* Fluctuating silicate:nitrate ratios and coastal plankton food webs. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **95**, 13048–13051 (1998).
- 10. Nixon, S. W. Coastal marine eutrophication: A definition, social causes, and future concerns. *Ophelia* **41**, 199–219 (1995).
- 11. Kirby, M. X. Fishing down the coast: Historical expansion and collapse of oyster fisheries along continental margins. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **101**, 13096–13099 (2004).
- 12. Mackenzie, C. L. Causes underlying the historical decline in Eastern oyster (*Crassostrea virginica* Gmelin, 1791) landings. *J. Shellfish Res.* **26**, 927–938 (2007).
- 13. Powell, E., Ashton-Alcox, K., Kraeuter, J., Ford, S. & Bushek, D. Long-term trends in oyster population dynamics in Delaware Bay: regime shifts and response to disease. *J. Shellfish Res.* **27**, 729–755 (2008).
- 14. Rick, T. *et al.* Millenial-scale sustainability of the Chesapeake Bay Native American oyster fishery. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **113**, 6568–6573 (2016).
- 15. Beck, M. W. *et al.* Oyster reefs at risk and recommendations for conservation, restoration, and management. *Bioscience* **61**, 107–116 (2011).
- 16. Zu Ermgassen, P. S. E. *et al.* Historical ecology with real numbers: Past and present extent and biomass of an imperilled estuarine habitat. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **279**, 3393–3400 (2012).
- 17. United Nations. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. (2015) doi:10.1201/b20466-7.
- 18. Newell, R., Fisher, T., Holyoke, R. & Cornwell, J. Influence of Eastern Oysters on Nitrogen and Phosphorus Regeneration in Chesapeake Bay , USA. in *The Comparative Roles of Suspension-Feeders in Ecosystems* vol. 47 93–120 (Springer, 2005).
- 19. Kellogg, M. L. *et al.* Use of oysters to mitigate eutrophication in coastal waters. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* **151**, 156–168 (2014).
- 20. Ray, N. E., Maguire, T. J., Al-Haj, A., Henning, M. & Fulweiler, R. W. Low greenhouse gas emissions from oyster aquaculture. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **53**, 9118–9127 (2019).
- 21. Carman, M. R., Morris, J. A., Karney, R. C. & Grunden, D. W. An initial assessment of native and invasive tunicates in shellfish aquaculture of the North American east coast. *J.*
- *Appl. Ichthyol.* **26**, 8–11 (2010).
- 22. Guy-Haim, T. *et al.* Diverse effects of invasive ecosystem engineers on marine biodiversity and ecosystem functions: A global review and meta-analysis. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **24**, 906–924 (2018).
- 23. Murray, A. G., Munro, L. A. & Matejusova, I. The network of farmed Pacific oyster movements in Scotland and routes for introduction and spread of invasive species and pathogens. *Aquaculture* **520**, 734747 (2020).
- 24. Rowe, G., Clifford, C. & Smith Jr, K. Benthic nutrient regeneration and its coupling to primary productivity in coastal waters. *Nature* **255**, 215–217 (1975).
- 25. Seitzinger, S. P. Denitrification in freshwater and coastal marine systems: Ecological and geochemical significance. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **334**, 702–724 (1988).
- 26. Ray, N. E., Henning, M. C. & Fulweiler, R. W. Nitrogen and phosphorus cycling in the digestive system and shell biofilm of the Eastern oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*). *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **621**, 95–105 (2019).
- 27. Duarte, C. M. *et al.* Rebuilding marine life. *Nature* **580**, 39–51 (2020).
- 28. Billion Oyster Project. https://billionoysterproject.org/.
- 29. FAO. *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2018 - Meeting the sustainable development goals*. (2018).
- 30. Gentry, R. R. *et al.* Mapping the global potential for marine aquaculture. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **1**, (2017).
- 31. Lacoste, E., Gueguen, Y., Moullac, G. Le, Koua, M. S. & Gaertner-Mazouni, N. Influence of farmed pearl oysters and associated biofouling communities on nutrient regeneration in lagoons of French Polynesia. *Aquac. Environ. Interact.* **5**, 209–219 (2014).
- 32. Buzin, F., Dupuy, B., Lefebvre, S., Barillé, L. & Haure, J. Storage of Pacific oysters *Crassostrea gigas* in recirculating tank: Ammonia excretion and potential nitrification rates. *Aquac. Eng.* **64**, 8–14 (2015).
- 33. Han, T. *et al.* Interactive effects of oyster and seaweed on seawater dissolved inorganic carbon systems: Implications for integrated multi-trophic aquaculture. *Aquac. Environ. Interact.* **9**, 469–478 (2017).
- 34. Kesarcodi-Watson, A., Klumpp, D. W. & Lucas, J. S. Comparative feeding and physiological energetics of diploid and triploid Sydney rock oysters, *Saccostrea commercialis* I. Effects of oyster size. *Aquaculture* **203**, 195–216 (2001).
- 35. Winter, J., Acevedo, M. & Navarro, J. Quempillen estuary, an experimental oyster cultivation station in southern Chile. Energy balance in *Ostrea chilensis*. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **20**, 151–164 (1984).
- 36. Sma, R. F. & Baggaley, A. Rate of excretion of ammonia by the hard clam *Mercenaria mercenaria* and the American oyster *Crassostrea virginica*. *Mar. Biol.* **36**, 251–258 (1976).
- 37. Jackson, M. Characterization of Oyster-Associated Biogeochemical Processes in Oyster Restoration and Aquaculture. (2019).
- 38. Mao, Y., Zhou, Y., Yang, H. & Wang, R. Seasonal variation in metabolism of cultured Pacific oyster, *Crassostrea gigas*, in Sanggou Bay, China. *Aquaculture* **253**, 322–333 (2006).
- 39. Smyth, A. R., Geraldi, N. R. & Piehler, M. F. Oyster-mediated benthic-pelagic coupling modifies nitrogen pools and processes. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **493**, 23–30 (2013).
- 40. Caffrey, J. M., Hollibaugh, J. T. & Mortazavi, B. Living oysters and their shells as sites of

 nitrification and denitrification. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* **112**, 86–90 (2016). 41. Erler, D. V. *et al.* The impact of suspended oyster farming on nitrogen cycling and nitrous oxide production in a sub-tropical Australian estuary. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* **192**, 117– 127 (2017). 42. Arfken, A., Song, B., Bowman, J. S. & Piehler, M. Denitrification potential of the eastern oyster microbiome using a 16S rRNA gene based metabolic inference approach. *PLoS One* **12**, e0185071 (2017). 43. Jackson, M., Owens, M. S., Cornwell, J. C. & Kellogg, M. L. Comparison of methods for determining biogeochemical fluxes from a restored oyster reef. *PLoS One* **13**, 1–14 (2018). 44. Gárate, M., Moseman-Valtierra, S. & Moen, A. Potential nitrous oxide production by marine shellfish in response to warming and nutrient enrichment. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* **146**, 236–246 (2019). 45. McCarthy, G., Ray, N. E. & Fulweiler, R. W. Greenhouse gas emissions from native and non-native oysters. *Front. Environ. Sci.* **7**, (2019). 46. Kellogg, M. L., Cornwell, J. C., Owens, M. S. & Paynter, K. T. Denitrification and nutrient assimilation on a restored oyster reef. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **480**, 1–19 (2013). 47. Higgins, C. B. *et al.* Effect of aquacultured oyster biodeposition on sediment N2 production in Chesapeake Bay. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **473**, 7–27 (2013). 48. Green, D. S., Rocha, C. & Crowe, T. P. Effects of non-indigenous oysters on ecosystem processes vary with abundance and context. *Ecosystems* **16**, 881–893 (2013). 49. Hyun, J. *et al.* Impacts of long-line aquaculture of Pacific Oysters (*Crassostrea gigas*) on sulfate reduction and diffusive nutrient flux in the coastal sediments of Jinhae-Tongyeong, Korea. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* **74**, 187–198 (2013). 50. Hoellein, T. J. & Zarnoch, C. B. Effect of eastern oysters (*Crassostrea virginica*) on sediment carbon and nitrogen dynamics in an urban estuary. *Ecol. Appl.* **24**, 271–286 (2014). 51. Andrieux-Loyer, F. *et al.* Impact of oyster farming on diagenetic processes and the phosphorus cycle in two estuaries (Brittany, France). *Aquat. Geochemistry* **20**, 573–611 625 (2014).
626 52. Hoellein 52. Hoellein, T. J., Zarnoch, C. B. & Grizzle, R. E. Eastern oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) filtration, biodeposition, and sediment nitrogen cycling at two oyster reefs with contrasting water quality in Great Bay Estuary (New Hampshire, USA). *Biogeochemistry* **122**, 113–129 (2015). 53. Smyth, A. R., Piehler, M. F. & Grabowski, J. H. Habitat context influences nitrogen removal by restored oyster reefs. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **52**, 716–725 (2015). 54. Mortazavi, B. *et al.* Evaluating the impact of oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) gardening on sediment nitrogen cycling in a subtropical estuary. *Bull. Mar. Sci.* **91**, 323–341 (2015). 55. Testa, J. M. *et al.* Modeling the impact of floating oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) aquaculture on sediment-water nutrient and oxygen fluxes. *Aquac. Environ. Interact.* **7**, 205–222 (2015). 56. Smyth, A. R., Geraldi, N. R., Thompson, S. P. & Piehler, M. F. Biological activity exceeds biogenic structure in influencing sediment nitrogen cycling in experimental oyster reefs. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **560**, 173–183 (2016). 57. Humphries, A. T. *et al.* Directly measured denitrification reveals oyster aquaculture and restored oyster reefs remove nitrogen at comparable high rates. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **3**, 74

- (2016).
- 58. Lacoste, E. & Gaertner-Mazouni, N. Nutrient regeneration in the water column and at the sediment-water interface in pearl oyster culture (*Pinctada margaritifera*) in a deep atoll lagoon (Ahe, French Polynesia). *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* **182**, 304–309 (2016).
- 59. Smyth, A. R., Murphy, A. E., Anderson, I. C. & Song, B. Differential effects of bivalves on sediment nitrogen cycling in a shallow coastal bay. *Estuaries and Coasts* **41**, 1147– 1163 (2018).
- 60. Onorevole, K. M., Thompson, S. P. & Piehler, M. F. Living shorelines enhance nitrogen removal capacity over time. *Ecol. Eng.* **120**, 238–248 (2018).
- 61. Lunstrum, A., McGlathery, K. & Smyth, A. Oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) aquaculture shifts sediment nitrogen processes toward mineralization over denitrification. *Estuaries and Coasts* **41**, 1130–1146 (2018).
- 62. Westbrook, P., Heffner, L. & La Peyre, M. K. Measuring carbon and nitrogen bioassimilation, burial, and denitrification contributions of oyster reefs in Gulf coast estuaries. *Mar. Biol.* **166**, 1–14 (2019).
- 63. Ray, N. E., Al-Haj, A. & Fulweiler, R. W. Sediment biogeochemistry along an oyster aquaculture chronosequence. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **646**, 13–27 (2020).
- 64. Hassett, M. The Influence of Eastern Oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) Reef Restoration on Nitrogen Cycling in a Eutrophic Estuary. (2015).
- 65. Vieillard, A. Impacts of New England Oyster Aquaculture on Sediment Nitrogen Cycling: Implications for Nitrogen Removal and Retention. (2017).
- 66. Boucher-Rodoni, R. & Boucher, G. *In situ* study of the effect of oyster biomass on benthic metabolic exchange rates. *Hydrobiologia* **206**, 115–123 (1990).
- 67. Ayvazian, S. G. *et al.* Evaluating connections between nitrogen cycling and the macrofauna in native oyster beds in a New England estuary. (In Review)*.*
- 68. Mazouni, N., Gaertner, J., Deslous-Paoli, J., Landrein, S. & D'Oedenberg, M. Nutrient and oxygen exchanges at the water-sediment interface in a shellfish farming lagoon (Thau, France). *J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol.* **205**, 91–113 (1996).
- 69. Porter, E. T., Cornwell, J. C., Sanford, L. P. & Newell, R. I. E. Effect of oysters *Crassostrea virginica* and bottom shear velocity on benthic-pelagic coupling and estuarine water quality. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **271**, 61–75 (2004).
- 70. Piehler, M. F. & Smyth, A. R. Habitat-specific distinctions in estuarine denitrification affect both ecosystem function and services. *Ecosphere* **2**, 1–17 (2011).
- 71. Green, D. S., Boots, B. & Crowe, T. P. Effects of non-indigenous oysters on microbial diversity and ecosystem functioning. *PLoS One* **7**, 1–10 (2012).
- 72. Gaertner-Mazouni, N. *et al.* Nutrient fluxes between water column and sediments: Potential influence of the pearl oyster culture. *Marine Pollut. Bull.* **65**, 500–505 (2012).
- 73. Smyth, A. R. *et al.* Assessing nitrogen dynamics throughout the estuarine landscape. *Estuaries and Coasts* **36**, 44–55 (2013).
- 74. Borenstein, M., Hedges, L., Higgins, J. & Rothstein, H. *Introduction to Meta-Analysis*. (John Wiley and Sons, 2009).
- 75. Egge, J. & Aksnes, D. Silicate as a regulating nutrient in phytoplankton competition. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **83**, 281–289 (1992).
- 76. Glibert, P. M. *et al.* Pluses and minuses of ammonium and nitrate uptake and assimilation by phytoplankton and implications for productivity and community composition, with emphasis on nitrogen-enriched conditions. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **61**, 165–197 (2016).
- 77. Doering, P. H. *et al.* Structure and function in a model coastal ecosystem: silicon, the benthos and eutrophication. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **52**, 287–299 (1989).
- 78. Vandevenne, F. I. *et al.* Grazers: biocatalysts of terrestrial silica cycling. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **280**, (2013).
- 79. Newell, R. I. E. Ecosystem influences of natural and cultivated populations of suspension-feeding bivalve molluscs: A review. *J. Shellfish Res.* **23**, 51–61 (2004).
- 80. Kana, T. M. *et al.* Membrane inlet mass spectrometer for rapid high-precision determination of N2, O2, and Ar in environmental water samples. *Anal. Chem.* **66**, 4166– 4170 (1994).
- 81. Nielsen, L. Denitrification in sediment determined from nitrogen isotope pairing technique. *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* **86**, 357–362 (1992).
- 82. Eyre, B. D., Rysgaard, S. S., Dalsgaard, T. & Christensen, P. B. Comparison of isotope 700 pairing and N_2 :Ar methods for measuring sediment denitrification—Assumptions, modifications, and implications. *Estuaries* **25**, 1077–1087 (2002).
- 83. Ferguson, A. J. P. & Eyre, B. D. Seasonal discrepancies in denitrification measured by 703 isotope pairing and N_2 :Ar techniques. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **350**, 19–27 (2007).
- 84. Cornwell, J. C., Kemp, W. M. & Kana, T. M. Denitrification in coastal ecosystems: methods, environmental controls, and ecosystem level controls, a review. *Aquat. Ecol.* **33**, 41–54 (1999).
- 85. Eyre, B. D. & Ferguson, A. J. P. Comparison of carbon production and decomposition, benthic nutrient fluxes and denitrification in seagrass , phytoplankton , benthic microalgae- and macroalgae- dominated warm-temperate Australian lagoons. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **229**, 43–59 (2002).
- 711 86. Fulweiler, R. W., Nixon, S. W., Buckley, B. A. & Granger, S. L. Net sediment N_2 fluxes in a coastal marine system-experimental manipulations and a conceptual model. *Ecosystems* **11**, 1168–1180 (2008).
- 87. *PAS 2050:2011 Specification for the assessment of the life cycle greenhouse gas emissions of goods and services*. (2011).
- 88. *PAS 2050-2:2012 Assessment of life cycle greenhouse gas emissions - Supplementary requirements for the application of PAS2050:2011 to seafood and other aquatic products*. (2012).
- 89. Fodrie, F. J. *et al.* Oyster reefs as carbon sources and sinks. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **284**, 20170891 (2017).
- 90. Ray, N. E., O'Meara, T., Wiliamson, T., Izursa, J.-L. L. & Kangas, P. C. Consideration of carbon dioxide release during shell production in LCA of bivalves. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **23**, 1042–1048 (2018).
- 91. Filgueira, R. *et al.* An integrated ecosystem approach for assessing the potential role of cultivated bivalve shells as part of the carbon trading system. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **518**, 281–287 (2015).
- 92. Troost, K. Causes and effects of a highly successful marine invasion: Case-study of the introduced Pacific oyster *Crassostrea gigas*in continental NW European estuaries. *J. Sea Res.* **64**, 145–165 (2010).
- 93. Scanes, E. *et al.* Quantifying abundance and distribution of native and invasive oysters in an urbanised estuary. *Aquat. Invasions* **11**, 425–436 (2016).
- 94. Laugen, A. T., Hollander, J., Obst, M. & Strand, Å. 10. The Pacific oyster (*Crassostrea gigas*) invasion in Scandinavian coastal waters: Impact on local ecosystem services. in
- *Biological Invasions in Changing Ecosystems: Vectors, Ecological Impacts, Management and Predictions* (ed. Canning-Clode, J.) 230–246 (De Gruyter Open, 2015).
- 95. Erbland, P. J. & Ozbay, G. A comparison of the macrofaunal communities inhabiting a *Crassostrea virginica* oyster reef and oyster aquaculture gear in Indian River Bay, Delaware. *Journal of Shellfish Research* vol. 27 757–768 (2008).
- 96. Marenghi, F., Ozbay, G., Erbland, P. J. & Rossi-Snook, K. A comparison of the habitat value of sub-tidal and floating oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) aquaculture gear with a created reef in Delaware's Inland Bays, USA. *Aquac. Int.* **18**, 69–81 (2010).
- 97. Tallman, J. & Forrester, G. Oyster grow-out cages function as artificial reefs for temperate fishes. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **136**, 790–799 (2007).
- 98. Hossain, M. *et al.* Oyster aquaculture for coastal defense with food production in Bangladesh. *Aquac. Asia* **18**, 15–24 (2013).
- 99. Piazza, B. P., Banks, P. D. & La Peyre, M. K. The potential for created oyster shell reefs as a sustainable shoreline protection strategy in Louisiana. *Restor. Ecol.* **13**, 499–506 (2005).
- 100. *Fisheries of the United States, 2017*. (2018).
- 101. Delgado, C. L. Rising consumption of meat and milk in developing countries has created a new food revolution. *J. Nutr* **133**, 3907–3910 (2003).
- 102. Sans, P. & Combris, P. World meat consumption patterns: An overview of the last fifty years (1961-2011). *Meat Sci.* **109**, 106–111 (2015).
- 103. Viechtbauer, W. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *J. Stat. Softw.* **36**, 1–48 (2010).
- 104. Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T. & Ebert, D. *Doing Meta-Analysis in R: A Hands-On Guide*. (2019).
- 105. Anton, A. *et al.* Global ecological impacts of marine exotic species. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **3**, 787–800 (2019).
- 106. Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T. & Ebert, D. *dmetar*: Companion R package for the guide 'Doing Meta-Analysis in R'. *R Packag. version 0.0.9* (2019).
- 107. Rudolph, J., Frenzel, P. & Pfennig, N. Acetylene inhibition technique underestimates in situ denitrification rates in intact cores of freshwater sediment. *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* **85**, 101–106 (1991).
- 108. Fulweiler, R. W. *et al.* Examining the impact of acetylene on N-fixation and the active sediment microbial community. *Front. Microbiol.* **6**, 1–9 (2015).
-