1	Title:
2	Meta-analysis of oyster impacts on coastal biogeochemistry
3	
4	Authors:
5	Nicholas E. Ray ^{1*} , Robinson W. Fulweiler ^{1,2}
6	
7	Affiliations:
8	¹ Department of Biology, Boston University, Boston MA 02215
9	² Department of Earth and Environment, Boston University, Boston MA 02215
10	
11	Corresponding Author Contact:
12	Nicholas E. Ray
13	<u>nray@bu.edu</u>
14	
15	

17 Abstract

Overfishing, nutrient fueled hypoxia, and habitat destruction have reduced oyster populations to 18 a fraction of their former abundance. Over the last two decades there has been widespread effort 19 to restore oyster reefs and develop oyster aquaculture. Yet it remains unclear how re-introduction 20 of large oyster populations will change coastal biogeochemistry. Of particular interest is whether 21 oysters may help offset excess nitrogen loading, which is responsible for widespread coastal 22 23 water quality degradation, low oxygen conditions, and biodiversity declines. Here, we used a 24 meta-analysis approach to assess how oysters alter inorganic nutrient cycling, with a focus on 25 nitrogen removal. Additionally, we examined how oysters alter greenhouse gas emissions. We 26 demonstrate that oysters enhance removal of excess nitrogen by stimulating denitrification, 27 promote efficient nutrient recycling, and may have a negligible greenhouse gas footprint. 28 Further, oyster reefs and oyster aquaculture appear to have similar biogeochemical function, suggesting the potential for sustainable production of animal protein alongside environmental 29 restoration. 30

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

Historically, oysters were found in large populations in many coastal systems, and 39 sustainably supported human populations for millennia¹⁴. Today over 85% of reefs have been 40 lost globally¹⁵, and less than 1% of wild populations remain in many locations¹⁶. Returning 41 oysters to human dominated coastal systems may help negate some deleterious anthropogenic 42 impacts and achieve Sustainable Development Goal 14 of the United Nations "To conserve and 43 sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development"¹⁷. 44 Specifically, rebuilding large and well managed oyster populations can promote conservation 45 46 and sustainable use of the seas by creating new habitat and maintaining productivity, cleaning water through removal of suspended particulates and excess nutrients^{18,19}, and providing a source 47 of animal protein for those living in coastal communities with limited access to livestock protein 48 49 sources, at a low greenhouse gas cost²⁰. Additionally, development of the oyster aquaculture industry provides economic benefits for small-scale fishers and coastal communities. 50 Introduction, or re-introduction of oysters to coastal systems may also be associated with 51 negative ecological consequences (e.g. competition for phytoplankton with other filter-feeders, 52 introduction of disease), particularly if a non-native species is used in restoration or 53 aquaculture $^{21-23}$. 54

In this paper, we examine the role oysters play in regulating coastal biogeochemical 55 cycling. In coastal ecosystems, N and P availability is controlled by external (e.g., sewage 56 discharge) and internal (e.g., recycling of nutrients from the sediments to the water column) 57 sources²⁴. Oysters enhance recycling of nutrients by stimulating sediment decomposition 58 processes following deposition of feces and pseudofeces (collectively "biodeposits")¹⁸. 59 Biodeposition can also reduce eutrophication by stimulating N loss through denitrification (the 60 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 62 digestive system²⁶. 63

Since the 1990s, there have been significant efforts to restore oyster habitat²⁷ and develop 64 the oyster aquaculture industry for economic benefit and to regain lost ecosystem services. For 65 example, New York City is working to return 1 billion oysters to its waters by 2035²⁸, and oyster 66 aquaculture is practiced on every continent except Antarctica. In 2016, global harvest of oysters 67 raised in aquaculture exceeded 5438 million tonnes – an 8% increase since 2014^{29} – and there is 68 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, 70 making extrapolation to larger scales difficult. Here, we used a meta-analysis approach to 71 72 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 73 74 denitrification, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. We then compare the biogeochemical impact of different ovster habitats and species. Finally, we suggest future studies that will 75 advance the field and clarify uncertainties identified in this meta-analysis. 76

77

78 Results & Discussion

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

89

90 Oyster Regulation of Nutrient 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 relative to P and Si, or NH_{4^+} relative to NO_x can lead to a phytoplankton community dominated 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 NH₄⁺ 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 ($g = 0.406 \pm$ 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 determine how oysters may change water column nutrient availability. For example, diatoms 108 require an N:Si ratio ≤ 1 to dominate. A g(N):g(Si) equal to 1 would indicate that oysters 109 stimulate sediment regeneration of N and Si at the same rate, and do not change the ratio of 110 sediment N and Si regeneration. If g(N):g(Si) > 1 then ovsters drive greater N than Si 111 regeneration relative to bare sediments, and if g(N): g(Si) < 1, than Si is regenerated more 112 rapidly than N. Oysters only slightly change the ratio of sediment N and P regeneration (g(NH₄⁺ 113 $+ NO_x$;g(PO₄³⁻) = 1.31), and likely do not drive either nutrient to become limiting to production. 114 However, oysters may drive greater regeneration of N relative to Si $(g(NH_4^+ + NO_x))$; g(Si) =115 116 2.17), though again only two studies compared sediment Si fluxes between bare sediment and sediment beneath oysters. In areas with large oyster populations, sediments will likely regenerate 117 118 at least twice as much NH_4^+ as NO_x (g(NH_4^+);g(NO_x) = 2.38). It appears oysters could potentially lead to shifts in phytoplankton community structure that preferentially use NH4⁺ to 119 NO_x , such as dinoflagellates and cyanobacteria^{75,77}. 120

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

between reefs ($g = 0.673 \pm 3.043$ (p = 0.665), n = 6) and aquaculture ($g = 0.077 \pm 0.571$ (p = 0.791), n = 4). NO₃⁻ fluxes did not differ (p = 0.063) between habitat types, despite the appearance of NO₃⁻ uptake by sediments beneath aquaculture ($g = -0.307 \pm 0.616$ (p = 0.328), n = 5) and release from sediments adjacent to reefs ($g = 0.316 \pm 0.230$ (p = 0.007) n = 4). Too few studies reported NO₂⁻ fluxes to allow for statistical comparison. PO₄³⁻ fluxes were also no different (p = 0.863) from sediments beneath reefs ($g = 0.616 \pm 0.677$ (p = 0.075), n = 4) and aquaculture ($g = 0.550 \pm 0.314$ (p < 0.001), n = 8).

Oysters themselves recycle significant quantities of NH_4^+ (5.73 ± 0.91 µmol NH_4^+ indiv⁻¹ 131 hr⁻¹) and PO₄³⁻ (0.82 \pm 0.1 µmol PO₄³⁻ indiv⁻¹ hr⁻¹) to the water column. NO_x fluxes were much 132 more variable (2.64 \pm 5.74 SE µmol NO_x indiv⁻¹ hr⁻¹), with one study reporting high NO_x 133 emission⁴³, and another reporting nearly equivalent NO_x consumption³⁹. NO_3 -fluxes were only 134 reported in two studies that met our criteria, but were slightly lower (0.50 ± 0.92 SE µmol NO₃⁻ 135 indiv⁻¹ hr⁻¹) than NO_x. Three studies reported NO₂⁻ fluxes, and they were lower (0.11 \pm 0.02 SE 136 μ mol NO₂⁻ indiv⁻¹ hr⁻¹) than the sum of NO_x and NO₃⁻ fluxes. We could not locate any studies 137 138 that report oyster DSi excretion. Other grazing organisms excrete DSi⁷⁸, so it is possible oysters may too. Unlike sediment nutrient regeneration, N and P excretion from oysters likely drives N 139 to become limiting in the context of the Redfield ratio (16N:1P), with an N:P molar ratio of 6.99 140 $NH_4^+: PO_4^{3-}$. 141

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 research should address this so we can better understand how larger oyster populations maychange 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 151 152 remove excess N from coastal systems, reducing the impact of eutrophication. There are two commonly used methods for measuring rates of denitrification $(N_2/Ar \text{ technique}^{80} \text{ and the})$ 153 isotope pairing technique (IPT)⁸¹). The N_2/Ar technique measures net exchange of N_2 between 154 sediment and water column, and the resulting fluxes are either net positive (i.e., denitrification) 155 or net negative (i.e., nitrogen fixation). IPT requires the addition of a tracer and a series of 156 methodological assumptions to calculate sediment denitrification, and IPT rates are generally 157 lower than those measured with the N_2/Ar technique⁸². 158

When we examined denitrification rates measured using the N_2/Ar technique we found 159 that oysters have a strong positive effect on sediment denitrification ($g = 0.682 \pm 0.276$ (p < 160 161 (0.001), n = 19; Figure 3). The effect of oysters on sediment denitrification is greater when measured using the N₂/Ar method ($g = 0.682 \pm 0.284$) relative to the isotope pairing technique 162 (IPT; $g = 0.239 \pm 0.745$ (p = 0.463), n = 7), likely due to under estimation of denitrification 163 164 using IPT⁸³. While the magnitude of the effect of oysters on net N₂ fluxes was higher in reef habitats $(g = 0.792 \pm 0.199 \text{ (p} < 0.001), n = 11)$ than aquaculture $(g = 0.514 \pm 0.220 \text{ (p} < 0.001), n = 10)$ 165 n = 6), there was no statistical difference between the two habitats (p = 0.223). A possible 166 explanation for this discrepancy is that some studies that measured denitrification in reefs 167 occasionally included the oysters in the incubation chamber. As oysters themselves produce N₂ 168 26,37,39,40,42,43 , this would likely increase the measured net N₂ flux. 169

170 Relative to sediment denitrification measurements made using the N₂/Ar technique (403 171 individual measurements of net denitrification in sediment beneath oysters), there are only a few 172 measurements of net N₂ from oysters themselves (n = 37). Regardless, it is clear that 173 denitrification proceeds within oysters, with an average denitrification rate from oysters of 4.78 174 \pm 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 176 excess N.

Despite a large number of studies that quantified denitrification from sediments in oyster habitats, every study that used the N₂/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 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.

It is important to consider the simultaneous removal and recycling of N in oyster habitats 183 184 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 185 regenerated from sediments beneath oysters was previously held in phytoplankton and detritus 186 187 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 188 nutrient loading to the system ¹⁸. Instead, oysters promote a second round of primary production 189 and efficient re-use of nutrients already in the system, while removing some excess N (Figure 6). 190 Specifically, any increase in water column primary productivity likely increases deposition of 191 192 organic matter to sediments. In turn, because sediment denitrification is positively correlated

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.

199

200 Greenhouse Gas Release from Oyster Habitats

Oyster biodeposition may promote release of carbon dioxide (CO_2) , methane (CH_4) , and 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 206 207 demonstrates high variability between studies, and no conclusions could be made for the effect of oysters on sediment CO₂ ($g = 0.620 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($g = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($g = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($g = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($g = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($g = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($g = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($g = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($g = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($g = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($g = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($g = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($g = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ ($p = 0.432 \pm 1.194$ (p = 0.155), n = 3; Figure 6), CH₄ 208 1.592 (p = 0.364), n = 3), or N₂O fluxes (g = -0.771 ± 2.969 (p = 0.469), n = 4). There was not 209 210 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 211 important step as aquaculture continues to expand and restoration projects are planned and 212 213 completed.

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

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

Oysters themselves release N₂O (0.00027 \pm 0.00054 µmol indiv⁻¹ hr⁻¹) and CH₄ (0.0057 \pm 223 $0.00085 \text{ }\mu\text{mol indiv}^{-1} \text{ }hr^{-1}$). Oyster N₂O release is dictated by the availability of dissolved N in 224 225 the water column, with higher rates of production when DIN concentrations are high, and N₂O consumption in the absence of DIN⁴⁴. There are at least two, not mutually exclusive, possibilities 226 227 as to how N₂O production associated with large oyster populations will interact with enhanced nutrient recycling and denitrification. Enhanced regeneration of dissolved NH4⁺ from sediments 228 followed by transformation to NO_x via water column nitrification may lead to N₂O release. 229 230 Alternatively, as DIN loading to coastal systems is reduced or removed via denitrification, there will be less N₂O production by oysters. Two of four studies reported enhanced uptake of N₂O in 231 sediments beneath oyster aquaculture which generally occurs in estuarine sediments when nitrate 232 233 is limiting to denitrification. If site specific conditions influence how oysters alter sediment N₂O fluxes, smart installation of oyster restoration and aquaculture could be an important strategy to 234 help reduce estuarine N_2O emissions, particularly in systems anthropogenically enriched with N. 235 It is unclear what controls oyster CH_4 production and consumption. Oyster respiration of CO_2 236 237 varies by size, water temperature, and food availability, though when estimating the greenhouse gas footprint of animals in food production systems CO₂ release is typically ignored as it is a 238

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

Jackson et al. ⁴³ showed a 1:1 relationship between DIC fluxes in oyster only incubations 241 242 relative to oyster and sediment incubations, indicating that the majority of CO_2 release in oyster reefs comes from the oysters themselves. Oysters may also influence the C budget over space 243 244 and time. Primary production and CO_2 sequestration may be higher downstream of oyster 245 habitats than upstream, driven by enhanced light and nutrient availability⁹¹, that could offset oyster associated CO₂ release. As oyster reefs accrete over time, they switch from a net source of 246 C to the atmosphere driven by respiration and shell formation, to a net sink as organic material 247 248 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. 252 253 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 254 255 non-native oysters have either invaded, or been introduced. For example, Crassostrea gigas has 256 largely replaced Ostrea edulis populations in Europe, both in natural habitats and in oyster farms⁹². O. edulis also threatens Saccostrea glomerate populations in Australia⁹³. Non-native 257 introductions have been associated with negative consequences, such as reduced ecosystem 258 carrying capacity and alteration of food web structure^{92,94}. It is less clear how non-native oysters 259 260 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 261

sediment NH₄⁺ and PO₄³⁻ fluxes as there were not enough studies that met our criteria for other fluxes or species. Nevertheless, this preliminary analysis affords some insight. We found that sediment NH₄⁺ fluxes were higher (p = 0.749) under both *C. gigas* (g = 0.836 ± 0.295 (p < 0.001), n = 5) and *C. virginica* habitats (g = 0.742 ± 0.497 (p = 0.003), n = 19). *C. gigas* appears to enhance sediment PO₄³⁻ fluxes (g = 0.847 ± 0.124 (p < 0.001), n = 3) more than *C. virginica* (g = 0.451 ± 0.473 (p = 0.062), n = 7), though the two species were not significantly different in regard to their effect on sediment PO₄³⁻ release (p = 0.113).

There is also limited information for direct fluxes from oysters apart from C. virginica 269 (Table 1). For this reason, we could not conduct statistical comparisons, though qualitatively it 270 appears that most fluxes were of a similar range across species. There is a clear need for more 271 272 studies of the impact of oysters on sediment biogeochemical fluxes as well as direct fluxes from ovsters species besides C. virginica. With this limited evidence available, we cautiously suggest 273 similar effects of ovsters on coastal biogeochemistry across species, consistent with a recent 274 study that reported no significant difference in GHG production by native (C. virginica) and non-275 276 native (O. edulis) in the north-eastern United States⁴⁵.

277

278 Similar Biogeochemistry in Oyster Reefs and Aquaculture

Oyster reefs and aquaculture had similar effects on sediment NH₄⁺ and PO₄³⁻ 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 reefs. Additionally, oyster reefs and aquaculture provide similar quality habitat^{95–97} and both may 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 economies^{29,100}. A recent study suggests oceans can be restored by 2050²⁷, 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 292 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, 293 294 like other bivalves, oysters have adapted to live in estuarine systems where they experience 295 diurnal, seasonal, and annual patterns of temperature, salinity, pH, and oxygen fluctuations, 296 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 297 consumption could lead to a significant reduction in GHG emissions²⁰. 298

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.

305 Methods

306

307 Literature Search

We aggregated studies measuring oyster fluxes and fluxes from sediments beneath 308 oysters and a control site from peer-reviewed studies and non-reviewed literature. Peer-reviewed 309 study identification was finalized on September 23, 2019 using Web of Science (Clarivate 310 311 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 312 dioxide); search 2. (oyster) AND (nitrogen OR denitrification OR phosphorus OR silica OR 313 314 methane OR nitrous oxide OR carbon dioxide). Together, these searches yielded 998 results 315 (Supplementary Figure 1). In addition to the initial literature search, we added published journal articles, dissertations and theses, and journal articles in review that we were aware of (n = 14)316 317 that did not appear in the Web of Science search, for a total of 1012 studies.

318

319 Study Selection Criteria

We applied two screening steps to select studies for inclusion in our analysis. In the first 320 step, we read the abstract of each study. If the abstract did not include a flux measurement from 321 322 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 323 first screening step. If the study did not measure a net-flux from adult oysters, report fluxes from 324 325 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 326 327 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). 328 We also excluded published abstracts for conference talks, and studies not published in English. 329

In some cases, studies reported sample size, but mean values and standard deviation or 330 error had to be estimated from figures in the paper. These studies were included in the analysis, 331 and the missing values were estimated by extracting them from plots and images embedded 332 within the manuscript using WebPlotDigitizer Version 3.9 software. When the error bar did not 333 pass the edge of the bar (or did not exist), error was calculated as 0, but an SD value of 1 was 334 used in order to calculate g values in the meta-analysis. When sample size was reported as a 335 336 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 337 the analysis. 338

339

340 Data Analysis – Sediment Fluxes

When studies reported standard error, we converted it to standard deviation (Equation 1). 341 We converted all flux rates to either unol g DTW⁻² hr⁻¹ (ovsters) or unol m⁻² hr⁻¹ (sediments). If 342 rates were reported seasonally or monthly, but no study mean was reported, we manually 343 344 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 345 studies reported the sample size as "n = 3 or 4" for each sampling month. In this case, we 346 347 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. 348

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 sediments beneath oysters (X_E) and control sediments (X_C) for whole studies were pooled as

were all variances) using a fixed effects model approach in the *metafor* package¹⁰³ in R 352 Statistical Software version 3.6.0, followed similar methods as Harrer et al¹⁰⁴ and Anton et al¹⁰⁵. 353 The J value in Equation 4 controls bias associated with different sample sizes between 354 studies (Equation 5). When interpreting g, the value reflects the effect size of the experimental 355 treatment (in this case presence or absence of oysters on sediment net N2 flux) in terms of 356 number and direction of standard deviations the experimental treatment is from the control. A g 357 value between 0 - 0.2 is typically considered a small effect, 0.2-0.5 a medium effect, 0.5-0.8 a 358 large effect, and >0.8 a very large effect⁷⁴. 359 360 Equation 1: 361 s. d. = s. e. $\times \sqrt{n}$ 362 363 Equation 2: 364 $X_{nooled} = ((X_a \times n_a) + (X_b \times n_b))/(n_a + n_b)$ 365 366 Equation 3: 367 $s.d._{pooled} = \sqrt{((n_a - 1) \times (s.d._a)^2 + (n_b - 1) \times (s.d._b)^2)/(n_a + n_b - 2)}$ 368 369 Equation 4: 370 $g = ((X_E - X_C) \times I)/s. d.$ 371 372 Equation 5: 373 $J = 1 - (3/(4 \times (N_E + N_C - 2) - 1))$ 374

375

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 model we used the Sidik-Jonkman method for determining τ^2 and the Hartung-Knapp 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 measurements^{107,108}. While only net N₂ fluxes from sediments and oyster matter in an ecosystem context, we also accepted studies that used the isotope pairing technique (IPT)⁸¹ in order to compare this direct measurement with a measurement of the net N₂ flux (N₂/Ar technique)⁸⁰ Studies using IPT were not included in the total estimate of oyster effects on sediment denitrification or comparison between habitat types.

388

389 Publication Bias – Sediment Fluxes

We followed the same methods used by Anton et al.¹⁰⁵ to test for publication bias among 390 sediment flux studies that may distort the results of the meta-analysis. We evaluated bias using 391 392 Egger's Test, which estimates a regression using standard error of study specific effect sizes, and is considered significant when the model intercept is statistically different from zero ¹⁰⁴. 393 Additionally, we identified outlier studies that may exert substantial influence on the direction of 394 the meta-analysis as those where the upper bound of the study 95% CI was lower than the lower 395 bound of the pooled 95% CI (i.e. an extremely small effect), or the lower bound of the study 396 95% CI was higher than the upper bound of the pooled 95% CI (i.e. an extremely large effect)¹⁰⁴. 397

Both of these tests are available in the *dmetar* package¹⁰⁶. When Eggers test indicated significant 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.

404

405 Data Analysis – Oysters

Oyster fluxes were reported in various units. We elected to convert all fluxes to unol ind-406 ¹ hr⁻¹, as some studies reported this rate without information about oyster tissue mass. For studies 407 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 408 is the dry tissue mass of commercial size oysters where most of the measurements included in 409 this meta-analysis were made (Atlantic Coast of the United States). We opted to report rates in 410 units of umol ind-1 h-1 so that we could maximize the amount of data included in this study and 411 because reporting on a spatial scale (e.g., umol m⁻² h⁻¹) is less descriptive than reporting on an 412 individual basis for several reasons. For example, there is and can be high variance in oyster 413 stocking density in reefs and aquaculture dependent on habitat, oyster size, food availability, 414 415 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 416 of oysters) will have a different oyster density (and flux m⁻²) than gear in shallow water with 417 only one bag of oysters. However, this choice also likely introduces some bias as oyster weight 418 419 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 420

421	rates to umol ind ⁻¹ h ⁻¹ , we calculated pooled means and variance across studies using Equation 2
422	and 3. We report all oyster flux values as mean \pm standard error. We did not perform publication
423	bias analyses on fluxes from oysters alone, as these studies only report rates and do not compare
424	oyster fluxes to anything.
425	
426	Data Availability
427	All data used in this study is available in the Figshare repository under the access number
428	https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.12488753.
429	
430	Code Availability
431	The R script used in this meta-analysis is available in the Github community repository
432	(https://github.com/nray17/Meta-analysis-oyster-impacts-on-biogeochemistry).

433 Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to NER.

434

435 *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.

441

442 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.

447

448 *Competing Interests*

449 The authors declare no competing interests.

451 Figure 1: Location of studies used in this meta-analysis. Map created by Emily Moothart using452 ArcGIS software with data collected during the literature review.



Figure 2: Effect size (Hedge's g, 95% confidence interval, and random effect meta-analysis model p-value) of oysters on rates of sediment regeneration of the nutrients ammonium (NH_4^+) , 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 magnitude of increase (g > 0) or decrease (g < 0) of a flux beneath ovsters 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 (g) of all studies together. For context, small effect: g = 0 - 0.2, medium effect: g = 0.2 - 0.5, and a strong effect: $g > 0.5^{74}$.



- 470 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
- 472 aquaculture studies (circles), reef studies (squares), and mesocosm studies (triangles). Details as473 in Figure 2.
 - Westbrook et al. 2019 Testa et al. 2015 Smyth et al. 2016 Smyth et al. 2015 - low Smyth et al. 2015 - high Smyth et al. 2013b Smyth et al. 2013a *g* = 0.682 Ray et al. 2020 95%CI = ± 0.276 Porter et al. 2004 p < 0.001 Piehler & Smyth 2011 Onorevole et al. 2018 Mortazavi et al. 2015 Kellogg et al. 2013 Jackson 2019 - Ch. 4 Humphries et al. 2016 - Reef Humphries et al. 2016 - Aqua Hoellein et al. 2015 Higgins et al. 2013 Hasset 2015 -2 2 4 0 N₂ flux Effect (g)
- 475 476

474

Figure 4: Transport of nitrogen (N) through coastal ecosystems with oyster habitats. Oysters 478 consume phytoplankton and move biodeposits containing N to the sediments. Oysters excrete 479 480 ammonium (NH_4^+) and drive NH_4^+ regeneration from sediments, supporting water column 481 primary production. Oysters also enhance N removal from the system through denitrification (N₂ production) in their digestive system and by stimulating sediment denitrification. A very 482 small amount of nitrous oxide (N₂O) is released from the oyster digestive system, likely due to 483 inefficient denitrification. Larger arrows indicate greater rates. Oyster and phytoplankton 484 symbols courtesy of the Integration and Application Network, University of Maryland Center for 485 Environmental Science (ian.umces.edu/symbols). 486





- 490 Figure 5: Effect size (Hedge's g, 95% confidence interval, and random effect meta-analysis
- 491 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 493 (circles) and reef studies (squares). Details as in Figure 2.





Table 1: Mean (± standard error) flux of dissolved nutrients and gases from various oyster species. All

498 values reported in μ mol ind⁻¹ hr⁻¹, except N₂O and CH₄ fluxes which are in nmol ind⁻¹ hr⁻. N₂ fluxes only

499 report values measured using the N_2/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 501 study selection criteria.

Species	N ₂ Flux	NH4 ⁺ Flux	NO _x Flux	NO ₃ ⁻ Flux	NO ₂ ⁻ Flux	PO4 ³⁻ Flux	N ₂ O Flux	CH₄ Flux
C. gigas	n.d.	2.81 ± 0.42	0.20 ± 0.05	n.d.	0.08 ± 0.01	0.87 ± 0.09	n.d.	n.d.
C. virginica	4.78 ± 2.46	9.44 ± 2.56	2.89 ± 6.33	0.80 ± 1.46	0.11 ± 0.03	1.33 ± 0.67	0.11 ± 0.76	2.93 ± 1.23
O. chilensis	n.d.	0.89 ± 0.20	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
O. edulis	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	0.47 ± 0.04	0.21 ± 0.97
S. glomerata	n.d.	5.65 ± 0.10	n.d.	$\textbf{-0.03} \pm 0.01$	n.d.	0.38 ± 0.06	67.66 ± 16.46	n.d.
All species	4.78 ± 2.46	5.73 ± 0.91	2.64 ± 5.74	0.50 ± 0.92	0.11 ± 0.02	0.82 ± 0.10	0.27 ± 0.54	1.84 ± 0.85

- 504 References:
- 505 1. United Nations. Factsheet: People and Oceans. (2017).
- 506 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).
- 514 6. Conley, D. J. *et al.* Controlling eutrophication: Nitrogen and phosphorus. *Science*. 323, 1014–1015 (2009).
- 516 7. Downing, J. A., Cherrier, C. T. & Fulweiler, R. W. Low ratios of silica to dissolved
 517 nitrogen supplied to rivers arise from agriculture not reservoirs. *Ecol. Lett.* 19, 1414–1418
 518 (2016).
- Scarey, J. C. & Fulweiler, R. W. Human activities directly alter watershed dissolved silica fluxes. *Biogeochemistry* 111, 125–138 (2012).
- 521 9. Turner, R. E. *et al.* Fluctuating silicate:nitrate ratios and coastal plankton food webs. *Proc.*522 Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 95, 13048–13051 (1998).
- Nixon, S. W. Coastal marine eutrophication: A definition, social causes, and future concerns. *Ophelia* 41, 199–219 (1995).
- 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).
- Mackenzie, C. L. Causes underlying the historical decline in Eastern oyster (*Crassostrea virginica* Gmelin, 1791) landings. J. Shellfish Res. 26, 927–938 (2007).
- 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).
- Beck, M. W. *et al.* Oyster reefs at risk and recommendations for conservation, restoration, and management. *Bioscience* 61, 107–116 (2011).
- 536 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).
- 539 17. United Nations. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable*540 *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).
- Kellogg, M. L. *et al.* Use of oysters to mitigate eutrophication in coastal waters. *Estuar*. *Coast. Shelf Sci.* 151, 156–168 (2014).
- 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).
- 548 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.

- 550 *Appl. Ichthyol.* **26**, 8–11 (2010).
- 551 22. Guy-Haim, T. *et al.* Diverse effects of invasive ecosystem engineers on marine
 552 biodiversity and ecosystem functions: A global review and meta-analysis. *Glob. Chang.*553 *Biol.* 24, 906–924 (2018).
- 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).
- Rowe, G., Clifford, C. & Smith Jr, K. Benthic nutrient regeneration and its coupling to primary productivity in coastal waters. *Nature* 255, 215–217 (1975).
- 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.*563 *Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 621, 95–105 (2019).
- 564 27. Duarte, C. M. et al. Rebuilding marine life. Nature 580, 39–51 (2020).
- 565 28. Billion Oyster Project. https://billionoysterproject.org/.
- 566 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).
- 570 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).
- 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).
- 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).
- 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).
- 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).
- 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).
- 593 39. Smyth, A. R., Geraldi, N. R. & Piehler, M. F. Oyster-mediated benthic-pelagic coupling 594 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).
- 606 44. Gárate, M., Moseman-Valtierra, S. & Moen, A. Potential nitrous oxide production by
 607 marine shellfish in response to warming and nutrient enrichment. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 146,
 608 236–246 (2019).
- 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).
- 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 (2014).
- 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).
- 632 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

- 642 (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).
- 649 60. Onorevole, K. M., Thompson, S. P. & Piehler, M. F. Living shorelines enhance nitrogen 650 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).
- 654 62. Westbrook, P., Heffner, L. & La Peyre, M. K. Measuring carbon and nitrogen
 655 bioassimilation, burial, and denitrification contributions of oyster reefs in Gulf coast
 656 estuaries. *Mar. Biol.* 166, 1–14 (2019).
- 657 63. Ray, N. E., Al-Haj, A. & Fulweiler, R. W. Sediment biogeochemistry along an oyster 658 aquaculture chronosequence. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **646**, 13–27 (2020).
- 659 64. Hassett, M. The Influence of Eastern Oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) Reef Restoration on
 660 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).
- 665 67. Ayvazian, S. G. *et al.* Evaluating connections between nitrogen cycling and the 666 macrofauna in native oyster beds in a New England estuary. (In Review).
- 667 68. Mazouni, N., Gaertner, J., Deslous-Paoli, J., Landrein, S. & D'Oedenberg, M. Nutrient
 668 and oxygen exchanges at the water-sediment interface in a shellfish farming lagoon (Thau,
 669 France). J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. 205, 91–113 (1996).
- 670 69. Porter, E. T., Cornwell, J. C., Sanford, L. P. & Newell, R. I. E. Effect of oysters
 671 *Crassostrea virginica* and bottom shear velocity on benthic-pelagic coupling and estuarine
 672 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).
- 675 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).
- 677 72. Gaertner-Mazouni, N. *et al.* Nutrient fluxes between water column and sediments:
 678 Potential influence of the pearl oyster culture. *Marine Pollut. Bull.* 65, 500–505 (2012).
- 679 73. Smyth, A. R. *et al.* Assessing nitrogen dynamics throughout the estuarine landscape.
 680 *Estuaries and Coasts* 36, 44–55 (2013).
- 681 74. Borenstein, M., Hedges, L., Higgins, J. & Rothstein, H. Introduction to Meta-Analysis.
 682 (John Wiley and Sons, 2009).
- Figge, J. & Aksnes, D. Silicate as a regulating nutrient in phytoplankton competition. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 83, 281–289 (1992).
- 685 76. Glibert, P. M. *et al.* Pluses and minuses of ammonium and nitrate uptake and assimilation 686 by phytoplankton and implications for productivity and community composition, with 687 emphasis on nitrogen-enriched conditions. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **61**, 165–197 (2016).

- 688 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).
- 690 78. Vandevenne, F. I. *et al.* Grazers: biocatalysts of terrestrial silica cycling. *Proc. R. Soc. B*691 *Biol. Sci.* 280, (2013).
- 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).
- 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).
- Eyre, B. D., Rysgaard, S. S., Dalsgaard, T. & Christensen, P. B. Comparison of isotope pairing and N₂:Ar methods for measuring sediment denitrification—Assumptions, modifications, and implications. *Estuaries* 25, 1077–1087 (2002).
- Ferguson, A. J. P. & Eyre, B. D. Seasonal discrepancies in denitrification measured by isotope pairing and N₂: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).
- Fulweiler, R. W., Nixon, S. W., Buckley, B. A. & Granger, S. L. Net sediment N₂ fluxes in a coastal marine system-experimental manipulations and a conceptual model. *Ecosystems* 11, 1168–1180 (2008).
- PAS 2050:2011 Specification for the assessment of the life cycle greenhouse gas emissions
 of goods and services. (2011).
- 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).
- 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*723 Assess. 23, 1042–1048 (2018).
- 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).
- 727 92. Troost, K. Causes and effects of a highly successful marine invasion: Case-study of the
 728 introduced Pacific oyster *Crassostrea gigas* in continental NW European estuaries. J. Sea
 729 Res. 64, 145–165 (2010).
- 730 93. Scanes, E. *et al.* Quantifying abundance and distribution of native and invasive oysters in
 731 an urbanised estuary. *Aquat. Invasions* 11, 425–436 (2016).
- P4. 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).
- Fishand, 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).
- 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).
- 742 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).
- 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).
- 749 100. *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).
- 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-*757 *On Guide*. (2019).
- 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).
- 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).
- 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).
- 767