

**This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:**

Traits of tidal marsh plants determine survival and growth response to hydrodynamic forcing : implications for nature-based shoreline protection

**Reference:**

Schoutens Ken, Luys Pieter, Heuner Maike, Fuchs Elmar, Minden Vanessa, Ostermann Tilla Schulte, Bouma Tjeerd J., van Belzen Jim, Temmerman Stijn.-  
Traits of tidal marsh plants determine survival and growth response to hydrodynamic forcing : implications for nature-based shoreline protection  
Marine ecology progress series - ISSN 1616-1599 - 693(2022), p. 107-124  
Full text (Publisher's DOI): <https://doi.org/10.3354/MEPS14091>  
To cite this reference: <https://hdl.handle.net/10067/1907020151162165141>

# Traits of tidal marsh plants determine survival and growth response to hydrodynamic forcing: implications for nature-based shoreline protection

Ken Schoutens<sup>1,\*</sup>, Pieter Luys<sup>1</sup>, Maike Heuner<sup>2</sup>, Elmar Fuchs<sup>2</sup>, Vanessa Minden<sup>3</sup>, Tilla Schulte Ostermann<sup>4</sup>, Tjeerd J. Bouma<sup>5</sup>, Jim Van Belzen<sup>5</sup>, Stijn Temmerman<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Antwerp, Ecosystem Management Research Group, 2610 Antwerp, Belgium

<sup>2</sup>Federal Institute of Hydrology, Department of Ecological Interactions, 56068 Koblenz, Germany

<sup>3</sup>Vrije Universiteit Brussels, Department of Biology, Ecology and Biodiversity, 1050 Brussels, Belgium

<sup>4</sup>University of Oldenburg, Institute of Biology and Environmental Sciences, Landscape Ecology Group, 26129 Oldenburg, Germany

<sup>5</sup>Netherlands Institute for Sea Research (NIOZ), Department of Estuarine and Delta Systems, Utrecht University, 4400 AC Yerseke, The Netherlands

\*Corresponding author: [ken.schoutens@uantwerpen.be](mailto:ken.schoutens@uantwerpen.be)

## 1 Abstract

Tidal marshes are increasingly valued for their nature-based shoreline protection function, as they reduce waves, currents and erosion. The effectiveness of this function depends on the ability of tidal marsh plants to grow and survive under waves and currents. However, how this varies with species-dependent plant traits is poorly understood. We performed a field transplanted experiment to quantify species-specific growth responses to different levels of hydrodynamic exposure and tidal inundation for three NW European marsh species: *Schoenoplectus tabernaemontani*, *Bolboschoenus maritimus* and *Phragmites australis*. In this order, these species show increasing shoot stiffness, length and biomass, which are plant traits known to increase hydrodynamic drag forces experienced by plants. Increased exposure to tidal inundation and hydrodynamics reduced the growth of all three species, but species with lower biomass, shorter, thinner and more flexible shoots could better cope with higher hydrodynamic exposure and tidal inundation. Furthermore, transplants of *S. tabernaemontani* (i.e. the species with the lowest shoot stiffness, length and biomass that survived under all tested conditions) developed smaller, thinner and more flexible shoots in response to higher hydrodynamic exposure and inundation. Hence our study indicates that similar inter- and intra-specific plant traits drive plant growth in response to hydrodynamics and inundation. This suggests that the spatial species distribution, typically observed in tidal marshes, does not only result from species-specific tolerance to tidal inundation gradients but also from hydrodynamic gradients. Allowing enough space for development of species zonation may be important to increase the efficiency of nature-based shoreline protection by tidal marshes.

## 2 Introduction

Climate change induced sea level rise and increasing storminess emphasize the need for sustainable shoreline protection strategies for often densely populated low-lying coastal zones, river deltas and estuaries (Hallegatte et al. 2013, Temmerman et al. 2013, Auerbach et al. 2015, Tessler et al. 2015). Conservation and restoration of coastal vegetated wetlands, such as tidal marshes and mangroves, is increasingly proposed and implemented as a nature-based climate adaptation strategy to complement man-made shoreline protection infrastructure such as dikes, common across the NW European coast (Schoonees et al. 2019, Smith et al. 2020). Tidal marshes in front of dikes have been shown to attenuate waves (Vuik et al. 2016, Chapter 2: Schoutens et al. 2019), tidal currents (Carus et al. 2016, Chapter 2: Schoutens et al. 2019), storm surges (Smolders et al. 2015, Stark et al. 2016) and erosion (Lo et al. 2017), thereby reducing wave loads on dikes, lowering the risk of dike failure during storms and even limiting the damage of the hinterland when dikes breach (Zhu et al. 2020a). Not only do tidal marshes provide this protection function, they also deliver a multitude of other valuable ecosystem services that benefit nature and society (Barbier et al. 2011).

The capacity of marsh plant species for nature-based shoreline protection depends on (1) their effectiveness to temper waves, currents and erosion, but also (2) their ability to grow and persist under the effects of waves and currents. The hydrodynamic attenuation has been the subject of multiple studies, showing that the effectiveness of wave and current attenuation depends on plant morphological traits such as high biomass (Paul & Amos 2011, Shepard et al. 2011, chapter 3: Schoutens et al. 2020), high density of shoots (Shepard et al. 2011, Vuik et al. 2016), high shoot lengths (Garzon et al. 2019) and stiff shoots (Rupprecht et al. 2017, Schulze et al. 2019, chapter 3: Schoutens et al. 2020). These plant traits increase friction (i.e. hydraulic resistance) on waves and tidal currents, hence contributing to decrease the hydrodynamic forces and reduce the risk of erosion in marshes and on the dikes behind marshes (Möller et al. 2014, chapter 2: Schoutens et al. 2019). Concerning the plant growth, fewer studies have identified the mechanisms determining the ability of marsh plants to withstand waves and tidal currents. Recent studies suggest that a trade-off exists between the capacity of plants to attenuate hydrodynamic forces and their capacity to cope with and grow under hydrodynamic forces (Heuner et al. 2015, chapter 3: Schoutens et al. 2020). These studies suggest that plant traits that enhance the reduction of hydrodynamic forces, such as having a high biomass and stiff shoots, also lead to higher drag forces exerted by the flow on the plants and thus higher mechanical stress experienced by the plants (Bouma et al. 2005).

The growth responses to mechanical stress from hydrodynamic forces have been studied in multiple aquatic ecosystems (e.g. Gaylord et al. 2003 and Demes et al. 2013 on kelp vegetation; Puijalon et al. 2008 and Schoelynck et al. 2015 on freshwater macrophytes; Nafie et al. 2012 and Peralta et al. 2006 on seagrasses). In tidal marshes,

key knowledge gaps on species-specific plant growth response to wave exposure remain. A limited number of short-term (minutes to hours) flume studies showed that drag forces on plants and dislodgement of plants in response to hydrodynamic forces increased with species-specific plant traits such as shoot stiffness (Bouma et al. 2005, Silinski et al. 2016b, chapter 4: Schoutens et al. 2021). Only few experimental studies have shown the longer-term (months) implications of hydrodynamic forces on intra-specific variations in plant growth during at most one summer growing season (Coops et al. 1996a, Silinski et al. 2016a, 2018, Cao et al. 2020). These studies revealed that stronger hydrodynamic forces resulted in seedling mortality, reduced growth and an increased shoot flexibility. There are however to our knowledge no experimental studies showing growth responses to hydrodynamic forces over multiple growing seasons. In particular, there are no field experiments in temperate-climate marshes that identified how hydrodynamic forces from waves and currents affect plant survival during winter seasons, when plants are largely dormant, and then affect regrowth of shoots from the roots and rhizomes during the subsequent growing seasons. Yet, such knowledge is key if we want to understand under which wave and current conditions tidal marshes can be conserved, restored, or created by plantings, e.g., for nature-based shoreline protection. Further, such knowledge is essential for developing models enabling the prediction of the biogeomorphic evolution of marshes (Schwarz et al. 2018, Gourgue et al. 2021) and their nature-based contribution to shoreline protection (Marijnissen et al. 2020, Willemsen et al. 2020).

Marshes that are most vulnerable to shoreline erosion are often the small fringes (i.e. 10-100 m) along embanked shorelines of estuaries and coasts, where hydrodynamic forces are dominant. These smaller fringing marshes in front of embankments are however of particular interest to policymakers and shoreline managers, because of their function as nature-based shoreline protection in addition to man-made structure like dikes landward of the fringing marshes (van der Nat et al. 2016, van Loon-Steensma & Schelfhout 2017, Schoonees et al. 2019). Whereas in wide marshes (i.e. several hundreds to several thousands of meters wide) the presence of a less-effective wave-attenuating species may be compensated for by the large width of the marsh providing significant wind wave attenuation (Shepard et al. 2011, Li et al. 2013, Xue et al. 2021). The species composition and their spatial distribution might play an important role in determining the capacity to attenuate hydrodynamic forces such as waves and currents (van Loon-Steensma et al. 2016, chapter 3: Schoutens et al. 2020). Moreover, increasing storminess and sea level rise might increase landward marsh edge erosion, reducing the width of the marsh in front of the dike (Torio & Chmura 2013, Borchert et al. 2018).

Apart from waves and currents, other environmental stress factors are known to affect plant growth in tidal marshes, e.g. tidal inundation, salinity, pollutants, sediment grainsize, competition, grazing. In particular, spatial species distribution has been

related to spatial variation in environmental stressors, as the capacity of a species to cope with these stress factors determines where they survive (Pennings et al. 2005, Silvestri et al. 2005, Rasser et al. 2013, Bang et al. 2018, Veldhuis et al. 2019). Most research on tidal marsh plant zonation has focused on the role of abiotic drivers such as species tolerance to salt gradients (Engels et al. 2011) and inundation frequency and time (Castillo et al. 2000, Farina et al. 2009), and how this affects biotic interactions via competition or facilitation between species (Bertness 1991). How species-dependent tolerance of marsh plants to waves and currents contributes to spatial plant zonation, in addition to other factors like tolerance to tidal inundation time, is much less studied (Heuner et al. 2018). That is, the ability of tidal marsh vegetation to cope with waves and tidal currents might play a role in the species zonation along a hydrodynamic exposure gradient from high exposure close to the shore towards lower exposure further inland (Bruno 2000, chapter 3: Schoutens et al. 2020). This means that some species might have plant properties that allow them to grow in more wave exposed conditions compared to other species that lack these properties. Phenotypic plasticity to waves and currents may further affect the growth and alter plant traits (Carus et al. 2016, Silinski et al. 2018) and thus modify their ability to withstand hydrodynamic forces. Although knowledge on the phenotypic plasticity, long-term growth and survival is crucial for marsh management and restoration projects, little is known on how co-occurring species differing in traits respond to gradients in contrasting hydrodynamic exposures.

The present study aims to quantify experimentally the relative effects of hydrodynamic forces from waves and currents, in addition to tidal inundation, on the growth and morphology of three different co-occurring pioneer species of temperate-climate brackish tidal marshes. We investigate over two subsequent growing seasons, including the winter dormant season, how species responses differ in relation to species-specific plant traits through a field transplantation experiment, in which we applied in-situ manipulation of the hydrodynamic forces along an inundation gradient. Based on the findings from this experiment we aim to enhance insight in the role of hydrodynamic forces, in addition to tidal inundation, on species-specific plant growth.

### **3 Materials and Methods**

#### **3.1 Study area and species description**

This study took place in the brackish zone of the Elbe Estuary, Germany (Fig. 1), where soil water salinity is ranging between 0.3 and 1.2 PSU (Schulte Ostermann et al. 2021a) and the semi-diurnal tide has an average tidal range of 2.8 m (data for 2018–2019 for the tide gauge station of Brokdorf, Küstendaten, Federal Waterways and Shipping Administration). Transplantation locations were selected on an intertidal flat using following selection criteria: A first criterion was absence of vegetation, so that

transplanted plants were not affected by existing vegetation. Secondly, we searched for a tidal flat location with similar surface elevations (i.e. similar tidal inundation frequency and time) as to where pioneer vegetation was present in adjacent areas. Thirdly, the tidal flat should be exposed to incoming waves at high tides. Along the marshes of Hollerwetter, a location with these conditions was found (53° 50' 0.7"N, 9° 22' 6.0"E). The tidal flat at this location has a gentle slope of  $\leq 1^\circ$  perpendicular to the estuary tidal channel with a median grainsize  $< 125 \mu\text{m}$ . There was a trend of larger grainsizes with increasing inundation depth, where hydrodynamic exposure is larger (table S1). The tidal flat is exposed to the dominant wind and wave direction coming from West to South as illustrated by the windrose diagram in Fig. 1b, with a wind fetch length at high tide of ca. 3 km.




Figure 1: (a) The study area in the Hollerwetter marshes was situated in the brackish part of the Elbe estuary in NW Germany. (b) The shape of the estuary in combination with the dominant wind directions illustrate that the Hollerwetter marsh is a wave exposed site. Wind conditions are shown on the wind rose diagram during the experimental period in 2018-2019. (c) The experimental setup was a factorial design of two hydrodynamic exposure treatments spread over three elevations (i.e. inundation treatments) representing 6 treatment sites. Sheltered wave and flow conditions were created with wooden wave barriers which were placed outside each other's wake zones. In every treatment site, 20 transplant units of each species were

installed in two staggered rows and in random order. Elevations relative to MHW are visualized with contour lines.

The species selected for this study are *Schoenoplectus tabernaemontani* (C.C.Gmel.) Palla (formerly *Scirpus tabernaemontani*), *Bolboschoenus maritimus* (L.) Palla (formerly *Scirpus maritimus*) and *Phragmites australis* (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud (Fig. S1). Those three species are typically found along the brackish zone of the Elbe estuary and other NW European estuaries, growing in distinct zones parallel to the marsh edge in which they are the dominant species in their respective zones: *S. tabernaemontani* typically grows in a zone at the waterfront of marshes, followed in landward direction by a zone of *B. maritimus* and then *P. australis* (chapter 3: Schoutens et al. 2020). Apart from seed dispersal, the three species reproduce by clonal outgrowth through rhizomes or by dispersal of root fragments, e.g. released from marsh erosion. During the winter period, the aboveground biomass of the three species dies back and can get washed away by the waves and tides. Next growing season, new shoots sprout from the surviving belowground biomass. *S. tabernaemontani* produces round, leafless stems up to 2.0 m and grows from thick rhizomes that form a sparse root network. *B. maritimus* grows as a triangular shoot up to 2.5 m tall and forms a dense root network of rhizomes and tubers. The hollow stems of *P. australis* can reach up to 4.0 m in brackish marshes and are supported by a densely branched network of rhizomes.

### 3.2 Set-up of transplantation experiment

Sites for transplantation of the three species were selected on three different intertidal elevations (corresponding to different tidal inundation times and depths), and in each elevation zone two sites were established of which one site was exposed to and the other one was sheltered from incoming waves. The three elevations represent inundation depths under which at least one of the three species can be found in natural marshes. During two growing seasons, from March 2018 until August 2019, three wave barriers of 24 m wide and 0.7 m high were installed, one at each of the three selected elevations (Fig. 1), to create wave sheltered conditions at the naturally wave exposed site. The barriers were made from horizontally piled wooden branches that were fixed in between two rows of poles which were hammered vertically in the soil (Fig. 1). The orientation of the barriers was perpendicular to the dominant incoming wave direction from the Southwest. Edge effects were limited by extending the barrier 2 m further than the transplanted vegetation. The outer ends of the barrier were placed under a slight angle to provide an even better protection from incoming waves with a direction that slightly deviates from the Southwest. Large deviation in wave direction is not expected due to wave refraction over the tidal flat, which is expected to result in dominant Southwestern wave directions more or less perpendicular to the tidal flat slope (Fig. 1). Apart from the three wave sheltered sites, three wave exposed sites (i.e. without wave barrier) were installed at the same elevations. Although the sites were positioned nearby each other to ensure similar conditions, they were positioned far enough (at

least 30 m) from each other to ensure the wave barriers did not affect the plant growth on the wave exposed treatment sites (without barriers) (Fig. 1).

Transplantation took place in April 2018 at the start of the growing season. In order to excavate a consistent amount of marsh soil for every transplant, a metal clump-extractor was used to create marsh soil transplant units with a surface area of 0.20 x 0.20 m and a depth of 0.30 m. At each of the six treatment sites, 20 transplants from each of the three species were planted equally spaced at 0.50 m from the adjacent transplant unit. The total of 60 transplant units per treatment site were transplanted in two spatially staggered rows parallel to the wave barrier (Fig. 1). All 360 transplant units were taken from the adjacent marsh and directly planted at the experimental sites. In December 2018, when aboveground vegetation was low, the wave barriers were washed away. The barriers were rebuilt in March 2019, before the start of the next growing season.

### 3.3 Growth response and species-specific plant traits

The following plant traits were quantified, which are known to affect the capacity of the plants for nature-based attenuation of waves and currents. For each transplant, the number of shoots were counted monthly from March 2018 until August 2019. In all six sites, canopy height (average of the three highest shoots per transplant) was measured monthly at ten transplant units per species and was used as a measure for average shoot length of the transplant. Basal shoot diameters were measured monthly at every site for ten shoots from different transplant units per species. Spatial outgrowth was quantified as the largest horizontal distance between shoots grown from the transplanted unit and was measured at every site for ten transplant units per species. In August 2019, at the end of the experiment, aboveground biomass was harvested from all treatments in case they survived. Upon drying at 70 °C for 72h, biomechanical properties were quantified on 20 individuals per species and per treatment. For more details on the methods to quantify biomechanical properties we refer to chapter 4: Schoutens et al. (2021).

### 3.4 Hydrodynamics and sediment dynamics

Hydrodynamic conditions were measured at the different sites to make sure that the barriers created an environment sheltered from waves and currents as compared to the sites without barriers. Tides, waves and current velocities were measured with automated pressure sensors (P-Log3021-MMC, Driesen & Kern) and acoustic doppler velocity sensors (Vector ADV, Nortek).

The pressure sensors were placed in front of the transplanted vegetation at an elevation of 0.07 m above the sediment surface and recording at 8 Hz. The pressure data was converted into water surface elevation using a Matlab routine, accounting for corrections for atmospheric pressure and depth-dependent pressure, followed by

calculations of the following wave characteristics: significant wave height ( $H_s$ , mean of the highest third of recorded waves) and  $H_{1/100}$  (mean of the highest 1% of recorded waves) over 10 min time intervals. For more details on this method, we refer to Belliard et al. (2019). The water surface elevation data were also used to calculate tidal inundation characteristics such as inundation time per tide ( $I_{time}$ ), mean inundation depth at high water ( $I_{depth}$ ), and inundation frequency (i.e. proportion of high tides inundating the sites).

The ADV sensors measured flow velocities at 1 Hz at 0.10 m above the sediment surface. After filtering out low quality data based on the signal to noise ratio and the beam correlations, the planar flow velocity ( $U$ , m/s) was calculated as  $U = \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}$  with  $u$  and  $v$  being the mean flow velocities (m/s) in the two horizontal dimensions perpendicular to each other, calculated over 10 min time intervals.

Hydrodynamic exposure or the presence of a barrier can alter the sediment dynamics. Therefore, sediment bed level changes were quantified with a combination of an RTK-GPS and laser leveler over the first growing period in 2018, revealing a vertical accuracy in the order of +/- 2 cm. At the start of the second growing season in March 2019, a triangular SEB (sedimentation erosion bar) setup was installed in every site (i.e. six in total) to increase the vertical accuracy of the bed level change measurements up to an order of +/- 2 mm (van Wijnen & Bakker 2001, Nolte et al. 2013). Monthly SEB measurements were done from March 2019 until the end of the experiment in August 2019.

### 3.5 Data analysis

Survival and growth response quantified through shoot counts were compared using a generalized linear model with negative binomial distribution to account for the many 'zero' counts (glm.nb function of the MASS package, R-project). Both treatments, i.e. the hydrodynamic treatments and the tidal inundation treatments were added as independent variables. The date of sampling was added to include the effect of seasonal variation. Separate models were made for each species since comparing shoot counts between the different species would not be meaningful without normalizing against typical shoot densities observed in the natural marsh populations. The factorial design of this transplantation experiment allowed us to test the effect of inundation and wave exposure on shoot morphological properties such as shoot length, stem diameter and aboveground shoot biomass and whether the size of the effect differs among the three species. To make interspecific comparisons, shoot length, stem diameter and aboveground biomass were normalized for the mean value of the respective property in the adjacent natural marsh population (table 1, data used from Schulte Ostermann et al. (2021a)), i.e., values >1 indicate a higher performance and values <1 indicate a lower performance of the respective variable compared to the natural population. The responses at the end of the growing season in 2019 were compared in a three-way

ANOVA including the species, wave exposure and inundation stress as independent variables. Within every species, the ANOVA was followed by a post-hoc comparison between the combined treatments using Tukey HSD. All statistical analyses were performed in R 4.0.3 (R Core Team 2020) and significance was assumed at  $p < 0.05$  for all tests. All  $p$ -values  $< 0.001$  were reported as '<0.001',  $p$ -values  $< 0.1$  were reported with the exact number and  $p$ -values  $> 0.1$  were reported as 'ns'. Assumptions were checked based on visual inspection with histograms and Q-Q plots.

Table 1: General description of the growth conditions where the three transplanted species are naturally growing in the adjacent tidal marshes of Hollerwetter. Elevations relative to the tidal range and distance to the marsh edge ( $\pm$  SD) indicate that the sampling of all three natural populations occurred on locations which were sheltered from incoming waves and currents. Data on shoot length, stem diameter and above-ground biomass measured on these populations were published in Schulte Ostermann et al. (2021b) and were used here to normalize the data measured from the transplants.

	<i>Elevation (relative to tidal range)</i>	<i>Distance to marsh edge (m)</i>
<i>S. tabernaemontani</i>	$0.70 \pm 0.13$	$5.7 \pm 3.0$
<i>B. maritimus</i>	$0.88 \pm 0.11$	$38.1 \pm 15.1$
<i>P. australis</i>	$1.08 \pm 0.05$	$86.6 \pm 35.2$

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Hydro- and morphodynamic conditions within the experimental treatments

Hydrodynamic forces from waves and currents were stronger in the exposed sites (table 2 and Fig. S2 and S3). Significant wave heights and mean flow velocities were higher in the exposed sites as compared to the sheltered sites, and this difference increased with decreasing tidal inundation depths (i.e. up to a maximum of 16 % higher significant wave heights and 21 % higher flow velocity). The deepest inundated sites had an inundation time which was approximately 1.5 h longer and a mean high-water depth that was around 0.40 m deeper than the shallowest inundated sites (table 2). Inundation frequency was  $> 98$  % for all sites, meaning that they were inundated nearly every high tide. Over the entire period of the experiment, all sites experienced both periods of erosion and accretion (table 2 and Fig. S4). Erosion mainly occurred during the winter period when waves were largest, and accretion in spring and summer as waves were smaller. It is important to note that during the winter period from December 2018 – March 2019, the wave barriers were damaged during storms, and this was associated with erosion up to 15 cm observed on several of the sheltered and exposed sites (Fig S4).

Table 2: Summary of the main hydrodynamic properties per treatment combination over the entire monitoring campaign; mean of the significant wave heights ( $H_s \pm SD$ , m), mean maximum wave height ( $H_{1/100} \pm SD$ , m), single maximum wave height ( $H_{max}$ , m), mean planar flow velocity ( $U \pm SD$ ,  $m\ s^{-1}$ ), mean inundation depth at high water ( $I_{depth}$ , m), mean inundation time per tide ( $I_{time}$ , min), elevation relative to MHW ( $E_{MHW}$ , m) and elevation variation ( $E_{var}$ , m) calculated as the maximum elevation – minimum elevation over the time period.

Inun.	Wave	$H_s$ (m)	$H_{1/100}$ (m)	$H_{max}$ (m)	$U$ (m/s)	$I_{depth}$ (m)	$I_{time}$ (min)	$E_{MHW}$ (m)	$E_{var}$ (cm)
Shallow	Exp.	0.088 ± 0.06	0.11 ± 0.08	0.71	0.06 ± 0.05	1.15	379	-1.17	13.6
	Shelt.	0.085 ± 0.05	0.10 ± 0.07	0.7	0.06 ± 0.04	1.13	373	-1.18	14.0
Mid	Exp.	0.084 ± 0.06	0.11 ± 0.08	0.68		1.38	425	-1.35	7.6
	Shelt.	0.071 ± 0.05	0.09 ± 0.07	0.5		1.29	405	-1.39	17.4
Deep	Exp.	0.085 ± 0.06	0.11 ± 0.08	0.89	0.19 ± 0.09	1.58	462	-1.62	5.9
	Shelt.	0.078 ± 0.06	0.10 ± 0.08	0.78	0.15 ± 0.08	1.52	451	-1.63	14.8

#### 4.2 Effects of hydrodynamic exposure and inundation on shoot numbers

Transplantation on deeper and longer inundated sites, i.e. with higher inundation time (> 405 min) and depth (>1.29 m) (table 1), reduced the number of shoots per transplant in the three species (Fig. 2,  $p < 0.001$ ). Interestingly, there was a big difference in shoot numbers between the two growing seasons (Fig. 2). In the second growing season, in the shallow inundation sites, the *S. tabernaemontani* and *B. maritimus* plants produced more shoots, while *P. australis* formed a similar amount of shoots compared to the first season. In the deep inundation treatments, the seasonal difference diminishes as shoot numbers of all species were strongly reduced. The number of shoots was highest in *S. tabernaemontani*, followed by *B. maritimus*. In the second growing season, *S. tabernaemontani* grew less than 50 shoots per transplant when inundated more than 1.29 m and more than 405 min per tide, i.e. deep inundation treatment, while the other species hardly grew any shoot starting from an intermediate inundation stress. Already in the first growing season, *P. australis* transplants died off in the intermediately and deeply inundated sites. Hydrodynamic exposure decreased the number of shoots in *B. maritimus* and *S. tabernaemontani* ( $p < 0.05$ ). The low number of shoots for *P. australis* did not allow the detection of significant differences between the exposed and sheltered sites. The different responses of shoot numbers to hydrodynamic exposure was only visible when the stress from tidal inundation was low enough.




Figure 2: Number of shoots per transplant unit for both hydrodynamic exposure treatments and three inundation treatments. The shoots were counted over two growing seasons (2018-2019). Grey boxes indicate the winter season when aboveground biomass dies-off and was flushed away by the tides.

#### 4.3 Effects of hydrodynamic exposure and inundation on shoot diameter, shoot length and biomechanical properties

In the natural marsh of Hollerwettern, from where plant material was collected for the transplantation, plant morphological measurements of the natural population showed a clear species-specific difference in plant traits (Fig. 3).




Figure 3: Plant morphological traits in the adjacent natural marsh (Hollerwettern) for *S. tabernaemontani*, *B. maritimus* and *P. australis*. Shoot length (m), basal shoot diameter (mm), dry shoot biomass (g) and shoot flexural stiffness (Nm<sup>2</sup>) were

quantified at peak biomass (data from Schulte Ostermann et al. (2021a)). Differences between the species are indicated with significance levels obtained with ANOVA.

Both the inundation stress and the hydrodynamic exposure had a negative effect on the basal shoot diameter and the shoot length (Fig. 4 and 5). Nevertheless, the response to these stressors was species-specific (table 3), i.e. *S. tabernaemontani* was able to cope better with the combined stressors from tidal inundation and hydrodynamic exposure, followed by *B. maritimus* and *P. australis* which had a strongly reduced growth compared to the natural population. In *S. tabernaemontani* transplants, increased inundation stress and increased hydrodynamic exposure resulted in thinner basal stem diameters and shorter shoots. Except for the exposed, deep inundation treatment, *S. tabernaemontani* transplants grew shoots that were consistently thicker and longer compared to the natural population. *B. maritimus* grew thinner and shorter shoots with increasing inundation stress, however, no significant differences between the hydrodynamic exposure treatments were found. Under shallow inundation, shoot of *B. maritimus* were up to twice as thick and 1.3 times longer compared to the natural population. In the two deeper inundation treatments, the basal shoot diameters of *B. maritimus* were more comparable to the natural population, however the shoot lengths were shorter compared to the natural population. In *P. australis*, no differences in treatment response were observed and compared to the natural population, the basal stem diameter of the remaining shoots was halved and the shoot lengths were less than half of the normal length.




Figure 4: Shoot basal diameter normalized by shoot diameters in the natural marsh (see Fig. 3) at peak biomass for the two hydrodynamic exposure treatments and the three inundation treatments. Significance of differences between the combined treatments was tested with ANOVA for every species and followed by a post-hoc Tukey's HSD, indicated by different letters.




Figure 5: Shoot lengths normalized by shoot lengths in the natural marsh (see Fig. 3) at peak biomass for the two hydrodynamic exposure treatments and the three inundation treatments. Significance of differences between the combined treatments was tested with ANOVA for every species and followed by a post-hoc Tukey's HSD, indicated by different letters.

Table 3: The ANOVA table for the linear model made for normalized shoot diameters, normalized shoot lengths and normalized stem biomass at peak biomass in August 2019. Both the hydrodynamic exposure treatment (exposed - sheltered) and the inundation treatment (shallow - intermediate - deep) were tested across the three species (*S. tabernaemontani*, *B. maritimus*, and *P. australis*). Significant variables are indicated with a **bold** p-value.

Variable	df	F	p	df	F	p	df	F	p
Wave	1	26.6	< <b>0.001</b>	1	19.6	< <b>0.001</b>	1	22.0	< <b>0.001</b>
Inundation	2	134.8	< <b>0.001</b>	2	129.5	< <b>0.001</b>	2	13.9	< <b>0.001</b>
Species	2	553.5	< <b>0.001</b>	2	537.2	< <b>0.001</b>	2	71.1	< <b>0.001</b>
Wave*inundation	2	1.8	0.2	2	0.4	0.7	2	4.5	< <b>0.05</b>
Wave*species	2	8.8	< <b>0.001</b>	2	1.8	0.2	2	4.6	< <b>0.05</b>
Inundation*species	3	8.8	< <b>0.001</b>	3	9.0	< <b>0.001</b>	3	4.3	< <b>0.05</b>
Wave*inundation*species	1	0.4	0.5	1	0.004	0.9	1	1.7	0.2

Biomechanical properties such as Young's modulus and flexural stiffness were not affected by the inundation treatment nor the hydrodynamic exposure treatment, except for *S. tabernaemontani* shoots in the shallow inundation sites, which were stiffer on the sheltered sites as compared to the exposed shoots (ANOVA,  $F_{1,77} = 15.3$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). More details are given in table S2.

#### 4.4 Effects of hydrodynamic exposure and inundation on lateral expansion and overall biomass

The three species in this transplantation experiment reproduce primarily by clonal outgrowth, which is important for the long-term survival of the species. Outgrowth of the transplants in the second growing season was reduced with increasing stress from inundation while no significant response to hydrodynamic exposure was observed. Outgrowth of the transplants in the second growing season did show a species-specific response and was highest in *S. tabernaemontani* which expanded in multiple directions forming a star-like pattern of shoots (Fig. 6). The transplants of *B. maritimus* were also expanding, however to a lesser extent compared to *S. tabernaemontani*. *P. australis* hardly expanded and the few surviving transplants had the same diameter as when the experiment started (Fig. 6).




Figure 6: Outgrowth of the transplants in the 2<sup>nd</sup> growing season, expressed as clump diameter (i.e. biggest diameter of the transplant unit) at peak biomass for the two hydrodynamic exposure treatments and the three inundation treatments. Significance of differences between the combined treatments was tested with ANOVA for every species and followed by a post-hoc Tukey's HSD, indicated by different letters.

Although there seems to be a trend of decreasing shoot biomass with increasing inundation stress (table 3), this trend was not consistent for all species with remaining shoots (Fig. 7). Nevertheless, biomass die-off in the deep inundation treatment for *B. maritimus* and in both the intermediate and deep inundation treatment for *P. australis* do show a negative effect on the survival and hence shoot biomass production as a result of increased inundation stress. Hydrodynamic exposure had a similar negative effect on the shoot biomass, however this was not significant for *S. tabernaemontani* and only significant in the intermediate inundation treatment for *B. maritimus* shoots. The remaining *P. australis* biomass in the shallow inundation treatments did not differ either. Shoot biomass of the transplants was lower in all treatments compared to the natural population, except for the shallow inundation and sheltered, intermediate inundation treatments of *S. tabernaemontani* and *B. maritimus* which had a similar biomass compared to the natural population. Only the sheltered, shallow inundated transplants of *S. tabernaemontani* grew a higher (by 1.5) shoot biomass.




Figure 7: Dry shoot biomass harvested in August 2019, normalized by shoot biomass in the natural marsh at peak biomass (see Fig. 3) for the two hydrodynamic exposure treatments and the three inundation treatments. Significance of differences between the combined treatments was tested with ANOVA for every species and followed by a post-hoc Tukey's HSD, indicated by different letters.

## 5 Discussion

Our findings highlight that plants with a higher capacity to grow under hydrodynamic forces, have inter- and intraspecific traits that are known to reduce mechanical stress from waves and currents. Species-specific growth responses to wave and current exposure is likely to contribute to spatial species zonation. Previous studies on nature-based shoreline protection by tidal marsh plants have identified species traits that increase their effectiveness to attenuate waves and currents (Bouma et al. 2005, 2010, Vuik et al. 2016, Schulze et al. 2019, chapter 3: Schoutens et al. 2020). In contrast, relatively little is known about how species traits affect the capacity of species to survive and grow under the influence of different levels of exposure to waves and currents. Yet, such knowledge on species-dependent growth responses to wave and current exposure is crucial to manage and restore marshes for nature-based shoreline protection. Here, we showed by a 2-year field transplantation experiment, that in

addition to tidal inundation, exposure to waves and currents also decreases the growth of three tidal marsh species, with the magnitude of growth reduction being species specific.

### 5.1 Species-specific response to tidal inundation and hydrodynamic forces

Tidal inundation had a negative effect on the shoot numbers, but with a species-specific magnitude (Fig. 2). Apart from limited light availability during inundation, water submergence creates anaerobic conditions which can suppress the growth of vegetation, e.g. by anaerobic formation of phytotoxic compounds surrounding the roots (Hellings et al. 1992, Coops et al. 1996a, Engloner 2009). Many tidal marsh species developed morphological adaptations to these anaerobic conditions of which oxygen supply to their root system is most common, i.e. species grow aerenchym tissue that allows oxygen transport from aerated organs such as leaves towards the root system (Armstrong et al. 2006, Lemoine et al. 2012). The thicker stems of *S. tabernaemontani* and *B. maritimus* provided structural rigidity in this study which might result from more aerenchyma tissue in response to oxygen deprivation (Albert et al. 2013). In contrast, more aerenchyma and thicker stems are also linked to a softer and thinner epidermic layer, i.e. resulting in less strength molecules and structural rigidity which increases the stem flexibility (Shah et al. 2017, Silinski et al. 2018). Growing shoots that stay emerged during flooding, facilitate and ensure the oxygen supply to the roots (Maricle & Lee 2002) and hence help to cope with increased tidal inundation (Colmer & Flowers 2008). However, this strategy can only work when shoots do not break due to hydrodynamic forces.

In addition to the tidal inundation treatments, plant growth and development were hampered in the wave and current exposed sites for *B. maritimus* and especially for *S. tabernaemontani*, compared to the sheltered sites, but the plants were still able to survive (Fig. 4, 5, 7). This result suggests that both species were, to some extent, able to grow under the increased mechanical stress from waves and currents which is most likely a result of species-specific plant morphological traits (Fig. 3). Plant traits such as small, flexible shoots found in the natural population of *S. tabernaemontani* and to a lesser extend *B. maritimus* reduce drag, hence increasing the capacity to cope with waves and currents (Bouma et al. 2005, Puijalon et al. 2011, Paul et al. 2016, chapter 3: Schoutens et al. 2020, Schulte Ostermann et al. 2021a). These are plant morphological traits that are often found in species growing under mechanical stress (Anten et al. 2005, Anten & Sterck 2012). For some wetland species, shoot elongation in response to inundation stress was described as part of a so called escape strategy, i.e. the shoots grow to stay emerged from the water (Garssen et al. 2015). This suggests that inundation stress and mechanical stress from hydrodynamic forces might have contrasting effects on plant growth.

For *P. australis*, the observed response to tidal inundation stress might be enhanced by an indirect response to damage from hydrodynamic exposure. *P. australis* grows relatively stiff stems in natural populations (see Fig. 3 and Coops et al. 1996b, chapter 3: Schoutens et al. 2020, Zhu et al. 2020b, Zhang & Nepf 2021), but shoots with a higher stiffness are more susceptible to stem breakage (Shah et al. 2017, Zhu et al. 2020b). Immediately from the first growing season after transplantation, *P. australis* produced little shoot numbers, which could suggest a mechanical growth restriction by breakage of young sprouting stiff shoots. It is known that *P. australis* is prone to drowning when shoots are cut during the growing season as a result of an impaired oxygen supply to the roots and the loss of photosynthetic activity (Hellings et al. 1992, Rolletschek et al. 2000, Asaeda et al. 2003). For the shoot that did survive, growth was hampered, e.g. by mechanical stress. Hence, the amount of photosynthetic active leaf surface is reduced which might increase the susceptibility to other stressors, such as oxygen deprivation by tidal inundation stress.

Apart from direct stress responses induced by the experimental treatments in this study, the observed stress responses of the species could be the result of a species-specific capacity to cope with the stress from the transplantation itself, e.g. change of local sediment properties or damage to the roots. Transplantation success of marsh plants is typically optimized by providing enough belowground biomass of nearby populations from species that have a high capacity to expand clonally (Thomsen et al. 2005, Ott et al. 2019, Popoff et al. 2021). Although no control transplantation was performed, it is known from literature, on previous transplantation treatments, that the three species in this study are well able to handle the disturbance of a transplantation (Coops et al. 1996b, Amsberry et al. 2000, Silinski et al. 2016a, Taylor et al. 2019). Indirect effects of the applied treatments might play an important role in the growth response too. For example, the hydrodynamically driven grain size distribution (table S1) results in coarser sediments on places with increased hydrodynamic exposure, more inundation alters the redox potential of the soil, and sheltered conditions might increase sediment accretion and potential burial of young shoots. Although sediment dynamics in this experiment were mostly limited outside the period of the growing season, we acknowledge that sediment dynamics and sediment characteristics can alter the growth of the root network which is important for the long term survival of the marsh plants (Bradley & Morris 1990, Chen et al. 2012, Jafari et al. 2019). Moreover, both direct and indirect effects of synergetic stressors should be considered (Veldhuis et al. 2019), e.g. the presence of grazers will reduce aboveground biomass and wave attenuation capacity, however it was shown that it promotes belowground biomass production which could increase the stability of the sediment bed (Pagès et al. 2019). Although changes in belowground biomass were not measured in this experiment, including belowground biomass dynamics should be considered in future research.

## 2 Phenotypic plasticity in response to tidal inundation and hydrodynamic forces

Apart from plant trait differences between species, a similar trend of intraspecific varying plant traits was also found in response to the different inundation and hydrodynamic exposure treatments. Within the species that was able to survive and grow under all tested conditions (i.e. *S. tabernaemontani*), the transplants developed smaller, thinner and more flexible shoots in response to higher exposure to waves and currents and increasing tidal inundation, which was similar to the response in interspecific variation in plant traits. Interestingly, when comparing morphological traits in the transplantation experiment with the natural population, *S. tabernaemontani* grew thicker and taller shoots on the sites with shallow and intermediate inundation (Fig. 4, 5), which resulted in a stronger stem geometry (i.e., high moment of area, see table S2) and stiffer shoots. This suggests that in these treatments stress from hydrodynamic exposure and tidal inundation were relatively low for *S. tabernaemontani*. Since all transplant units were evenly spaced from each other to limit potential competition between them, this enhanced growth capacity compared to the natural population might result from better resource availability and less competition between shoots in the transplants (Shen et al. 2020). Phenotypic plasticity as a growth response to waves or currents has been previously reported for *B. maritimus*, as it grows shorter and more flexible shoots with thicker stem diameters in response to increasing exposure to waves and currents (Carus et al. 2016, Silinski et al. 2018). Interestingly, this response can vary depending on the species and habitat-specific conditions, e.g. for *Juncus roemerianus* and *Spartina alterniflora* thinner stem diameters in response to wave exposure were reported (Temple et al. 2021).

Variation of plant traits in response to environmental stress creates variation in the functional role of the plants and their bio-physical interactions within the environment (Heuner et al. 2015, Renzi et al. 2019, Battisti 2021). The intra- and interspecific variation of plant traits generate different ecosystem engineering capacities, e.g. plant traits that generate more friction with the water, have a stronger wave attenuation effect which will promote sedimentation and limit erosion risk (Silinski et al. 2018, chapter 3: Schoutens et al. 2020). In this context, plant traits are linked to species habitat, i.e. seagrasses benefit from being flexible, limiting their capacity to accrete sediments, but maintaining the submerged conditions (Bouma et al. 2005). Variability in plant traits will therefore generate spatial variability in bio-physical interactions which is important for the geomorphology of the marsh, e.g. sedimentation-erosion processes (Bouma et al. 2009, Corenblit et al. 2015). The balance between the strength of the bio-physical interactions, generated through the plant traits, and the environmental stressors will therefore create large-scale geomorphological patterns such as cliffs and channels (Van de Koppel et al. 2005, Brückner et al. 2019).

Interestingly, the adaptive nature of tidal marsh plants and their plant trait-based variation in functionality can improve the resilience of the ecosystem to a range of environmental settings (Battisti 2021).

### 5.3 Consequences for spatial species distribution in pioneer tidal marshes

Spatial species distribution within tidal marshes is traditionally thought as being predominantly the result of the balance between competition and species tolerance to environmental stress factors, typically tidal inundation and salinity (Pennings & Callaway 1992, Wang et al. 2010, Janousek & Mayo 2013, Rasser et al. 2013). This study indicates that species-specific tolerance to waves and currents can play an additional role in the spatial distribution of pioneer tidal marsh plants. The high capacity of *S. tabernaemontani* to grow under hydrodynamic forces allows this species to colonize areas where other species might not be able to grow. The establishment of *S. tabernaemontani* leads to attenuation of waves and currents within and behind patches of *S. tabernaemontani* (chapter 3: Schoutens et al. 2020) and as such is expected to create more sheltered conditions that may facilitate the establishment of other species, less tolerant to waves and currents, such as *B. maritimus*. Subsequently the presence of those two species zones can create even more wave and current attenuation and hence create the environmental conditions that allow the establishment of species such as *P. australis*. Wave-induced species distribution in pioneer tidal marshes has been suggested in other studies (Heuner et al. 2018, chapter 3: Schoutens et al. 2020, Zhu et al. 2020b). Although the growth response to waves and currents was less clear for *B. maritimus* and *P. australis*, tidal inundation is likely to be the dominant stressor which diminishes the potential effects of wave exposure on survival or growth. To make the growth response to hydrodynamic exposure more apparent, future research should consider increasing the elevation range towards higher sites, reducing the tidal inundation stress, and/or increasing the differences between the hydrodynamic exposure treatments.

### 5.4 Species-specific survival chances determine the shoreline protection capacity of tidal marshes

Nature-based shoreline protection capacity of tidal marshes depends on (1) the wave and current attenuation capacity of marsh plants and (2) their ability to cope with the exposure to waves and currents. Our results emphasize there is an apparent trade-off between these two aspects, i.e. that species growing at the wave exposed marsh edge have plant traits (smaller, more flexible shoots) that reduce the drag forces on their shoots, but the same plant traits reduce their wave attenuation capacity, which has been hypothesized before (chapter 3: Schoutens et al. 2020). Studies on wave and current attenuation use plant traits of natural populations or plants that were grown under ideal conditions (Suzuki et al. 2012, Möller et al. 2014, Vuik et al. 2016, Garzon et al. 2019, Willemsen et al. 2020). The effectiveness of attenuating hydrodynamics is then

described based on the plant traits of idealized species. However, when considering tidal marsh restoration and (re-)establishment, the new environmental conditions (e.g. in case of strong hydrodynamic exposure and high tidal inundation stress) might alter the growth and plant traits of some species, which also changes the expected wave- and current attenuation capacity of the newly formed marsh. Nevertheless, we argue here that the traits that allow plants to grow in more exposed sites create more sheltered conditions in the landward direction and facilitate there the growth of species that otherwise would not have been able to cope with the stronger hydrodynamic forces. Such facilitation implies that tidal marshes might be able to survive more exposed conditions than previously thought. Nevertheless, growth facilitation between different marsh species zones will only work when there is enough space for the marsh to develop different vegetation zones. At many shorelines all over the world, land use change has reduced the spatial extent of tidal marshes drastically (Duarte 2009, Davidson 2014, Crosby et al. 2016, Spencer et al. 2016). Moreover, sea level rise and increased hydrodynamics (e.g. shipping) will enhance the so called coastal squeeze, increasing hydrodynamic exposure of tidal marshes (Torio & Chmura 2013, Borchert et al. 2018, Valiela et al. 2018). This trend will make the existing space for interspecific growth facilitation and tidal marsh development even smaller. However, we argue that providing enough space for tidal marsh development and species facilitation is important to ensure shoreline protection throughout changes in the hydrodynamic conditions which as a result may improve marsh resilience to environmental change (Renzi et al. 2019).

Our findings have practical implications for restoration and conservation of natural shorelines, a measure that is often applied to improve the ecosystem service functions of tidal marshes, such as biodiversity conservation, water quality improvement, carbon sequestration and coastal defense (Barbier et al. 2011). Firstly we argue that, when space allows, interspecific facilitation of plant growth and survival results in a species distribution which increases the effectiveness of the hydrodynamic attenuation function of the marsh. Secondly, the presented results can help to identify sites that are suitable for tidal marsh restoration in terms of suitable site exposure to waves and currents and tidal inundation. This type of data is also highly useful for improving models that predict species occurrence and that can be used in restoration projects (Gourgue et al. 2021). More specifically, species-specific growth rates under a range of hydrodynamic conditions could be used to calibrate and validate such models (Van de Koppel et al. 2005, Mariotti & Fagherazzi 2010, Hu et al. 2015, Carus et al. 2017). Rather than e.g. planting seedlings, creating enough space for a suitable environment where species with the right plant traits can grow, might be even more important for long term survival of tidal marshes and therefore their shoreline protection capacity.

## **6 Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank the nature conservation authority of the Steinburg district (Germany) for approving the experiment and giving permission for plant removal in the neighboring marsh. We would like to thank Wasserstraßen-und Schifffahrtsamt Hamburg (Glückstadt, Germany) very much for building the wave barrier and logistical support in the field; Hannes Sahl and Thomas Jansen for measuring the elevations with dGPS; Flanders Hydrology for providing the Matlab routine to process the wave data and all field assistants for occasional help. This research was financed by the research project TIBASS (Tidal Bank Science and Services) of the Bundesanstalt für Gewässerkunde (Bfg), Koblenz, Germany and the Research Foundation Flanders, Belgium (FWO, PhD fellowship for fundamental research K. Schoutens, 1116319N).

## 7 References

- Albert DA, Cox DT, Lemein T, Yoon HD (2013) Characterization of *schoenoplectus pungens* in a great lakes Coastal Wetland and a Pacific Northwestern Estuary. *Wetlands* 33:445–458.
- Amsberry L, Baker M a., Ewanchuk PJ, Bertness MD (2000) Clonal integration and the expansion of *Phragmites australis*. *Ecol Appl* 10:1110–1118.
- Anten NPR, Casado-Garcia R, Nagashima H (2005) Effects of Mechanical Stress and Plant Density on Mechanical Characteristics, Growth, and Lifetime Reproduction of Tobacco Plants. *Am Nat* 166:650.
- Anten NPR, Sterck FJ (2012) Terrestrial vs aquatic plants: How general is the drag tolerance-avoidance trade-off? *New Phytol* 193:6–8.
- Armstrong J, Jones RE, Armstrong W (2006) Rhizome phyllosphere oxygenation in *Phragmites* and other species in relation to redox potential, convective gas flow, submergence and aeration pathways. *New Phytol* 172:719–731.
- Asaeda T, Manatunge J, Fujino T, Sovira D (2003) Effects of salinity and cutting on the development of *Phragmites australis*. *Wetl Ecol Manag* 11:127–140.
- Auerbach LW, Goodbred SL, Mondal DR, Wilson CA, Ahmed KR, Roy K, Steckler MS, Small C, Gilligan JM, Ackerly BA (2015) Flood risk of natural and embanked landscapes on the Ganges-Brahmaputra tidal delta plain. *Nat Clim Chang* 5:153–157.
- Bang JH, Bae MJ, Lee EJ (2018) Plant distribution along an elevational gradient in a macrotidal salt marsh on the west coast of Korea. *Aquat Bot* 147:52–60.
- Barbier EB, Hacker SD, Kennedy C, Koch EW, Stier AC, Silliman BR (2011) The value of estuarine and coastal ecosystem services. *Ecol Monogr* 81:169–193.
- Battisti D De (2021) The resilience of coastal ecosystems: A functional trait-based perspective. *J Ecol*:1–14.
- Belliard JP, Silinski A, Meire D, Kolokythas G, Levy Y, Van Braeckel A, Bouma TJ, Temmerman S (2019) High-resolution bed level changes in relation to tidal and wave forcing on a narrow fringing macrotidal flat: Bridging intra-tidal, daily and seasonal sediment dynamics. *Mar Geol* 412:123–138.
- Bertness MD (1991) Zonation of *Spartina patens* and *Spartina alterniflora* in a New England Salt Marsh. *Ecology* 72:138–148.
- Borchert SM, Osland MJ, Enwright NM, Griffith KT (2018) Coastal wetland adaptation to sea level rise: Quantifying potential for landward migration and coastal squeeze. *J Appl Ecol* 55:2876–2887.
- Bouma TJ, Friedrichs M, van Wesenbeeck BK, Temmerman S, Graf G, Herman PMJ (2009) Density-dependent linkage of scale-dependent feedbacks: a flume study on the intertidal

- macrophyte *Spartina anglica*. *Oikos* 118:260–268.
- Bouma TJ, De Vries MB, Herman PMJ (2010) Comparing ecosystem engineering efficiency of two plant species with contrasting growth strategies. *Ecol Soc Am* 91:2696–2704.
- Bouma TJ, De Vries MB, Low E, Peralta G, Tánzos IC, van de Koppel J, Herman PMJ (2005) Trade-offs related to ecosystem engineering: a case study on stiffness of emerging macrophytes. *Ecology* 86:2187–2199.
- Bradley P, Morris J (1990) Physical characteristics of salt marsh sediments: ecological implications. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 61:245–252.
- Brückner MZM, Schwarz C, van Dijk WM, van Oorschot M, Douma H, Kleinhans MG (2019) Salt Marsh Establishment and Eco-Engineering Effects in Dynamic Estuaries Determined by Species Growth and Mortality. *J Geophys Res Earth Surf* 124:2962–2986.
- Bruno JF (2000) Facilitation of cobble beach plant communities through habitat modification by *Spartina alterniflora*. *Ecology* 81:1179–1192.
- Cao H, Zhu Z, James R, Herman PMJJ, Liqian Z, Yuan L, Bouma TJ, Zhang L, Yuan L, Bouma TJ (2020) Wave effects on seedling establishment of three pioneer marsh species: survival, morphology and biomechanics. *Ann Bot* 125:345–352.
- Carus J, Heuner M, Paul M, Schröder B (2017) Which factors and processes drive the spatio-temporal dynamics of brackish marshes?—Insights from development and parameterisation of a mechanistic vegetation model. *Ecol Modell* 363:122–136.
- Carus J, Paul M, Schröder B (2016) Vegetation as self-adaptive coastal protection: Reduction of current velocity and morphologic plasticity of a brackish marsh pioneer. *Ecol Evol* 6:1579–1589.
- Castillo JM, Fernandez-Baco L, Castellanos EM, Luque CJ, Figueroa ME, Davy AJ (2000) Lower limits of *Spartina densiflora* and *S. maritima* in a Mediterranean salt marsh determined by different ecophysiological tolerances. *J Ecol* 88:801–812.
- Chen Y, Thompson CEL, Collins MB (2012) Saltmarsh creek bank stability: Biostabilisation and consolidation with depth. *Cont Shelf Res* 35:64–74.
- Colmer TD, Flowers TJ (2008) Flooding tolerance in halophytes. *New Phytol* 179:964–74.
- Coops H, van den Brink FWB, Van der Velde G (1996a) Growth and morphological responses of four helophyte species in an experimental water-depth gradient. *Aquat Bot* 54:11–24.
- Coops H, Van der Velde G, Velde G Van Der (1996b) Effects of waves on helophyte stands: mechanical characteristics of stems of *Phragmites australis* and *Scirpus lacustris*. *Aquat Bot* 53:175–185.

- Corenblit D, Baas A, Balke T, Bouma T, Fromard F, Garófano-Gómez V, González E, Gurnell AM, Hortobágyi B, Julien F, Kim D, Lambs L, Stallins JA, Steiger J, Tabacchi E, Walcker R (2015) Engineer pioneer plants respond to and affect geomorphic constraints similarly along water-terrestrial interfaces world-wide. *Glob Ecol Biogeogr*:n/a-n/a.
- Crosby SC, Sax DF, Palmer ME, Booth HS, Deegan LA, Bertness MD, Leslie HM (2016) Salt marsh persistence is threatened by predicted sea-level rise. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci* 181:93–99.
- Davidson NC (2014) How much wetland has the world lost? Long-term and recent trends in global wetland area. *Mar Freshw Res* 65:934–941.
- Demes KW, Pruitt JN, Harley CDG, Carrington E (2013) Survival of the weakest: increased frond mechanical strength in a wave-swept kelp inhibits self-pruning and increases whole-plant mortality. *Funct Ecol* 27:439–445.
- Duarte CM (2009) Introduction: Global Loss of Coastal Habitats Rates, Causes and Consequences. In: *Global Loss of Coastal Habitats Rates, Causes and Consequences*. p 14–24
- Engels JG, Rink F, Jensen K (2011) Stress tolerance and biotic interactions determine plant zonation patterns in estuarine marshes during seedling emergence and early establishment. *J Ecol* 99:277–287.
- Engloner AI (2009) Structure, growth dynamics and biomass of reed (*Phragmites australis*) - A review. *Flora Morphol Distrib Funct Ecol Plants* 204:331–346.
- Farina JM, Silliman BR, Bertness MD (2009) Can conservation biologists rely on established community structure rules to manage novel systems? ... Not in salt marshes. *Ecol Appl* 19:413–422.
- Garssen AG, Baattrup-Pedersen A, Voesenek LACJ, Verhoeven JTA, Soons MB (2015) Riparian plant community responses to increased flooding a meta-analysis. *Glob Chang Biol* 21:2881–2890.
- Garzon JL, Maza M, Ferreira CM, Lara JL, Losada IJ (2019) Wave Attenuation by *Spartina* Saltmarshes in the Chesapeake Bay Under Storm Surge Conditions. *J Geophys Res Ocean* 124:5220–5243.
- Gaylord BP, Denny MW, Koehl MAR (2003) Modulation of wave forces on kelp canopies by alongshore currents. *Limnol Oceanogr* 48:860–871.
- Gourgue O, van Belzen J, Schwarz C, Bouma TJ, van de Koppel J, Temmerman S (2021) A Convolution Method to Assess Subgrid-Scale Interactions Between Flow and Patchy Vegetation in Biogeomorphic Models. *J Adv Model Earth Syst* 13:1–25.
- Hallegatte S, Green C, Nicholls RJ, Corfee-Morlot J (2013) Future flood losses in major coastal cities. *Nat Clim Chang* 3:802–806.

- Hellings SE, Gallagher JL, Hellings SE, Gallagher JL (1992) The effects of salinity and flooding on *Phragmites australis*. *J Appl Ecol* 29:41–49.
- Heuner M, Schröder B, Schröder U, Kleinschmit B (2018) Contrasting elevational responses of regularly flooded marsh plants in navigable estuaries. *Ecohydrol Hydrobiol* 19:38–53.
- Heuner M, Silinski A, Schoelynck J, Bouma TJ, Puijalon S, Troch P, Fuchs E, Schröder B, Schröder U, Meire P, Temmerman S (2015) Ecosystem Engineering by Plants on Wave-Exposed Intertidal Flats Is Governed by Relationships between Effect and Response Traits. *PLoS One* 10:e0138086.
- Hu Z, van Belzen J, van der Wal D, Balke T, Wang ZB, Stive M, Bouma TJ (2015) Windows of opportunity for salt marsh vegetation establishment on bare tidal flats: The importance of temporal and spatial variability in hydrodynamic forcing. *J Geophys Res Biogeosciences* 120.
- Jafari NH, Harris BD, Cadigan JA, Day JW, Sasser CE, Kemp GP, Wigand C, Freeman A, Sharp LA, Pahl J, Shaffer GP, Holm GO, Lane RR (2019) Wetland shear strength with emphasis on the impact of nutrients, sediments, and sea level rise. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci* 229.
- Janousek CN, Mayo C (2013) Plant responses to increased inundation and salt exposure: interactive effects on tidal marsh productivity. *Plant Ecol* 214:917–928.
- Van de Koppel J, Van der Wal D, Bakker JP, Herman PMJ (2005) Self-Organization and Vegetation Collapse in Salt Marsh Ecosystems. *Am Nat* 165:1–12.
- Lemoine DG, Mermillod-blondin F, Barrat-Segretain M-H, Masse C, Malet E (2012) The ability of aquatic macrophytes to increase root porosity and radial oxygen loss determines their resistance to sediment anoxia. *Aquat Ecol* 46:191–200.
- Li X, Ren L, Liu Y, Craft C, Mander Ü, Yang S (2013) The impact of the change in vegetation structure on the ecological functions of salt marshes: the example of the Yangtze estuary. *Reg Environ Chang* 14:623–632.
- Lo VB, Bouma TJ, van Belzen J, Van Colen C, Airoldi L (2017) Interactive effects of vegetation and sediment properties on erosion of salt marshes in the Northern Adriatic Sea. *Mar Environ Res* 131:32–42.
- van Loon-Steensma JM, Hu Z, Slim AP (2016) Modelled Impact of Vegetation Heterogeneity and Salt-Marsh Zonation on Wave Damping. *J Coast Res* 32:241–252.
- van Loon-Steensma JM, Schelfhout HA (2017) Wide Green Dikes: A sustainable adaptation option with benefits for both nature and landscape values? *Land use policy* 63:528–538.
- Maricle BR, Lee RW (2002) Aerenchyma development and oxygen transport in the

- estuarine cordgrasses *Spartina alterniflora* and *S. anglica*. *Aquat Bot* 74:109–120.
- Marijnissen R, Esselink P, Kok M, Kroeze C, van Loon-Steensma JM (2020) How natural processes contribute to flood protection - A sustainable adaptation scheme for a wide green dike. *Sci Total Environ* 739:139698.
- Mariotti G, Fagherazzi S (2010) A numerical model for the coupled long-term evolution of salt marshes and tidal flats. *J Geophys Res* 115:F01004.
- Möller I, Kudella M, Rupprecht F, Spencer T, Paul M, van Wesenbeeck BK, Wolters G, Jensen K, Bouma TJ, Miranda-Lange M, Schimmels S (2014) Wave attenuation over coastal salt marshes under storm surge conditions. *Nat Geosci* 7:727–731.
- Nafie YA La, Santos CBDL, Brun FG, Katwijk MM Van (2012) Waves and high nutrient loads jointly decrease survival and separately affect morphological and biomechanical properties in the seagrass *Zostera noltii*. *Estuaries* 57:1664–1672.
- van der Nat A, Vellinga P, Leemans R, van Slobbe E (2016) Ranking coastal flood protection designs from engineered to nature-based. *Ecol Eng* 87:80–90.
- Nolte S, Koppelaar EC, Esselink P, Dijkema KS, Schuerch M, De Groot A V., Bakker JP, Temmerman S (2013) Measuring sedimentation in tidal marshes: A review on methods and their applicability in biogeomorphological studies. *J Coast Conserv* 17:301–325.
- Ott JP, Klimešová J, Hartnett DC (2019) The ecology and significance of below-ground bud banks in plants. *Ann Bot* 123:1099–1118.
- Pagès JF, Jenkins SR, Bouma TJ, Sharps E, Skov MW (2019) Opposing Indirect Effects of Domestic Herbivores on Saltmarsh Erosion. *Ecosystems* 22:1055–1068.
- Paul M, Amos CL (2011) Spatial and seasonal variation in wave attenuation over *Zostera noltii*. *J Geophys Res Ocean* 116:1–16.
- Paul M, Rupprecht F, Möller I, Bouma TJ, Spencer T, Kudella M, Wolters G, van Wesenbeeck BK, Jensen K, Miranda-Lange M, Schimmels S (2016) Plant stiffness and biomass as drivers for drag forces under extreme wave loading: A flume study on mimics. *Coast Eng* 117:70–78.
- Pennings SC, Callaway RM (1992) Salt marsh plant zonation: the relative importance of competition and physical factors. *Ecol Soc Am* 73:681–690.
- Pennings SC, Grant M, Bertness MD (2005) Plant zonation in low-latitude salt marshes: disentangling the roles of flooding, salinity and competition. *J Coast Res* 93:159–167.
- Peralta G, Brun FG, Pérez-Lloréns JL, Bouma TJ (2006) Direct effects of current velocity on the growth, morphometry and architecture of seagrasses: A

- case study on *Zostera noltii*. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 327:135–142.
- Popoff N, Jaunatre R, Le Bouteiller C, Paillet Y, Favier G, Buisson M, Meyer C, Dedonder E, Evette A (2021) Optimization of restoration techniques: In-situ transplantation experiment of an endangered clonal plant species (*Typha minima* Hoppe). *Ecol Eng* 160.
- Puijalon S, Bouma TJ, Douady CJ, van Groenendael J, Anten NPR, Martel E, Bornette G (2011) Plant resistance to mechanical stress: evidence of an avoidance-tolerance trade-off. *New Phytol* 191:1141–9.
- Puijalon S, Bouma TJ, Van Groenendael J, Bornette G (2008) Clonal plasticity of aquatic plant species submitted to mechanical stress: Escape versus resistance strategy. *Ann Bot* 102:989–996.
- R Core Team (2020) R: A language and environment for statistical computing.
- Rasser MK, Fowler NL, Dunton KH (2013) Elevation and plant community distribution in a microtidal salt marsh of the western Gulf of Mexico. *Wetlands* 33:575–583.
- Renzi JJ, He Q, Silliman BR (2019) Harnessing positive species interactions to enhance coastal wetland restoration. *Front Ecol Evol* 7:1–14.
- Rolletschek H, Rolletschek A, Hartzendorf T, Kohl J (2000) Physiological consequences of mowing and burning of *Phragmites australis* stands for rhizome ventilation and amino acid metabolism. *Wetl Ecol Manag* 8:425–433.
- Rupprecht F, Möller I, Paul M, Kudella M, Spencer T, van Wesenbeeck BK, Wolters G, Jensen K, Bouma TJ, Miranda-Lange M, Schimmels S (2017) Vegetation-wave interactions in salt marshes under storm surge conditions. *Ecol Eng* 100:301–315.
- Schoelynck J, Puijalon S, Meire P, Struyf E (2015) Thigmomorphogenetic responses of an aquatic macrophyte to hydrodynamic stress. *Front Plant Sci* 6:1–7.
- Schoonees T, Gijón Mancheño A, Scheres B, Bouma TJ, Silva R, Schlurmann T, Schüttrumpf H (2019) Hard Structures for Coastal Protection, Towards Greener Designs. *Estuaries and Coasts* 42:1709–1729.
- Schoutens K, Heuner M, Fuchs E, Minden V, Schulte Ostermann T, Belliard JP, Bouma TJ, Temmerman S (2020) Nature-based shoreline protection by tidal marsh plants depends on trade-offs between avoidance and attenuation of hydrodynamic forces. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci* 236:11.
- Schoutens K, Heuner M, Minden V, Schulte Ostermann T, Silinski A, Belliard J-P, Temmerman S (2019) How effective are tidal marshes as nature-based shoreline protection throughout seasons? *Limnol Oceanogr* 64:1750–1762.
- Schoutens K, Reents S, Nolte S, Evans B, Paul M, Kudella M, Bouma T, Möller I, Temmerman S (2021) Survival of the thickest?

- Impacts of extreme wave-forcing on marsh seedlings are mediated by species morphology. *Limnol Oceanogr*:1–16.
- Schulte Ostermann T, Heuner M, Fuchs E, Temmerman S, Schoutens K, Bouma TJ, Minden V (2021a) Unraveling plant strategies in tidal marshes by investigating plant traits and environmental conditions. *J Veg Sci*:1–17.
- Schulte Ostermann T, Kleyer M, Heuner M, Fuchs E, Temmerman S, Schoutens K, Bouma TJ, Minden V (2021b) Hydrodynamics affect plant traits in estuarine ecotones with impact on carbon sequestration potentials. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci* 259:107464.
- Schulze D, Rupprecht F, Nolte S, Jensen K (2019) Seasonal and spatial within - marsh differences of biophysical plant properties: implications for wave attenuation capacity of salt marshes. *Aquat Sci* 81:1–11.
- Schwarz C, Gourgue O, van Belzen J, Zhu Z, Bouma TJ, van de Koppel J, Ruessink G, Claude N, Temmerman S (2018) Self-organization of a biogeomorphic landscape controlled by plant life-history traits. *Nat Geosci* 11.
- Shah DU, Reynolds TPS, Ramage MH (2017) The strength of plants: Theory and experimental methods to measure the mechanical properties of stems. *J Exp Bot* 68:4497–4516.
- Shen N, Liu C, Yu H, Qu J (2020) Effects of resource heterogeneity and environmental disturbance on the growth performance and interspecific competition of wetland clonal plants. *Glob Ecol Conserv* 22:e00914.
- Shepard CC, Crain CM, Beck MW (2011) The protective role of coastal marshes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 6.
- Silinski A, Fransen E, van Belzen J, Bouma TJ, Troch P, Meire P, Temmerman S, Fransen E, Bouma TJ, Troch P, Meire P, Temmerman S (2016a) Quantifying critical conditions for seaward expansion of tidal marshes: A transplantation experiment. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci* 169:227–237.
- Silinski A, Fransen E, Bouma TJ, Meire P, Temmerman S (2016b) Unravelling the controls of lateral expansion and elevation change of pioneer tidal marshes. *Geomorphology* 274:106–115.
- Silinski A, Schoutens K, Puijalon S, Schoelynck J, Luyckx D, Troch P, Meire P, Temmerman S (2018) Coping with waves: Plasticity in tidal marsh plants as self-adapting coastal ecosystem engineers. *Limnol Oceanogr* 63:799–815.
- Silvestri S, Defina A, Marani M (2005) Tidal regime, salinity and salt marsh plant zonation. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci* 62:119–130.
- Smith CS, Rudd ME, Gittman RK, Melvin EC, Patterson VS, Renzi JJ, Wellman EH, Silliman BR (2020) Coming to terms with living shorelines: A scoping review of novel restoration strategies for shoreline protection. *Front Mar Sci* 7:1–14.
- Smolders S, Plancke Y, Ides S, Meire P, Temmerman S (2015) Role of

- intertidal wetlands for tidal and storm tide attenuation along a confined estuary: A model study. *Nat Hazards Earth Syst Sci* 15:1659–1675.
- Spencer T, Schuerch M, Nicholls RJ, Hinkel J, Lincke D, Vafeidis AT, Reef R, McFadden L, Brown S (2016) Global coastal wetland change under sea-level rise and related stresses: The DIVA Wetland Change Model. *Glob Planet Change* 139:15–30.
- Stark J, Plancke Y, Ides S, Meire P, Temmerman S (2016) Coastal flood protection by a combined nature-based and engineering approach: Modeling the effects of marsh geometry and surrounding dikes. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci* 175:34–45.
- Suzuki T, Zijlema M, Burger B, Meijer MC, Narayan S (2012) Wave dissipation by vegetation with layer schematization in SWAN. *Coast Eng* 59:64–71.
- Taylor BW, Paterson DM, Baxter JM (2019) Sediment dynamics of natural and restored *Bolboschoenus maritimus* saltmarsh. *Front Ecol Evol* 7:1–10.
- Temmerman S, Meire P, Bouma TJ, Herman PMJ, Ysebaert T, De Vriend HJ (2013) Ecosystem-based coastal defence in the face of global change. *Nature* 504:79–83.
- Temple NA, Sparks EL, Webb BM, Cebrian J, Virden MF, Lucre AE, Moss HB (2021) Responses of two fringing salt marsh plant species along a wave climate gradient. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 675:53–66.
- Tessler ZD, Vörösmarty CJ, Grossberg M, Gladkova I, Aizenman H, Syvitski JPM, Foufoula-Georgiou E (2015) Profiling risk and sustainability in coastal deltas of the world. *Science* (80- ) 349:638–643.
- Thomsen D, Marsden ID, Sparrow AD (2005) A field experiment to assess the transplant success of salt marsh plants into tidal wetlands. *Wetl Ecol Manag* 13:489–497.
- Torio DD, Chmura GL (2013) Assessing coastal squeeze of tidal wetlands. *J Coast Res* 29:1049–1061.
- Valiela I, Lloret J, Bowyer T, Miner S, Remsen D, Elmstrom E, Cogswell C, Robert Thieler E (2018) Transient coastal landscapes: Rising sea level threatens salt marshes. *Sci Total Environ* 640–641:1148–1156.
- Veldhuis ER, Schrama M, Staal M, Elzenga JTM (2019) Plant stress-tolerance traits predict salt marsh vegetation patterning. *Front Mar Sci* 5:1–11.
- Vuik V, Jonkman SN, Borsje BW, Suzuki T (2016) Nature-based flood protection: The efficiency of vegetated foreshores for reducing wave loads on coastal dikes. *Coast Eng* 116:42–56.
- Wang CH, Lu M, Yang B, Yang Q, Zhang XD, Hara T, Li B (2010) Effects of environmental gradients on the performances of four dominant plants in a Chinese saltmarsh: Implications for plant zonation. *Ecol Res* 25:347–358.

- van Wijnen HJ, Bakker JP (2001) Long-term Surface Elevation Change in Salt Marshes: a Prediction of Marsh Response to Future Sea-Level Rise. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci* 52:381–390.
- Willemsen PWJM, Borsje BW, Vuik V, Bouma TJ, Suzanne JM, Hulscher H (2020) Field-based decadal wave attenuating capacity of combined tidal flats and salt marshes. *Coast Eng* 156.
- Xue L, Li X, Shi B, Yang B, Lin S, Yuan Y, Ma Y, Peng Z (2021) Pattern-regulated wave attenuation by salt marshes in the Yangtze Estuary, China. *Ocean Coast Manag* 209:105686.
- Zhang X, Nepf H (2021) Wave-induced reconfiguration of and drag on marsh plants. *J Fluids Struct* 100:103192.
- Zhu Z, Vuik V, Visser PJ, Soens T, van Wesenbeeck B, van de Koppel J, Jonkman SN, Temmerman S, Bouma TJ (2020a) Historic storms and the hidden value of coastal wetlands for nature-based flood defence. *Nat Sustain*.
- Zhu Z, Yang Z, Bouma TJ (2020b) Biomechanical properties of marsh vegetation in space and time: effects of salinity, inundation and seasonality. *Ann Bot*.

