THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Recruitment enhancement varies by taxonomic group and oyster reef habitat characteristics

Citation for published version:

Davenport, TM, Hughes, AR & Zu Ermgassen, P 2021, 'Recruitment enhancement varies by taxonomic group and oyster reef habitat characteristics', *Ecological Applications*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2340>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1002/eap.2340](https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2340)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Ecological Applications

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 Recruitment enhancement varies by taxonomic group and oyster reef habitat characteristics

2
3 Theresa M. Davenport^{1*}, A. Randall Hughes¹, Philine S. E. zu Ermgassen², Jonathan H.
4 Grabowski¹
5

6 ¹Marine Science Center, Northeastern University, Nahant, MA 01908

7 ²Changing Oceans Group, School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH9
8 3FD, UK

9 *davenport.th@husky.neu.edu
10

11 Correspondence:

12 Theresa M. Davenport

13 Northeastern University Marine Science Center

14 430 Nahant Rd., Nahant, MA 01908

15 davenport.th@northeastern.edu

16 267-261-8825
17

Abstract

The rapid loss of coastal and estuarine biogenic habitats has reduced the delivery of valuable ecosystem services, resulting in calls for increased habitat restoration. Yet, a lack of information on how key habitat characteristics (e.g., area, vertical relief, age) influence the ability of restored habitats to deliver these ecosystem services hinders efforts to maximize the return on restoration investments. We conducted a meta-analysis to assess the influence of reef type (natural or restored), taxa, and restored reef size, vertical relief, age, and tidal zone on the presence and magnitude of recruitment enhancement for nekton (i.e. fish and swimming crabs). Both intertidal and subtidal reefs, as well as restored and natural reefs, enhanced nekton recruitment, though there was variation among taxonomic groups with reef types. Recruitment enhancement was more common across taxa on restored (six families) than on natural (one family) reefs. Resident nekton families were more consistently enhanced than transient families. Nekton enhancement varied with a number of restored reef characteristics. Recruitment enhancement increased with greater reef size across taxa, decreased with higher vertical relief for two families, and showed maximum recruitment around a single intertidal reef age for one family, and minimum recruitment around a single subtidal reef age for three families. Understanding variation across species in response to key design elements will improve restoration success and enhance return on investment. Moving forward, we recommend studies that vary reef habitat characteristics independently and in combination to identify how variation in these characteristics interact to influence nekton recruitment enhancement by oyster reefs.

Keywords: *habitat restoration, meta-analysis, nekton, oyster reef, recruitment enhancement, reef size, reef age, design, vertical relief*

41

42

Introduction

Coastal ecosystems consist of landscapes of biogenic habitats (e.g., oyster reefs, corals, salt marshes, mangroves, and seagrasses) that provide a range of ecosystem functions. They serve as nursery and foraging grounds for fish and invertebrates (Coen et al. 1999; Beck et al. 2001; Soniat et al. 2004), regulate energy flow and nutrient fluxes (Dame et al. 1984; Piehler and Smyth 2011; Kellogg et al. 2013), stabilize shorelines and slow erosion (Meyer et al. 1997; Piazza et al. 2005), reduce storm surge water levels (Krauss et al. 2009), and enhance biological diversity (Wells 1961; Bahr and Lanier 1981; functions are reviewed in Powers and Boyer 2014). These ecosystem functions result in a host of associated services, such as enhancing economically valuable fisheries (Peterson et al. 2003, zu Ermgassen et al. 2016), protecting shorelines and infrastructure (Meyer et al. 1997; Krauss et al. 2009; Scyphers et al. 2011), enhancing water quality by removing excess nitrogen (Piehler and Smyth 2011), and providing cultural benefits such as enhancing recreational opportunities (Carlton et al. 2016; services are reviewed in Barbier et al. 2011; Martin et al. 2016). However, degradation and loss of biogenic habitats are intensifying as human populations continue to grow and exert more pressure on coastal systems, leading to reduced aerial extent and complexity of these biogenic habitats and threatening the critical ecosystem functions they provide (Alongi 2002; Waycott et al. 2009; zu Ermgassen et al. 2012, 2013). To combat these impacts and restore ecosystem functions, habitat restoration is increasingly employed as a tool (Peterson and Lipcius 2003). Although there are many examples of successful habitat restoration efforts (e.g., oysters in protected areas, Powers et al. 2009; seagrasses in Chesapeake Bay, Lefcheck et al. 2018), overall success rates for many projects, including those in coastal habitats, are moderate (Bayraktarov et al. 2016), and ecosystem functions may remain reduced in restored versus intact habitats (Rey Benayas et al.

2009). Understanding how particular ecosystem functions vary across a range of restored habitat characteristics (e.g., areal extent, age) can inform future habitat restoration efforts by helping decision-makers better predict how restoration design elements may influence service delivery.

Re-establishing biodiversity is a common goal of habitat restoration (Peterson and Lipcius 2003; Rey Benayas et al. 2009), yet distribution patterns of fauna among patchy habitats are difficult to predict because they are shaped by processes occurring at various scales of space, time, and ecological organization that often differ from the scales at which patterns are observed (Levin 1992). Understanding how restoration design influences faunal abundances across multiple taxa will enhance the ability of restoration practitioners to increase the return on investments made by future conservation and restoration efforts. Oyster reefs are broadly distributed and augment populations of many faunal species (Zimmerman et al. 1989; Coen et al. 1999; Rodney and Paynter 2006). Although many studies have documented augmented faunal abundances by oyster reefs, the degree of enhancement varies considerably among studies, species, and ocean basins (e.g., Robillard et al. 2010; Kingsley-Smith et al. 2012; Nevins et al. 2014; synthesized in zu Ermgassen et al. 2016). This variation in recruitment enhancement could stem from several differences among studies due to varying habitat characteristics, including reef areal extent, vertical relief, tidal zone (e.g., subtidal vs. intertidal) tidal elevation, salinity, or landscape setting (Lenihan 1999; Lenihan et al. 2001; Lehnert and Allen 2002; Grabowski et al. 2005), but the potential role of these factors has yet to be thoroughly examined.

We synthesized information from Eastern Oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) restoration studies across the U.S. to assess the potential influence of habitat characteristics incorporated into reef restoration designs on the abundance of reef-associated nekton (specifically fish and swimming crabs in association with oyster reefs). Augmentation of nekton can occur through

recruitment enhancement of early life stages (which includes improved settlement, growth, and survival of juveniles; Beck et al. 2001), or enhanced growth and reproductive effort of adults (e.g., by concentrating food resources and enhancing foraging and spawning opportunities; Peterson et al. 2003, Powers et al. 2003) relative to unstructured habitats. Because growth enhancement likely contributes far less to lifetime augmented nekton production by oyster reefs than recruitment enhancement (Peterson et al. 2003, zu Ermgassen et al. 2016), our synthesis focused on recruitment enhancement. We specifically examined whether reef recruitment enhancement varies by taxonomic group and 1) reef type (i.e., natural or restored reefs) or 2) the size, vertical relief, or age of restored reefs. Our ultimate goal was to provide information for resource managers to guide future habitat restoration efforts.

Methods

Literature review

First, we determined the variety of reef characteristics reported by studies investigating nekton recruitment enhancement by oyster reefs using citations from the reference list of a recently completed meta-analysis (zu Ermgassen et al. 2016). We identified nekton families that were regularly reported at oyster reef and control habitats, including both resident (i.e., species that feed, breed, and shelter on reefs long after initial recruitment, Coen et al. 1999; Harding and Mann 2000) and transient (i.e., species that recruit to structured habitats but are more widely distributed across multiple habitats after recruitment, Harding and Mann 2001) reef-associated species. We also performed forward searches in Google Scholar on two published syntheses: Peterson et al. (2003) and zu Ermgassen et al. (2016). We retained studies that met the following criteria: 1) authors quantified density or relative abundance of target nekton families at both

oyster reefs (or experimental units that contained oyster shell and served as a mimic for reef habitat; e.g., Humphries et al. 2011) and unstructured mud or sand habitats within the same study; 2) restored reefs used oyster shell, including shell piles, cultch, bagged shell, or shell piles from other species (e.g., surf clams) if topped by oyster shell; 3) restored reefs were within the tidal extent of natural reefs (< 10 m deep relative to mean low water [MLW] at the base of the reef; Kennedy and Sanford 1999) , 4) fishing gear(s) quantitatively censused juveniles; and 5) authors reported densities or abundances of target nekton by species or family.

Data Extraction

We extracted densities or abundances, measures of spread (standard deviation or standard error), and sample sizes of each nekton species from oyster reefs and their paired unstructured control habitat patches. We extracted data for nine nekton families, including reef residents: toadfish (Batrachoididae), blennies (Blenniidae), gobies (Gobiidae), and skilletfish (Gobiesocidae, which were later removed due to limited data availability); and reef transients: grunts (Haemulidae), snappers (Lutjanidae), swimming crabs (Portunidae), drums (Sciaenidae), and porgies (Sparidae; Table 1). We normalized densities to mean individuals m^{-2} , abundances to mean individuals per sample (relative abundances), and measures of spread to one standard error of the mean (Appendix B). We extracted tidal zone (subtidal or intertidal), reef type (restored or natural), restoration method (reefs restored with or without live oysters), and when available, reef size (standardized to m^2), vertical relief (distance from bare sediment to the highest point on the reef, standardized to m), tidal elevation (at the base of the reef, in m relative to MLW), adult oyster density (individuals $m^{-2} > 75$ mm in shell height, or specified as adult by the authors), and the year of restored reef construction, from which we calculated reef age (Table A1; Appendix B).

Analyses

To compare nekton recruitment to oyster reefs versus unstructured control habitat, we calculated log response ratios (LRRs, Hedges et al. 1999) with 95% confidence intervals by family (Appendix B). An LRR with CIs > 0 implies that nekton recruitment was enhanced by oyster reefs, an LRR with CIs < 0 implies the opposite, and an LRR with CIs that include 0 implies no difference in recruitment between oyster reef and control habitats. For each research question, we assessed data publication bias with funnel plots (Appendix C) and data availability with mosaic and violin plots (Appendix D).

To assess whether recruitment enhancement varied as a function of reef type (natural or restored) and nekton family, we conducted linear mixed model analyses separately for intertidal and subtidal reefs that included two categorical factors (reef type and nekton family) and their interaction as fixed effects, with study as a random effect. We conducted mixed model analyses separately by tidal zone since subtidal and intertidal habitats harbor different nekton communities (Lehnert and Allen 2002), and subtidal and intertidal oyster reefs are distributed unevenly in our database: intertidal reefs are more prevalent on the Atlantic coast and subtidal reefs are more common in the Gulf of Mexico (Fig. 1; Tab. A1). Furthermore, the reef characteristics in our database differed across tidal zones (Fig. D1-D12). We removed any family that was represented by fewer than three independent studies and/or fewer than 10 independent LRRs (“NA” on Fig. 2). Results of randomization and resampling in support of these criteria are presented in Appendix E.

To evaluate the effects of restored reef characteristics (i.e., reef size, vertical relief, and age) on recruitment enhancement, we focused on restored reefs only, and performed linear mixed effect regression models with orthogonal polynomials (first and second order) for the continuous

reef characteristics as fixed effects, and study as a random effect. We conducted separate analyses for each reef characteristic, nekton family, and tidal zone. We did not model families represented by fewer than three independent studies and/or 10 independent LRRs covering different values of the reef characteristics (e.g., reef sizes, vertical reliefs, or ages; “insufficient data” in Figs. 3-8), and results are not reported or plotted for models that did not converge. Since not all families were represented at all values of each reef characteristic (e.g., all vertical reliefs or sizes), we performed separate analyses for each family and included all available data (but for combined-family approaches, see Appendix B for methods and Appendix E for results). We also examined the influence of tidal elevation on recruitment enhancement for each family using linear mixed effect regression models with orthogonal polynomials (first and second order) for tidal elevation as a fixed effect and study as a random effect (Appendix E). Where models indicated that predictor variables are on substantially different scales (i.e. reef size) we rescaled using natural log transformation.

All models were weighted by sample size (Appendix B). All analyses were conducted in R 3.6.1 (R Core Team, 2019) on the RStudio IDE 1.2.1335 (RStudio Team, 2019).

Results

We extracted density or relative abundance comparisons from 28 studies (Table A1) that generated 1,820 LRRs across eight target nekton families (excluding skillettfish), represented by 51 species (Table 1). Studies were distributed along the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coastlines from New Jersey to Texas, USA, across 25 embayments (Fig. 1). Funnel plots indicated no evidence of publication bias (Fig. C1).

Restored vs. natural reefs (reef type)

Recruitment enhancement on intertidal reefs varied interactively by family and reef type (Fig. 2a; family * reef type, $F_{4,790} = 8.25$ $p < 0.001$). In the intertidal, recruitment was frequently enhanced on restored reefs (i.e., $LRR > 0$ for two resident families: toadfish and blennies and three transient families: grunts, snappers and porgies; Fig. 2a), but not on natural oyster reefs (i.e., $LRR = 0$; Fig. 2a). Recruitment enhancement on subtidal reefs varied by family and was marginally related to reef type, but not their interaction (Fig. 2b; family, $F_{3,513} = 8.19$, $p < 0.001$; reef type, $F_{1,11} = 3.53$ $p = 0.09$; family * reef type, $F_{3,513} = 1.81$, $p = 0.15$). Five families (three resident: toadfishes, blennies, and gobies; two transient: grunts and porgies) were enhanced at subtidal restored reefs (Fig. 2b), and one resident family (blennies) was enhanced on subtidal natural reefs (Fig. 2b). Swimming crabs were more abundant on unstructured sedimentary habitat than natural reefs in both intertidal and subtidal zones (i.e., $LRR < 0$; Fig. 2a-b), though they did not differ between restored reefs and unstructured habitat in either zone (Fig. 2a-b). In the subtidal zone, drums were more abundant on unstructured sedimentary habitat than restored reefs but did not differ between natural reefs and controls (Fig. 2b).

Restored reef characteristics (reef size, vertical relief, and age)

Recruitment enhancement differed with reef size for only one family (blennies; Fig. 3-4). On intertidal reefs, there was no relationship between blenny recruitment and reef size (natural log transformed). On subtidal reefs, there was a marginal U-shaped relationship between blenny recruitment enhancement and subtidal reef size ($t_{54.7} = 1.78$, $p = 0.08$), with recruitment enhancement decreasing from 0.5 m^2 to 28.3 m^2 and increasing from 28.3 m^2 to 50.3 m^2 (Fig. 4b).

Recruitment enhancement of several families (grunts, drums, and blennies) varied with reef vertical relief (Fig. 5-6). Drum enhancement varied with vertical relief on intertidal reefs in

a U-shaped pattern (Fig. 5g, $t_{6.9} = 2.66$, $p = 0.03$), though a single experiment, at a vertical relief of 0.48 m with 20 independent replicates, appears to drive this relationship (Fig. 5g). Enhancement of blennies on subtidal reefs tended to decrease with increasing vertical relief (Fig. 6b; $t_{6.6} = -1.96$, $p = 0.09$). On subtidal reefs, drum enhancement decreased as vertical relief increased (Fig. 6g; $t_{7.44} = -2.52$, $p = 0.04$).

Recruitment enhancement of some families was also correlated with reef age (Figs. 7-8). On subtidal reefs, toadfish enhancement varied with reef age in a U-shaped pattern, decreasing from reefs that were between 0 and approximately 4 years of age, and then increasing from reefs aged approximately 4 to 6 years ($t_{77.6} = 2.43$, $p = 0.02$; Fig. 8a). Drum enhancement responded similarly to reef age on subtidal reefs ($t_{126.8} = 7.25$, $p < 0.0001$; Fig. 8g), decreasing from 0- to 4-year-old reefs, then increasing on six-year-old reefs (Fig. 8g). Porgy enhancement on subtidal reefs also varied similarly with reef age ($t_{56.2} = 2.56$, $p = 0.01$; Fig. 8h), decreasing on reefs between 0- to 3-years old, and then increasing on six-year-old reefs (Fig. 8h). Porgy enhancement on intertidal reefs tended to vary with reef age in a hump-shaped pattern (Fig. 7h, $t_{17.7} = -2.04$, $p = 0.06$), with recruitment enhancement increasing from 0 to 7 years, and decreasing from 7 to 13 years.

Discussion

Our analyses confirmed that both natural and restored oyster reefs enhance nekton recruitment, and we further demonstrate that the magnitude of this enhancement is as strong or stronger on restored reefs as natural reefs for five nekton families (Fig. 2). The magnitude of enhancement also varied by family and tidal zone and key characteristics of restored reef design (i.e., reef size, reef vertical relief, and reef age) also influenced recruitment enhancement of

227 fishes and swimming crabs. Nekton recruitment enhancement tended to increase with intertidal
228 reef size, though increases in vertical relief decreased enhancement, particularly at subtidal reefs.
229 Enhancement of many nekton species occurred immediately, though enhancement of porgies
230 peaked around 6 years on intertidal reefs, and enhancement of toadfish, drums and porgies was
231 lowest at intermediate ages (about 3-4 years) on subtidal reefs. Further data are needed to
232 examine whether recruitment enhancement is sustained over longer time periods.

233 Review of past restoration projects suggest that enhancement of nekton recruitment is
234 generally greater on restored than on natural reefs. The enhancement by restored reefs supports
235 earlier findings that nekton communities respond rapidly to oyster reef restoration efforts
236 (Lenihan et al.2001; Grabowski et al. 2005; La Peyre et al. 2014) and highlights the utility of reef
237 restoration as a technique to recover nekton abundances. We do not know why restored reefs
238 more consistently augmented nekton than natural reefs, but past or current exposure of natural
239 reefs to destructive harvesting practices that reduced their habitat quality may have contributed
240 to this difference. Given the dramatic losses of oyster populations to overharvesting and other
241 contributing factors (reviewed in Kirby 2004), remaining natural reefs may be degraded and
242 exhibiting reduced function (zu Ermgassen et al. 2012; 2013), whereas restored reefs are often
243 protected from harvest (e.g., Dunnigan 2015). Only 10 of 29 studies in our analysis reported
244 susceptibility to harvest, with even fewer providing specific harvest methods and amounts,
245 precluding an analysis of the effects of harvest on nekton recruitment enhancement in this study.

246 Habitat patch size can mediate the population dynamics of mobile species (Hanski 1999):
247 larger habitat patches have lower metapopulation extinction rates (MacArthur and Wilson 1967,
248 Hanski 1999) and alleviate negative edge effects in fragmented landscapes (Reis 2004). Thus, we
249 expected enhancement of fish and mobile crustacean recruitment to increase with restored reef

(patch) size. Our analyses of individual families were not significant but there were positive trends at intertidal reefs, and our combined-family analysis provided additional support that recruitment enhancement increases with intertidal reef size (Fig. E2a). For subtidal reefs, the influence of reef size was taxon-dependent (Fig E2b), consistent with findings from the habitat fragmentation literature (Eggleston et al. 1999; Johnson and Heck 2006). Relationships between fish recruitment enhancement and reef size may be more consistent within a region than across regions. For instance, the density of commercial fishes within marine reserves increased with reserve size when marine reserves within a single region were compared to unprotected spaces (Edgar and Barrett 1997; Claudet et al. 2008), yet Lester et al. (2009) found no relationship between density enhancement and MPA size when synthesizing MPAs globally. Additionally, an over-representation of small reef sizes in our analysis, as in the global analysis of MPAs (Lester et al. 2009), may have hindered our ability to detect an impact of habitat size. Reefs in our analysis ranged in size over four orders of magnitude (0.45 to $> 8000 \text{ m}^2$), though greater than 70% of restored reefs that reported sizes were $\leq 50 \text{ m}^2$ (Fig. D3). Given the magnitude of degradation that has occurred in many estuaries in the U.S. and elsewhere, extensive restoration efforts are necessary. Studies that include larger (i.e., $\sim 100 - 1000 \text{ m}^2$) restored reefs are needed to better define the relationship between reef size and recruitment enhancement and determine whether there are optimal or minimum sizes necessary to benefit target species.

The vertical relief of a reef can influence oyster survival (Taylor and Bushek 2008; Colden et al. 2017). We expected that greater relief would also increase augmentation of fish and mobile crustacean abundances, as taller reefs are less likely to be influenced by bottom-water hypoxia (Lenihan et al 2001), more likely to avoid sedimentation and sustain oyster populations (Taylor and Bushek 2008; Colden et al. 2017), and potentially provide greater reef complexity

and refuge quality. Recruitment enhancement of individual families did not vary consistently with vertical relief on intertidal reefs, which may be more strongly influenced by seldom-reported tidal emersion (determined by a combination of vertical relief, tidal elevation, and tidal range in the embayment; Fodrie et al. 2014; Walles et al. 2016) than vertical relief alone. On subtidal reefs, we found evidence that increasing reef vertical relief decreased recruitment enhancement of two families. Perhaps greater vertical relief on these reefs provided more accessible area to support a wider variety of predators, leading to these negative relationships. Prior studies have described thresholds in initial height of subtidal restored oyster reefs (~0.2 – 0.45 m) for the persistence of oyster growth (Lenihan 1999; Powers et al. 2009; Schulte et al. 2009; Lipcius et al. 2015; Grizzle and Ward 2016; Colden et al. 2017). Our results suggest a threshold under which nekton recruitment is enhanced (< 1 m) by greater reef height; from 0 to 1 m reef height, small gains in reef height can lead to substantial increases in nekton recruitment enhancement until they reach a maximum and then decline above around 1 m reef height. Thus, designing reefs to optimize oyster recruitment will likely influence enhancement of fish families. Although the mechanisms driving this relationship are not clear, if reefs are preferentially restored in areas that are not typically subjected to hypoxia, then reefs with higher vertical relief may not be necessary. Given that constructing high relief reefs is more expensive and requires greater amounts of shell material, restoration decision-makers could increase the aerial extent of restored reefs in areas where low-relief reefs will be effective.

Variability in recruitment enhancement across families may also be attributable to their degree of reef fidelity (e.g., reef residents vs. transients). Oyster habitat is considered an essential habitat for resident species long after initial recruitment (Coen et al. 1999; Harding and Mann 2000), whereas transient species spend less time on reefs and are more widely distributed across

multiple structured habitats (Harding and Mann 2001). In our database, some intriguing potential differences between residents and transients emerged. Each resident species we examined demonstrated recruitment enhancement, whereas only two families of transient species were enhanced (grunts and porgies), and two demonstrated lower recruitment at some oyster reefs (drums and crabs; Fig. 2). Drums are transient among estuarine habitats and utilize oyster reefs over non-vegetated habitat in some studies (Lenihan et al. 2001; Kingsley-Smith et al. 2012), though they utilize marsh edges and subtidal areas over oyster reefs in other studies (Stunz et al. 2010). Low or no recruitment of drums to oyster reefs may therefore reflect functional redundancy of structured habitats (Grabowski et al. 2005; Geraldi et al. 2009) and/or alternative habitat selection, particularly in intertidal zones where alternative structured habitats are often readily available. Understanding the influence of coastal habitat landscapes, rather than just individual habitats, on faunal abundance is a key research priority for informing habitat restoration efforts (Gilby et al. 2018). In the case of the Blue crab, *Callinectes sapidus*, previous studies found blue crab to be enhanced by oyster reef in the Gulf of Mexico, but not in the Atlantic coast (zu Ermgassen et al. 2016). It is possible that by using data from both regions in this analysis, this regional enhancement was masked in our results.

Several other factors not included in our analysis likely influence nekton recruitment enhancement by oyster reefs. For instance, nekton densities on oyster reefs, including many of our target families, fluctuate seasonally (Lehnert and Allen 2002; Shervette and Gelwick 2008). Many studies in our synthesis reported densities pooled across repeated time points, precluding an analysis of seasonality. Further, our synthesis included studies conducted across different latitudes where seasonality effects may differ. Although we were not able to explicitly evaluate

the effects of seasonality, assuming nekton do not change their relative use of oyster vs. unstructured habitats by season, this omission should not confound our results.

We are often forced to make assumptions about whether ecosystem services from restored habitats are consistent over time because of the lack of temporal data on service delivery (Barbier et al. 2011; Grabowski et al. 2012). While many studies reviewed in this meta-analysis have documented that fish and invertebrate communities respond quickly to restoration efforts, ecological theory predicts that recruitment enhancement will vary through time. For example, as restored reefs age, we expect their associated communities will undergo succession (Connell and Slatyer 1977; Manley et al. 2010; Quan et al. 2012). Recruitment was reported at intertidal restored reefs 0 – 13 years old in our study. Though reef age was not a strong predictor of recruitment enhancement in our analyses, porgies provided some evidence for a maximum recruitment enhancement at intermediate reef ages, while recruitment enhancement data for intertidal reefs aged 8 – 12 years are not available for any family and represent a data gap (Fig. 7). For restored reefs in the subtidal, a minimum recruitment enhancement value at reefs aged 3 – 4 years were represented by data from a single study that reported annual recruitment on reefs > 1 year old (Lenihan et al. 2001). Additional studies are needed to provide further evidence for this relationship and address the data gap beyond 6 years old for subtidal reefs. Several studies pooled densities across years (4 of 21 studies that reported reef construction date, Appendix A), indicating that services were consistent over the time these studies were sampled (e.g., La Peyre et al. 2014). However, the limited data for nekton recruitment enhancement over a decadal timescale (but see Ziegler et al. 2018) challenges our ability to project whether ecosystem service delivery remains constant or varies temporally at the scale of several years to decades. Thus,

340 long-term studies investigating the degree to which nekton enhancement varies with reef age
341 would be particularly useful.

342 Reef habitat complexity (the physical structure of an environment) is predicted to
343 increase with reef age as oysters settle atop one another and grow vertically in the water column
344 (Bahr and Lanier 1981; Grabowski et al. 2005; Rodriguez et al. 2014; Ziegler et al. 2018). Such
345 habitat complexity has been linked to habitat quality for associated communities, with interstitial
346 refuges that decrease interaction strengths (i.e., predation, Humphries et al. 2011) and increase
347 rugosity, which alters water flow and enhances larval settlement opportunities (Breitburg et al.
348 1995). Oyster density and biomass are often used as quantitative measures of reef complexity
349 (Baggett et al. 2015); thus, we expected augmentation of fish and mobile crustaceans to increase
350 with oyster density and biomass on oyster reefs, even in the absence of explicit information
351 about reef age. However, we could not assess nekton responses to oyster density, as only five out
352 of the 22 studies of restored reefs in our database reported oyster density, and fewer yet reported
353 biomass.

354 Syntheses across restoration efforts can identify potential influences of reef
355 characteristics on recruitment enhancement, determine restoration designs that are most
356 beneficial to target species, and help assess tradeoffs among targeted services. Future
357 experiments that manipulate multiple restoration design factors orthogonally will further our
358 understanding and predictive capacity of how they potentially interact to influence ecosystem
359 service delivery by restored habitats, including nekton recruitment enhancement at oyster reefs.
360 Such manipulations are difficult at scales relevant for restoration, so data syntheses are also a
361 critical tool for advancing restoration science. Future synthesis efforts will be facilitated by
362 consistent reporting across restoration efforts; therefore, we highlight Baggett et al.'s (2015)

recommendations for reporting universal oyster reef metrics (project footprint and reef area, reef vertical relief, oyster density, and oyster size-frequency distribution) and environmental variables (water temperature, salinity, and for subtidal reefs, dissolved oxygen) from all oyster restoration projects, in addition to densities of target species when reefs are intended to benefit nekton. We also support Walles et al. (2016)'s recommendation to add tidal emersion for intertidal reefs to this set of recommendations, and we further suggest that tidal elevation, reef age at the time of sampling, and exposure to oyster harvest be reported for effective comparisons across restored reefs. Given the magnitude of restoration needed to recover lost ecosystem services from biogenic habitats, experimental and synthetic efforts aimed at guiding restoration decision-making are critical.

Acknowledgments

We thank all of the authors of the data used in this synthesis who generously contributed their data and expertise, as well as X anonymous reviews whose comments greatly improved this work. This work was supported by a Miró Graduate Fellowship through Northeastern University to TMD, a National Science Foundation award OCE-1652320 to ARH, funding through Lenfest Ocean Program to JHG, and Federal funds under award NA15NMF4690242 from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce to JHG. The statements, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration or the U.S. Department of Commerce or the Lenfest Ocean Program. This is publication number XXX from Northeastern University's Marine Science Center.

Literature Cited

386 Alongi, D. M. 2002. Present state and future of the world's mangrove forests. *Environmental*
387 *Conservation*, 29:331–349.

388 Baggett, L.P, Powers, S.P., Brumbaugh, R.D., Coen, L.D., DeAngelis, B.M., Greene, J.K.,
389 Hancock, B.T., Morlock, S.M., Allen, B.L., Breitburg, D.L., Bushek, D., Grabowski,
390 J.H., Grizzle, R.E., Grosholz, E.D., La Peyre, M.K., Luckenbach, M.W, McGraw, K.A.,
391 Piehler, M.F., Westby, S.R., and zu Ermgassen, P.S.E. 2015. Setting guidelines for
392 evaluating performance of oyster habitat restoration. *Restoration Ecology*, 23:737–745.

393 Bahr, L.M., and Lanier, W.P. 1981. The ecology of intertidal oyster Reefs of the South Atlantic
394 Coast: A Community Profile. US Fish and Wildlife Service. Report no. FWS/OBS-81/15.

395 Barbier, E.B., Hacker, S.D., Kennedy, C., Koch, E.W., Stier, A.C. and Silliman, B.R. 2011. The
396 value of estuarine and coastal ecosystem services. *Ecological Monographs*, 81:169–193.

397 Bayraktarov, E., Saunders, M.I., Abdullah, S., Mills, M., Beher, J., Possingham, H.P., Mumby,
398 P.J., and Lovelock, C.E. 2016. The cost and feasibility of marine coastal restoration,
399 *Ecological Applications*, 26(4):1055–1074.

400 Beck, M.W., Heck Jr., K.L., Able, K.W., Childers, D.L., Eggleston, D.B., Gillanders, B.M.,
401 Halpern, B., Hays, C.G., Hoshino, K., Minello, T.J., Orth, R.J., Sheridan, P. NS
402 Weinstein, M.P. 2001. The identification, conservation, and management of estuarine and
403 marine nurseries for fish and invertebrates: a better understanding of the habitats that
404 serve as nurseries for marine species and the factors that create site-specific variability in
405 nursery quality will improve conservation and management of these areas. *BioScience*,
406 51(8):633–641.

407 Breitburg, D.L., Palmer, A.M., and Loher, T. 1995. Larval distributions and the spatial patterns
 408 of settlement of an oyster reef fish: responses to flow and structure. *Marine Ecology*
 409 *Progress Series*, 125:45–60.

410 Carlton, J. S., Ropichi, A., and Balboa, B. 2016. The Half Moon Reef restoration: A
 411 socioeconomic evaluation. Texas Sea Grant Publication TAMU-SG-16-211. Texas Sea
 412 Grant College Program, College Station Texas.

413 Claudet, J., Osenberg, C.W., Benedetti-Cecchi, L., Domenici, P., Garcia-Charton, J-A, Pérez-
 414 Ruzafa, Á., Badalamenti, F., Bayle-Sempere, J., Brito, A., Bulleri, F., Culioli, J-M,
 415 Dimech, M., Falcón, J.M., Guala, I., Milazzo, M., Sánchez-Meca, J., Somerfield, P. J.,
 416 Vandeperre, F., Valle, C., and Planes, S. 2008. Marine reserves: size and age do matter.
 417 *Ecology Letters*, 11:481–489.

418 Coen, L.D., M.W. Luckenbach, and Breitburg, D.L. 1999. The role of oyster reefs as essential
 419 fish habitat: a review of current knowledge and some new perspectives. *American*
 420 *Fisheries Society Symposium*, 22:438–454.

421 Colden, A.M., Latour, R.J., and Lipcius, R.N. 2017. Reef height drives threshold dynamics of
 422 restored oyster reefs. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 582:1–13.

423 Connell J.H. and Slatyer, R.O. 1977. Mechanisms of succession in natural communities and their
 424 role in community stability and organization. *The American Naturalist*, 111:1119–1144

425 Dame, R.F., Zingmark R.G., and Haskins, E. 1984. Oyster reefs as processors of estuarine
 426 materials. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 83:239–247.

427 Dunnigan, S.K. 2015. Habitat Value of Restored Intertidal Shoreline for Fish and Macrobenthic
 428 Communities in Northeast Florida. Master's thesis. University of North Florida.

429 Edgar, G.J. and Barrett, N.S. 1997. Short term monitoring of biotic change in Tasmanian marine
 430 reserves. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 213:261–279.

431 Eggleston, D.B., Elis, W.E., Etherington, L.L., Dahlgren, C.P., and Posey, M.H. 1999. Organism
 432 responses to habitat fragmentation and diversity: Habitat colonization by estuarine
 433 macrofauna. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 236:107–132.

434 zu Ermgassen, P.S.E., Grabowski, J.H., Gair, J.R., and Powers, S.P. 2016. Quantifying fish and
 435 mobile invertebrate production from a threatened nursery habitat. *Journal of Applied*
 436 *Ecology*, 53(2):596–606.

437 zu Ermgassen, P.S.E., Spalding, M.D., Blake, B., Coen, L.D., Dumbauld, B., Geiger, S.,
 438 Grabowski, J.H., Grizzle, R., Luckenbach, M., McGraw, K., Rodney, W., Reusink, J.,
 439 Powers, S., and Brumbaugh, R. 2012. Historical ecology with real numbers: past and
 440 present extent and biomass of an imperilled estuarine habitat. *Proceedings of the Royal*
 441 *Society B*, 279:3393–3400.

442 zu Ermgassen, P.S.E., Spalding, M.D., Grizzle, R.E., and Brumbaugh, R.D. 2013. Quantifying
 443 the loss of a marine ecosystem service: filtration by the Eastern Oyster in US estuaries.
 444 *Estuaries and Coasts*, 36(1):36–43.

445 Fodrie, F.J., Rodriguez, A.B., Baillie, C.J., Brodeur, .C., Coleman, S.E. Gittman, R.K., Keller,
 446 D.A., Kenworthy, M.A., Poray, A.K., Ridge, J.T., Theuerkauf, E.J., and Lindquist, N.L.
 447 2014. Classic paradigms in a novel environment: Inserting food web and productivity
 448 lessons from rocky shores and saltmarshes into biogenic reef restoration. *J. Appl.*
 449 *Ecol.* 51:1314–1325.

450 Geraldi, N.R., Powers, S.P., Heck, K.L. and Cebrian, J. 2009. Can habitat restoration be
 451 redundant? Response of mobile fishes and crustaceans to oyster reef restoration in marsh
 452 tidal creeks. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 389:171–180.

453 Gilby, B. L., A. D. Olds, C. H. Peterson, R. M. Connolly, C. M. Voss, M. J. Bishop, M. Elliott, J.
 454 H. Grabowski, N. L. Ortodossi, and T. A. Schlacher. 2018. Maximising the benefits of
 455 oyster reef restoration for fish and fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries* 19:931–947.

456 Grabowski, J.H., Brumbaugh, R.D., Conrad, R.F., Keeler, A.G., Opaluch, J.J., Peterson, C.H.,
 457 Piehler, M.F., Powers, S.P. and Smyth, A.R. 2012. Economic valuation of ecosystem
 458 services provided by oyster reefs. *BioScience*, 62:900–909.

459 Grabowski, J.H., Hughes, A.R., Kimbro, D.L., and Dolan, M.K. 2005. How habitat setting
 460 influences restored oyster reef communities. *Ecology* 86:1926–1935.

461 Grizzle, R.E., and K. Ward. (2016). Assessment of recent eastern oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*)
 462 reef restoration projects in the Great Bay Estuary, New Hampshire: Planning for the
 463 future. PREP Publications. 353.

464 Hanski, I. 1999. *Metapopulation Ecology*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

465 Harding, J.M. and Mann, R. 2000. Estimates of naked goby (*Gobiosoma bosc*), striped blenny
 466 (*Chasmodes bosquianus*) and eastern oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) larval production
 467 around a restored Chesapeake Bay oyster reef. *Bulletin of Marine Science*, 66:29–45.

468 Harding, J.M. and Mann, R. 2001. Oyster reefs as fish habitat: opportunistic use of restored reefs
 469 by transient fishes. *Journal of Shellfish Research*, 20:951–959.

470 Heck Jr., K.L. Coen, L.D., and Morgan, S.G. 2001. Pre- and post-settlement factors as
 471 determinants of juvenile blue crab *Callinectes sapidus* abundance: results from the north-
 472 central Gulf of Mexico. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 222:163–176.

473 Hedges, L.V., Gurevitch, J., and Curtis, P.S. 1999. The meta-analysis of response ratios in
 474 experimental ecology. *Ecology*, 80(4):1150–1156.

475 Hines, A.H. 2003. Ecology of juvenile and adult blue crabs: Summary of discussion of research
 476 themes and directions. *Bulletin of Marine Science*, 72(2):423–433.

477 Humphries, A.T. La Peyre, M.K., Kimball, M. E., and Rozas, L.P. 2011. Testing the effect of
 478 habitat structure and complexity on nekton assemblages using experimental oyster reefs.
 479 *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 409:172–179.

480 Johnson, M.W. and Heck Jr., K.L. 2006. Effects of habitat fragmentation per se on decapods and
 481 fishes inhabiting seagrass meadows in the northern Gulf of Mexico. *Marine Ecology*
 482 *Progress Series*, 306:233–246.

483 Kellogg, M.L., Cornwell, J.C., Owens, M.S., and Paynter, K.T. 2013. Denitrification and nutrient
 484 assimilation on a restored oyster reef. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 480:1–19.

485 Kennedy, V.S. and Sanford, L.P. 1999. Characteristics of relatively unexploited beds of the
 486 Eastern Oyster, *Crassostrea virginica*, and early restoration programs. In: Luckenbach,
 487 M.W., Marr, R. and Wesson, J.A. 1999. Oyster reef habitat restoration: a synopsis and
 488 synthesis of approaches; proceedings from the symposium, Williamsburg, Virginia, April
 489 1999. Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William and Mary.
 490 <http://doi.org/10.21220/V5NK51>

491 Kingsley-Smith, P.R., Joyce, R.E., Arnott, S.A., Roumillat, W.A., McDonough, C.J. and
 492 Reichert, M.J.M. 2012. Habitat use of intertidal eastern oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*)
 493 reefs by nekton in South Carolina estuaries. *Journal of Shellfish Research*, 31:1009–1021.

494 Kirby, M.X. 2004. Fishing down the coast: Historical expansion and collapse of oyster fisheries
 495 along continental margins. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, USA*
 496 101:13096–13099.

497 Krauss, K.W., Doyle, T.W., Doyle, T.J., Swarzenski, C.M., From, A.S., Day, R.H. and Conner,
 498 W.H. 2009. Water level observations in mangrove swamps during two hurricanes in
 499 Florida. *Wetlands* 29(1):142–149.

500 La Peyre, M.K., Humphries, A.T., Casas, A.M., La Peyre, J.F. 2014. Temporal variation in
 501 development of ecosystem services from oyster reef restoration. *Ecological Engineering*
 502 63:34–44.

503 Lefcheck, J.S., Orth, R.J., Dennison, W.C., Wilcox, D.J., Murphy, R.R., Keisman, J., Gurbisz,
 504 C., Hannam, M., Landry, J.B., Moore, K.A., Patrick, C.J., Testa, J., Weller, D.E. and
 505 Batiuk, R.A. 2018. Long-term nutrient reductions lead to the unprecedented recovery of a
 506 temperate coastal region. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
 507 *States of America*, 115(14):3658–3662.

508 Lehnert, R.L. and Allen, D.M. 2002. Nekton use of subtidal oyster shell in a Southeastern U.S.
 509 estuary. *Estuaries*, 25:1015–1024.

510 Lenihan, H.S. 1999. Physical - biological coupling on oyster reefs: how habitat structure
 511 influences individual performance. *Ecological Monographs*, 69(3):251–275.

512 Lenihan, H.S., Peterson, C.H., Byers, J.E., Grabowski, J.H., Thayer, G.W. and Colby, D.R. 2001.
 513 Cascading of habitat degradation: oyster reefs invaded by refugee fishes escaping stress.
 514 *Ecological Applications*, 11:764–782.

515 Lester, S.E., Halpern, B.S., Grorud-Colvert, K., Lubchenco, J., Ruttenberg, B.I., Gaines, S.D.,
 516 Aíramé, S., and Warner, R.R. 2009. Biological effects within no-take marine reserves: a
 517 global synthesis. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 384:33–46.

518 Levin, S.A. 1992. The problem of pattern and scale in ecology. *Ecology*, 73:1943–1967.

519 Lipcius, R.N., Burke, R.P. McCulloch, D.N., Schreiber, S.J., Schulte, D.M., Seitz, R.D., and
 520 Shen, J. 2015. Overcoming restoration paradigms: value of the historical record and
 521 metapopulation dynamics in native oyster restoration. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 2:65.

522 Lipcius, R.N., Seitz, R.D., Seebo, M.S., and Colón-Carrión, D. 2005. Density, abundance and
 523 survival of the blue crab in seagrass and unstructured salt marsh nurseries of Chesapeake
 524 Bay. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 319:69–80.

525 MacArthur, R.H. and Wilson, E.O. 1967. *The Theory of Island Biogeography*. Princeton
 526 University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, USA.

527 Manley, J., Power, A., Walker, R., Hurley, D., Belcher, C., and Richardson, J. 2010. Ecological
 528 succession on restored intertidal oyster habitat in the tidal creeks of coastal Georgia.
 529 *Journal of Shellfish Research*, 29:917 – 926.

530 Martin, C.L., Momtaz, S., Gaston, T., and Moltschaniwskyj, N.A. 2016. A systematic
 531 quantitative review of coastal and marine cultural ecosystem services: current status and
 532 future research. *Marine Policy*, 74:25–32.

533 Meyer, D.L., Townsend, E.C., and Thayer, G.W. 1997. Stabilization and erosion control value of
 534 oyster cultch for intertidal marsh. *Restoration Ecology* 5:93–99.

535 Nevins, J.A., Pollack, J.B., and Stunz, G.W. 2014. Characterizing nekton use of the largest
 536 unfished oyster reef in the United States compared with adjacent estuarine habitats.
 537 *Journal of Shellfish Research*, 33:227–238.

538 Peterson, C.H., Grabowski, J.H. and Powers, S.P. 2003. Estimated enhancement of fish
 539 production resulting from restoring oyster reef habitat: quantitative valuation. *Marine*
 540 *Ecology Progress Series*, 264:249–264.

541 Peterson, C.H., and Lipcius, R.N. 2003. Conceptual progress towards predicting quantitative
 542 ecosystem benefits of ecological restorations. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 264:297–
 543 307.

544 Piazza, B.P., Banks, P.D, and La Peyre, M.K. 2005. The potential for created oyster shell reefs as
 545 a sustainable shoreline protection strategy in Louisiana. *Restoration Ecology*, 13:499–
 546 506.

547 Piehler, M.F., and Smyth, A.R. 2011. Habitat-specific distinctions in estuarine denitrification
 548 affect both ecosystem function and services. *Ecosphere* 2(1):1–16.

549 Powers, S.P. and Boyer, K.E. 2014. *Marine Restoration ecology*. *Marine Community Ecology*
 550 *and Conservation* (eds M.D. Bertness, J.F. Bruno, B.R. Silliman, J.J. Stchowicz), pp 495–
 551 516. Sinauer Associates, Inc., Sunderland, MA, USA.

552 Powers, S.P., Grabowski, J.H., Peterson, C.H., and Lindberg, W.J. 2003. Estimating
 553 enhancement of fish production by offshore artificial reefs: uncertainty exhibited by
 554 divergent scenarios. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 264:265–277.

555 Powers, S.P., Peterson, C.H., Grabowski, J.H. and Lenihan, H.S. 2009. Success of constructed
 556 oyster reefs in no-harvest sanctuaries: implications for restoration. *Marine Ecology*
 557 *Progress Series*, 389:159–170.

558 Quan, W., Humphries, A.T., Shen, X., and Chen, Y. 2012. Oyster and associated benthic
 559 macrofaunal development on a created intertidal oyster (*Crassostrea ariakensis*) reef in
 560 the Yangtze River Estuary, China. *Journal of Shellfish Research*, 31(3):599–610.

561 R Core Team. 2019. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
 562 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
 563 Rey Benayas, J.M., Newton, A.C., Diaz, A., and Bullock, J.M. 2009. Enhancement of
 564 biodiversity and ecosystem services by ecological restoration: A meta-analysis. *Science*,
 565 325:1121–1124.
 566 Ries, L., R.J. Fletcher Jr., Battin, J., and Sisk, T.D. 2004. Ecological responses to habitat edges:
 567 mechanisms, models, and variability explained. *Annual Reviews of Ecology, Evolution, and*
 568 *Systematics*, 35:491–522.
 569 Robillard, M.M.R., Stunz, G.W. and Simons, J. 2010. Relative value of deep subtidal oyster
 570 reefs to other estuarine habitat types using a novel sampling method. *Journal of Shellfish*
 571 *Research*, 29:291–302.
 572 Rodriguez, A.B., Fodrie, F.J., Ridge, J.T., Lindquist, N.L., Theuerkauf, E.J., Coleman, S.E.,
 573 Grabowski, J.H., Brodeur, M.C., Gittman, R.K., Keller, D.A., and Kenworthy, M.D.
 574 2014. Oyster reefs can outpace sea-level rise. *Nature Climate Change*, 4:493–497.
 575 Rodney, W.S. and Paynter, K.T. 2006. Comparisons of macrofaunal assemblages on restored and
 576 non-restored oyster reefs in mesohaline regions of Chesapeake Bay in Maryland. *Journal*
 577 *of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 335:39–51.
 578 RStudio Team 2019. RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, Inc., Boston, MA
 579 URL <http://www.rstudio.com/>.
 580 Schulte, D.M., Burke, R.P. Lipcius, R.N. 2009. Unprecedented Restoration of a Native Oyster
 581 Metapopulation. *Science*, 325:1124–1128.

582 Scyphers, S.B., Powers, S.P., Heck, K.L. and Byron, D. 2011. Oyster reefs as natural
 583 breakwaters mitigate shoreline loss and facilitate fisheries. Public Library of Science
 584 ONE, 6:e22396.

585 Shervette, V.R. and Gelwick, F. 2008. Seasonal and spatial variations in fish and
 586 macroinvertebrate communities of oyster and adjacent habitats in a Mississippi estuary.
 587 Estuaries and Coasts, 31:584–596.

588 Soniat, T.M., C.M. Finelli, and Ruiz, J.T. 2004. Vertical structure and predator refuge mediate
 589 oyster reef development and community dynamics. Journal of Experimental Marine
 590 Biology and Ecology 310:163–182.

591 Stunz, G.W., Minello, T.J. and Rozas, L.P. 2010. Relative value of oyster reef as habitat for
 592 estuarine nekton in Galveston Bay, Texas. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 406:147–159.

593 Taylor, J. and Bushek, D. 2008. Intertidal oyster reefs can persist and function in a temperate
 594 North American Atlantic estuary. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 361:301–306.

595 Walles, B., Fodrie, F.J., Nieuwhof, S., Jewell, O.J.D., Herman, P.M.J., and Ysebaert, T. 2016.
 596 Guidelines for evaluating performance of oyster habitat restoration should include tidal
 597 emersion: reply to Baggett et al. Restoration Ecology, 24(1):4–7.

598 Waycott M., Duarte C.M., Carruthers T.J.B., Orth, R.J., Dennison, W.C., Olyarnik, S., Calladine,
 599 A., Fourqurean, J.W., Heck Jr., K.L., Hughes, A.R., Kendrick, G.A., Kenworthy, W.J.,
 600 Short, F.T., and Williams, S.L. 2009. Accelerating loss of seagrasses across the globe
 601 threatens coastal ecosystems. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the
 602 United States of America, 106:12377–12381.

603 Wells, H.W. 1961. The fauna of oyster beds, with special reference to the salinity factor.
 604 Ecological Monographs 31:239–266.

605 Ziegler, S.L., Grabowski, J.H., Baillie, C.J., and Fodrie, F.J. 2018. Effects of landscape setting
606 on oyster reefs structure and function largely persist more than a decade post-restoration.
607 Restoration Ecology, 26:933–942. doi: 10.1111/rec.12651.

608 Zimmerman, R.J., Minello, T.J., Baumer, T. and Castiglione, M. 1989. Oyster reef as habitat for
609 estuarine macrofauna. NOAA Technical Memorandum, NMFS-SEFC-249 pp. 16.
610 NOAA.
611
612

613 **Supporting Information**

614 Supporting information may be found in the online version of this article.

615 **Appendix A.** Key features and citations for studies included in the meta-analysis.

616 **Appendix B.** Detailed description of methods including additional comparisons of mean LRRs.

617 **Appendix C.** Assessment of publication bias.

618 **Appendix D.** Assessment of data availability.

619 **Appendix E.** Additional results: Resampling and additional comparisons of mean LRRs.

620

621 **Table 1.** List of species represented in the dataset by reef association, family common and
622 scientific name, and species common and scientific names.

Reef Association	Family (common)	Common Name	Species
Resident	Toadfish (Batrachoididae)	Gulf toadfish	<i>Opsanus beta</i>
		Oyster toadfish	<i>Opsanus tau</i>
		Stiped blenny	<i>Chasmodes bosquianus</i>
		Florida blenny	<i>Chasmodes saburrae</i>
		Crested blenny	<i>Hypleurochilus geminatus</i>
		Feather blenny	<i>Hypsoblennius hentz</i>
		Freckled blenny	<i>Hypsoblennius ionthas</i>
		Highfin blenny	<i>Lupinoblennius nicholsi</i>
		Blenny species	<i>Blennidae spp.</i>
	Skilletfish (Gobiesocidae)	Skilletfish	<i>Gobiesox strumosus</i>
	Goby (Gobiidae)	Frillfin goby	<i>Bathygobius soporator</i>
		Darter goby	<i>Ctenogobius boleosoma</i>
		Freshwater goby	<i>Ctenogobius shufeldti</i>
		Emerald goby	<i>Ctenogobius smaragdus</i>
		Highfin goby	<i>Gobionellus oceanus</i>
		Naked goby	<i>Gobiosoma bosc</i>
		Seaboard goby	<i>Gobiosoma ginsburgi</i>
		Code goby	<i>Gobiosoma robustum</i>
		Clown goby	<i>Microgobius gulosus</i>
		Green goby	<i>Microgobius thalassinus</i>
		Goby species	<i>Gobiosoma spp.;</i> <i>Microgobius spp.;</i> <i>Gobiidae</i>
Transient	Grunt (Haemulidae)	Barred grunt	<i>Conodon nobilis</i>
		White grunt	<i>Haemulon plumierii</i>
		Pigfish	<i>Orthopristis chrysoptera</i>
	Snapper (Lutjanidae)	Gray snapper	<i>Lutjanus griseus</i>
		Lane snapper	<i>Lutjanus synagris</i>
	Swimming crab (Portunidae)	Blue crab	<i>Callinectes sapidus</i>
		Lesser blue crab	<i>Callinectes similis</i>

	Iridescent swimming crab	<i>Portunus gibbesii</i>
	Blotched swimming crab	<i>Portunus spinimanus</i>
	Swimming crab species	<i>Callinectes</i> spp.; Portunidae
Drum (Sciaenidae)	Silver perch	<i>Bairdiella chrysoura</i>
	Sand seatrout	<i>Cynoscion arenarius</i>
	Spotted seatrout	<i>Cynoscion nebulosus</i>
	Silver seatrout	<i>Cynoscion nothus</i>
	Weakfish	<i>Cynoscion regalis</i>
	Banded drum	<i>Larimus fasciatus</i>
	Spot croaker	<i>Leiostomus xanthurus</i>
	Southern kingfish	<i>Menticirrhus americanus</i>
	Northern kingfish	<i>Menticirrhus saxatilis</i>
	Atlantic croaker	<i>Micropogonias undulatus</i>
	Black drum	<i>Pogonias cromis</i>
	Red drum	<i>Sciaenops ocellatus</i>
	American stardrum	<i>Stellifer lanceolatus</i>
	Drum species	<i>Cynoscion</i> spp. Sciaenidae
Porgy (Sparidae)	Sheepshead	<i>Archosargus probatocephalus</i>
	Spottail seabream	<i>Diplodus holbrookii</i>
	Pinfish	<i>Lagodon rhomboides</i>

623

624

625

Figure 1. Map of study sites along the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Coasts of the USA. States shaded in gray are represented in the dataset. Each point represents an independent study, with shapes representing tidal zone (circles represent intertidal reefs and triangles represent subtidal reefs). Additional study attributes are listed in Table A1.

Figure 2a-b. Mean and 95% confidence intervals of the Log Response Ratios (LRR) of nekton densities at oyster compared to unstructured sedimentary control habitats for each family (toadfish = Batrachoididae, blenny = Blenniidae, goby = Gobiidae, grunt = Haemulidae, snapper = Lutjanidae, crab = Portunidae, drum = Sciaenidae, porgy = Sparidae), at natural vs. restored reefs, for a) intertidal reefs, and b) subtidal reefs. Numbers indicate the total number of LRRs that contributed to the mean LRR for each family. Asterisks indicate 95% confidence intervals that do not overlap 0. NA indicates that data were insufficient to include in analyses, as there were fewer than 10 LRRs included in the mean.

Figure 3a-h. Variation in mean Log Response Ratios (LRR) of nekton densities by reef size (m^2) on intertidal reefs. Point size is weighted by the number of independent replicates for each reef. The model for Toadfish (panel a) has a singular fit and should be interpreted with caution.

Figure 4a-h. Variation in mean Log Response Ratios (LRR) of nekton densities by reef size (m^2) on subtidal reefs. Studies that included multiple experiments with reefs of different sizes are assigned separate points for each reef. Point size is weighted by the number of independent replicates for each reef. For readability, mean LRRs (0.921 for toadfish, 0.679 for drums and 1.63

for porgies) for the study with the largest subtidal reef ($> 8000 \text{ m}^2$; Table A1) are not pictured.
The model for Gobies (panel c) has a singular fit and should be interpreted with caution.

Figure 5a-h. Variation in mean Log Response Ratios (LRR) of nekton densities by vertical relief (m) on intertidal reefs. Studies that included multiple experiments with reefs of different reliefs are assigned separate points for each reef. Point size is weighted by the number of independent replicates for each reef. Plots with a solid trend line and 95% confidence intervals (gray areas) indicate a significant effect of vertical relief from single-family mixed model analysis. The model for Grunts (panel d) has a singular fit and should be interpreted with caution.

Figure 6a-h. Variation in mean Log Response Ratios (LRR) of nekton densities by vertical relief (m) on subtidal reefs. Studies that included multiple experiments with reefs of different reliefs are assigned separate points for each reef. Point size is weighted by the number of independent replicates for each reef. Plots with a solid trend line and 95% confidence intervals (gray areas) indicate a significant effect of reef age from single-family mixed model analysis. Dashed lines indicate vertical relief effects for which $0.05 \leq P \leq 0.1$.

Figure 7a-h. Variation in mean Log Response Ratios (LRR) of nekton densities by reef age (years) on intertidal reefs. Studies that included multiple experiments with reefs of different ages are assigned separate points for each reef. Point size is weighted by the number of independent replicates for each reef. Plots with a dashed trend line and 95% confidence intervals (gray areas) indicate a reef age from single-family mixed model analysis for which $0.05 \leq P \leq 0.1$. The model for Toadfish (panel a) has a singular fit and should be interpreted with caution.

Figure 8a-h. Variation in mean Log Response Ratios (LRR) of nekton densities by reef age (years) on subtidal reefs. Studies that included multiple experiments with reefs of different ages are assigned separate points for each reef. Point size is weighted by the number of independent replicates for each reef. Plots with a trend line and 95% confidence intervals (gray areas) indicate a significant effect of reef age from single-family mixed model analysis.

681 Figure 1.

682

683 **Figure 2a-b.**

684

685

689 **Figure 4a-h.**

690
691

692

695 **Figure 6a-h.**

696

697

701 **Figure 8a-h.**

702