Manuscript Details

Manuscript number

PROOCE_2018_54_R2

Coral forests and Derelict fishing gears in submarine canyon systems of the Ligurian Sea

Abstract

Title

Biodiversity of coral forests and occurrence of Derelict Fishing Gears (DFGs) have been assessed in canyon systems of the western Ligurian Sea (Dramont, Monaco, Bordighera, Arma di Taggia and Bergeggi) exposed to different anthropic pressures. Arborescent cnidarians were elected as representative species due to their role as structuring organisms and their vulnerability to DFGs damage; hence, their occurrence, density and distribution were correlated to the presence of DFGs. The canyon systems were mapped using a Multibeam Echo Sounder and visually surveyed by means of a Remotely Operated Vehicle between 20 and 445 m depth. With the exception of the Bergeggi canyon system all sites host rich assemblages of structuring anthozoans, accounting for more than 2000 colonies belonging to 11 species, predominantly Corallium rubrum, Dendrophyllia cornigera, Eunicella cavolinii, E. verrucosa, and Paramuricea clavata. The coral forests appear vulnerable with the larger structuring gorgonians being the most susceptible to mechanical injuries. DFGs, represent 85% of the total marine litter is the most serious threat to resident sessile communities, most noticeably in the eastern canyons. The fishing footprints is strongly influenced by vicinity to ports, size and fishing effort of local fleets, and by socio-economical differences in the fishing activity . Our study further confirms the role of submarine canyons as site of high coral biodiversity and vulnerability to the mechanical damages by fishing-related littering, calling for adequate management measures to reduce fishery pressure and concomitant DFG discharge.

Submission Files Included in this PDF

File Name [File Type]

Giusti_et_response_to_reviewers.docx [Response to Reviewers]

Highlights.docx [Highlights]

Giusti_et_al_071218.docx [Manuscript File]

To view all the submission files, including those not included in the PDF, click on the manuscript title on your EVISE Homepage, then click 'Download zip file'.

Ref: PROOCE_2018_54_R1 Title: Derelict fishing gear and megabenthic cnidarian distribution in submarine canyons of the Ligurian Sea and adjacent shelves Journal: Progress in Oceanography

Dear Dr. GIUSTI,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Progress in Oceanography. Guest Editor Danovaro has completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below. He recommends reconsideration of your paper following major revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing all reviewer comments.

When resubmitting your manuscript, please carefully consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments, outline every change made point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed.

To submit your revised manuscript:

- Log into EVISE® at: <u>http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=PROO</u> <u>CE</u>
- Locate your manuscript under the header 'My Submissions that need Revisions' on your 'My Author Tasks' view
- Click on 'Agree to Revise'
- Make the required edits
- Click on 'Complete Submission' to approve

What happens next?

After you approve your submission preview you will receive a notification that the submission is complete. To track the status of your paper throughout the editorial process, log in to Evise® at: http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=PROOCE.

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript as soon as possible.

Kind regards,

Dr Mantua Co Editor-in-Chief Progress in Oceanography

Comments from the editors and reviewers: -Editor Danovaro

Dear Dr Giusti,

As you can see in the reviewers' report, Rev#1 is positive and suggests minor revision while Rev#2 is still critic on the content of your paper.

Although the present version has been improved according to most of the previous Rev#2's comments, the request of statistical analyses to support data has been completely neglected.

I would like to offer you the possibility to respond to the specific comment on data elaboration and other suggestions provided by the ref#2 in this second report.

If you are not in the position to respond to all rev#2'comments, I regret to inform you that your contribution cannot be considered for publication in this special issue.

-Reviewer 1

Dear Editor,

Please find attached my comments on Giusti et al. In this current version authors have addressed some of my suggestions. After carefool consideration I believe this manuscript still requires lots of work and it cannot be published in its current status. My biggest concern is that authors have failed to provide any statistical evidence that reinforce their assumptions. Authors indicate that they did not have enough time to do required statistical analysis. I consider that this is not a valid argument. Some of the suggested statistical analyses were very simple and could have been done with the available data (linear regressions evaluating cnidarian and DFG densities).

The Introduction and the Materials and Methods have been improved. As I previously mentioned, in the Results section I think that authors must provide statistical analyses regarding the relationship between DFGs and cnidarian density. Moreover, authors are looking at the relationship of DFGs and megabenthic cnidarians I think it is necessary to give information on the status of these populations' necrosis and epibiosis (number of colonies, necrotic or epiphyted surface %, dimensions of affected colonies, which is the epiphyte species). This information can easily be extracted from the video transects. Once more, I do not think it is a valid argument to say that authors have ran out of time. In the previous version of the manuscript authors did not show the number of entangled colonies (Fig. 8). I assume they had to review the videos to provide this information. In this sense, I believe authors could have easily provided the number of epiphyted or necrotic colonies. To do so only 3 canyons needed to be revised, since authors mentioned that they already have the number of epiphyted colonies for Arma di Taggia canyon (Authors original quote: *We were not able provide the necrotic colonies and the epibiosis presence because we didn't clearly identified them, except for the Arma di Taggia canyon and buecause, due to the large number of changes made with the help of the reviewer, we ran out of time).*

Most of the Discussion section is mainly a summary of the previously mentioned results. Author's indicate that *E. verrucosa* faces the highest risk of entanglement what are the bases for this? This contradicts the results in Fig. 8. Less than 10 colonies out of 267 (Table 2) have been entangled, this represent ~4% of all observed colonies. Other species such as *D. cornigera* (approx. 120 entangled colonies out of 175, ~68% of observed colonies), *C. rubrum* (approx.130 entangled colonies out of 287, ~45% of observed colonies), or *P. clavata* (appox.100 colonies out of 417, ~24% of observed colonies) present much larger entangling values. Authors need to dig deeper on their results, compare them with previous data on the Mediterranean and other areas of the world. For instance, why do you think *D. cornigera* is so heavily impacted? Could it be that *C. rubrum* colonies were affected since they tend to occur on overhanging rocks where fishing gear can easily get stuck? *P. clavata* is a species that can reach very large dimensions (e.g. Linares *et al.* 2018), was there any size pattern regarding entangled colonies? Which type of fishing gear tends to entangle the most? In case there is a trend is it the same in all canyons? Authors should add a few conclusions summarizing their most relevant findings.

Regarding the Reference authors need to correct all mistakes an add newly added references.

Authors have a very interesting data set with great potential make the best of it.

Considering that this manuscript was submitted in a special issue of Progress in Oceanography I leave on the hands of the Editor to decide if it should go to major changes or be rejected.

 The paper was greatly modified according to the reviewer's suggestions. The ROV dataset has been viewed again and the data analysis redone; the statistical analysis has been added as well as the analysis of the entangled, epibiotic and necrotic cnidarians species. Compared to the previous version, this one has been significantly modified in the hope of having responded adequately to all the reviewers' suggestions. The title has been modified to : "Coral forests and Derelict fishing gears in submarine canyon systems of the Ligurian Sea" to better focalize the subject of our manuscript. As for the answers below, we tried to answer as best as possible, but the work has changed a lot compared to the previous one: for example, the numbers of the lines no longer correspond to those of the previous version and several sentences have been removed and / or modified, as well as some bibliographical references.

Authors have not addressed the following suggestions or mistakes from the previous review:

Regarding my previous comment: *Depth range are given into four different forms* "-47 and -93 m, 242 –423 meters, 60-116 meters, 64m and 287m". *Use only one form I suggest: 242 – 423 meters depth.*

• The form suggested was used

Please, sea lines 282–290, lines 337–344 of the current version.

• Modified as suggested

Please, correct line 372, 376, 389, 391 of the current version, species names are not properly written.

• Species names corrected

Quoting authors response: Corrected. The name of the species was also ganged throughout the text from E. cavolinii to E. cavolini , as reported by the world Register of Marine Species

E. cavolinii should be maintained as this gorgonian species was named after Filippo Cavolini, and consequently double final "i" is needed following the international code of zoological nomenclature

• Corrected

Line 370-371: In particular, DFG was found along all the depths at which E. verrucosa is present.

The bathymetric distribution of DFGs in Arma di Taggia canyon cover the entire bathymetric range overlapping with all species found in this canyon why do you focus on *E. verrucosa*?

• The reviewer is right and the phrase was removed

Please see my previous comment on S. dubia.

You have not corrected Table 2 and Figure 4, lines 295: change Swiftia dubiato Swiftia sp.

• Swiftia dubia changed to Swiftia sp.

Regarding density values, authors have mentioned that they have used 1 m⁻²(Authors quote: *Density* was calculated as colonies per 1 m⁻²). If this is correct how can you obtain such low values in 1 m⁻²? Based on my experience such low densities are found with surface units larger than 1 m². Please, clarify if you have calculated density considering the hall surface of the transect or surfaces larger than 1 m⁻².

• Density of cnidarians was expressed as number of colonies per square meter of hardground.

Data were checked again and we obtained such low densities values.

Minor comments:

Lines 74-81: This study is based on canyons on the Ligurian Sea. Why do you focus on the canyons on the Adriatic Sea? If authors wanted to give an example of Mediterranean submarine canyons hosting CWC and sponge assemblages there are many examples all over the western Basin: North Ionian Sea (Saviani et al., 2010), Sardinia (Taviani et al., 2015); Southern Thyrrenian (Pierdomenico et al., 2016); Corsica (Fourt et al., 2017), Gulf of Lion (Gori et al., 2013) Catalan Margin (Lastras et al., 2016); Balearic Islands (Grinyó et al., 2018; Santín et al., 2018).

Authors have given a much-detailed vision of CWC assemblages in submarine canyons of the NW Mediterranean improving this section. However, if Authors consider that the Adriatic Sea is part of the Eastern Basin shouldn't they consider the North Ionian Sea as part of the Eastern Basin?

• The reviewer is right and the North Ionian Sea was moved to the phrase concerning the Eastern Basin.

Line 87:

Remove extra space.

• Removed

Line 94:

"Lost fishing gear, (Derelict Fishing Gear = DFG)..." please change as follows "Lost fishing gears, referred from now one as Derelict Fishing Gears (DFG)..."

• Changed

Line 99:

Correct (Cánovas- Molina et al. 2016) to (Cánovas-Molina et al., 2016).

• Corrected

Line 101

Small fleets or small boats?

• Phrase modified in the text

Line 167

Correct "0°to" to "0° to"

• Corrected

Line "0°-52°": in all previous cases you've used "to". Change 0° to 52°.

• Changed

Line 174:

There is an extra space: "with moderately".

• Extra space removed

Line 176:

Please change Km to km.

• Km was changed to km

Table 1:

"Dive lenght" to "Dive lenght" correct lenght to length

• corrected

Line 185:

Remove extra space between Bordighera and ,.

• Extra space removed

Line 192:

Remove extra space "...vessels. The three..."

• Extra space removed

Line 243, 301 and 330:

Correct: "m-²" to "m⁻²"

• Corrected

Line 255:

I suggest adding megabenthic in front of cnidarins:

"In this study, megabenthic cnidarian species were chosen..."

• Phrase modified in the text

Table 288:

Correct 117 -310 to 117-310.

• Corrected

Line 387: Change "twenty two" to 22. In line 34 authors numerical values "22 megabenthic species" please be consistent throughout the manuscript.

• Changed "twenty two" to 22

Line 406: *"E. verrucosa*, as other large anthozoans (e.g. other gorgonians and antipatharians), isa long-lived species, able to form dense three-dimensional habitats (the so called "coral gardens" or "animal forests")"

Provide reference for coral gardens and the animal forest and please look beyond *E. verrucosa*. You have shown in Figure 8 that other species are, actually, more susceptible to entanglement than *E. verrucosa*.

• References for coral gardens and the animal forest were added and new considerations about the entanglement of the species were also added

Line 410: "As a consequence, there is a higher probability of losing fishing gear and thus increasing the risk of being caught in the nets."

Why is there a higher probability of losing fishing gear? Is it due to the three-dimensional structure of the organisms forming the animal forests?

• Phrase modified in the text

Line 412: "We can speculate that this large amount of lost fishing nets at this site is due to the fact that it is close to the coast, in front of the Bordighera port and near San Remo port, which makes this canyon more accessible to fishing vessels."

How about the fishing fleet is it larger than in other canyons? You need to discuss this. Do you think recreational fishing may also play a role in the degradation of this canyons ecosystems? Could it be that recreational fishing boats also visited this area more often due to its proximity to shore?

• Phrase modified in the text

Line 421:

Please correct: "that coveri"

• Corrected

References:

The following references are missing in the Reference list: Saviani *et al.*, 2010 Pierdomenico *et al.*, 2016 Fourt *et al.*, 2017 Gori *et al.*, 2013 Lastras *et al.*, 2016 Grinyó *et al.*, 2018

Santín et al., 2018

• References were modified according to the changes made in the manuscript

Extra spaces on lines 445, 478, 486, 501, 583, 587, 739.

• Extra spaces removed

Line 519: Sarda change to Sardà

• Sarda changed to Sardà

Line 529: Italics?

• Corrected

Line 578: García not Carcìa

• Reference removed

Line 605: Nazare to Nazaré

• Reference removed

Line 606: you are missing)

• Added

Line 610, 621, 653, 715: you are missing a space

• Added

-Reviewer 2

The Authors checked the ms according to the referee' suggestion. In my opinion can be accepterd. In the file attached I have marked some errors in the bibliography.

• The bibliography was checked and the errors corrected.

Highlights

- Derelict Fishing Gears (DFGs) cause severe impact on megabenthic species.
- High biodiversity areas are the primary target for artisanal fisheries.
- Derelict Fishing Gears (DFGs) are present up to a depth of 300 meters.
- None of the five canyons investigated were free from DFGs.

Coral forests and Derelict fishing gears in submarine canyon systems of the **Ligurian Sea**

M. GIUSTI¹, S. CANESE¹, M. FOURT², M. BO³, C. INNOCENTI¹, A. GOUJARD⁴, B. DANIEL⁵, L. ANGELETTI⁶, M. TAVIANI^{6,7,8}, L. AQUILINA⁹ AND L. TUNESI¹

| 4 | 7 | ¹ ISPRA, Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale. Via Vitaliano Brancati 60, Roma, Italy |
|----------------------------|----------------|---|
| 6 7 | 8 9 | ² IMBE, Aix Marseille Univ, Avignon Université, CNRS, IRD, Station Marine d'Endoume, 13007 Marseille, France |
| 9 | 10 11 | ³ DiSTAV, Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, dell'Ambiente e della Vita, Università di Genova, Corso Europa 26, Genova, Italy |
| 2 | 12 13 | ⁴ GIS Posidonie, Campus de Luminy, MOI, Case 901, OCEANOMED, Bâtiment Méditerranée, Marseille Cedex |
| 5 | 14 | ⁵ Agence française pour la biodiversité, rue de la République 26, Marseille, France |
| 6 7 | 15 | ⁶ ISMAR, Istituto di Scienze Marine – Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Via Gobetti 101, Bologna, Italy, |
| 9 | 16 17 | ⁷ Biology Department, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, 266 Woods Hole Road, Woods Hole, MA 02543, USA |
| 1 | 18 | ⁸ Stazione Zoologica Anton Dohrn, Villa Comunale, 80121 Naples, Italy |
| 2 3 | 19 | ⁹ Division Patrimoine Naturel, Direction de l'Environnement, Avenue de Fontvieille 3, Monaco |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 | 20 21 22 | *Corresponding author: michela.giusti@isprambiente.it |
| 0 1 2 | 23 | Abstract |
| 3 | 24 | Biodiversity of coral forests and occurrence of Derelict Fishing Gears (DFGs) have been assessed in |
| .5 .6 | 25 | canyon systems of the western Ligurian Sea (Dramont, Monaco, Bordighera, Arma di Taggia and |
| 7 8 | 26 | Bergeggi) exposed to different anthropic pressures. Arborescent cnidarians were elected as |
| 9 | 27 | representative species due to their role as structuring organisms and their vulnerability to DFGs |
| 1 | 28 | damage; hence, their occurrence, density and distribution were correlated to the presence of DFGs. |
| 4 | 29 | The canyon systems were mapped using a Multibeam Echo Sounder and visually surveyed by means |

of a Remotely Operated Vehicle between 20 and 445 m depth. With the exception of the Bergeggi

canyon system all sites host rich assemblages of structuring anthozoans, accounting for more than 2000 colonies belonging to 11 species, predominantly Corallium rubrum, Dendrophyllia cornigera, Eunicella cavolinii, E. verrucosa, and Paramuricea clavata.

The coral forests appear vulnerable with the larger structuring gorgonians being the most susceptible to mechanical injuries. DFGs, represent 85% of the total marine litter is the most serious threat to resident sessile communities, most noticeably in the eastern canyons. The fishing footprints is strongly influenced by vicinity to ports, size and fishing effort of local fleets, and by socioeconomical differences in the fishing activity

Our study further confirms the role of submarine canyons as site of high coral biodiversity and vulnerability to the mechanical damages by fishing-related littering, calling for adequate management measures to reduce fishery pressure and concomitant DFG discharge.

Keywords: structuring anthozoans; marine litter; Derelict Fishing Gears, fishing impact; Ligurian Sea; canyons .

Introduction

Submarine canyons are major geomorphic features of continental margins characterised by steep and complex topography (e.g. Lastras et al., 2007; Harris and Whiteway, 2011; Amblas et al., 2017). They are formed at the junction of the continental shelf with the continental slope. Schematically, they are a V-shaped valley, with steep walls (e.g. Shepard, 1972). A submarine canyon consists of an upper part, the "canyon head", that deeply incises the continental shelf extending down to the continental slope and ending at the base of the continental slope, where it forms a "canyon mouth" (Canals et al., 2009; Würtz, 2012). Canyons are characterised by a variety of topographic situations and bedforms (Rowe et al., 1982; Vetter, 1994; Trincardi et al., 2007; McClain and Barry, 2010; Migeon et al., 2012; De Leo et al., 2014; Fabri et al., 2014; Lo Iacono et al., 2015; Quattrini et al., 2015; Robert et al., 2015). They influence current patterns (Shepard et al., 1979; Canals et al., 2006;

Xu, 2011), and are a major pathway for the particle-transport from the continental shelf to the deepsea (Nittrouer and Wright, 1994; Amaro *et al.*, 2016; Fildani, 2017), thus playing a fundamental role in shelf-deep ocean exchanges (Würtz, 2012).

From a biological perspective, they play a key role in providing habitat, nursery and refuge for spawning pelagic and benthic species, some of which of commercial interest (Sardà et al., 1994; Yoklavich et al., 2000; Tyler et al., 2009; De Leo et al., 2010; Hoff, 2010; Vetter et al., 2010; Companing al., 2012, Farrugio, 2012; Morris et al., 2013; Fernandez-Arcaya et al., 2017). Canyons often House Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs) usually dominated by gorgonians, antipatharians, scleractinians, and sponges (Schlacher et al., 2007; Huvenne et al., 2011; Davies et al., 2014; Morris et al., 2013; Brooke and Ross 2014, Miller et al., 2015; Trotter et al., 2018), having the ability to form three-dimensional habitats costal forests, coral gardens, or animal forests: Rossi *et* al., 2017). For instance, the Mediterranean canyons provide habitat to Cold-Water Coral (CWC) as documented in the western basin for the Catalan Margin (Orejas et al., 2009; Lastras et al., 2016), Balearic Islands (Grinvó et al., 2018; Santín et al., 2018), Gulf of Lion (Gori et al., 2013; Fabri et al., 2014, 2017), Ligurian canyons (Fanelli et al., 2017), Corsica (Fourt et al., 2017), South Sardinia (Taviani et al., 2017), Gulf of Naples (Taviani et al., in press), and southern Tyrrhenian Sea (Pierdomenico et al., 2016). In the central basin, most information is available for the southern Adriatic Sea, i.e. the Bari Canyon (Freiwald et al., 2009; Bo et al., 2012; Sanfilippo et al., 2013; Angeletti et al., 2014; D'Onghia et al., 2015, 2016; Taviani et al., 2011, 2016), the Tricase Canyon (Prampolini et al., in press) and canyons and incisions in the eastern side of Montenegrin and Albanian margins (Angeletti et al., 2014, 2015, in press; Taviani et al., 2016, this issue).

Submarine canyon systems resent climate change that can modify the intensity of the currents and seriously affect the structure and functioning of the benthic communities, for example, by impinging on the nutrient supply to the deep ocean ecosystems (Solomon, 2007; Levin and Le Bris, 2015). However, the main source of impact is due to human activities, such as dumping (Hughes *et al.*, 2015; Ramirez-Llodra *et al.*, 2015), oil and gas extraction (Harris *et al.*, 2007), litter (Mordecai *et al.*, 2011; Ramirez-Llodra *et al.*, 2013; Bergmann *et al.*, 2015; Tubau *et al.*, 2015; Cau *et al.*, 2017), chemical pollutants (Palanques *et al.*, 2008; Koenig *et al.*, 2013; Pham *et al.*, 2014), and fishing activities (Palanques *et al.*, 2001; Oberle *et al.*, 2018).

Fishing exerts considerable pressure on submarine canyons by Figure ring their morphology (Puig *et al.*, 2015; Daly *et al.*, 2018) Figure ectly impacting the benthic assemblages thriving here. The negative effects related to fishing activities are due to the removal of conspicuous habitat-forming species (gorgonians, black corals, scleractinians, sponges and bryozoans) and also to the accidental loss of demersal gears (Company *et al.*, 2003; Mortensen *et al.*, 2005; Martín *et al.*, 2008; Orejas *et al.*, 2009; Buhl-Mortensen *et al.*, 2015; Cau *et al.*, 2017; Gori *et al.*, 2017; Taviani *et al.*, 2017).

Lost fishing gears (Derelict Fishing Gears: DFGs, hereafter) can affect negatively the seafloor integrity by suffocating benthic organisms and inducing epibiont overgrowth, or by mechanical removing mostly of erect species (Bavestrello *et al.*, 1997; Bo *et al.*, 2014). The loss of threedimensionality, in turn, may lead towards an over-simplification of the community structure (Ponti *et al.*, 2014). Once on the seabottom, DFGs like nets or traps, may continue to exert negative effects for long by trapping fish and other organisms, a problem known as ghost fishing (Fernandez-Arcaya *et al.*, 2017). Several studies have highlighted the impact of DFGs on deep benthic communities or have used indicators of impact regarding structuring species as parameters of ecological indexes evaluating the health status of these communities (e.g. Bo *et al.*, 2014, 2015; Cánovas-Molina *et al.*, 2016; Oberle *et al.*, 2018).

The problem of fishing impact is usually related to demersal artisanal fisheries operating on the continental shelf (0 - 200 m) or on the upper bathyal zone (200 - 400 m) (Forcada, 2009), and it can be amplified by recreational fishermen insisting on the same grounds (Bo *et al.*, 2014). Canyon biota are negatively impacted by bottom trawling, mainly operated along the mouth of the canyon, because of the heavy mechanical action of the trawl net enhanced by metal footropes, accompanied by deleterious sediment resuspension (Martín *et al.*, 2014; Payo-Payo *et al.*, 2015; Paradis *et al.*, 2017).

(Cattaneo Vietti et al., 2010); thus far, only few studies have been, however, devoted to evaluate the environmental status of the deep benthic communities (Cánovas-Molina et al., 2016).

This paper describes the megabenthic biodiversity, with main focus on the anthozoan component, and the occurrence of lost fishing gears and lines (DFGs) in five canyons located in the western Ligurian Sea (north-western Mediterranean Sea). Presence, density and distribution of cnidarian megabenthic species as well as DFGs, were analysed and related to two physical descriptors of seafloor morphology, depth and slope.

Materials and methods

Study area

The five investigated canyon systems are, from West to East: Dramont (France), Monaco (Principality of Monaco), Bordighera, Arma di Taggia, and Bergeggi (Italy) (Fig. 1). The study sites were mapped using a Multibeam Echo Sounder (MBES) and explored with a Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) from 20 to 445 m. Except Bergeggi, all canyons, were investigated during a scientific campaign organised in the frame of the RAMOGE (Saint-RApahel, MOnaco and GEnoa) agreement. The main objective of RAMOGE is to coordinate the activities of France, Italy and Monaco for protection of the marine environment, through the establishment of multidisciplinary collaboration between local and regional administrations, scientific institutions and users of the sea in order to carry out joint actions. During the 2014 ad hoc workshop on the Mediterranean Sea organized within the framework of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in Malaga (Spain), two Ecologically Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs) were identified in the North-western or Mediterranean Sea: one for pelagic and one for benthic ecosystems. Through cross-border cooperation between RAMOGE countries for the implementation of CBD criteria, 35 focus areas were identified in the Ligurian Sea (Italy), 6 in Monaco and 25 in the Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur Region (France). Most of the identified areas are represented by submarine canyon heads and outer continental shelf rocky outcrops. In 2015, RAMOGE organized its first deep-sea exploration

campaign at a depth range of 50 - 400 m aimed to obtain an overall picture of the habitats, occurrence of protected and commercial species, and human pressures. Six ecological focal areas were identified for the campaign (Daniel *et al.*, 2017), four of which are the canyon systems examined by this study. A fifth site (Bergeggi) was investigated during the CNR oceanographic cruise BIOLIG, designed to explore mega- and macrobenthic communities, and meiofauna of the Ligurian Sea canyons.



Fig. 1. Location of the five investigated canyons and nearby shelf regions.

The canyon systems under scrutiny are exposed to various human stressors, above all fishing activities. Bergeggi is located at a distance of about 4 km from the port of Savona. According to the fleet register data (http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/fleet/index.cfm), Savona hosts 64 artisanal fishing vessels (less than 12 m overall length). Arma di Taggia and Bordighera, are located at a distance of 6 km and 8 km, respectively, from the port of San Remo that hosts, according to the fleet register data,

about 30 artisanal fishing vessels. These three canyons are important fishing areas for local, smallscale fishery fleets. The Monaco canvon, belonging to the Principality of Monaco, could be considered as a reference site for fishing activities pressure because there is only one artisanal fishing boat operating in the area (L. Tunesi, unpublished).

Data acquisition and analysis

The RAMOGE research campaign was conducted on board the R/V Astrea from 16 to 23 August 2015. During the survey, high resolution bathymetric data were collected using an MBES Kongsberg EM 2040, operating at a frequency of 300 kHz and nine ROV dives were carried out, five in the canyon heads and seven on the adjacent continental shelves (Table 1). The BIOLIG oceanographic cruise took place on board the R/V Minerva Uno from 9 to 12 May 2013. High-resolution bathymetric data of the Bergeggi Canyon were collected using an MBES Reason SeaBat 8160, operating at a frequency of 50 kHz. The canyon was explored through three ROV dives, two in the canyon's head and one on the nearby continental shelf (Table 1).

High-resolution bathymetric data were collected using the Seafloor Information System (SIS) software and were analysed with the HIPS and SIPS (CARIS) software. The morphometric parameters were extrapolated with the open source SAGA GIS software (Conrad et al., 2015), georeferenced to the World Geodetic System 1984 ellipsoid and converted to metres within Zone 32N of the Universal Transverse Mercator projection.

Preliminary georeferenced maps were generated on-board first from non-filtered MBES data in order to identify the presence of hard bottoms suitable to be explored by ROV. Twelve ROV dives were then performed between 20 - 445 m to assess megabenthic communities and anthropic impact (Table 1). A "Pollux III" ROV was equipped with a high-resolution video camera and a reflex (DSLR) Canon camera with two strobes; real-time position was provided by an underwater acoustic positioning system (Linguest - Tracklink 1500 MA), connected with a Geographic Information System (GIS) (Blue Marble geographics, Global Mapper v17; a depth sensor, a compass and two

laser beams placed 10 cm apart for scale complete ROV equipment. The ROV navigated at an average speed of 0.3 m s⁻¹, approximately 1.5 m above the substrate. The field of view of the ROV was estimated to be approximately two metres wide (defined on the distance of the two parallel laser pointers) when moving at that distance from the bottom (Bo *et al.*, 2009).

Georeferenced videos were recorded continuously and images were extrapolated from the video tracks for a total of 642 frames by means of the free Internet software DVDVideoSoft, every 10 s, (Table 1). For every image the following parameters were considered: i) megabenthic diversity; ii) number of cnidarian colonies; iii) number and typology of litter items. Density of cnidarians (expressed as number of colonies per square meter) was obtained for each site and for each topographic area (shelf and canyon head). Impacted colonies (entangled or epibionted) were also annotated and compared in terms of percentage of frames over the entire site dataset.

Precise location, depth and number of cnidarian colonies and litter items were also mapped in ArcGIS 10.1 (ESRI) to check and avoid for image overlapping.

Marine litter was classified according to the categories reported in the "Guidance on monitoring of
Marine Litter in European Seas" (GMML) (Galgani *et al.*, 2015). The DFGs belonging to categories
A. 6, A. 7 and A. 9 were used to calculate the density of the various litter categories (expressed as
number of items per hectare).

Morphobathymetric data were used to extrapolate two physical descriptors of seafloor morphology, depth and slope. Due to the fact that data were collected using two different MBES models, these descriptors were gridded differently in the corresponding raster files. MBES data collected within the framework of the RAMOGE campaign were gridded in raster files with 1x1 m cell size, while MBES data collected within the framework of the BIOLIG campaign were gridded in raster files with 10x10 defayr m cell size. These are the highest possible resolution MBES cell sizes that can be retrieved from the systems used, operating at the depths reported above, without losing information (Giusti *et al.*, 2017). Depth and slope are considered to be among the main factors influencing coral distribution on hard bottoms (e.g. Davies and Guinotte, 2011; Giusti *et al.*, 2014, 2017; Angeletti *et al.*, *in press*). Slope

describes the rate of change in elevation, with low values associated with flat bottom and a high probability of sediment deposition sites, and higher values indicating potential hard bottoms (rocky or lithified sediments). The output slope raster was calculated in degrees from 0° (flat) to 90° (vertical).

In this study, arborescent anthozoans were chosen due to their paramount role as structuring organisms and their vulnerability to DFGs (Bo *et al.*, 2014). For this reason, their occurrence was related to the two terrain attributes described above (depth and slope).

Furthermore, with the aim of better understand the correlation between the co-occurrence of structuring enidarians and DFGs, partial correlation matrices were calculated. In order to do that the ROV data were organized in a table that reports the depth, the distance from the coast, the distance from the nearest port, the presence or absence of enidarians and DFGs and, in case of presence, the number of specimens/items found. The linear correlation between presence or absence of enidarians and DFGs did not show any statistically significant result. However, simple linear correlations between the presence of the species and that of DFGs could lead to misleading results due to other variables that could influence both the habitat of the species and the presence of DFGs, such as depth, distance from the coast and from the nearest port (Ferrigno *et al.*, 2017; Consoli *et al.*, 2018).

To control the effect of other variables, partial correlations were used to calculate the relationships between species, DFGs, depth, distance from the coast and from the nearest port. Partial correlations allow to calculate the linear correlations between two variables removing the effects of the other variables, that can be numerically associated to the two variables of interest, thus leading to confound results (Anderson *et al.*, 1958). The partial correlations were calculated in the R environment (R Core Team, 2018) using the "ppcor package" (Kim, 2015) and the relative matrices were drawn using the "corrplot package" (Wei *et al.*, 2017).

Sites description

The canyon systems here considered present different topographic characteristics. (1) Dramont (Fig. 2A) is W-E oriented and is located at a distance of 1.5 km from the coast, with the canyon's actual incision starting at ca. 145 m. The slope in the W-E direction ranges from 6° to 34°. (2) Monaco (Fig. 2B) is oriented in a NW-SE direction; it is at a distance of 1.6 km from the coast, starting at a depth of 102 m; the slope in the NW-SE direction ranges from 6° to 31°. (3) Bordighera has two heads (Fig. 2C), both oriented in a N-S direction, located at a distance of about 0.5 km from the coast, beginning at a depth of 80 m; both heads have a slope range from 0° to 85°. (4) Arma di Taggia is formed by two heads (Fig. 2D). One is oriented in a N-S direction, the other mainly W-E. Both heads are at a distance of about 2 km from the coast, beginning at a depth of 100 m. The N-S oriented slope ranges from 7° to 46°. The slope of the other head ranges from 7° to 34° (5) Bergeggi canyon (Fig. 2E) is NW-SE oriented and located at about 4.6 km from the coast. The slope ranges from 0° to 55°.





6°57'30"E







Fig. 2. Morphobathymethric maps with the position of the ROV dives (black lines); (A) Dramont,

(B) Monaco, (C) Bordighera, (D) Arma di Taggia, (E) Bergeg

| Canyon | ROV dive | Dive sta (decim: | nrt position al degrees) | Dive en (decim: | nd position al degrees) | Dive duration (h:mm) | N° of frames per site | Dive depth- range (m) | Dive length (m) | Hard bottom length (m) | Dive area (m ²) | Hard bottor surface (m ² |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| | | latitude | longitude | latitude | longitude | | <u> </u> | 1 | | <u> </u> | 1 | <u> </u> |
| Dramont | 9 | 43.433 | 6.925 | 43.433 | 6.925 | 2:09 | | 20-342 | 2,476 | 2,476 | 3,071 | 3,071 |
| | 10* | 43.429 | 6.907 | 43.430 | 6.910 | 1:08 | 99 | 20-90 | 811 | 354 | 1,269 | 554 |
| | 11 | 43.427 | 6.939 | 43.427 | 6.939 | 0:36 | | 20-165 | 530 | 530 | 731 | 731 |
| Monaco | 12 | 43.710 | 7.432 | 43.710 | 7.432 | 2:45 | 38 | 40-251 | 4,360 | 412 | 5,621 | 531 |
| Bordighera | 4* | 43.770 | 7.678 | 43.764 | 7.691 | 2:50 | 246 | 20-300 | 2,282 | 830 | 3,575 | 1,300 |
| - | 5* | 43.755 | 7.678 | 43.752 | 7.685 | 1:36 | | 22-263 | 1,427 | 1,427 | 2,192 | 2,192 |
| | 1 | 43.792 | 7.912 | 43.796 | 7.921 | 0:46 | 179 | 25-61 | 959 | 615 | 1,709 | 1,096 |
| Arma di Taggia | 2 | 43.801 | 7.897 | 43.801 | 7.898 | 1:53 | | 25-66 | 1,726 | 494 | 2,920 | 836 |
| | 3 | 43.809 | 7.893 | 43.805 | 7.892 | 0:58 | | 25-95 | 956 | 956 | 1,483 | 1,483 |
| | 6 | 44.264 | 8.523 | 44.265 | 8.525 | 1:37 | | 230-240 | 890 | 134 | 1,349 | 203 |
| Bergeggi | 7* | 44.260 | 8.541 | 44.260 | 8.541 | 2:35 | 80 | 383-405 | 1,640 | 224 | 2,271 | 310 |
| | 8* | 44.257 | 8.553 | 44.255 | 8.553 | 2:18 | | 352-445 | 1,247 | 184 | 1,647 | 243 |

Table 1. Metadata of ROV dives (the ROV dives executed in the canyon heads are marked with an*).

Results

Structuring cnidarians: diversity, abundance, distribution and vulnerability

The ROV dives surveyed the sea bottom over a distance of 19,304 linear m (8,636 m are hard substrates) covering an area of 27,838 m² (12,550 m² are hard substrates) (Table 1).

Considering the shelves and the canyons heads altogether, a total of 140 species have been recorded (Table 2). The most diverse community was found in the Italian canyons of Bordighera and Arma di Taggia, where 73 and 72 species were found, respectively, followed by Dramont canyon hosting 64 species, Monaco canyon hosting 30 species, and, lastly, Bergeggi canyon with only 12 species. Among benthic invertebrates, cnidarians are the most common taxonomic group, with a consistent presence in all investigated sites (from 15% to 70%) followed by sponges (from 15% to 24%) (Fig. 3). Another highly diversified taxon is that of fish, ranging from 12% in Bergeggi canyon to 40% in the Monaco canyon.

| 14 | ble 2. Sp | pecies | recorded | in the | five | invest | igated | canyon | systems | 5. |
|----|-----------|--------|----------|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|---------|----|
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| Species observe | ed in the five canyons | Dramont | Monaco | Bordighera | Arma di Taggia |
|-----------------|----------------------------|----------|--------|------------|----------------|
| k | Kingdom: Plantae | | | | |
| Phylum | Species | | | | |
| Chlorophyta | Palmophyllum crassum | <u>x</u> | | | |
| Rhodophyta | Peyssonnelia sp. | <u>x</u> | | | |
| Ki | ingdom: Animalia | | | | |
| Phylum | Species | | | | |
| Porifera | Aaptos aaptos | x | | x | |
| | Agelas oroides | | | | x |
| | Aplysina cavernicola | x | | x | x |
| | Axinella damicornis | x | x | x | |
| | Axinella polypoides | | x | x | x |
| | Axinella sp. | x | x | x | x |
| | Axinella verrucosa | x | | x | |
| | Chondrosia reniformis | | | | x |
| | Cladocroce fibrosa | x | | | |
| | Clathrina clathrus | | | | x |
| | <i>Dysidea</i> sp. | | | | x |
| | Haliclona magna | | | x | |
| | Haliclona poecillastroides | x | x | x | x |
| | Hemimycale sp. | | | | x |
| | Hexadella pruvoti | x | | x | x |
| | Hexadella racovitzai | x | | x | x |
| | Spongia lamella | | x | | x |
| | Spongia officinalis | | | x | |
| | Pleraplysilla spinifera | | | | x |
| | Poecillastra compressa | x | | | |
| | <i>Oscarella</i> sp. | | | | x |
| | Petrosia ficiformis | | | | x |
| | Sarcotragus foetidus | | | | x |
| | <i>Tethya</i> sp. | x | | | |
| Cnidaria | Alcyonium acaule | x | | x | x |
| | Alcyonium coralloides | x | | x | x |
| | Alcyonium palmatum | x | x | | |
| | Antipathella subpinnata | x | | x | x |
| | Antipathes dichotoma | x | | | |
| | Caryophyllia sp. | 1 | | | x |
| | Cerianthus membranaceus | | | x | x |
| | Corallium rubrum | x | | x | x |
| | Dendrophyllia cornigera | x | | x | x |
| | Eunicella cavolinii | x | | x | x |
| | + | - | | | |

| | Eunicella verrucosa | x | x | x | x | |
|-------------|-----------------------------|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Funiculina quadrangularis | x | | x | | x |
| | Leiopathes glaberrima | | | | | x |
| | Leptogorgia sarmentosa | x | x | x | x | |
| | Paramuricea clavata | x | x | x | x | |
| | Parantipathes larix | | | | | x |
| | Parazoanthus axinellae | | | | r | |
| | Pannatula phosphoraa | | | r | | |
| | | | | л | | |
| | | | <i>x</i> | <i>x</i> | | |
| | Solmissus sp. | | | | | <i>x</i> |
| | Switfia sp. | | | x | | |
| | Villogorgia bebrycoides | | | | | x |
| Mollusca | Eledone cirrhosa | x | | | | |
| | Loligo sp. | | | | x | |
| | Neopycnodonte cochlear | | x | x | | |
| | Octopus salutii | | | x | | |
| | Octopus vulgaris | | | x | | |
| | Pteria hirundo | | | x | x | |
| | Peltodoris atromaculata | r | | | x | |
| Anellida | Ronellia viridis | r | r | r | r | |
| Allellida | Eiloguaga/Salmaging complex | л | л | л | л | |
| | Filograna/Salmacina complex | | | | X | |
| | <i>Myxicola</i> sp. | x | | | | |
| | Myxicola infundibulum | | | | <i>x</i> | |
| | Protula sp. | | | | x | |
| | Sabella sp. | x | | | | |
| | Sabella spallanzanii | | | | x | |
| | Serpula vermicularis | | x | | | |
| Artrhopoda | Latreillia elegans | x | | | | |
| | Macropipus tuberculatus | | | x | | |
| | Munida sp. | x | x | x | | x |
| | Pagurus prideaux | x | | x | | |
| | Palinurus elephas | x | x | x | x | |
| | Plesionika gigliolii | | | r | | |
| | Plosionika sp | | | л | | |
| Desshiereda | riesionika sp. | | | | | А. |
| Brachiopoda | Gryphus vitreus | x | | x | | |
| Bryozoa | Myriapora truncata | x | | | | |
| | <i>Reteporella</i> sp. | x | | x | | |
| | Turbicellepora avicularis | | | | x | |
| | Smittina cervicornis | | | | <i>x</i> | |
| | Myriapora truncata | | | | x | |
| | Pentapora fascialis | | | | x | |
| | Reteporella grimaldii | | | | x | |
| | Schizomavella mamillata | | | | x | |
| | | | | | | |

| Echinodermata | Amphiura sp. | | | | x | |
|---------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anseropoda placenta | | | x | | Τ |
| | Astrospartus mediterraneus | x | | x | x | |
| | Centrostephanus longispinus | x | | x | x | |
| | Echinaster sepositus | | | x | x | |
| | Echinus melo | | | x | x | |
| | Hacelia attenuata | x | | x | x | |
| | Holothuria forskali | x | x | x | x | |
| | Holothuria poli | | | | x | |
| | Holothuria sp. | x | x | x | x | |
| | Leptometra phalangium | | | x | | |
| | Marthasterias glacialis | | | x | | |
| | Parastichopus regalis | x | x | x | | |
| | Peltaster placenta | x | | | x | |
| | Spatangus purpureus | | | | x | |
| Chordata | Acantholabrus palloni | x | | x | | |
| | Anthias anthias | x | x | x | x | |
| | Argentina sphyraena | | | x | | |
| | Aulopus filamentosus | x | | x | | |
| | Benthocometes robustus | x | | | | |
| | Capros aper | x | x | x | | |
| | Chlorophthalmus agassizi | x | | | | |
| | Ciona intestinalis | | | | x | |
| | Ciona sp. | | | | x | |
| | <i>Clavelina</i> sp. | | | | x | |
| | Coelorinchus caelorinchus | x | | | | |
| | Conger conger | | | x | x | |
| | Coris julis | | | | x | |
| | Diplodus vulgaris | | | | x | |
| | Gadiculus argenteus | | x | x | | |
| | Halocynthia papillosa | x | x | x | x | |
| | Helicolenus dactylopterus | x | | x | | |
| | Lappanella fasciata | | | x | | |
| | Lepidorhombus boscii | x | | x | | |
| | Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis | | | x | | |
| | Lesueurigobius friesii | | | x | | |
| | Lophius piscatorius | | | x | | |
| | Macroramphosus scolopax | x | x | x | | |
| | Mullus barbatus | | | x | | |
| | Mullus surmuletus | | x | | | |
| | Muraena helena | x | | x | x | |
| | Pagellus acarne | x | | | | |
| | | | + | | | + |

| Phycis blennoides | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Phycis phycis | x | x | x | x |
| Scorpaena elongata | | x | | |
| Scorpaena porcus | | | | x |
| Scorpaena scrofa | | x | | x |
| Scorpaena sp. | x | x | x | x |
| Scyliorhinus canicula | x | | | |
| Seriola dumerili | x | | x | |
| Serranus cabrilla | x | x | x | x |
| Serranus hepatus | x | x | | |
| Spicara maena | | | x | |
| Spicara smaris | | | | x |
| Symphodus mediterraneus | | | | x |
| Scyliorhinus sp. | | | | x |
| Trachurus sp. | | | x | |
| Zeus faber | | | x | |



Cnidarians accounted for 22 species, 11 of which can be ascribed to structuring arborescent taxa settling hardgrounds (2080 colonies) (Table 3). ur such arborescent species (three gorgonians and one scleractinian) represented > 97% of the total records, with *Eunicella cavolinii* being the most representative (42%) (Table 3). Three species, *E. verrucosa, Leptogorgia sarmentosa* and *Paramuricea clavata*, occur in all canyon sytems, except Bergeggi, while *Dendrophyllia cornigera*

was not detected in Monaco (Table 3).

885

Table 3. Cnidarian diversity and abundance in Ligurian canyon systems; the five most representative species are noted in bold, while the asterisk refer to the structuring taxa.

| Cnidarian species | Colonies total number | Dramont | Monaco | Bordighera | Arma di Taggia | Bergeggi |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|--------|------------|-------------------|----------|
| Alcyonium acaule | 3 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | |
| Alcyonium coralloides | 13 | 1 | | 1 | 11 | |
| Alcyonium palmatum | 12 | 1 | 10 | 1 | | |
| Antipathella subpinnata* | 39 | 6 | | 26 | 7 | |
| Antipathes dichotoma* | 6 | 1 | | | | 5 |
| <i>Caryophyllia</i> sp. | 3 | | | | 3 | |
| Cerianthus membranaceus | 5 | | | 2 | 3 | |
| Corallium rubrum* | 287 | 142 | | 49 | 96 | |
| Dendrophyllia cornigera* | 173 | 6 | | 157 | 1 | 9 |
| Eunicella cavolinii* | 881 | 244 | | 331 | 306 | |
| Eunicella singularis* | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| Eunicella verrucosa* | 267 | 31 | 64 | 148 | 24 | |
| Funiculina quadrangularis | 67 | 5 | | 61 | | 1 |
| Leiopathes glaberrima* | 2 | | | | | 2 |
| Leptogorgia sarmentosa* | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| Paramuricea clavata* | 417 | 74 | 4 | 301 | 38 | |
| Parantipathes larix* | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Parazoanthus axinellae | 292 | | | | 292 | |
| Pennatula phosphorea | 9 | | | 9 | | |
| Pennatula rubra | 3 | | 2 | 1 | | |
| Swiftia sp. | 2 | | | 2 | | |
| Villogorgia bebrycoides | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| TOTAL | 2,490 | 514 | 81 | 1,091 | 785 | 19 |

Some differences appear in the composition of the structuring cnidarians observed at canyon heads and continental shelf (Fig. 4). Both situations share eight conspicuous, arborescent species; *Antipathes dichotoma* and *Antipathella subpinnata* were only observed in the canyon heads, whereas, *E. singularis, Leiopathes glaberrima,* and *Parantipathes larix* were detected only on the continental shelves (Fig. 4).



Fig. 4. Density (n° colonies m⁻²) of the structuring species in the canyon heads (A) and on the continental shelves (B).

The occurrence of coral forests relate differently to the abiotic variables in the five study sites. At Arma di Taggia, structuring colonies were found between 47 - 93 metres depth on substrates with a slope range of 6° - 50°. At Bergeggi, structuring species were observed between 229 - 394 metres depth, with slopes of 29° - 41°. At Bordighera, structuring species were observed between 117 - 310depth, with slopes of 29° - 41°. At Bordighera, structuring species were observed between 117 - 310

1238 1239

1224 1225

metres depth along slopes ranges of $22^{\circ} - 47^{\circ}$. Structuring cnidarians in Dramont were identified between 64 - 287 metres depth on substrates with an inclination range of $6^{\circ} - 62^{\circ}$. Finally, at Monaco the structuring species were found between 84 - 128 metres depth over slopes of about 14° . On average, our data show that 95% of the structuring cnidarian colonies in canyons' heads mainly settled in correspondence of slope range values of $6^{\circ} - 61^{\circ}$, whereas, on the continental shelf, 97.6% of the colonies occurred on sites with slope range values of $7^{\circ} - 49^{\circ}$.

Various parameters have been gathered concerning the vulnerability of the most common structuring species in the five areas. Monaco and Bordighera canyon systems showed the highest percentage of impacted frames (58% and 47%, respectively), followed by Arma di Taggia (26%), Dramont and Bergeggi (20% and 12%). Despite this, Monaco showed no frames with entangled colonies; a relatively low percentage was observed in all other canyons with the exception of Bordighera (17%). A total of 553 impacted colonies were counted, divided into 72% of entangled specimens, 21% of epibiotic and 31% of necrotic ones. When considering the single species, the ones mostly interested by these phenomena are P. clavata, E. cavolinii, E. verrucosa, D. cornigera, and C. rubrum, with site-specific differences. In Arma di Taggia shelf, 67% of red coral colonies are entangled, while P. *clavata* and *E. verrucosa* wed the highest percentage of overgrown and necrotic colonies (Fig. 5A-C). Eignificant necrosis signs were observed only in this site. P. clavata colonies are usually colonized by the serpulid *Filograna* spp., whose presence and degree of coverage (about 11%), however, is considered normal. E. verrucosa colonies are commonly colonized (about 10% of the surface) by the parasitic soft coral Alcyonium coralloides and sometimes by hydroids. In the Bordighera Canyon, E. cavolinii is the species most affected by the epibiosis phenomena (Fig. 5B): topies are usually covered by the A. coralloides or hydroids for nearly 40% of their surface. D. cornigera, instead, is observed to be the most frequently entangled in lines (Fig. 5A). In the Bergeggi Canyon, few species are affected by epibiosis and necrosis phenomena, as well as entanglements (Fig. 5A-C).



Fig. 5. Percentage of colonies showing entanglement (A), epibiosis (B) and necrosis (C).

At Dramont *P. clavata* and *E. verrucosa* displayed the largest percentage of overgrown colonies (Fig. 5B), almost all of them being colonized by *A. coralloides* or hydroids covering the gorgonians

1357

surfaces for over 40%. High percentages of entangled colonies concerned *cavolinii* and *C. rubrum* (Fig. 5C). Finally, the Monaco canyon system hosted the least compromised coral forests (Fig. 5A-B).

Regarding necrosis, the largest number of necrotic colonies were found in the Arma di Taggia site where *P. clavata* was the species most affected by the phenomenon (Fig. 5C). A single colony of *E. verrucosa* entirely necrotic was observed in Monaco (Fig. 5C).

Marine litter: typologies and distribution

The presence of marine litter was widely registered along the paths of the twelve ROV dives carried out in the canyons (Table 4; Fig. 6).



Fig. 6. Examples of Derelict Fishing Gears: (A) lost trammel net in the Bordighera Canyon; (B) lost trammel net in the Arma di Taggia site; (C-D) lost fishing lines in the Arma di Taggia site. Scale bar= 10 cm.

A total of 146 items were found in the study areas, accounting for 85% of DFGs (divided into fishing nets (57%), lines (12%) and ropes (16%)). The remaining 15% is related to general urban litter, mainly plastic (12%), followed by glass and metals.

None of the five canyons investigated were free of DFGs, however, some differences were reported
among sites in terms of litter density per hectare: the site with the highest density of litter was
Bergeggi, followed by Monaco and Bordighera (Fig. 7). DFGs are well represented in the sites of
Bergeggi and Bordighera, while urban litter is more abundant in Monaco.

Marine litter also was related to the considered environmental variables. In the Dramont Canyon, litter was found between 68 - 227 m depth, with slope range from 23° to 44°. In the Monaco Canyon, litter was found between 95 - 127 m with a slope values of about 13°. In the Bordighera Canyon, litter was observed between 62 - 300 m with slope range from 15° to 34°. In Arma di Taggia site, litter was found between 47 - 93 m over slope range from 9° to 21°, while in the Bergeggi Canyon, litter was observed between 229 - 434 m with slope range from 14° to 44°.

 Table 4. Number of marine litter items observed along the ROV dive tracks. Codes from Galgani *et al.* (2015) of the categories are reported in brackets.

| Canyon System | ROV dive | Fishing nets (A.6) | Fishing lines (A.7) | Fishing ropes (A.9) | Metals (C) | Glass (D) | Other (I) |
|----------------|----------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Descent | 9 | 4 | | | | 2 | |
| Dramont | 10 | 4 | | | | | |
| | 11 | 3 | | | | | |
| Monaco | 12 | 4 | | | | 1 | 7 |
| Bordighera | 4 | 28 | | | 1 | | 2 |
| | 5 | 38 | | | | | 1 |
| Arma di Taggia | 1 | | 5 | | | | 3 |
| 00 | 2 | | 4 | | | | 2 |
| | 3 | 2 | 8 | 3 | | | |
| Bergeggi | 6 | 1 | | 7 | 1 | | 1 |
| 2418488 | 7 | | | 6 | | | |
| | 8 | | | 7 | | | 1 |



Fig. 7. Density of marine litter items (n° litter items ha⁻¹) observed along the path of the ROV dives.

A representation of the partial correlations between DFGs, occurrence of structuring cnidarians, depth, distance from the coast and from the nearest port is shown in Fig. 8 for the whole dataset, and in Fig. 9A-E for each canyon. In both, positive correlations are displayed in blue, and negative correlations in red colours. The correlation values that are not statistically significant (p-value > 0.05) are not displayed.

Focusing on DFGs, the matrix showing the partial correlations calculated on the whole ROV dataset (Fig. 8) highlights that:

| • | the presence of fishing nets is negatively partially correlated with that of D . cornigera (r = - |
|---|--|
| | 0.25), E. verrucosa (r = -0.23), A. subpinnata (r = -0.20), A. dicothoma (r = -0.15), E. |
| | <i>cavolinii</i> ($r = -0.14$), <i>L. sarmentosa</i> ($r = -0.12$) and <i>L. glaberrima</i> ($r = -0.12$). Moreover, the |
| | fishing nets are positively correlated with depth ($r = 0.42$) and negatively correlate with the |
| | distance from the nearest port (r = - 0.25), the distance from the coast (r = - 014) and the |
| | presence of ropes (r = -0.23); |

074

35 976

997

¹⁵178

79

the presence of fishing lines is not significantly correlated with the presence of any species, it is correlated negatively with depth (r = -0.14) and positively with the distance from the coast (r = 0.20);

• the presence of ropes is negatively correlated with that of *A. dicothoma* (r = -0.29), *L. glaberrima* (r = -0.29), *D. cornigera* (r = -0.24) and *P. larix* (r = -0.21). In addition, the presence of ropes is positively correlated with depth (r = 0.52) and the distance from the coast (r = 0.20), and it is negatively correlated with the presence of fishing nets (r = -0.23).



Fig. 8. Partial correlations matrix calculated on the whole dataset.

Regarding the partial correlations of DFGs calculated for each canyon system, the matrices of Fig. 9 point out that:

in the Dramont Canyon (Fig. 9A) the presence of fishing nets is negatively correlated with that of *A. dicothoma* (r = - 0.54) and *D. cornigera* (r = - 0.41), and is positively partially correlated with depth (r = 0.60);

| 1594 | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| 1595 | | |
| 1596 1597 1597 | • | in the Monaco Canyon (Fig. 9B) there are no statistically significant correlations. |
| 1598 15 993 | • | in the Bordighera Canyon (Fig. 9C) the presence of fishing nets is negatively correlated with |
| 1600 16 004 | | that of <i>D. cornigera</i> ($r = -0.33$), <i>E. verrucosa</i> ($r = -0.25$) and <i>A. subpinnata</i> ($r = -0.23$); |
| 1602 16 405 | ٠ | in the Arma di Taggia site (Fig. 9D) the presence of fishing nets is negatively correlated with |
| 1604 16 456 | | that of C. rubrum ($r = -0.24$). The presence of fishing lines is negatively correlated with that |
| 1606 1607 1608 | | of <i>E. verrucosa</i> ($r = -0.32$) and <i>E. cavolinii</i> ($r = -0.29$), with depth ($r = -0.30$) and presence |
| 1609 408 1610 | | of ropes (r = - 0.25). The latter is also negatively correlated both with the presence of C . |
| 1611 409 1612 | | <i>rubrum</i> ($r = -0.25$) and of fishing lines ($r = -0.25$). |
| 1613 16 44 0 | • | in the Bergeggi Canyon (Fig. 9E) the presence of fishing nets is negatively correlated with the |
| 1615 16 461 | | presence of <i>D. cornigera</i> ($r = -0.41$) and the presence of ropes ($r = -0.46$); the presence of |
| 1617 16 482 | | ropes is negatively correlated with the presence of <i>D. cornigera</i> ($r = -0.66$), <i>L. glaberrima</i> (r |
| 1619 16 20 3 | | = - 0.66), A. dicothoma (r = - 0.65), P. larix (r = - 0.55) and with the presence of fishing nets |
| 1621 | | |
| 16224 | | (r = -0.46). |
| 1623 | | |
| 1024 | | |
| 1626 | | |
| 1627 | | |
| 1628 | | |
| 1629 | | |
| 1630 | | |
| 1631 | | |
| 1632 | | |
| 1633 | | |
| 1634 | | |
| 1635 | | |
| 1636 | | |
| 1637 | | |
| 1638 | | |
| 1639 | | |
| 1640 | | |
| 1641 | | |
| 1642 | | |
| 1643 | | |
| 1044 | | |
| 1646 | | |
| 1647 | | |
| 1648 | | |
| 1649 | | |

| Depth Asubpinnata A.dichotoma C.rubrum D.cornigera E.cavolinii E.verrucosa Lsarmentosa Rclavata Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 1 0.7 0.4 0.6 | | 0.7 1 -0.4 -0.5 -0.3 | -0.3 | 0.4 -0.4 1 -0.4 -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.6 -0.5 -0.4 1 | -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 | 0.4 | -1 |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| A subpinnata A.dichotoma C.rubrum D.cornigera E.cavolinii E.verrucosa L.sarmentosa Rclavata Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 0.7 | | -0.4 -0.5 -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.4 1 -0.4 -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -0.5 | -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 | 0.4 | -1 |
| A.subpinnata A.dichotoma C.rubrum D.cornigera E.cavolinii E.verrucosa L.sarmentosa Relavata Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 0.7 | | 1 -0.4 -0.5 -0.5 | -0.3 | -0.4 1 -0.4 -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -0.5 | -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 | 0.4 | -1 |
| A.dichotoma C.rubrum D.cornigera E.cavolinii E.verrucosa L.sarmentosa Rclavata Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 0.7 | | 1 -0.4 -0.5 -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.4 1 -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -0.5 -0.4 1 | -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 | 0.4 | -1 |
| C.rubrum D.cornigera E.cavolinii E.verrucosa L.sarmentosa Relavata Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 0.4 | | -0.4 -0.5 -0.5 -0.3 | -0.3 | 1 -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -0.4 | -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 1 1 | 0.4 | -1 |
| C.rubrum D.cornigera E.cavolinii E.verrucosa L.sarmentosa Relavata Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 0.4 | | -0.4 | -0.3 | 1 -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -0.4 | -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 | 0.4 | -1 |
| D.cornigera E.cavolinii E.verrucosa L.sarmentosa Rclavata Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 0.4 | | -0.4 | -0.3 | 1 -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -0.4 | -0.3 | 0.4 | -1 |
| E.cavolinii E.verrucosa L.sarmentosa P.clavata Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 0.6 | | -0.5 -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 1 | -1 |
| E.cavounu E.verrucosa L.sarmentosa P.clavata Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 0.6 | | -0.5 -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 1 | -1 |
| E.verrucosa L.sarmentosa Rclavata Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 0.6 | | -0.5 -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| L.sarmentosa P.clavata Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 0.6 | | -0.5 -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| <i>Relavata</i> Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 0.6 | | -0.5 -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| <i>Relavata</i> Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 0.6 | | -0.5 -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| Fishing Net Coast Distance Port Distance | 0.6 | | -0.5 -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.4 -0.3 0.4 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| Coast Distance Port Distance | | | -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.3 0.4 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| Coast Distance Port Distance | | | -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.3 0.4 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| Port Distance | | | sa | | 0.4 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| | | | sa | | a | | | | | | | | -1 |
| | _ | | sa | | a | | | | | | | | |
| | - | | sa | | a | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | | sa | | a | | | | | 43 | | | |
| | _ | | S | | \$ | | | ÷ | | nce | | ce | |
| | _ | | 8 | | 0111 | ta | | Ne | | ista | | tan | |
| | th | | rru | | rme | ava | | ing | | Ð | A | ñ | |
| | Del | | . ve | | 20 | D.Cl | | ish | | oas | | ort | |
| | | | Н | F | 7 | | | Щ | | 0 | f | ᆚ | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Depth | 1 | | | | | | | | | -1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | _ | | | | | | | _ | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| verrucosa | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| armentosa | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | _ | | | | | | | _ | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P.clavata | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 'ishing Net | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| st Distance | -1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | ' | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| rt Distance | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | -1 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>P.clavata</i> ishing Net st Distance rt Distance | <i>P.clavata</i> ishing Net st Distance -1 rt Distance 1 | P.clavata ishing Net st Distance -1 rt Distance 1 | P.clavata ishing Net st Distance -1 rt Distance 1 | P.clavata ishing Net st Distance -1 rt Distance 1 | P.clavata ishing Net st Distance -1 rt Distance 1 | P.clavata 1 ishing Net 1 st Distance -1 It Distance 1 | P.clavata 1 ishing Net 1 st Distance -1 1 1 | P.clavata 1 ishing Net 1 st Distance -1 1 1 rt Distance 1 | P.clavata 1 1 ishing Net 1 1 st Distance -1 1 1 rt Distance 1 1 1 | P.clavata11ishing Net11st Distance-11It Distance11 | P.clavata 1 1 1 ishing Net Image: Constraint of the second | P.clavata111ishing Net111st Distance-111nt Distance111 |

1711

В

А

| 1714 1 | 1712 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|----------------|------------|------|---------------|------|------|--------|----------|------|------|----------|----------|--------|----------|----------|---|----|---|
| 1715 j j j j j j j j | 1717 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c} 1710 \\ 1717 \\ 1717 \\ 1718 \\ 1718 \\ 1718 \\ 1718 \\ 1719 \\ 1720 \\ 1721 \\ 1722 \\ 1723 \\ 1723 \\ 1722 \\ 1723 \\ 1722 \\ 1723 \\ 1724 \\ 1724 \\ 1725 \\ 1726 \\ 1726 \\ 1727 \\ 1728 \\ 1726 \\ 1727 \\ 1728 \\ 1728 \\ 1728 \\ 1729 \\ 1731 \\ 1737 \\ 1738 \\ 1731 \\ 1737 \\ 1738 \\ 1737 \\ 1738 \\ 1736 \\ 1737 \\ 1738 \\ 1736 \\ 1737 \\ 1738 \\ 11 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 1$ | 1715 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | e | | | | С |
| 17107 mini di ui di | 1710 | | | | ata | | a | | | sa | osa | | t | | anc | nce | | | C |
| 1717 1 1 1 1 1 0.8 0.7 1 1722 Depth 1 1 1 1 1 0.8 0.7 1 1722 Asubpinneta 1 1 1 1 1 0.8 0.7 1 1 1 1 0.8 0.7 1 1 1 1 0.8 0.7 1 1 1 1 0.8 0.7 1 1 1 1 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 0.2 | 1710 | | | _ | im | шп. | ige | lini | 1111 | ICO. | ent | ata | Z | i n | Dist | sta | | | |
| 1713 A 4 5 5 6 6 4 5 7 1 0 | 1710 | | anth | md | dq_{l} | ıqn. | uло | 200 | | erri | m.n | lavi | . ji | , | stI | Ē | | | |
| 1719 Depth 1 1 0.8 0.7 1 1722 A. subprinnata 1 0.8 0.7 0.8 0.7 0.8 0.7 0.8 0.7 0.8 0.7 0.8 0.7 0.7 0.2 0 </td <td>1710</td> <td></td> <td>Č</td> <td>Ľ,</td> <td>4.<i>s</i>1</td> <td>C.1</td> <td>D.C</td> <td>С Ц</td> <td>3</td> <td>E. A</td> <td>L.SC</td> <td>P.c</td> <td>E.</td> <td></td> <td>Coa</td> <td>Port</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | 1710 | | Č | Ľ, | 4. <i>s</i> 1 | C.1 | D.C | С Ц | 3 | E. A | L.SC | P.c | E. | | Coa | Port | | | |
| 1721 Depth 1 - - - 0.8 0.7 1 1722 A.subpinnata 1 - - - 0.2 - < | 1719 | | | | × | | | | <u> </u> | · | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| 1721 Depti 1 0.8 0.7 1722 A.subpinnata 1 0.2 0 1724 C.rubrum 1 0.3 0.2 0 1725 D.cornigera 1 0.3 0.2 0 1727 E.carolinii 1 0.2 0.2 0 1729 E.verrncosa 1 0.2 0.2 0.2 1731 L.sarmentosa 1 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 1733 Relavata 0.2 0.3 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 1733 Relavata 0.8 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 1 1733 Relavata 0.8 0.2 0.2 1 1 1 0.2 0.2 1< | 1720 | Donth | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | 0.7 | | 1 | |
| 1722 A.subpinnata 1 - - -0.2 - | 1721 | Depui | | - | | | | | | | | | _ | | 0.0 | -0.7 | | | |
| 1724 C.rubrun 1 - <td< td=""><td>1722</td><td>A.subpinnata</td><td>ı </td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-0</td><td>.2</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<> | 1722 | A.subpinnata | ı | | 1 | | | | | | | | -0 | .2 | | | | | |
| 1124 C. rubrun 1 1 -0.3 0 1725 D. corruigera 1 1 -0.3 0 1727 E. cavolinii 1 1 -0.2 0.2 0 1729 E. vermeosa 1 1 -0.2 0.2 0 0 1731 L. samentosa -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 0.2 0 0 1733 Pelavata -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 -0.2 0.2 1733 Pelavata -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 -0.2 1 1 0.2 -0.2 1 1 0.2 -0.2 1 1 1 0.2 -0.2 1 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 1 1 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 | 1723 | - | | - | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1726 1727 1728 D.corrigera E.cavolinii 1 1 -0.3 - - 0 1727 1728 E.cavolinii 1 1 - -0.3 - 0 0 1729 E.vernicosa - 1 1 - 0 0 0 0 1731 L.sarmentosa - 1 1 0.2 -0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 1 1 0 <t< td=""><td>1724</td><td>C.rubrum</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<> | 1724 | C.rubrum | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | 1720 | Deornicary | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | |
| 1127 E. carolinii 1 1 -0.2 0.2 0.2 1730 L. sarmentosa 0 0 1 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 1731 L.sarmentosa 0 0 0 1 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 1733 Palarata 0.2 0.3 0.2 1 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 1 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 < | 1720 | D.cornigera | <i>i</i> | _ | | | 1 | | | | | | -0 | . ၁ | | | | | |
| 1729 E verrucosa 1 1 -0.2 -0.2 0.2 0 1730 L.samentosa 1 1 0.2 -0.2 0.2 0 1731 L.samentosa 0 0 1 0.2 -0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.3 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.3< | 1720 | E.cavolinii | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1129 Everrucosa 1 -0.2 -0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.2 0.2 1 1 0.3 0. | 1728 | | - | - | | | | - | | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| 1730 L.sarmentosa | 1729 | E. verrucosa | | | | | | | | 1 | | | -0 | .2 | -0.2 | 0.2 | | 0 | |
| 1731 L.sameluosa Image: construction of the structure of the str | 1730 | . , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1732 Pclavata 1 0.2 -0.2 1 0.2 -0.2 1733 Fishing Net -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 1 1 0.2 -0.2 1736 Coast Distance 0.8 0 0.2 0.2 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <td>1731</td> <td>L.sarmentosa</td> <td>!</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | 1731 | L.sarmentosa | ! | | | | | _ | | | 1 | | _ | | | | | | |
| 1733 Fishing Net -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 1 -1 1 | 1732 | Pelavata | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 0.2 | -0.2 | | | |
| 1734 1735 1736 Coast Distance -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 1 1 -1 1737 1738 Port Distance 0.8 0 0.2 0.2 1 1 1 -1 1 1737 1738 Port Distance -0.7 0 0.2 -0.2 1 1 1 -1 < | 1733 | 1101011010 | - | - | | | | - | | | | · · | - | | | | | | |
| 1736 1737 1738 1737 1738 1739 1739 1740 1741 1741 1744 1744 1744 1744 1744 | 1734 | Fishing Net | | | -0.2 | | -0.3 | : | - I • | 0.2 | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| 1736 Coast Distance 0.8 -0.2 0.2 1 1 1737 Port Distance -0.7 0.2 -0.2 1 1 1739 -0.7 0.2 -0.2 1 1 - 1740 -0.7 0.2 -0.2 1 1 - - 1741 -0.7 0.2 -0.2 1 1 - | 1735 | a . D' . | | _ | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| 1737 1738 1739 Port Distance 0.7 0.2 -0.2 1 1 -1 1739 1739 1740 1 1 0.2 -0.2 1 1 1 -1 | 1736 | Coast Distance | e <u> </u> | .8 | | | | _ | | 0.2 | | 0.2 | - | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| 1738 1.000000000000000000000000000000000000 | 1737 | Port Distance | | 7 | | | | | | 0 2 | | -0 : | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| 1739 1740 1 </td <td>1738</td> <td></td> <td>· ·</td> <td></td> <td>-1</td> <td></td> | 1738 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | · · | | -1 | |
| 1740 Image: strateging and strategi | 1739 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1741 1 0.3 0.2 0.3 0. | 1740 | | | ta | | 2 | | 25 | 2 | 50 | | e | | | nce | ce | | | |
| 1742 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 | 1741 | | | ına | ш | Ser | nii | ari. | SOS | into | 7 | L'n | Net | | ista | tan | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | 1742 | | Ч | hpi | $_{pru}$ | rnig | voli | Bul | rruc | rme | wat | ы В | ы Е | 0 | t D | Dis | | | D |
| 1744 Depth 1 0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 1 1746 A.subpinnata 1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 1 1 1 1747 A.subpinnata 1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 1 | 1743 | | ept | | 'n. | 00.0 | ca | SIF | Ve V | | cla | ishi | ish | ob | Coa | ort | | | |
| 1745 Depth 1 0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.3 1 1747 A.subpinnata 1 0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.3 1 1 1748 C.nubrum 0.3 -0.3 1 -0.3 -0.2 0.3 1 1749 D.cornigera 1 -0.3 -0.2 0.3 -0.2 0.3 1 1750 E.cavolinii -0.2 1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 1 </td <td>1744</td> <td></td> <td>н</td> <td>7</td> <td>0</td> <td>Ч</td> <td>띠</td> <td>ы</td> <td>머리</td> <td>~</td> <td>~~~</td> <td><u>н</u></td> <td><u>н</u></td> <td>~~~</td> <td></td> <td><u> </u></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td> | 1744 | | н | 7 | 0 | Ч | 띠 | ы | 머리 | ~ | ~~~ | <u>н</u> | <u>н</u> | ~~~ | | <u> </u> | _ | | |
| 1746 A.subpinnata 1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 1 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 1 | 1740 | Depth | 1 | | 0.3 | | -0.2 | | | | | -0.3 | | | -0.3 | | | 1 | |
| 1747 1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 1 1 1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 1 1 1 1 1 -0 | 1740 | A.subpinnata | | 4 | 0.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1748 C.narian 0.3 -0.3 1 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 1< | 1747 | (n chrysen | | | -0.3 | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | |
| 1749 D.cornigera 1 1 0 0 0 1750 E.cavolinii 0.2 1 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0 0 1752 E.singularis 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1753 E.vernucosa 0.3 0.3 1 0.3 0.3 0 0 0 1754 L.sarmentosa 0.3 0.3 1 0.3 0.3 1 0 0 0 1755 Rclavata 0.3 0.3 1 0.2 0 0 0 0 1757 Fishing Net 0.3 0.3 0.3 1 0.2 0 </td <td>1740</td> <td>C.ruorum</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>-0.3</td> <td>3 1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-0.3</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-0.2</td> <td>-0.3</td> <td>8</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | 1740 | C.ruorum | 0.3 | -0.3 | 3 1 | | | | -0.3 | | | | -0.2 | -0.3 | 8 | | | | |
| 1750 E.cavolinii -0.2 1 -0.3 1 -0.2 -0.3 -0.3 1 -0.2 -0.3 1 -0.2 -0.3 1 -0.2 -0.3 1 -0.2 -0.3 1 -0.2 -0.3 1 -0.2 -0.3 1 -0.2 -0.3 1 -0.2 -0.3 1 -0.2 1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 1 -0.2 1 1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 1 -0.2 1 1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 1 1 1 1 -0.3 -0.3 1 1 1 1 1 | 1749 | D.cornigera | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1751 E.singularis 1 1 0 0 0 1752 E.singularis -0.3 -0.3 1 0 0 0 1753 E.vernucosa -0.3 -0.3 1 0.3 0 0 0 1754 L.sarmentosa -0.3 0.3 1 0 0 0 0 1755 Rclavata -0.3 0.3 1 0 0 0 0 1757 Fishing Line -0.3 -0.3 0 0 0 0 0 0 1759 Rope -0.3 0 0 0 1 0 <t< td=""><td>1751</td><td>E.cavolinii</td><td>-0.2</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td><td>-0.3</td><td>-0.3</td><td></td><td>-0.3</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<> | 1751 | E.cavolinii | -0.2 | | | | 1 | | -0.3 | -0.3 | | -0.3 | | | | | | | |
| 1752 | 1752 | E.singularis | | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1753 <i>L.vertacosa</i> -0.3 -0.3 1 -0.3 -0.3 0 1754 <i>L.sarmentosa</i> -0.3 1 -0.3 1 0 0 1755 <i>Rclavata</i> -0.3 1 0 0 0 0 1757 Fishing Line -0.3 -0.3 1 0 0 0 1758 Fishing Net -0.2 0 1 0 0 0 1759 Rope -0.3 0.3 0 0 1 0 0 1761 Coast Distance -0.3 0 0 0 1 1 1 1762 Port Distance -0.3 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1763 17647 1 0 0 0 0 1 | 1752 | Europa | | | | | | - | | | | | | | - | | | | |
| 1734 L.sarmentosa -0.3 1 -0.4 1 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 1 1 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 1 1 1 -0.5 -1 -1 -0.5 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 | 1753 | E.vernicosa | | | -0.3 | | -0.3 | | 1 | | -0.3 | -0.3 | | | | _ | | | |
| 1735 <i>Relavata</i> 1756 <i>Relavata</i> 1757 Fishing Line 1758 Fishing Net 1759 Rope 1760 -0.3 -0.3 1 -0.2 - 1761 Coast Distance -0.3 - - - 1 - 1762 Port Distance - - - - 1 1 - 1763 1763 - - - - - 1 1 - </td <td>1755</td> <td>L.sarmentosa</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-0.3</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> | 1755 | L.sarmentosa | | | | | -0.3 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| 1750 Fishing Line -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 1 -0.2 -0.3 1758 Fishing Net -0.2 -0.3 -0.3 1 -0.2 -0.3 1760 Rope -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 1 -0.2 1 -0.2 1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 1 -0.3 -0.4 1 1 1 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.4 1 1 1 -0.3 -0.4 | 1756 | P.clavata | | | | | | | -0.3 | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 1757 Fishing Net 1758 Fishing Net 1759 Rope 1760 -0.2 1761 Coast Distance 1762 Port Distance 1763 -0.3 1764 -1 | 1757 | Fishing Line | | | | | | | | | · · | | | | | | | | |
| 1736 Fishing Net -0.2 1 - 1759 Rope -0.3 -0.2 1 - 1761 Coast Distance -0.3 -0.3 - 1 1 1762 Port Distance -0.3 - 1 1 1 1763 -0.3 - - 1 1 1 1763 - - - 1 1 1 1763 - - - 1 1 1 1765 - - - - - 1 1 | 1750 | T' L' NI | -0.3 | | | | -0.3 | | -0.3 | | | 1 | | -0.2 | | | | | |
| 1760 Rope -0.3 -0.2 1 1761 Coast Distance -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 1 1 1762 Port Distance -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 1 1 1762 Port Distance -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -1 1 1763 -17648 | 1750 | Fishing Net | | | -0.2 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| 1761 Coast Distance -0.3 1 1 1762 Port Distance 0 1 1 1 1763 1 1 1 1 1 1763 17417 1765 17488 -1 -1 | 1760 | Rope | | | -0.3 | | | | | | | -0.2 | | 1 | | | | | |
| 1762 Port Distance 1 1 1763 -1 17647 1765 17648 | 1761 | Coast Distance | .0 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| 1 1 1 1763 17 €1 17 51 17 511 17 51111111111111 | 1762 | Port Distance | -0.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 647 1765 17 68 | 1763 | I on Distance | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| 1765 17 68 | 17417 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .1 | |
| 17 8 8 | 1765 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 17668 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

689

| 1771 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----------|---|---|
| 1772 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1773 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1774 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1775 | | | | | | | | | e | | | |
| 1776 | | | ра | ra | та | | et | | tanc | nce | | |
| 1777 | | | oto, | 186 | erri | | Ž | | Dis | ista | | |
| 1778 | | oth | ich | orn | labi | rix | inid | e | ast | <u>t</u> | | |
| 1779 | | Del | A.d | D.0 | L.8 | P.la | Eis | Roj | ပိ | Poi | | |
| 1780 | | | | | | | | | | | | l |
| 1781 | Depth | 1 | | | | | | | 0.9 | -0.9 | | - |
| 1782 | • | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1783 | A.dichotoma | | 1 | -0.5 | -0.5 | -0.4 | | -0.6 | | | | |
| 1784 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1785 | D.cornigera | | -0.5 | 1 | -0.5 | -0.4 | -0.4 | -0.7 | | | | |
| 1786 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1787 | L.glaberrima | | -0.5 | -0.5 | 1 | -0.4 | | -0.7 | | | | |
| 1788 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1789 | P.larix | | -0.4 | -0.4 | -0.4 | 1 | | -0.5 | | | |) |
| 1790 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1791 | Fishing Net | | | -0.4 | | | 1 | -0.5 | | | | |
| 1792 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1793 | Rope | | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.5 | -0.5 | 1 | | | | |
| 1794 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1795 | Coast Distance | 0.9 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| 1796 | D (D) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1797 | Poit Distance | -0.9 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| 1798 | | | | | | | | | | | - | 1 |

Fig. 9. Partial correlations matrices calculated for each sites. (A) Dramont, (B) Monaco, (C) Bordighera, (D) Arma di Taggia and (E) Bergeggi.

Regarding the five most representative species (Table 3), the partial correlations underline that:

- *C. rubrum* occurrence is mostly hampered by fishing nets and ropes in Arma di Taggia site (Fig. 9D) and does not show any statistically significant correlation in the aggregate data (Fig. 8) and in Bordighera (Fig. 9C) and Dramont canyons (Fig. 9A);
- D. cornigera presence is mostly affected by fishing nets and ropes in the aggregate data (Fig. 8) and in Bergeggi Canyon (Fig. 9E) and by fishing nets both in Bordighera (Fig. 9C) and Dramont canyons (Fig. 9A). It does not show any statistically significant correlation in the sites of Arma di Taggia (Fig. 9D) and Monaco (Fig. 9B);

• *E. cavolinii* is mostly affected by fishing nets in the aggregate data (Fig. 8), by fishing lines in the Arma di Taggia site (Fig. 9D), and does not show statistically significant correlation both in Bordighera (Fig. 9C) and Dramont canyons (Fig. 9A);

• The presence of *E. verrucosa* presence is negatively correlated with that of fishing nets in the aggregate data (Fig. 8) and in Bordighera Canyon (Fig. 9C), with that of fishing lines in the Arma di Taggia site (Fig. 9D), and does not show statistically significant correlation in the canyons of Dramont (Fig. 9A) and Monaco (Fig. 9B).

• *P. clavata* presence does not show statistically significant correlations in the aggregate data matrix (Fig. 8) and in none of the matrices of the canyons where it was observed (Fig. 9A, B, C and D).

18445 Discussion

436

438

18<u>4</u>39

18<u>45</u>0

1850²

A better understanding of the biological and ecological role as well as of threats and vulnerability of deep-sea environments such as canyons, is crucial for their sustainable governance. Only a limited 448 number of the over 500 canyons recorded for the Mediterranean Sea (Würtz, 2012) has been 449 1865 investigated for their resident biota. With respect to the Western Mediterranean, the Spanish and 1867 0 French canyons are among the best known with respect to sessile macro- and megabenthos (Orejas et al., 2009; Gori et al., 2013; Fabri et al., 2014), while lesser is known for Ligurian canyons (Tunesi et al., 2001; Fanelli et al., 2017). The Ligurian region comprehends 24 major canyons, out of 19 are 18#52 along the Italian coasts, one in Monaco and four along the French coastline (Würtz, 2012; Fabri et al., 2014). In this context, this study represents the first description of the deep assemblages of five Ligurian canyons' head and adjacent shelf areas.

Of the five investigated topographic features, all except one (Bergeggi), showed rich megabenthic communities mainly dominated by arborescent anthozoan forests, recognized as highly valuable and complex Mediterranean ecosystems both along the continental shelf and in deeper areas (Bo *et al.*, 2015; Gori *et al.*, 2017; Chimienti *et al.*, *in press*). This situation is related to a higher occurrence of

1891 4**60** 1892 discription in those canyons with a shallower canyon head; hard sloping substrates are considered 1893 1894 1894 preferential habitats for coral forests formed by dense aggregations of gorgonians and black corals (Gori *et al.*, 2017). Additionally, it has to be noted that the deeper depth range investigated in 1897 Bergeggi was mainly outside the bathymetric distribution interval of the main recorded species, E. 18463 1899 cavolinii, E. verrucosa and P. clavata. 19<mark>964</mark> 1901 19**995** A great effort was dedicated in investigating the structure, habitat preference and environmental 1922 19<mark>086</mark> status of the coral forests. The assemblages are multi-specific, mainly composed of gorgonians and 1905 19<mark>467</mark> 1907 only occasionally by antipatharians. Species show distinct habitat preferences: on average, in the 1908 468 1909 canyon heads forests are found on moderately sloped sites, whereas, on the continental shelf they 1910 19**469** thrive on flatter surfaces. Slope and depth are among the abiotic drivers well recognized as 1912 19**430** environmental constraints of benthic settling that control the distribution of large filter-feeders (e.g.: 1914 19431 1916 19472

Mortensen and Buhl-Mortensen, 2004; Davies and Guinotte, 2011; Angeletti et al., in press, Lo Iacono et al., in press): the mean slope values found are probably a compromise in relation to the 19493 local current movements, allowing specimens to prevent sedimentation and ensure a correct exposure 19274 to the water flow for the food supply. Moreover, slope can be considered an important factor in 19235 providing protection from bottom trawling, because this kind of fishing cannot be carry out on 1925 4**76** 1926 sloping sea bottoms (Fabri et al., 2014). Canyons, as privileged environments for deep hydrodynamic 192<u>7</u> 1927 1928 circulation, are generally considered good fishing grounds (Revenga Martinez de Pazos, 2012). This assumption is based on the fishing footprints available for canyon ecosystems, but can be derived 19308 also on the base of the well-recognized role of animal forests in supplying food and protection 19**329** attracting a rich associated fauna, including fish of commercial interest, thus enhancing the fishing 19**480** exploitment of these areas (Cerrano et al., 2010; D'Onghia et al., 2012; Bo et al., 2014; Galgani et 19**361** 19262 al., 2018). The occurrence of steep flanks and rocky outcrops in canyon areas (Fourt et al., 2013) ¹⁹483 enhances the settling of coral forests that, indirectly, where fishing effort. Because of their steep ¹⁹⁴² 484 profiles, which we generally protected from bottom trawling, but, on the other hand, are highly

1945 1946

1918

1920

1922

1924

1929

1931

1933

1935

1937

1939

1941

1943 1944

1889 1890

exploited by artisanal and recreational fishermen, especially in the Ligurian context in which the canyons' heads are relatively close to the coastline, hence accessible.

This study confirms the vulnerability of such ecosystems to fishing activities as demonstrated by the high frequency of occurrence of DFGs in all investigated canyons and a high rate of entanglements especially for large arborescent species (P. clavata) and fragile, calcareous ones (D. cornigera and C. *rubrum*). As previously observed, the size of the colonies as well as the complexity of their canopies or the fragility of their skeletons, greatly affect the catchability of conspicuous, structuring species, hence their vulnerability (Sampaio et al., 2012; Bo et al., 2014; Mytilineou et al., 2014; Cau et al., 2017). The fragility of these species and the risk for their habitats due to the fishing activities pressure, clearly emerged from the many negative indexes of the partial correlations calculated between the presence of the species and that of the DFGs (Figs. 8 and 9A-E). This result points out that the presence of all the species, with the exception of *P. clavata* and *E. singularis*, is negatively affected by that of one or more types of DFGs. Considering the aggregate data (Fig. 8), the fishing nets, that are the most numerous DFGs, seem to have the greatest impact. However, in the Bergeggi Canyon and Arma di Taggia shelf, the DFGs that are more representative, and that have the major number of negatively correlation with the occurrence of the species, are ropes and fishing lines, respectively. Every canyon has a predominant DFGs typology, but whatever it is, its presence is negatively correlated with that of one or more species, with the exception of Monaco where no meaningful correlations were found. In the case of *P. clavata*, one of the most entangled species, the partial correlation matrices are not statistically significant regarding the co-occurrence of specimens vs DFGs. Considering that 1) in the studied areas specimens are surely affected by the presence of DFGs (percentage of entangled specimens); 2) respect to the overall population, the colonies highly damaged (presence of necrosis and/or epibiosis) are a small number; 3) no evidence of broken colonies were found; and 4) the presence of the *P.clavata* is not correlated with the presence of DFGs, we can speculate that *P. clavata* could have a certain degree of resilience respect to the fishing

activities, probably due to its flexible skeleton. DFGs, also, were found in sites moderately sloped which indicate the presence of rocky bottoms where the nets remain entangled.

The contribution of generic urban trash to the observed litter is minimal, whilst the majority is attributable to DFGs, especially nets and lines. Our results agree well with published results regarding the continental platform and slopes in the Mediterranean Sea (Fabri *et al.*, 2014; Bo *et al.*, 2014; Angiolillo *et al.*, 2015; Cau *et al.*, 2017). The Bordighera canyon system appears to be the most affected in respect to the abundance of litter and its impact on enidarian colonies, followed by Arma di Taggia and Dramont. The Monaco canyon system is the less impacted by fishing litter, likely because of a reduced fishing effort there operated by the small local fleet, what guarantees the protection of its coral forests. Still, major differences are reported between Italian and French sites, probably ascribable to different socio-economic and cultural approaches to fishing activities, as well as to the body of the local fleets, besides local physiographic differences in the various canyon systems that may influence the actual exposure to fishing malpractices for their benthic ecosystems. A similar difference was highlighted by Fabri *et al.* (2014) when comparing the abundance of litter and typology of material between the Gulf of Lion's canyons and those in the French Ligurian Sea.

Conclusions

We have identified the occurrence of vulnerable coral forests in canyon systems and adjacent shelves of the Ligurian Sea. Although these canyon systems share a number of arborescent cnidarian species in common, they also display local differences in their compositions. Many such environments appear impacted at various degree by fishing, especially with respect to the local abundance of derelict fishing gears. We urge to implement specific abatement measures aimed at containing malpractices in the use of small-scale professional fishing gears in submarine canyons as well as promoting the identification of "Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs)" to protect and include in basin-scale protection networks.

Acknowledgements

The authors recognize the paramount role of the RAMOGE agreement and its Secretariat in supporting financially the oceanographic campaign in the three signatory countries and the activities in four of the five canyons.

Thanks are due to the Captains and crews of RRVV Astrea and Minerva Uno for their precious help and work during the field operations and to Tiffany L. Hogan and to Penny Marinou (http://www.litterae.gr/) for the English revision of this paper. We also thank two anonymous reviewers that with their comments helped us to improve our work.

This paper is Ismar-CNR, Bologna scientific contribution n. 1975, and is part of EU F.P. VII Projects COCONET, (contract no. 287844), and EVER-EST (contract no. 674907), DG Environment programme IDEM (grant agreement No 11.0661 /2017/750680/SUB/EN V.C2), and the Flag Project Ritmare (Ricerca Italiana per il Mare).

References

Amaro, T., Huvenne, V.A.I., Allcock, A.L., Aslam, T., Davies, J.S., Danovaro, R., De Stigter, H.C., Duineveld, G.C.A., Gambi, C., Gooday, A.J., Gunton, L.M., Hall, R., Howell, K.L., Ingels, J., Kiriakoulakis, K., Kershaw, C.E., Lavaleye, M.S.S., Robert, K., Stewart, H., Van Rooij, D., White, M., Wilson, A.M., 2016. The Whittard Canyon-A case study of submarine canyon processes. Progress in Oceanography, 146, 38-57.

Amblas, D., Ceramicola, S., Gerber, T.P., Canals, M., Chiocci, F.L., Dowdeswell, J.A., Harris, P.T., Huvenne, V.A.I., Lai, S.Y.J., Lastras, G., Lo Iacono, C., Micallef, A., Mountjoy, J.J., Paull, C.K., Puig, P., Sanchez-Vidal, A., 2017. Submarine Canyons and Gullies. In: Micallef A., Krastel S., Savini A. (Eds.) Submarine Geomophology. Springer Geology, pp. 251-272.

Anderson, T. W., Anderson, T. W., Anderson, T. W., Anderson, T. W., Mathématicien, E. U., 1958. An introduction to multivariate statistical analysis. Wiley, New York.

Angeletti, L., Bargain, A., Campiani, E., Foglini, F., Grande, V., Leidi, E., Mercorella, A.,
Prampolini, M., Taviani, M., *in press*. Cold-Water Coral Habitat Mapping in the Mediterranean Sea:
Methodologies and Perspectives. In: C. Orejas, C. Jiménez (eds.), Mediterranean Cold-Water Corals:
Past, Present and Future, Coral Reefs of the World 9, <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91608-8_16</u>.
Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature 2019.

Angeletti, L., Taviani, M., Canese, S., Foglini, F., Mastrototaro, F., Argnani, A., Trincardi F., Bakran-Petricioli, T., Ceregato, A., Chimienti, G., Mačić, V., Poliseno, A., 2014. New deep-water cnidarian sites in the southern Adriatic Sea. Mediterranean Marine Science, 15(2), 263-273.

Angeletti, L., Canese, S., Franchi, F., Montagna, P., Reitner, J., Walliser, E.O., Taviani, M., 2015. The "chimney forest" of the deep Montenegrin margin, south-eastern Adriatic Sea. Marine and Petroleum Geology, 66, 542-554.

Angiolillo, M., di Lorenzo, B., Farcomeni, A., Bo, M., Bavestrello, G., Santangelo, G., Cau, A., Mastascusa, V., Cau, A., Sacco, F., Canese, S., 2015. Distribution and assessment of marine debris in the deep Tyrrhenian Sea (NW Mediterranean Sea, Italy). Marine Pollution Bulletin, 92(1-2), 149-159.

Bavestrello, G., Cerrano, C., Zanzi, D., Cattaneo-Vietti, R., 1997. Damage by fishing activities to the Gorgonian coral *Paramuricea clavata* in the Ligurian Sea. Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems 7, 253–262. Bergmann, M., Gutow, L., Klages, M., 2015. Marine anthropogenic litter. Springer, Berlin, pp. 1-447.

Bo, M., Bavestrello, G., Canese, S., Giusti, M., Salvati, E., Angiolillo, M., Greco, S., 2009.Characteristics of a black coral meadow in the twilight zone of the central Mediterranean Sea. MarineEcology Progress Series, 397, 53-61.

Bo, M., Bertolino, M., Bavestrello, G., Canese, S., Giusti, M., Angiolillo, M., Pansini, M., Taviani, M., 2012. Role of deep sponge grounds in the Mediterranean Sea: a case study in southern Italy. Hydrobiologia, 687(1), 163-177.

Bo, M., Bava, S., Canese S., Angiolillo M., Cattaneo-Vietti, R., Bavestrello, G., 2014. Fishing impact on deep Mediterranean rocky habitats as revealed by ROV investigation. Biological Conservation, 171, 167-176.

Bo, M., Bavestrello, G., Angiolillo, M., Calcagnile, L., Canese, S., Cannas, R., Cau, A., D'Elia, M.,
D'Oriano, F., Follesa, M.C., Quarta, G., Cau, A., 2015. Persistence of pristine deep-sea coral gardens
in the Mediterranean Sea (SW Sardinia). PLoS One, 10(3), e0119393.

Brooke, S., Ross, S.W., 2014. First observations of the cold-water coral *Lophelia pertusa* in midAtlantic canyons of the USA. Deep Sea Research II, 104, 245-251.

Buhl-Mortensen, L., Ellingsen, K.E., Buhl-Mortensen, P., Skaar, K.L., Gonzalez-Mirelis, G., 2015.
Trawling disturbance on megabenthos and sediment in the Barents Sea: chronic effects on density,
diversity, and composition. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73(suppl. 1), i98-i114.

Canals, M., Puig, P., de Madron, X.D., Heussner, S., Palanques, A., Fabres, J., 2006. Flushing submarine canyons. Nature, 444(7117), 354-357.

Canals, M., Danovaro, R., Heussner, S., Lykousis, V., Puig, P., Trincardi, F., Calafat A.M., Durrieu de Madron X., Palanques, A., Sanchez-Vidal, A., 2009. Cascades in Mediterranean submarine grand canyons. Oceanography, 22(1), 26-43.

Cánovas-Molina, A., Montefalcone, M., Bavestrello, G., Cau, A., Bianchi, C.N., Morri, C., Canese
S., Bo, M., 2016. A new ecological index for the status of mesophotic megabenthic assemblages in
the Mediterranean based on ROV photography and video footage. Continental Shelf Research, 121,
13-20.

Cattaneo-Vietti, R., Albertelli, G., Aliani, S., Bava, S., Bavestrello, G., Benedetti Cecchi, L., Bianchi,
C.N., Bozzo E., Capello, M, Castellano, M., Cerrano, C., Chiantore, M., Corradi, N., Cocito, S.,
Cutroneo, L., Diviacco, G., Fabiano, M., Faimali, M., Ferrari, M., Gasparini, G.P., Locritani, M.,
Mangialajo, L., Marin, V., Moreno, M., Morri, C., Orsi Relini, L., Pane, L., Paoli, C., Petrillo, M.,
Povero, P., Pronzato, R., Relini, G., Santangelo, G., Tucci, S., Tunesi, L., Vacchi, M., Vassallo P.,
Vezzulli L., Würtz, M., 2010. The Ligurian Sea: present status, problems and perspectives.
Chemistry and Ecology, 26, 319-340.

Cau, A., Alvito, A., Moccia, D., Canese, S., Pusceddu, A., Rita, C., Angiolillo M., Follesa, M.C.,
2017. Submarine canyons along the upper Sardinian slope (Central Western Mediterranean) as
repositories for derelict fishing gears. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 123(1-2), 357-364.

Cerrano, C., Danovaro, R., Gambi, C., Pusceddu A., Riva, A., Schiaparelli S., 2010. Gold coral (*Savalia savaglia*) and gorgonian forests enhance benthic biodiversity and ecosystem functioning in the mesophotic zone. Biodiversity and Conservation, 19, 153-167.

Chimienti, G., Bo, M., Taviani, M., Mastrototaro, F., *in press*. Occurrence and biogeography of
Mediterranean CWCs. In: Orejas C, Jiménez C (eds). Mediterranean Cold-Water Corals: Past,
Present and Future. Springer International Publishing, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-91608-8.

Company, J.B., Rotlland, G., Sardà, F., 2003. Gaps in Mediterranean deep-sea megafaunal biology
and fisheries in Mare Incognitum? Exploring Mediterranean deep-sea biology. CIESM Workshop
Monographs, 23, Monaco, 128pp.

Company, J.B., Ramirez-Llodra, E., Sardà, F., Aguzzi, J., Puig, P., Canals, M., Calafat, A.,
Palanques, A., Solé, M., Sanchez-Vidal, A., Martin, J., Lastras, G., Tecchio, S., Koenig, S.,
Fernandez-Arcaya, U., Mechó, A., Fernández, P., 2012. Submarine canyons in the Catalan Sea (NW
Mediterranean): megafaunal biodiversity patterns and anthropogenic threats. Mediterranean
submarine canyons: Ecology and Governance, 133-144.

Conrad, O., Bechtel, B., Bock, M., Dietrich, H., Fischer, E., Gerlitz, L., Wehberg, V., Wichmann, V.,
Böhner, J., 2015. System for automated geoscientific analyses (SAGA) v. 2.1. 4. Geoscientific Model
Development, 8(7), 1991-2007.

Consoli, P., Falautano, M., Sinopoli, M., Perzia, P., Canese, S., Esposito, V., Battaglia, P., Romeo,
T., Andaloro, F., Galgani, F., Castriota, L., 2018. Composition and abundance of benthic marine litter
in a coastal area of the central Mediterranean Sea. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 136, 243-247.

Daly, E., Johnson, M.P., Wilson, A.M., Gerritsen, H.D., Kiriakoulakis, K., Allcock, A.L., White, M., 2018. Bottom trawling at Whittard Canyon: Evidence for seabed modification, trawl plumes and food source heterogeneity. Progress in Oceanography (in press).

Daniel, B., Tunesi, L., Vissio, A., 2017. Deep-sea exploration campaign. Accord RAMOGE, Monaco, 50 pp.

Davies, A.J., Guinotte, J.M., 2011. Global habitat suitability for framework-forming cold-water corals. PloS one, 6(4), e18483.

Davies, J.S., Howell, K.L., Stewart, H.A., Guinan, J., Golding, N., 2014. Defining biological assemblages (biotopes) of conservation interest in the submarine canyons of the South West Approaches (offshore United Kingdom) for use in marine habitat mapping. Deep Sea Research II, 104, 208-229.

De Leo, F.C., Smith, C.R., Rowden, A.A., Bowden, D.A., Clark, M.R., 2010. Submarine canyons: hotspots of benthic biomass and productivity in the deep sea. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences, rspb.2010.0462.

De Leo, F.C., Vetter, E.W., Smith, C.R., Rowden, A.A., McGranaghan, M., 2014. Spatial scaledependent habitat heterogeneity influences submarine canyon macrofaunal abundance and diversity off the Main and Northwest Hawaiian Islands. Deep Sea Research II, 104, 267-290.

D'Onghia, G., Capezzuto, F., Cardone, F., Carlucci, R., Carluccio, A., Chimienti, G., Corriero, G., Longo, C., Maiorano, P., Mastrototaro, F., Panetta, P., Rosso, A., Sanfilippo, R., Sion, L., Tursi, A.,

2015. Macro- and megafauna recorded in the submarine Bari Canyon (southern Adriatic, Mediterranean Sea) using different tools. Mediterranean Marine Science, 16(1), 180–196.

D'Onghia, G., Calculli, C., Capezzuto, F., Carlucci, R., Carluccio, A., Maiorano, P., Pollice, A., Ricci, P., Sion, L., Tursi, A., 2016. New records of cold-water coral sites and fish fauna characterization of a potential network existing in the Mediterranean Sea. Marine Ecology, 37(6), 1398-1422.

Fabri, M.C., Pedel, L., Beuck, L., Galgani, F., Hebbeln, D., Freiwald, A., 2014. Megafauna of vulnerable marine ecosystems in French Mediterranean submarine canyons: Spatial distribution and anthropogenic impacts. Deep Sea Research II, 104, 184-207.

Fanelli, E., Delbono, I., Ivaldi, R., Pratellesi, M., Cocito, S., Peirano, A., 2017. Cold-water coral Madrepora oculata in the eastern Ligurian Sea (NW Mediterranean): Historical and recent findings. Aquatic Conservation. Marine Freshwater Ecosystems 27, 965–975.

Farrugio, H., 2012. A refugium for the spawners of exploited Mediterranean marine species: the canyons of the continental slope of the Gulf of Lion. Mediterranean Submarine Canyons: Ecology and Governance, 45-49.

Fernandez-Arcaya, U., Ramirez-Llodra, E., Aguzzi, J., Allcock, A.L., Davies, J.S., Dissanayake, A., Harris, P., Howell, K., Huvenne, V.A.I., Macmillan-Lawler, M., Martín, J., Menot, L., Nizinski, M., Puig, P., Rowden, A., Sanchez, F., Van den Beld, I.M.J., 2017. Ecological role of submarine canvons and need for canyon conservation: a review. Frontiers in Marine Science, 4(5). doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2017.00005

Ferrigno, F., Russo, G. F., Sandulli, R., 2017. Coralligenous Bioconstructions Quality Index (CBQI): a synthetic indicator to assess the status of different types of coralligenous habitats. Ecological Indicators, 82, 271-279.

Fildani, A., 2017. Submarine Canyons: A brief review looking forward. Geology, 45(4), 383-384.
Forcada, A., Valle, C., Sánchez-Lizaso, J.L., Bayle-Sempere, J.T., Corsi, F., 2009. Structure and spatio-temporal dynamics of artisanal fisheries around a Mediterranean marine protected area. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 67(2), 191-203.

Fourt, M., Goujard, A., Mascle, J., Watremez, P., Chevaldonné, P., Daniel, B., 2013. Rock outcrops from French Mediterranean Canyons: observations from AAMP MedSeaCan and CorSeaCan exploration surveys. Rapp. Comm. Int. Mer Médit., 40, 38.

Fourt, M., Goujard, A., Pérez, T., Chevaldonné, P., 2017. Guide de la faune profonde de la Mer Méditerranée. Explorations des roches et des canyons sous-marins des côtes françaises. Patrimoines naturels. Publications scientifiques du Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle de Paris, 75, 1-184.

Freiwald, A., Beuck, L., Rüggeberg, A., Taviani, M., Hebbeln, D., and R/V Meteor Cruise M70-1
Participants, 2009. The White Coral Community in the Central Mediterranean Sea Revealed by ROV
Surveys. Oceanography, 22(1), 58–74.

Galgani, F., Hanke, G., Maes, T., 2015. Global distribution, composition and abundance of marine
litter. In: Bergmann, M., Gutow, L., Klages M. (Eds.), Marine Anthropogenic Litter. Springer,
Berlin, pp. 29–56.

Galgani, F., Pham, C.K., Claro, F., Consoli, P., 2018. Marine animal forests as useful indicators of entanglement by marine litter. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 135, 735-738.

Giusti, M., Innocenti, C., Canese, S., 2014. Predicting suitable habitat for the gold coral *Savalia savaglia* (Bertoloni, 1819) (Cnidaria, Zoantharia) in the South Tyrrhenian Sea. Continental Shelf Research, 81, 19-28.

Giusti, M., Bo, M., Angiolillo, M., Cannas, R., Cau, A., Follesa, M.C., Canese, S., 2017. Habitat
 preference of *Viminella flagellum* (Alcyonacea: Ellisellidae) in relation to bathymetric variables in
 southeastern Sardinian waters. Continental Shelf Research, 138, 41-50.

Gori, A., Orejas, C., Madurell, T., Bramanti, L., Martins, M., Quintanilla, E., Marti-Puig, P., Lo Iacono, C., Puig, P., Requena, S., Greenacre, M., Gili, J.M., 2013. Bathymetrical distribution and size structure of cold-water coral populations in the Cap de Creus and Lacaze-Duthiers canyons (northwestern Mediterranean). Biogeosciences, 10(3), 2049-2060.

Gori, A., Bavestrello, G., Grinyó, J., Dominguez-Carrió, C., Ambroso, S., Bo, M., 2017. Animal
Forests in Deep Coastal Bottoms and Continental Shelves of the Mediterranean Sea. In: Rossi, S.,
Bramanti, L., Gori, A., Orejas, C., (Eds.), Marine Animal Forests: The Ecology of Benthic
Biodiversity Hotspots. Springer International Publishing, pp. 207-233.

Grinyó, J., Gori, A., Greenacre, M., Requena, S., Canepa, A., Iacono, C.L., Ambroso, S., Purroy, A.,
Gili, J.M., 2018. Megabenthic assemblages in the continental shelf edge and upper slope of the
Menorca Channel, Western Mediterranean Sea. Progress in Oceanography, 162, 40-51.

| Harris, P.T., Heap, A., Post, A., Whiteway, T., Potter, A., Bradshaw, M., 2007. Marine zone |
|---|
| management and the EPBC Act-How environmental marine geological information provides |
| certainty for petroleum exploration. The APPEA Journal, 47(1), 329-345. |
| |
| Harris, P.T., Whiteway, T., 2011. Global distribution of large submarine canyons: Geomorphic |
| differences between active and passive continental margins. Marine Geology, 285, 69-86. |
| |
| Hoff, G.R., 2010. Identification of skate nursery habitat in the eastern Bering Sea. Marine Ecology |
| Progress Series, 403, 243-254. |
| |
| Hughes, D.J., Shimmield, T.M., Black, K.D., Howe, J.A., 2015. Ecological impacts of large-scale |
| disposal of mining waste in the deep sea. Scientific Reports, 5, 9985. |
| |
| Huvenne, V.A.I, Tyler, P.A., Masson, D.G., Fisher, E.H., Hauton, C., Hühnerbach, V., Le Bas, T.P., |
| Wolff, G.A., 2011. A picture on the wall: innovative mapping reveals cold-water coral refuge in |
| submarine canyon PloS One $6(12)$ e28755 |
| suomarme earlyon. 1 100 one, 0(12), 020733. |
| |
| Kim, S., 2015. ppcor: An R package for a fast calculation to semi-partial correlation coefficients. |
| Communications for Statistical Applications and Methods, 22(6), 665-674. |
| |
| Koenig, S., Fernández, P., Company, J.B., Huertas, D., Solé, M., 2013. Are deep-sea organisms |
| dwelling within a submarine canyon more at risk from anthropogenic contamination than those from |
| the adjacent open slope? A case study of Blanes Canyon (NW Mediterranean). Progress in |
| |
| Oceanography, 118, 249-259. |
| |

Lastras, G., Canals, M., Urgeles, R., Amblas, D., Ivanov, M., Droz, L., Dennielou, B., Fabrés, J.,
Schoolmeester, T., Akhmetzhanov, A., Orange, D., Garcia-Garcia, A., 2007. A walk down the Cap
de Creus Canyon, Northwestern Mediterranean Sea: Recent processes inferred from morphology and
sediment bedforms. Marine Geology, 246(2), 176-192.

Lastras, G., Canals, M., Ballesteros, E., Gili, J.M., Sanchez-Vidal, A., 2016. Cold-water corals and
 anthropogenic impacts in La Fonera submarine canyon head, Northwestern Mediterranean Sea.
 PloSOne, 11(5), e0155729.

Levin, L.A., Le Bris, N., 2015. The deep ocean under climate change. Science, 350, 766–768.

Lo Iacono, C., Agate, M., Sulli, A., Cartigny, M., Robert, K., Gori, A., Russo, T., 2015. Development, human impact and habitat distribution in submarine canyons of the Central and Western Mediterranean. In: Submarine Canyon Dynamics in the Mediterranean and Tributary Seas-An integrated geological, oceanographic and biological perspective. Rapp. Comm. Int. Mer Médit., 47, pp. 87-96..

Lo Iacono, C., Robert, K., Gonzalez-Villanueva, R., Gori, A., Gili, J.M., Orejas, C. in press. Predicting cold-water coral distribution in the Cap de Creus Canyon (NW Mediterranean): Implications for marine conservation planning. Progress in Oceanography. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2018.02.012.

Martín, J., Puig, P., Palanques, A., Masqué, P., García-Orellana, J., 2008. Effect of commercial
trawling on the deep sedimentation in a Mediterranean submarine canyon. Marine Geology, 252,
150–155.

Martín, J., Puig, P., Palanques, A., Ribó, M., 2014. Trawling-induced daily sediment resuspension in the flank of a Mediterranean submarine canyon. Deep Sea Research II, 104, 174-183.

McClain, C.R., Barry, J.P., 2010. Habitat heterogeneity, disturbance, and productivity work in
concert to regulate biodiversity in deep submarine canyons. Ecology, 91(4), 964-976.

Migeon, S., Mascle, J., Coste, M., Rouillard, P., 2012. Mediterranean submarine canyons and
 channels: morphological and geological backgrounds. In: Würtz, M. (Ed.), Mediterranean Submarine
 Canyons: Ecology and Governance. Gland, Switzerland and Malaga, Spain, pp., 27-42.

Miller, R.J., Juska, C., Hocevar, J., 2015. Submarine canyons as coral and sponge habitat on the eastern Bering Sea slope. Global Ecology and Conservation, 4, 85-94.

Mordecai, G., Tyler, P.A., Masson, D.G., Huvenne, V.A.I, 2011. Litter in submarine canyons off the west coast of Portugal. Deep Sea Research II, 58(23), 2489-2496.

Morris, K.J., Tyler, P.A., Masson, D.G., Huvenne, V.A.I., Rogers, A.D., 2013. Distribution of coldwater corals in the Whittard Canyon, NE Atlantic Ocean. Deep Sea Research II, 92, 136-144.

Mortensen, P.B., Buhl-Mortensen, L., 2004. Distribution of deep-water gorgonian corals in relation to benthic habitat features in the Northeast Channel (Atlantic Canada). Marine Biology, 144(6), 1223-1238.

Mortensen, P.B., Buhl-Mortensen, L., Gordon, D.C., Fader, G.B.J., McKeown, D.L., Fenton, D.G., 2005. Effects of fisheries on deepwater gorgonian corals in the Northeast Channel, Nova Scotia. In: American Fisheries Society Symposium, 41, 369-382.

Mytilineou, C., Smith, C.J., Anastasopoulou, A., Papadopoulou, K.N., Christidis, G., Bekas, P., Kavadas, S., Dokos, J., 2014. New cold-water coral occurrences in the Eastern Ionian Sea: Results from experimental long line fishing. Deep-Sea Research II, 99, 146-157.

Nittrouer, C.A., Wright, L.D., 1994. Transport of particles across continental shelves. Reviews of Geophysics, 32(1), 85-113.

Oberle, F.K., Puig, P., Martín, J., 2018. Fishing Activities. In: Savini, A., Micallef, A., Krastel, S., (Eds.), Submarine Geomorphology. Springer International Publishing, Springer Geology, pp. 503-534.

Orejas, C., Gori, A., Lo Iacono, C., Puig, P., Gili, J.M., Dale, M.R., 2009. Cold-water corals in the Cap de Creus Canvon, northwestern Mediterranean spatial distribution, density and anthropogenic impact. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 397, 37-51.

Palanques, A., Masqué, P., Puig, P., Sanchez-Cabeza, J.A., Frignani, M., Alvisi, F., 2008. Anthropogenic trace metals in the sedimentary record of the Llobregat continental shelf and adjacent Foix Submarine Canyon (northwestern Mediterranean). Marine Geology, 248(3), 213-227.

Paradis, S., Puig, P., Masqué, P., Juan-Díaz, X., Martín, J., Palangues, A., 2017. Bottom-trawling along submarine canyons impacts deep sedimentary regimes. Scientific Reports, 7, 43332.

Payo-Payo, M., Jacinto, R.S., Lastras, G., Canals, M., Puig, P., Martín, J., Sanchez-Vidal, A., Rabineau, M., 2015. Modelling bottom trawling-generated sediment flows in La Fonera submarine canyon (Northwestern Mediterranean Sea). Geophysical Research Abstracts, 17, EGU2015-11693, EGU General Assembly 2015. Vienna, Austria.

Pham, C.K., Ramirez-Llodra, E., Alt, C.H., Amaro, T., Bergmann, M., Canals, M., Company, J.B.,
Davies, G., Duineveld, G., Galgani, F., Howell, K.L., Huvenne, V.A.I., Isidro, E., Jones, D.O.B.,
Lastras, G., Morato, T., Gomes-Pereira, J.N., Purser, A., Stewart, H., Tojeira, I., Tubau, X., Van
Rooji, D., Tyler, P.A., 2014. Marine litter distribution and density in European seas, from the shelves
to deep basins. PLoS One, 9(4), e95839.

Pierdomenico, M., Martorelli, E., Dominguez-Carrió, C., Gili, J.M., Chiocci, F. L. 2016. Seafloor
 characterization and benthic megafaunal distribution of an active submarine canyon and surrounding
 sectors: The case of Gioia Canyon (Southern Tyrrhenian Sea). Journal of Marine Systems, 157, 101 117.

Ponti, M., Perlini, R.A., Ventra, V., Grech, D., Abbiati, M., Cerrano, C., 2014. Ecological shifts in
Mediterranean coralligenous assemblages related to gorgonian forest loss. PLoS One, 9(7), e102782.

Prampolini, M., Angeletti, L., Grande, V., Taviani, M., Foglini, F., *in press*. Tricase Submarine
Canyon: cold-water coral habitats in the south-westernmost Apulian margin (Mediterranean Sea).
Seafloor Geomorphology as Benthic Habitat, second edition. In: Harris P, Baker E (eds). Elsevier.

Puig, P., Martín, J., Masqué, P., Palanques, A., 2015. Increasing sediment accumulation rates in La
Fonera (Palamós) submarine canyon axis and their relationship with bottom trawling activities.
Geophysical Research Letters, 42, 8106–8113.

Quattrini, A.M., Nizinski, M.S., Chaytor, J.D., Demopoulos, A.W., Roark, E.B., France, S.C.,
Moore, J.A., Heyl, T., Auster, P.J., Kinlan, B., Ruppel, C., Elliott, K.P., Kennedy, B.R.C., Lobecker,
E., Skarke, A., Shank, T.M., 2015. Exploration of the canyon-incised continental margin of the

northeastern United States reveals dynamic habitats and diverse communities. PloS One, 10(10), e0139904.

R Core Team, 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/.

Ramirez-Llodra, E., De Mol, B., Company, J.B., Coll, M., Sardà, F., 2013. Effects of natural and
anthropogenic processes in the distribution of marine litter in the deep Mediterranean Sea. Progress
in Oceanography, 118, 273-287.

Ramirez-Llodra, E., Trannum, H.C., Evenset, A., Levin, L.A., Andersson, M., Finne, T.E., Hilario,
A., Flem, B., Christensen, G., Schaanning, M., Vanreusel, A., 2015. Submarine and deep-sea mine
tailing placements: a review of current practices, environmental issues, natural analogs and
knowledge gaps in Norway and internationally. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 97, 13–35.

Revenga Martínez de Pazos, S., 2012. The fisheries importance of four submarine canyons in the
Spanish Mediterranean Sea: Cap de Creus, Palamós, Cape Tiñoso and Alborán platform canyons. In.
Würtz, M. (Ed.), Mediterranean Submarine Canyons: Ecology and Governance. Gland, Switzerland
and Malaga, Spain, pp. 51-55.

Robert, K., Jones, D.O., Tyler, P.A., Van Rooij, D., Huvenne, V.A.I., 2015. Finding the hotspots
within a biodiversity hotspot: fine-scale biological predictions within a submarine canyon using highresolution acoustic mapping techniques. Marine Ecology, 36(4), 1256-1276.

Rossi, S., Bramanti, L., Gori, A., Orejas, C., 2017. Marine Animal Forests: The Ecology of Benthic
Biodiversity Hotspots. Springer International Publishing, pp. 1-1366.

Rowe, G.T., Polloni, P.T., Haedrich, R.L., 1982. The deep-sea macrobenthos on the continental margin of the Northwest Atlantic Ocean. Deep Sea Research, 29, 257–278.

Sampaio, I., Braga-Henriques, A., Pham, C., Ocaña, O., De Matos, V., Morato, T., Porteiro, F. M., 2012. Cold-water corals landed by bottom longline fisheries in the Azores (north-eastern Atlantic). Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, 92(7), 1547-1555. Sanfilippo, R., Vertino, A., Rosso, A., Beuck, L., Freiwald, A., Taviani, M., 2013. Serpula aggregates and their role in deep-sea coral communities in the southern Adriatic Sea. Facies, 59(4), 663-677.

Santín, A., Grinyó, J., Ambroso, S., Uriz, M. J., Gori, A., Dominguez-Carrió, C., Gili, J. M. 2018. Sponge assemblages on the deep Mediterranean continental shelf and slope (Menorca Channel, Western Mediterranean Sea). Deep Sea Research I, 131, 75-86.

Sardà, F., Cartes, J.E., Company, J.B., 1994. Spatio-temporal variations in megabenthos abundance in three different habitats in the Catalan deep-sea (Western Mediterranean). Marine Biology, 120, 211-219.

Schlacher, T.A., Schlacher-Hoenlinger, M.A., Williams, A., Althaus, F., Hooper, J.N., Kloser, R., 2007. Richness and distribution of sponge megabenthos in continental margin canyons off southeastern Australia. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 340, 73-88.

Shepard, F. P., 1972. Submarine canyons. Earth-Science Reviews, 8 (1), 1-12.

Shepard, F.P., Marshall, N.F., McLoughlin, P.A., Sullivan, G.G., 1979. Currents in submarine

canyons and other seavalleys. American Association of Petroleum Geologists Studies in Geology, 8, 1-173.

Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K.B., Tignor, M., Miller, H.L., 2007. Climate Change 2008 - the physical science basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA. pp. 1-996.

Taviani, M., Angeletti, L., Canese, S., Cannas, R., Cardone, F., Cau, A., Cau, A.B., Follesa, M.C., Marchese, F., Montagna, P., Tessarolo, C., 2017. The "Sardinian cold-water coral province" in the context of the Mediterranean coral ecosystems. Deep Sea Research II, 145, 61-78.

Taviani, M., Angeletti, L., Beuck, L., Campiani, E., Canese, S., Foglini, F., Freiwald, A., Montagna P., Trincardi, F., 2016. Reprint of "On and off the beaten track: Megafaunal sessile life and Adriatic cascading processes". Marine Geology, 375, 146-160.

Taviani, M., Angeletti, L., Cardone, F., Montagna, P., Danovaro, R., in press-a. A cold-water coralbivalve biotope new to the Mediterranean offshore the Naples megalopolis. Scientific Reports.

Taviani, M., Angeletti, L., Foglini, F., Corselli, C., Nasto, I., Pons-Branchu, E., Montagna, P., in press-b. U/Th dating records of cold-water coral colonization in submarine canyons and adjacent sectors of the southern Adriatic Sea since the Last Glacial Maximum. Progress in Oceanography.

Taviani, M., Angeletti, L., Antolini, B., Ceregato, A., Froglia, C., López Correa, M., Montagna, P., Remia, A., Trincardi, F., Vertino, A., 2011a. Geo-biology of Mediterranean deep-water coral

ecosystems. In: Brugnoli, E., Cavarretta, G., Mazzola, S., Trincardi, F., Ravaioli, M., Santoleri, R., (Eds.), Marine Research at CNR, Volume DTA 6, 809-822.

Trincardi, F, Foglini, F., Verdicchio, G., Asioli, A., Correggiari, A., Minisini, D., Piva, A., Remia,
A., Ridente, D., Taviani, M., 2007. The impact of cascading currents on the Bari Canyon System,
SW-Adriatic Margin (Central Mediterranean). Marine Geology, 246, 208-230.

Trotter, J.A., Pattiaratchi, C., Montagna, P., Taviani, M., Falter, J., Thresher, R., Hosie, A., Haig, D.,
Foglini, F., Hua, Q., McCulloch, M.T., 2018. Unveiling the Perth Canyon and its deep-water faunas,
Biogeosciences Discussion, https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2018-319, in review.

Tubau, X., Canals, M., Lastras, G., Rayo, X., Rivera, J., Amblas, D., 2015. Marine litter on the floor of deep submarine canyons of the Northwestern Mediterranean Sea: the role of hydrodynamic processes. Progress in Oceanography, 134, 379-403.

Tunesi, L., Diviacco, G., Mo, G., 2001. Observations by submersible on the biocoenosis of the deepsea corals off Portofino promontory (Northwestern Mediterranean Sea). In Proceedings of the First
International Symposium on Deep-Sea Corals, Ecology Action Centre and Nova Scotia Museum,
Halifax, Nova Scotia, pp. 76-87.

Tyler, P., Amaro, T., Arzola, R., Cunha, M.R., De Stiger, H., Gooday, A., Huvenne, V.A.I., Ingels,
J., Kiriakoulakis, K., Lastras, G., Masson, D., Oliveira, A., Pattenden, A., Vanreusel, A., Van
Weering, T., Vitorino, J., Witte, U., Wolff, G., 2009. Europe's Grand Canyon. Nazaré Submarine
Canyon. Oceanography, 22(1), 46-57.

Vetter, E.W., 1994. Hotspots of benthic production. Nature, 372, 47.

Vetter, E.W., Smith, C.R., De Leo, F.C., 2010. Hawaiian hotspots: enhanced megafaunal abundance and diversity in submarine canyons on the oceanic islands of Hawaii Marine Ecology, 31(1), 183-199. Wei, T., Simko, V., Levy, M., Xie, Y., Jin, Y., Zemla, J. 2017. Package 'corrplot'. Statistician, 56, 316-324. Würtz, M., 2012. Submarine canyons and their role in the Mediterranean ecosystem. In. Würtz, M. (Ed.), Mediterranean Submarine Canyons: Ecology and Governance. Gland, Switzerland and Malaga, Spain, pp. 11-26. Xu, J., 2011. Measuring currents in submarine canyons: technological and scientific progress in the past 30 years. Geosphere, 7, 868-876. Yoklavich, M.M., Greene, H.G., Cailliet, G.M., Sullivan, D.E., Lea, R.N., Love, M.S., 2000. Habitat associations of deep-water rockfishes in a submarine canyon: an example of a natural refuge. Fishery Bulletin-National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 98(3), 625-641.