

Spatial distribution, diversity, and taphonomy of clypeasteroid and spatangoid echinoids of the central Florida Keys

Tobias B. Grun¹, Michał Kowalewski¹

¹Division of Invertebrate Paleontology, Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, United States of America

Corresponding Author:

Tobias B. Grun¹, 1659 Museum Road, Gainesville, Florida, 32611, United States of America

Email address: tgrun@ufl.edu

Abstract

Background. Irregular echinoids are ecosystem engineers with diverse functional services. Documenting present-day distribution of those widespread organisms is important for understanding their ecological significance and enhancing our ability to interpret their rich fossil record.

Methods. This study summarizes SCUBA surveys of clypeasteroid and spatangoid echinoids conducted in 2020 and 2021 along the central part of the Florida Keys. The survey included observations on both live and dead specimens, their distribution, habitat preferences, abundance, and live-dead comparison.

Results. Echinoids were found at 17 out of 27 examined sites (63%) and occurred across a wide range of habitats including coastal seagrass meadows, subtidal sand and seagrass settings of the Hawk Channel, backreef sands, and fine muddy sands of deeper forereef habitats. The encountered species, both dead and alive, included *Clypeaster rosaceus* (4 sites), *Clypeaster subdepressus* (5 sites), *Encope michelini* (3 sites), *Leodia sexiesperforata* (8 sites), *Meoma ventricosa* (9 sites), and *Plagiobrissus grandis* (4 sites). All sites were dominated by one species, but some sites included up to five echinoid species. Live-dead fidelity was high, including a good agreement in species composition of living and dead assemblages, congruence in species rank abundance, and overlapping spatial distribution patterns. This high fidelity may either reflect long-term persistence of local echinoid populations or fragility of echinoid tests that could prevent post-mortem transport and the formation of time-averaged death assemblages. Regardless of causative factors, the live-dead comparisons suggest that irregular echinoid assemblages, from settings that are comparable to the study area, may provide a fossil record with a high spatial and compositional fidelity. The survey of live fauna is consistent with past regional surveys in terms of identity of observed species, their rank abundance, and their spatial distribution patterns. The results suggest that despite increasingly frequent hurricanes, active seasonal fisheries, massive tourism, and urban development, irregular echinoids continue to thrive across a wide range of habitats where they provide diverse ecosystem services by

oxygenating sediments, recycling organic matter, supporting commensal organisms, and providing food to predators. Results reported here document the present-day status of local echinoid populations and should serve as a useful reference point for assessing future regional changes in echinoid distribution and abundance.

Introduction

Echinoids are one of the unique groups of organisms that are not only ecologically important in many present-day marine ecosystems (e.g., Kier and Grant 1965, Scheibling 1984, Nebelsick 2020, Plee and Pomory 2020 and literature cited therein), but also widespread and diverse in the fossil record (e.g., Kroh 2010, Osborn et al. 2020). Echinoids are also a prominent member of the Modern Evolutionary Fauna that has dominated marine ecosystems since the late Mesozoic Era (e.g., Sepkoski 1984, Alroy 2010, Rojas et al. 2021). Consequently, research on present-day echinoids not only benefits our understanding of their distribution and ecological importance today (e.g., Weihe and Gray 1968, Aller and Dodge 1974, Bell and Frey 1969, Findlay and White 1983, Krantzberg 1985, Reidenauer 1989, Dahlgren et al. 1999, Yeo et al. 2013, Brustolin et al. 2014, Nebelsick 2020), but can also improve our ability to interpret their rich fossil record (e.g., Kidwell and Baumiller 1990, Nebelsick 1998, Nebelsick and Kowalewski 1999, Kroh and Nebelsick 2003; 2010, Grun et al. 2014, 2017; 2018, Mooi et al. 2016, Grun 2017, Tyler et al. 2018).

Here, we report the results of a recent survey of live populations and dead remains of irregular echinoids inhabiting the central part of the Florida Keys. Multiple genera of the orders Clypeasteroidea and Spatangoida were previously reported from the region in case studies (e.g., Kier and Grant 1965, Chesher 1969) and additional collecting efforts have been documented in online databases (see details below). However, the existing data are limited in terms of both spatial and temporal coverage. In addition, only a few sampling events have taken place in the last few decades and the central part of the Florida Keys has been particularly poorly sampled (Fig. 1).

Multiple goals motivate this study. First, this is a bio-inventorying effort aimed at assessing the distribution and ecological importance of irregular echinoids in the study region. Second, the study aims to integrate behavioral, ecological, taphonomic, and sedimentological observations to inform our neontological and paleontological knowledge of a group of marine benthic organisms, which is of significant ecological and paleontological importance. Finally, the study includes a joint survey of living populations and dead remains, a comparative approach aimed at evaluating live-dead congruence of echinoid assemblages with paleontological and bio-inventorying implications.

Materials & Methods

Three SCUBA surveys (August 2020, January 2021, and April 2021) were conducted during daytime along the central Florida Keys in the Long Key area (Fig. 1) by a team of two divers (TBG and MK). A total of 27 sites were surveyed for clypeasteroid and spatangoid

echinoids (Fig. 1; Table 1). All surveying and collecting activities were carried out within the scope of the collecting permits #SAL-19-2195-SR and #SAL-18-1294A-SR issued by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

Sites were selected to cover common types of habitats occurring along an onshore-offshore gradient with the surveyed sites ranging in water depth from 2.5 m to 37.5 m. During each dive, the seafloor was surveyed visually for the presence of live echinoids, echinoid tests (denuded skeletons), test fragments (denuded and partially disintegrated skeletons), and trails produced by shallow-burrowing species. The sampling time for each dive was 15 ± 3 min. The abundance of each species was semi-quantitatively recorded using three ordinal ranks: present (less than three specimens per m^2), common (three to ten specimens per m^2), and abundant (ten or more specimens per m^2). In addition, divers raked sediment with their hands to a depth of ~ 15 cm to search for echinoids. The raking was done throughout the duration of the dive whenever soft sediment that could potentially host echinoids was present. At each site, exemplar specimens were collected for each encountered species. Upon surfacing, specimens were stored on ice and transferred into 70% ethanol for soft tissue fixation. After multiple days of storage in ethanol, the specimens were air dried. Length measurements were collected for complete specimens along the longitudinal (anterior-posterior) axis. Specimens are stored in the Division of Invertebrate Zoology at the Florida Museum (University of Florida) under consecutive repository numbers from UF-Echinodermata-24037 to UF-Echinodermata-24069. The final dataset summarizing survey is provided in Appendix 1.

It should be noted here that whereas all species reported in this study represent intermediate-bodied to large-bodied species (>3 cm in test length), our experience in conducting similar surveys elsewhere (e.g., Nebelsick and Kowalewski 1999; Grun et al. 2014) indicate that small echinoids can be detected on the sediment surface in SCUBA surveys, including specimens as small as 1 mm in length. However, small-bodied live specimens are easier to miss and dead tests are more likely to disintegrate during hand-raking. Thus, while small-bodied species are detectable, they may be underrepresented or even missed (especially dead specimens) in SCUBA surveys.

The tests of surveyed echinoids are expected to vary in their intrinsic durability across species. This variability in test integrity can potentially impact their post-mortem survival and the resulting abundance in dead assemblages. To assess the potential durability of tests, each species was assessed in terms of relative test thickness and structural reinforcements provided by internal support structures. Test thickness was scored from 0 (thin) to 3 (thick) and structural reinforcements were scored from 0 (support structures absent) to 3 (support structures well developed). The overall durability score was estimated as an arithmetic mean of the thickness and reinforcement scores (Appendix 2).

Occurrences of echinoids in the region, documented in surveys conducted prior to this study (Appendix 3) were downloaded (10/25/2021) from the iDigBio database aggregator (URL: <https://www.idigbio.org/portal/search>). Longitude and latitude ranges (W 82.0 – 80.3 and N 24.4 – 25.2) were defined by the regional study area map (Fig. 1, Appendix 4) and used to restrict the

geographic scope of the search. The word ‘echinoidea’ was used as a keyword. Subsequently, the downloaded data were vetted to limit data to irregular echinoid species and species names were reassessed (25/10/2021) using WORMS (<https://www.marinespecies.org>). Fossil occurrences were excluded. The results were cross-checked against genus-targeted searches (e.g., ‘*Meoma*’ instead of ‘echinoidea’) and the outputs were generally consistent.

Maps were generated using custom-written R scripts with shoreline coordinates downloaded from https://gnome.orr.noaa.gov/goods/tools/GSHHS/coast_subset on September 5 2021. Ordinal rank abundances for live and dead specimens were computed for each species by summing up semi-quantitative ordinal scores defined above. The resulting estimate provided a semi-quantitative ordinal proxy that combined frequency of occurrences and semi-quantitative ordinal rank abundance information. Results were also evaluated by downgrading ordinal rank abundance down to simple occurrence (presence-absence) data. That is, the presence-absence data derived from ordinal scores were used to assess if analytical outcomes were sensitive to analytical resolution at which the data were examined. A statistical agreement between ordinal rank abundance of live and dead specimens was evaluated using the Spearman Rank Correlation test. The Spearman Rank Correlation is a standard measure of live-dead concordance used in fidelity studies (e.g., Kidwell 2007) and is particularly appropriate here given the ordinal rank variables used to measure echinoid abundance. Alternatively, Kendall Rank Correlation could be used. However, because past fidelity studies used the Spearman measure of correlation, Kendall Rank Correlation was deemed less useful in terms of comparability to the previous literature. Differences in distribution/frequency of echinoids between shallow and deep habitats was assessed using Chi-Square Heterogeneity test. Because some of the chi-square analyses were based on tables with low expected frequencies, a Monte Carlo test was employed (Hope 1968), as implemented in “chisq.test” function in R (R Core Team 2021). The significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ was used to make statistical decisions. All plots, numerical analyses, and statistical tests were performed using custom written scripts in R (R Core Team 2021, Appendix 5).

The Live-dead fidelity analyses aims to assess the agreement between live communities and sympatric dead assemblages, including concordance in faunal composition (e.g., Kidwell 2007), sample-level diversity/evenness (e.g., Olszewski and Kidwell 2007), and spatial trends (e.g., Tyler and Kowalewski 2017).

Results

Assemblage-Level Patterns

Out of the 27 surveyed sites, irregular echinoids were encountered at 17 sites (63% of sites) and a total of six species were identified (Fig. 2; Table 1). These included four clypeasteroid species (*Clypeaster rosaceus*, *Clypeaster subdepressus*, *Encope michelini*, and *Leodia sexiesperforata*), and two spatangoid species (*Meoma ventricosa* and *Plagiobrissus grandis*). At all sites, at which irregular echinoids were present, one species was dominant, and in some cases only one species was observed (Table 1). However, at five sites three or more species co-occurred (sites 5, 8, 9, 21, 26) and in one case a total of five species were observed within a single patch of sand (site

9). Out of 17 sites in which echinoids were observed, seven sites were characterized by abundant presence of echinoids, with visually estimated densities exceeding ten specimens per m². Dead echinoid tests and test fragments were found at nine sites (33% of sites) and abundant tests were found at two sites (**Table 1**). Dead remains were found at sites where live echinoids were observed. The sturdiness of echinoid tests did not seem to be an overriding factor in controlling the abundance of dead tests. In places where alive echinoids with a sturdy test were abundant, bare tests were typically found in higher numbers as well (Table 1). This pattern is similar for echinoids with a low sturdiness rank. However, durability may have played some role in preservation because the most robust taxon (*Clypeaster rosaceus*) ranked higher in dead assemblages than in live assemblages, whereas the much more fragile taxon (*Meoma ventricosa*) was ranked lower in dead assemblages comparing with live assemblages (Fig. 3). Dense live populations were invariably dominated by one species, including *Meoma ventricosa* at site 21, *Leodia sexiesperforata* at site 5, and *Clypeaster rosaceus* at site 8 and site 18.

Echinoids were more widespread, abundant, and diverse in shallower waters (< 20 m), including seagrass and algae meadows, open sand flats, and backreef settings, but less common in deeper forereef habitats. Specifically, out of 16 sites sampled in shallow subtidal, Hawk Channel, and backreef habitats, echinoids were present at 13 sites (81%) and abundant at six sites (38%). Multiple species were observed at six sites (38%). In contrast, in deeper forereef habitats (> 20 m), echinoids were observed at only four out of 11 sites (36%) and restricted to rare monospecific occurrences of *Meoma ventricosa* and *Clypeaster subdepressus*, with only one site (9%) characterized by abundant presence of *M. ventricosa*. The observed differences between shallow habitats and forereef habitats (**Fig. 4**) were statistically significant in terms of the proportion of sites at which echinoids were present (Chi-Square Test, Chi-Square = 5.7, *p* = 0.039, based on 100,000 replicate Monte Carlo samples).

In addition to echinoids themselves, symbiotic pea crabs (Pinnotheridae) were observed on multiple specimens. They were particularly common on larger species such as *Meoma ventricosa*. Some of the dead echinoid tests included singular circular holes likely recording drilling predation by cassid gastropods. Parasitic eulimid gastropods, that are known to be associated with echinoid hosts, were not observed.

Species-level Patterns

Clypeaster rosaceus (**Fig. 2A**) was found alive at four sites (**Fig. 5A; Table 1**) that were characterized by sparse seagrass and algae meadows. All four sites were shallow (< 10 m water depth). At two sites, dense populations (> 10 specimens per m²) were observed. Dead tests co-occurred at three out of the four sites, but only at one site dead tests were abundant. Collected specimens ranged in test length from 39.5 mm to 137.8 mm with median length of 119.1 mm (N = 89). All specimens observed alive were epifaunal with their oral side located around the sediment-water interface. The aboral side of *C. rosaceus* was covered with dead seagrass, debris, and shells. Trails produced by actively moving *C. rosaceus* were observed directly behind active animals with a trail length of up to about two test length. Older trails were rarely discernable.

Clypeaster subdepressus (**Fig. 2B**) was found alive at three sites that represented open sand flats (**Fig. 5B; Table 1**). These three sites ranged from shallow (< 10 m depth) to deeper (~ 38 m depth) habitats. At all sites, the species was uncommon (< three specimens per m²). Dead tests co-occurred with live individuals at one of the three sites. Dead tests were observed at two additional sites at which no live specimens were observed. The measured specimen was 117.5 mm in test length. All specimens observed alive were shallow infaunal to semi-infaunal burrower with the echinoid body usually penetrating no more than the uppermost 5 cm of sediment. An aboral part of the test was either exposed above the surface or barely covered by a very thin blanket of surficial sediment.

Encope michelini (**Fig. 2C**) was found alive at one site that represented open sand flats (**Fig. 5C; Table 1**). This site was shallow (8.2 m) with only one live specimen found. Dead tests co-occurred with the live individual at this site. Dead tests were observed at two additional sites at which no live specimens were observed. The live specimen length was 114.1 mm. The observed live specimen was a shallow infaunal burrower with its body being only covered by a thin sediment layer and its outline well visible through the sediment. Visible trails were observed behind the actively moving individual.

Leodia sexiesperforata (**Fig. 2D**) was the most widespread species among recorded irregular echinoids in the surveyed area. This species was found alive at eight sites that represented open sand flats (**Fig. 5D; Table 1**). The eight sites ranged from coastal (< 2 m depth) to shallow subtidal (~ 15 m) habitats. At one site, the population was dense (> 10 specimens per m²), another site was characterized by intermediate population density (three to ten specimens per m²). At six sites, populations were sparse (< three specimens per m²). Dead tests co-occurred with live individuals at three sites. Collected specimens ranged in test length from 29.7 mm to 103.3 mm, with median length of 75.6 mm (N = 57). All specimens observed alive were found burrowed in the sediment down to 10-15 cm. Occasionally, individuals of this species were found just below the sediment-water interface.

Meoma ventricosa (**Fig. 2E**) was by far the most common spatangoid species in the surveyed area. This species was found at nine sites that represented sandy habitats (**Fig. 5D; Table 1**). The nine sites ranged from shallow (< 10 m depth) to deeper (~ 35 m depth) habitats and included three sites where the species was abundant, three sites where the species was common, and three sites where the species was rare. Dead tests co-occurred with live individuals at three sites. Collected specimens ranged in test length from 115.8 mm to 142.2 mm, with median length of 126.2 mm (N = 31). All specimens observed alive were usually found buried with the apical system covered by a thin layer (less than 1 cm thick) of sediment, especially at the shallow sites (< 30 m depth). At deeper sites, *Meoma ventricosa* was found only partly buried or even moving on the sediment surface (an unusual daytime behavior for this species). This is in contrast to shallower sites, at which *Meoma ventricosa* was observed buried with the apical system sometimes exposed to the water column. In those settings, this spatangoid produced well-recognizable furrows in the sediment due to its digging behavior.

Plagiobrissus grandis (**Fig. 2F**) was the rarest spatangoid in the surveyed area. This species was found alive at two sites that represented sandy flats (**Fig. 5F; Table 1**). The two sites were shallow to intermediate (eleven and 15 m depth). At both sites, the specimens were observed as single occurrences. Dead tests did not co-occur with live individuals, but two additional sites revealed single dead specimens. The measured specimen was 140.4 mm in test length. All specimens observed alive were infaunal and lived deeply buried between 10 cm and 20 cm sediment depth. Due to its deep burrowing behavior, the authors assume that this species is underrepresented in this study. Trails were not observed in direct vicinity of live specimens.

Live-Dead Patterns

For data pooled across all sites, there is a complete compositional agreement between species found dead and alive: the same six species were observed. In addition, the three species that are most common in the life assemblages are also the most common in the death assemblage (**Fig. 3**). When using semi-quantitative estimates of echinoid abundance, the compositional fidelity measured as Spearman Rank Correlation is high and statistically significant ($\rho = 0.84$, $p = 0.036$). When estimates are reduced to presence-absence data, the correlation is still positive, but weak and statistically insignificant ($\rho = 0.39$, $p = 0.44$).

Spatial fidelity was high at the assemblage level. Live and dead echinoids co-occurred at nine sites and were both absent at ten sites. Live echinoids were present while dead tests were absent only at eight out of 27 sites. However, when dead specimens were observed (nine sites), live specimens were always found (**Fig. 5; Table 1**). Dead and live echinoids representing the same species co-occurred at eight out of nine sites at which both dead and live specimens were present. The bathymetric distribution was also congruent. Both live and dead echinoids were more frequent and more abundant in shallow habitats when comparing to the more offshore forereef settings (**Fig. 4**). There was a high and significant Spearman Rank Correlation between ordinal abundance of live and dead echinoids along the sample bathymetric gradient (**Fig. 6**). The correlation observed for raw data ($\rho = 0.63$, $p = 0.009$) increased after detrending the two compared spatial series ($\rho = 0.72$, $p = 0.002$) further supporting high spatial/bathymetric live-dead fidelity at the assemblage level. Spatial and bathymetric fidelity was also high at species level (**Figs. 4 and 5**), although dead remains were occasionally found at sites for which live specimens of the same species were not observed and vice versa (**Figs. 4 and 5**).

The records from prior research indicate that 257 occurrences of irregular echinoids identified to genus or species level are currently archived in databases (**Appendix 3**), with uneven geographic and bathymetric coverage across the study region (**Fig. 1**). Distribution of sampling events over the last decades (**Fig. 7**) indicates that most of the occurrences resulted from collecting events in the 1960s and 1980s. The first cluster of sampling events in the 1960s reflects extensive sampling efforts by Kier and Grant (1965) and Chesher (1969). The second cluster dates back to 1984 and 1985, a time interval that directly follows the die off of *Diadema antillarum* (Lessios et al. 1984a, b). This massive mortality event, which likely started in January 1983 (Lessios 2016), may have triggered a spike in echinoid surveys. There is a general decline

toward the present. A total of 37 species of irregular echinoids were reported in the study area (Fig. 8) with the last species newly encountered in the region added in 2011 (Fig. 7). The ten species that were most common in terms of occurrences were *Clypeaster subdepressus* (38 occurrences), *Clypeaster rosaceus* (31), *Echinocyamus grandiporus* (28), *Clypeaster ravenelii* (24), *Encope michelini* (19), *Leodia sexiesperforata* (15), *Meoma ventricosa* (11), *Brissopsis atlantica* (9), *Clypeaster chesheri* (9), and *Echinolampas depressa* (9). Except for *Plagiobrissus grandis*, the species reported in our survey all represent taxa that were among the top ten in the region (Fig. 8).

Discussion

Neontological Implications

The new survey of live and dead echinoids points to a widespread presence of multiple species of clypeasteroid and spatangoid echinoids along the central part of Florida Keys. All six species reported here were previously documented in the region and five of those taxa were among the seven species most frequently encountered in the past (Fig. 8). Moreover, the present-day faunal assemblages resemble closely faunal assemblages that were reported by Kier and Grant (1965) about 60 years ago from a comparable array of habitats in the Key Largo area, 60 km northeastward of our study area. Multiple surveys previously conducted in the study area revealed a total of eight clypeasteroid and spatangoid species, including the same six species (Kier and Grant 1965) that were identified in the current survey. The two additional species reported from Key Largo (*Brissus unicolor* and *Schizaster floridiensis*) were rare or represented by dead tests only. These historical comparisons suggest that the present-day irregular echinoid fauna is comparable in its taxonomic composition to faunal associations documented in surveys and case studies conducted in the regions in the 20th century, predominately in 1960s and 1980s (Fig. 7).

The recent survey suggests that many aspects of echinoid biology and ecology have remained unchanged over the last 60 years. In most cases, echinoid species were observed in spatially constrained patches dominated by single species (e.g., Smith 1981, Highsmith 1982, Tyler et al. 2018). The survey also documented presence of biotic interactions known to be commonly affecting irregular echinoids, including predation by cassid snails (e.g., Nebelsick and Kowalewski 1999, Grun et al. 2014; 2017; 2018, Grun 2017, Meadows et al. 2015, Tyler et al. 2018) and infestation by symbiotic pea crabs (e.g., George et al. 2003). The same types of biotic interactions were documented in the region multiple decades ago (Kier and Grant 1965, Chesher 1969). The observed behaviors of individual species, including tiering, mobility, and other characteristics, are in line with the ecological knowledge for the six observed species (e.g., Seilacher 1979), except for an intriguing epifaunal daytime mode of live observed for *Meoma ventricosa* in the more offshore, forereef settings. The bathymetric and habitat distribution patterns are also remarkably consistent with past studies. As in the case of previous studies, most of the species were observed in back reef and coastal habitats (Kier and Grant 1965), whereas the

only irregular echinoid relatively common in the deeper, forereef habitat was *Meoma ventricosa* (Kier and Grant 1965, Chesher 1969).

In summary, the similarities between the recent survey and past studies suggest that neither faunal composition of dominant taxa, nor spatial distribution and ecology of the common species appear to have undergone any substantial changes over the last 60 years. This is remarkable given that the study area has been intensely affect by local human stressors and global environmental changes. Multiple major hurricanes such as Andrew 1992, Katrina 2005, Wilma 2005 (Malmstadt et al. 2009) disturbed coastal habitats recently and multiple local stressors related to heavy urbanization, tourism, and local fishery have been continuously impacting the region over the last several decades (e.g., Lutz 2006, Smith et al. 2007). However, this study suggests that local populations of irregular echinoids (and thus ecosystem services that they provide) may have remained largely unchanged despite multiple decades of local and global environmental impacts. It should be stressed here that those results should not be used to dismiss the negative impact of human-induced environmental changes in Florida Keys. There are numerous well documented studies demonstrating that the local ecosystems have declined dramatically in recent decades due to direct and indirect human activities, including reefs, wetlands, water quality, and aquatic or water-associated life (e.g., Fourqurean and Zieman 2002, Smith et al. 2007). However, the results of this survey suggest that the documented irregular echinoid species may be more resilient to environmental impacts than other organisms. Consequently, they deserve attention as resilient benthic macro-organisms and important ecosystem engineers that keep thriving across a wide range of the Florida Keys habitats and keep contributing in terms of ecosystem services that benefit local benthic ecosystems.

Paleontological Implications

The high fidelity indicated by live-dead comparisons suggests that dead remains of echinoid may archive spatial distribution and taxonomic composition of local echinoid populations. However, this interpretation needs to be treated cautiously because it is based on one study area. Also, multiple causative explanations can be provided to explain the observed congruence. Specifically, two alternative hypotheses can be postulated to explain the high congruence of living communities and death assemblages. Hypothesis 1: if echinoid tests represent a time-averaged assemblage that accumulated over multiple decades or centuries, the high congruence could indicate that local populations of echinoids have been remarkably stable in terms of their spatial distribution and taxonomic composition. The striking similarity with the surveys of Kier and Grant (1965) conducted about 60 years ago are consistent with hypothesis 1, as are observations from other regions documenting monospecific populations of echinoids persisting in small patches for multiple decades (e.g., Smith 1981, Highsmith 1982, Tyler et al. 2018). Previous surveys (Appendix 3) of sites close to our survey sites (Fig. 1) uncovered a comparable suite of irregular echinoid, including *Clypeaster rosaceus*, *Leodia sexiesperforata*, and *Encope michelini*. However, previous surveys also reported *Echinocardium* (Appendix 3), which has not been noted in our surveys.

The alternative hypothesis 2 is based on taphonomic filters and states that echinoid remains all came from individuals that died in recent months or years. There is growing evidence that irregular echinoid tests perish quickly and cannot form extensively time-averaged archives of local echinoid populations. More recently, direct evidence supporting taphonomic fragility of skeletal remains of irregular echinoid were provided via radiocarbon dating of individual tests of *Leodia sexiesperforata* on a shallow carbonate platform in Bahamas (Kowalewski et al. 2018). The dating effort indicated that all sampled tests came from individuals that died in the few previous years, even though the sympatric mollusk shells collected from the same sediments were time-averaged over multi-millennial time scales (Kowalewski et al. 2018). Under the taphonomic hypothesis 2, echinoid tests do not survive substantial lateral transport or persist for decades or centuries around the sediment surface, and consequently, the high spatial and compositional fidelity reflects the fact that the great majority of dead remains found during the surveys represent recently deceased specimens that lived in the area. This hypothesis is also consistent with taphonomic studies on regular echinoids (e.g., Kidwell and Baumiller 1990; Greenstein 1991).

However, Nawrot et al. (2022) documented recently extensive time-averaging for small clypeasteroid echinoids. Thus, the hypothesis 2, even if proven correct for the study area, should be extrapolated with caution to other echinoid taxa and other environmental settings.

More generally, the data available currently cannot resolved which of those two hypotheses is more likely to be correct. This is because the observed results could be produced if echinoid patches persist through time and/or dead remains disappear quickly. However, regardless of its causative explanation, the observed spatial and compositional fidelity has two potential implications. First, the incipient fossil record currently forming around sediment surface may provide a faithful representation of living echinoid populations, both in terms of spatial distribution and faunal composition. Thus, if the sediment were to be preserved in a rapid burial event, the resulting fossil record would archive echinoid populations with high spatial and compositional fidelity. Second, the dead remains track closely living populations and thus their presence provides a circumstantial line of evidence for the presence of living echinoids in the area. In the case of the study area, whenever dead remains were found, living echinoids were always observed. Comparative live-dead studies of irregular echinoids in other climatic and depositional settings across a broader suite of taxa is needed to confirm if these applications are valid as a broader generalization.

Finally, occurrences of echinoid remains may constitute valuable data that can enhance bio-inventorying efforts based on surveys of live individuals.

Whereas the abundance of dead material on species level might be skewed towards more robust skeletons, the results of this study indicate that species that are more abundant alive, are generally also more abundant in death assemblages (Fig. 3).

Bio-inventorying Implications

The survey of the literature and databases indicates that most of the efforts focused on bio-inventorying echinoids around Florida Keys took place in the mid-to-late twenty century and declined dramatically over the most recent decades (Fig. 7). This dearth of recent surveys points to the critical importance of allocating time and resources toward resurveying marine habitats, especially in areas that experience intense and diverse human impacts. The recent surveys such as the one reported here not only allow for comparative assessment with past surveys and archived occurrence records, but also provide an important reference point for future reassessment and monitoring efforts.

Conclusions

- (1) Irregular echinoids are present in 63% of surveyed sites in the Florida Keys.
- (2) When echinoids are present, their abundance is typically high (> 10 individuals per m^2).
- (3) Six irregular echinoid species were identified: *Clypeaster rosaceus*, *Clypeaster subdepressus*, *Encope michelini*, *Leodia sexiesperforata*, *Meoma ventricosa*, and *Plagiobrissus grandis*.
- (4) The distribution and faunal composition of echinoids is consistent with observations made 50 years ago (Kier and Grant, 1965) suggesting that despite numerous anthropogenic stressors affecting the region the echinoid fauna has remained relatively unchanged over the recent decades.
- (5) Up to five species co-occurred within single sites in shallow waters (< 20 m), but typically only one species was dominant.
- (6) Deeper sites (> 20 m) appear to be restricted to rare monospecific occurrences of *Meoma ventricosa* and *Clypeaster subdepressus*.
- (7) Dead echinoid tests typically co-occur with live specimens but are less frequent than live specimens.

Acknowledgements

We thank the Keys Marine Lab (University of South Florida) for providing infrastructure and housing during our field work and our captain of the R/V Diodon Bill Ferrell for his professional support. Roger W. Portell, Alshina Kanai, and Luke Grimmelbein (University of Florida) are gratefully acknowledged for help with field work. We thank Andreas Kroh, Hin Boo Wee, and an anonymous reviewer for their constructive reviews. We thank Sean Roberts (University of Florida) for photographing specimens.

References

- Aller RC, Dodge RE, Animal-sediment relations in a tropical lagoon, Discovery Bay, Jamaica. J Mar Res. 1974; 32: 209-232.
- Alroy J, The shifting balance of diversity among major marine animal groups. Science. 2010; 329: 191-1194.
- Bell BM, Frey RW, Observations on ecology and the feeding and burrowing mechanisms of *Mellita quinquiesperforata* (Leske). J Paleontol. 1969; 43: 553-560.

- Brustolin MC, Thomas MC, Mafra Jr LL, Lana PC, Does *Encope emarginata* (Echinodermata: Echinoidea) affect spatial variation patterns of estuarine subtidal meiofauna and microphytobenthos? J Sea Res. 2014; 91: 70-78.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seares.2014.03.006>.
- Chesher RH, Contributions to the biology of *Meoma ventricosa* (Echinoidea: Spatangoida). Bull Mar Sci. 1969; 19: 72-110.
- Dahlgren CP, Posey MH, Hulbert AW, The effects of bioturbation on the infaunal community adjacent to an offshore hardbottom reef. Bull Mar Sci. 1999; 64: 21-34.
- Findlay RH, White DC, The effects of feeding by the sand dollar *Mellita quinquesperforata* (Leske) on the benthic microbial community. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol. 1983; 72: 25-41.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0981\(83\)90017-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0981(83)90017-5)
- Fourqurean JW, Zieman JC, Nutrient content of the seagrass *Thalassia testudinum* reveals regional patterns of relative availability of nitrogen and phosphorus in the Florida Keys USA. Biogeochemistry. 2002; 61: 229-245.
- George SB, Boone S, The ectosymbiont crab *Dissodactylus mellitae* – sand dollar *Mellita isometra* relationship. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol. 2003; 294: 235-255. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0981\(03\)00271-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0981(03)00271-5)
- Greenstein BJ, An integrated study of echinoid taphonomy: predictions for the fossil record of four echinoid families. Palaios. 1991; 6: 519-540.
- Grun TB, Recognizing traces of snail predation on the Caribbean sand dollar *Leodia sexiesperforata*. Palaios. 2017; 32: 448-461. <http://doi.org/10.2110/palo.2017.001>
- Grun T, Sievers D, Nebelsick JH, Drilling predation on the clypeasteroid echinoid *Echinocyamus pusillus* from the Mediterranean Sea (Giglio, Italy). Hist Biol. 2014; 26: 745-757.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/08912963.2013.841683>
- Grun TB, Kroh A, Nebelsick JH, Comparative drilling predation on time-averaged phosphatized and non-phosphatized specimens of the minute clypeasteroid echinoid *Echinocyamus stellatus* from Miocene offshore sediments (Globigerina Limestone Fm., Malta). J Paleontol. 2017; 91: 633-462. <http://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2016.123>
- Grun TB, Mancosu A, Belaústegui Z, Nebelsick JH, The Taphonomy of *Clypeaster*: a paleontological tool to identify stable structures in natural shell systems. Neues Jahrb Geol Paläontol Abh. 2018; 288: 189-202. <http://doi.org/10.1127/njgpa/2018/0737>
- Highsmith RC, Induced settlement and metamorphosis of sand dollar (*Dendraster excentricus*) larvae in predator-free sites: adult sand dollar beds. Ecology. 1982; 63: 329-337.
- Hope ACA, A simplified Monte Carlo significance test procedure. J R Stat Soc B. 1968; 30:582-598. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1968.tb00759.x>.
- Kidwell SM, Discordance between living and death assemblages as evidence for anthropogenic ecological change. PNAS. 2007; 104: 17701-17706.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0707194104>
- Kidwell SM, Baumiller TK, Experimental disintegration of regular echinoids. Roles of temperatures, oxygen, and decay thresholds. Paleobiol. 1990; 16: 247-271.

- Kier PM, Grant RE, Echinoid distribution and habits, Key Largo Coral Reef Preserve, Florida. *Smithson Misc Collect.* 1965; 146: 1-68.
- Kowalewski M, Casebolt S, Hua Q, Whitacre KE, Kaufman DS, Kosnik MA, One fossil record, multiple time resolutions: disparate time-averaging of echinoids and mollusks on a Holocene carbonate platform. *Geology*. 2018; 46: 51-54. <https://doi.org/10.1130/G39789.1>
- Krantzberg G, The influence of bioturbation on physical, chemical and biological parameters in aquatic environments: a review. *Environ Pollut Ser A: Ecol Biol.* 1985; 39: 99-122. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0143-1471\(85\)90009-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0143-1471(85)90009-1).
- Kroh A, Index of Living and Fossil Echinoids 1971-2008. *Ann Naturhistor. Mus Wien Serie A.* 2010; 112:195-470.
- Kroh A, Nebelsick JH, Echinoid assemblages as a tool for palaeoenvironmental reconstruction – an example from the Early Miocene of Egypt. *Palaeogeogr Palaeoclimatol Palaeoecol.* 2003; 201: 157-177. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-0182\(03\)00610-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-0182(03)00610-2)
- Kroh A, Nebelsick JH, Echinoderms and Oligo-Miocene carbonate systems: potential applications in sedimentology and environmental reconstructions. *Int Ass Sedimentol Spec Publ.* 2010; 42: 201-228.
- Lessios HA, The Great *Diadema antillarum* die-off: 30 years later. *Ann Rev Mar Sci.* 2016; 8: 267-283. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-marine-122414-033857>
- Lessios HA, Cubit JD, Robertson DR, Shulman MJ, Parker MR, Garrity SD, Levings SD, Mass mortality of *Diadema antillarum* on the Caribbean coast of Panama. *Coral Reefs.* 1984a; 3: 173–82.
- Lessios HA, Robertson DR, Cubit JD, Spread of *Diadema* mass mortality through the Caribbean. *Science.* 1984b; 226: 335-37.
- Lutz SJ, A thousand cuts? An assessment of small-boat grounding damage to shallow corals of the Florida Keys. In: Precht WF, editor. *Coral Reef Restoration Handbook*. Boca Raton: Taylor and Francis; 2006. pp. 25-38.
- Malmstadt J, Scheitlin K, Elsner J, Florida hurricanes and damage costs. *Southeast Geogr.* 2009; 49: 108-131.
- Meadows, C.A., Fordyce, R.E., and Baumiller, T.K., Drill holes in the irregular echinoid, *Fibularia*, from the Oligocene of New Zealand: *Palaios.* 2015; 30: 810-817.
- Mooi R, Martínez S, Parma SG, Phylogenetic systematics of Tertiary monophorasterid sand dollars (Clypeasteroidea: Echinoidea) from South America. *J Paleont.* 2016; 74: 263-281. [https://doi.org/10.1666/0022-3360\(2000\)074<0263:PSOTMS>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1666/0022-3360(2000)074<0263:PSOTMS>2.0.CO;2)
- Nawrot R, Berensmeier M, Gallmetzer I, Haselmair A, Tomašových A, Zuschin M, Multiple phyla, one time resolution? Similar time averaging in benthic foraminifera, mollusk, echinoid, crustacean, and otolith fossil assemblages. *Geology.* 2022, 50: 902-906. <https://doi.org/10.1130/G49970.1>
- Nebelsick JH, Clypeasteroids. In: Lawrence JM, editor. *Biology and Ecology of Sea Urchins*, Vol. 43, 4th Edition. London: Elsevier; 2020. pp. 315-332.

- Nebelsick JH, Taphonomic legacy of predation on echinoids. In: Candia Carnevali C, Bonasoro F, editors. Echinoderm Research 1998: Proceedings of the Fifth European Conference on Echinoderms, Milan Italy, 7–12 September. Rotterdam: Balkema. pp. 347-352.
- Nebelsick JH, Kowalewski M, Drilling predation on Recent clypeasteroid echinoids from the Red Sea. *Palaios*. 1999; 14: 127-144. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3515369>.
- Olszewski TD, Kidwell SM, The preservational fidelity of evenness in molluscan death assemblages. *Paleobiol*. 2007; 33: 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1666/05059.1>
- Osborn AS, Portell RW, Mooi R, Neogene Echinoids of Florida. *Bull Fla Nat Hist*. 2020; 57: 237-469.
- Plee TA, Pomory CM, Microplastics in sandy environments in the Florida Keys and the Panhandle of Florida, and the ingestion by sea cucumbers (Echinodermata: Holothuroidea) and sand dollars (Echinodermata: Echinoidea). *Mar Poll Bull*. 2020; 158: 111437. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2020.111437>
- R Core Team. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2021. www.r-project.org.
- Reidenauer JA, Sand-dollar *Mellita quinquiesperforata* (Leske) burrow trails: sites of harpacticoid disturbance and nematode attraction. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol*. 1989; 130: 223-235. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0981\(89\)90165-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0981(89)90165-2).
- Rojas A, Calatayud J, Kowalewski M, Neuman M, Rosvall M, A multiscale view of the Phanerozoic fossil record reveals the three major biotic transitions. *Commun Biol*. 2021; 4: 309. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-021-01805-y>
- Scheibling RE, Echinoids, epizootics and ecological stability in the rocky subtidal off Nova Scotia, Canada. *Helgo Meeresunters*. 1984; 37:232-242.
- Seilacher A, Constructional morphology of sand dollars. *Paleobiol*. 1979; 5: 191-221.
- Sepkoski JJ, A kinetic model of Phanerozoic taxonomic diversity. III. Post-Paleozoic families and mass extinctions. *Paleobiol*. 1984; 10: 246-267.
- Smith AL, Comparisom of macrofaunal invertebrates in sand dollar (*Dendraster excentricus*) bed and in adjacent areas free of sand dollars. *Mar Biolo*. 1981; 65:191-198.
- Smith TB, Purcell J, Barimo JF, The rocky intertidal biota of the Florida Keys: fifty-two years of change after Stephenson and Stephenson (1950). *Bull Mar Scien*. 2007; 80: 1-19.
- Tyler CL, Dexter TA, Portell RW, Kowalewski M, Predation-facilitated preservation of echinoids in a tropical marine environment. *Palaios*. 2018; 33: 478-486. <https://doi.org/10.2110/palo.2018.046>
- Tyler CL, Dexter TA, Portell RW, Kowalewski M, Predation-facilitated preservation of echinoids in a tropical marine environment. *Palaios*. 2018; 33: 478-486. <https://doi.org/10.2110/palo.2018.046>
- Weihe SC, Gray IE, Observations on the biology of the sand dollar *Mellita quinquiesperforata* (Leske). *J Elisha Mitchell Sci Soc*. 1968; 84: 315-327.

554 Yeo S, Keesing JK, van Keulen M, Seasonal and diel variation in movement rhythms of sand
555 dollar, *Peronella lesueurii* (Valenciennes 1841), in Cockburn Sound, Western Australia.
556 Mar Biol. 2013; 160: 277-284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-012-2086-3>