FISH and FISHERIES WILEY

Where land meets sea: Intertidal areas as key-habitats for sharks and rays

Guido Leurs[1,2] | Brian O. Nieuwenhuis[1,3] | Thije J. Zuidewind[1] | Nadia Hijner[1] | Han Olff[1] | Laura L. Govers[1,2]

[1]Conservation Ecology Group, Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences (GELIFES), University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

[2]Department of Coastal Systems, Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research (NIOZ), Texel, the Netherlands

[3]Red Sea Research Center (RSRC), King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Thuwal, Saudi-Arabia

Correspondence
Guido Leurs, Conservation Ecology Group, Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences (GELIFES), University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands.
Email: g.h.l.leurs@rug.nl

Abstract

Intertidal habitats (i.e. marine habitats that are (partially) exposed during low tide) have traditionally been studied from a shorebird-centred perspective. We show that these habitats are accessible and important to marine predators such as elasmobranchs (i.e. sharks and rays). Our synthesis shows that at least 43 shark and 45 ray species, of which 54.5% are currently threatened, use intertidal habitats. Elasmobranchs use intertidal habitats mostly for feeding and as refugia, but also for parturition and thermoregulation. However, the motivation of intertidal habitat use remains unclear due to limitations to observe elasmobranch behaviour in these dynamic habitats. We argue that elasmobranch predators can play an important role in intertidal food webs by feeding on shared resources during high tide (i.e. 'high-tide predators'), which are accessible and also consumed by terrestrial or avian predators during low tide (i.e. 'low-tide predators'). In addition, elasmobranchs are able to change the bio-geomorphology of intertidal habitats by increasing habitat heterogeneity due to feeding activities and may also alter resource availability for other consumers. We discuss how the ecological role of elasmobranchs in intertidal habitats is being affected by the continued overexploitation of these species, and conversely, how the global loss of intertidal areas poses an additional threat to an already vulnerable taxonomic group. We conclude that studies on intertidal ecology should include both low-tide (e.g. shorebirds) and high-tide (e.g. elasmobranchs) predatory guilds and their ecological interactions. The global loss of elasmobranch predatory species and intertidal habitat provides additional compelling arguments for the conservation of these areas.

KEYWORDS
coastal ecology, elasmobranchs, fisheries, food web, littoral, species interactions

1 | INTRODUCTION

Coastal habitats are vital to both coastal and oceanic marine species, such as marine mammals, teleost fishes and elasmobranchs (i.e. sharks and rays). Coastal reefs, estuaries, saltmarshes and soft-bottom flat habitats play an important role in the life cycle of many species, for example as nursery habitats for early life-stages, feeding areas or as sites for mating or spawning/parturition (Knip et al., 2010,

Sievers et al., 2019). Among coastal habitats, the intertidal harbours some of the most dynamic habitats in the world. The intertidal is the transition zone between land and sea, between low and high tide level, where the same habitat is exposed during low tide and submerged during high tide (Figure 1a). With a global distribution, intertidal ecosystems deliver important ecosystem services, such as food production and coastal protection (Beninger, 2019; Koch et al., 2009; Murray et al., 2019). However, intertidal ecosystems are threatened by coastal development, sea level rise and coastal erosion. Since 1984 approximately 16% of the global areal of intertidal flat areas has been lost (Murray et al., 2019). The ongoing degradation of these habitats threatens its associated species, some of which already face significant anthropogenic disturbances like overexploitation, pollution and climate change (Halpern et al., 2008; Lotze et al., 2006; Lu et al., 2018; Pendleton et al., 2012).

Intertidal habitats are constantly influenced by the rhythm of the tide. Compared with (sub)tidal habitats, which are always submerged, species using the intertidal face additional challenges and constraints as a result of the never-ending cycle of the incoming and receding tide (Figure 1). Intertidal habitats are only exposed or submerged for a certain period of time, depending on the elevation of the habitat and the local tidal regime. For example, high intertidal habitats such as saltmarshes are only submerged occasionally, whereas habitats like intertidal flats and mangroves are often exposed for a certain number of hours each day (Figure 1). These changes in tidal phases are often influenced by strong hydrodynamic forces and severe changes in temperature and/or salinity (e.g. Hernández et al., 2002; Smith, 1956). The interplay of tides in areas bordering land and sea makes these habitats accessible to both marine and terrestrial/avian species (Figure 1c).

The value of intertidal habitats has been recognized for species groups such as migratory wading birds (Deppe, 1999; Piersma et al., 1993), marine mammals (Vermeulen, 2018; Wilson & Jones, 2018), teleost fishes (Deppe, 1999; Gibson & Yoshiyama, 1999) and even for some terrestrial mammals (Carlton & Hodder, 2003). For instance, migratory wading birds use intertidal flats as stop-over sites between wintering and breeding grounds along their migratory flyways as feeding areas to profit from the high availability of benthic prey species (Piersma et al., 1993; Zwarts & Piersma, 1990). Marine mammals such as small cetaceans and pinnipeds use intertidal habitats for feeding (Vermeulen, 2018) and for resting (Wilson & Jones, 2018), whereas terrestrial mammals benefit from the extra feeding opportunities that intertidal habitats provide (Carlton & Hodder, 2003). During high tide, marine species such as teleost fishes use intertidal habitats for feeding, refuge and as a nursery habitat (Gibson, 1986; Gibson & Yoshiyama, 1999). This often includes early life-stages of many commercial and pelagic fish species (Jin et al., 2007; Rangeley & Kramer, 1995).

Although the importance of coastal and nearshore habitats to elasmobranch species is generally well understood (Heithaus et al., 2010; Knip et al., 2010), less is known about the use of tidal habitats (i.e. habitats strongly influenced by tidal water movements). Furthermore, knowledge of intertidal habitat use (i.e. habitats that are only available

during a certain phase in the tidal cycle due to exposure) is often completely absent or remains undocumented. This is surprising, as these species may play an essential role in the functioning of these marine ecosystems (Atwood et al., 2015; Heupel et al., 2014), and intertidal habitats potentially allow elasmobranchs to indirectly interact with other (terrestrial and/or avian) predator guilds.

Ecosystem functioning (i.e. defined as the fluxes of material and energy within an ecosystem (Brandl et al., 2019)) is sustained

FIGURE 1 Intertidal habitats are strongly influenced by the tide, being submerged and exposed at least once per day (a). Compared to subtidal (i.e. always submerged habitat) or supratidal habitats (i.e. always exposed habitat), intertidal habitats are submerged for a certain amount of time each day (b). These habitats are used by species adapted to these challenges, such as mobile sharks, rays and teleosts which use intertidal habitats during high tide and wading shorebirds which use the same habitat during low tide (c). Larger-bodied sharks, rays and teleosts are restricted to subtidal habitats.

by species interacting within food webs and their abiotic environment (Boero & Bonsdorff, 2007; Brandl et al., 2019). Keystone species often play an important role in the functioning of ecosystems, by maintaining diversity and structure of ecological communities (Mills & Doak, 1993; Power et al., 1996). Within marine food webs, large-bodied, mobile sharks have been recognized as top-predators (Heupel et al., 2014; Navia et al., 2016), and smaller shark and ray species often occupy meso-predatory positions (Navia et al., 2016). Both top-predatory sharks and meso-predatory rays have been identified as having keystone roles on coral reef and intertidal habitats, respectively (Heithaus et al., 2010; Power et al., 1996; Ruiz & Wolff, 2011). According to recent estimates, 31% of all shark species and 36% of all ray species are currently threatened with extinction (Dulvy et al., 2021), jeopardizing their key-role in the functioning of marine ecosystems (Atwood et al., 2015; Ferretti et al., 2010; Hammerschlag et al., 2019).

We aimed to address the knowledge gaps surrounding the intertidal habitat use of elasmobranchs. We provide a global synthesis of available information on intertidal habitat use by sharks and rays, in order to describe how these species use these habitats and to conceptualize how these habitats allow elasmobranchs to interact with other (low tide) predatory guilds. Specifically, we aimed to (1) describe which elasmobranch species and which life stages of their populations use intertidal habitats and for what purpose, (2) describe novel perspectives on how shark and rays potentially interact with other species and predator guilds, with a focus on potential trophic interactions between different predatory guilds using intertidal habitats and (3) discuss how the removal of sharks and rays from these areas could undermine the functioning of intertidal ecosystems and their communities, and conversely how the loss of intertidal habitats could affect sharks and rays.

2 | METHODS

To identify literature describing the intertidal habitat use by elasmobranchs, we performed a literature search on the Web of Science. This literature search was conducted using a combination of the search terms 'elasmobranch*', 'shark*', 'ray*', 'skate', 'batoid*' and 'chondrichthyan*' with 'tidal*' and 'intertidal*'. After deleting irrelevant studies (i.e. studies outside the scope of this study), this search resulted in 150 studies. Secondly, we included additional literature based on the initial literature search by following the snowball principle (see Lecy & Beatty, 2012), resulting in a total of 403 studies to be included in our review process. Each study was assessed by two different researchers and was only included if the study described elasmobranchs utilizing intertidal habitats, defined as shallow coastal habitats that are influenced by the tidal cycle, that emerge during low tide and are submerged during high tide (i.e. differing from tidal habitats that are not necessarily exposed during low tide; Table 1). These habitats included soft-bottom mudflats and sandflats, including beaches, and vegetated soft-bottom flats (e.g. intertidal seagrass beds, mangroves or saltmarshes), and hard-bottom reef flats that are exposed for a certain time of the day (i.e. depending on the tidal regime and lunar cycle). Additionally, we added studies that describe species utilizing tide pools, tidal creeks and channels which connect intertidal flat habitats, such as within large intertidal mangrove and saltmarsh areas (Table 1). We excluded studies for which it was uncertain if the focal species used the intertidal part of the study resulting in a conservative selection of 119 publications describing intertidal habitat use of elasmobranchs. For each study, we then extracted observations of species using one or more of the defined habitats. For each species we then described all defined habitats for which habitat use of that species was

TABLE 1 Definitions of intertidal habitats, with a differentiation of soft- and hard-substrate flats, tidal creeks and tidal pools.

Intertidal habitat: shallow coastal habitat that is influenced by the tidal cycle, emerging during low tide and submerged during high tide	
Soft-bottom flats	Sand or mud flats regularly exposed during low tide while submerged during high tide. This includes vegetated soft-bottom flats (e.g. intertidal seagrass, mangroves or saltmarshes)
Reef flats	Coral or rocky reef flats regularly exposed during low tide while submerged during high tide
Tide pools	A water body isolated during low tide and (partially) connected with surrounding waters during high tide. These include tide pools and tidal lagoons
Tidal creeks and channels	Creeks and channels which are dependent on tidal flow and connect or flow through intertidal areas. Creeks and channels can partially or completely fall dry during low tide

Note: Definitions were based on Rafaelli and Hawkins (1999), Mitra and Zaman (2016), and Kaiser et al. (2020).

documented, which life stages of the species use these habitats, and which behaviour was observed or hypothesized to motivate their intertidal habitat use (Table S1). Habitats were classified according to their definitions (Table 1). In instances where a study described a species using multiple intertidal habitats, all used habitats were recorded. Life stages (when specified) were classified as neonates, young-of-the-year (YOY), juveniles or adults. If multiple life stages of a species were documented to use a habitat, all were documented. We classified behaviour into four non-exclusive categories: feeding, refuge, reproduction and thermoregulation. If more than one motivation for intertidal habitat use was hypothesized in the study, all of these motivations were recorded. We classified feeding behaviour if authors could determine that the species used the habitat for foraging or predation. Reproduction indicates that the area was used for mating, parturition or egg-laying and thermoregulation was used if authors indicated the elasmobranch species use of area to regulate their body temperature.

3 | INTERTIDAL HABITAT USE BY SHARKS AND RAYS

We selected 119 studies from 20 different countries covering 6 continents that adequately described elasmobranchs utilizing intertidal habitats (Figure S1, Table S1). The large majority of studies were conducted in Oceania (62.5%) and North America (23.3%), whereas the lowest number of studies were conducted in South America (1.7%), Africa (4.7%) and Europe (0.4%). This contrasts with the global distribution of both intertidal areas and elasmobranch species. The majority of intertidal habitats are located in East Asia (e.g. China, Malaysia, etc.) and Western Europe (Murray et al., 2019, 2022), whereas global hotspots for coastal shark and ray biodiversity are located off the northern and eastern coast of Australia, the Indo-West Pacific, Japan, China, Taiwan, the southwest Indian Ocean and western Africa (Derrick et al., 2020, Dulvy et al., 2021; Stein et al., 2018). These differences are likely due to the relatively higher number of elasmobranch-focused studies conducted in Australia and the United States (Momigliano & Harcourt, 2014) or due to limited (published) research in other regions due to economic (e.g. limited resources and capacity) and social barriers (e.g. limited integration and of non-English researchers) (Graham et al., 2022). This imbalance maintains existing knowledge gaps related to the ecology of

elasmobranchs within large intertidal areas, such as the trophic ecology and spatiotemporal use of intertidal habitats, and generally how these habitats contribute to the overall fitness of a (specific life stage of) elasmobranch species. The lack of studies on intertidal habitat use of elasmobranchs in European waters can be caused by the great decline that these species experienced in the region due to overfishing and habitat degradation. For example, once common, elasmobranch species are now rare in the Wadden Sea, the largest intertidal area in the world (Wolff, 2005).

3.1 | Species using intertidal habitats

Selected studies describe a total of 232 observations of elasmobranch species using intertidal habitats, with the number of observations divided equally among sharks ($n = 116$) and rays ($n = 116$). Observations describe intertidal habitat use of 88 elasmobranch species belonging to 25 different families (Figure 2). The three most frequently described species are the blacktip reef shark (*Carcharhinus melanopterus*, Carcharhinidae; $n = 15$), sicklefin lemon shark (*Negaprion acutidens*, Carcharhinidae; $n = 9$), and the giant shovelnose ray (*Glaucostegus typus*, Glaucostegidae; $n = 9$). Most species described in the selected studies belonged to the families of requiem sharks (Carcharhinidae, 31.9%), stingrays (Dasyatidae, 23.3%), sawfishes (Pristidae, 6.0%), hammerhead sharks (Sphyrnidae, 4.3%) and houndsharks (Triakidae, 4.3%).

Early life stages use intertidal habitats more compared to adult elasmobranchs (Figure S2a). The high percentage of neonates (7.4%), young-of-the-year (YOY, 5.3%) and juveniles (38.5%) compared to adults (25.7%) using the intertidal suggest that these habitats are important habitats for early life stages of elasmobranchs, providing both refuge and feeding opportunities. The discrepancy between juveniles and adults using intertidal habitats is more evident for large-bodied shark species (e.g. requiem sharks, hammerhead sharks and nurse sharks, Ginglymostomatidae) compared to small-bodied sharks (e.g. houndsharks and longtailed carpetsharks, Hemiscylliidae) and rays (e.g. stingrays). This suggests that intertidal habitats may be an important component of coastal nursery areas of these species to minimize the risks posed by adult conspecifics or other predators (Heupel et al., 2007; Martins et al., 2018; Speed et al., 2010). Previous studies underline the importance of nearshore habitats for early life stages of sharks (Chin et al., 2016; Knip et al., 2010) and rays (Martins et al., 2018;

FIGURE 2 Shark (blue) and ray (red) families for which intertidal habitat use has been confirmed. Percentages indicate the relative number of observations of a family in the reviewed studies. The different species for which intertidal habitat use was confirmed are indicated by the different segments (black lines within each family), colours indicate the taxonomic family. The total number of species confirmed to use intertidal habitats are given for both sharks and rays, with the proportion of threatened species given in parenthesis.

Vaudo & Heithaus, 2012). These results show that early-life stages possibly rely more on intertidal habitats than adult elasmobranchs.

Elasmobranchs were mostly documented in soft-bottom intertidal habitats (56.9%), with most observations being stingrays (31.8%, Dasyatidae) and requiem sharks (22.9%, Carcharhinidae) (Figure S2b). Tidal creeks and channels were mostly used by requiem sharks (61.9%) and sawfishes (11.9%), and reef flats mostly by requiem sharks (41.2%, Carcharhinidae), stingrays (23.5%, Dasyatidae) and longtailed carpetsharks (14.7%, Hemiscylliidae). Tidal pools and lagoons (4.0%) were documented to be used by species like the blacktip reef shark, nurse shark (*Ginglymostoma cirratum*, Ginglymostomatidae) and shortnose guitarfish (*Zapteryx brevirostris*, Trygonorrhinidae).

Sharks and rays use the productive intertidal mainly for feeding, but also as refuge, for reproduction and thermoregulation (Figure 3a). Elasmobranch species use these highly dynamic habitats as soon as these become available with the incoming tide, moving in from connected habitats. Utilization of intertidal habitats by elasmobranchs peaks during high tide (Ackerman et al., 2000; Campos et al., 2009; Carlisle & Starr, 2010; Matern et al., 2000). During receding tide, elasmobranchs move to adjacent (edge) habitats such as the shallow subtidal, tidal creeks or channels to seek refuge or to feed during the low-tide phase (Brinton & Curran, 2017; Campos et al., 2009; Martins et al., 2020). Some elasmobranch species have been documented to remain in shallow (semi-)enclosed waterbodies like tide pools or lagoons during low tide (Figure 3a).

FIGURE 3 (a) Conceptual visualization of intertidal habitat use by elasmobranchs for both tidal phases, low tide (top) and high tide (bottom). (NEO = neonates, YOY = young-of-the-year, JUV = juveniles, AD = adults). (b) Simplified intertidal food web consisting of intertidal prey species (green), low-tide predators (brown) and marine predators (elasmobranch meso-predators in red, elasmobranch top-predators in dark blue and teleosts in light blue). (c) The risk-effects induced by intertidal predators, and the risk effect of stranding for marine predators.

3.2 | Feeding in intertidal habitats

Most studies described the feeding behaviour of elasmobranchs in intertidal habitats (32.3%, Figure S2c). Stingrays (57.4%, Dasyatidae) and eagle rays (10.3%, Myliobatidae) accounted for most feeding observations by rays, as these species often leave distinctive feeding pits on intertidal soft-bottom flats (e.g. Hines et al., 1997; O'Shea et al., 2012; Takeuchi & Tamaki, 2014) (Figure 3a). Of all sharks, intertidal feeding behaviour was mainly described for requiem sharks (62.1%, Carcharhinidae), houndsharks (24.1% Triakidae) and hammerhead sharks (10.3% Sphyrnidae). Feeding activities of elasmobranchs may have direct (i.e. removal of prey species) and indirect effects (i.e. changing biogeomorphology, biogeochemistry) on intertidal habitats.

3.2.1 | Direct trophic effects

In nearshore ecosystems, large-bodied sharks like the great hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna mokarran*, Sphyrnidae), tiger shark (*Galeocerdo cuvier*, Carcharhinidae) and bull shark (*Carcharhinus leucas*, Carcharhinidae), occupy top-predatory niches and can control the abundance of lower trophic species (Atwood et al., 2015; Hammerschlag et al., 2019; Heithaus, 2001; Navia et al., 2016). In coastal areas, large sharks are often defined as generalist predators (e.g. Hussey et al., 2015; Nowicki et al., 2019), with a diet consisting of large teleost fishes, rays, smaller shark species and sea turtles (Figure 3b). Depending on the habitat, ontogenetic changes, and individual specialization, large sharks can also be specialist predators (Matich et al., 2011). For example, great hammerhead sharks were

found to be specialized shark and ray predators in eastern Australia (Raoult et al., 2019). The niches of some shark species are wider and resilient to (environmental) changes (Munroe et al., 2014). Our results show that adults of large-bodied shark species rarely use intertidal habitats. This could be explained by the physical constraints of shallow habitats for large-bodied sharks, and a lack of larger prey. However, Roemer et al. (2016) shows that adult great hammerhead sharks venture into shallow waters to feed on small sharks or eagle rays. This suggests that large sharks—as vagrant predators occupying a top-predatory position (Heupel et al., 2014; Navia et al., 2016)—may use shallow habitats like the intertidal opportunistically, but spend the large majority of time in (adjacent) subtidal waters (Figure 1c). As large sharks can control prey abundance through top-down processes (e.g. Bascompte et al., 2005), the removal of large sharks is hypothesized to release prey species from predation, causing an increase in their abundance (Atwood et al., 2015; Ferretti et al., 2010; Myers et al., 2007; Ward & Myers, 2005), but these predator–prey dynamics need further investigation (e.g. Grubbs et al., 2016).

We found that intertidal habitats are mostly used by early life stages and small-bodied elasmobranchs (e.g. George et al., 2019; Knip et al., 2011), which typically occupy a meso-predatory position in coastal food webs (Flowers et al., 2021; Navia et al., 2016). Ray species feeding in intertidal habitats can have a generalist or specialist feeding strategy. For example, generalist species like the New Zealand eagle ray (*Myliobatis tenuicaudatus*, Myliobatidae), bat ray (*Myliobatis californicus*, Myliobatidae), the American cownose ray (*Rhinoptera bonasus*, Rhinopteridae) and Indonesian sharpnose ray (*Telatrygon biasa*, Dasyatidae) consume a wide variety of prey species as part of their opportunistic feeding strategy (Collins et al., 2007; Gray et al., 1997, Hines et al., 1997; Lim et al., 2018,). Specialist meso-predators like the leopard shark (*Triakis semifasciata*, Triakidae) feed primarily on a narrow range of prey species, limited to a diet consisting of a small number of polychaete or bivalve species (Ackerman et al., 2000). Ajemian and Powers (2012) show that the feeding strategy of American cownose rays possibly switch between specialist and opportunistic generalist feeding strategies depending on location and prey availability. Adult bat rays consume larger and harder prey (e.g. large bivalves and crustaceans), compared to juvenile conspecifics, which have a more generalist feeding strategy and feed on a wider variety of prey (e.g. small bivalves and shrimp) (Gray et al., 1997). A similar ontogenetic shift was shown for other ray and benthic shark species (Bethea et al., 2007; Clements et al., 2022; Lim et al., 2018). Hollensead et al. (2016) describes that juvenile smalltooth sawfishes (*Pristis pectinate*, Pristidae) most likely use the edge of intertidal flats to ambush schools of mullet (Mugilidae) leaving the intertidal habitat during receding tide. Collectively, meso-predatory elasmobranchs primarily feed on crustaceans, bivalves, polychaetes and small teleosts in intertidal habitats during high tide (Ackerman et al., 2000; Haeseker & Cech, 1994; Talent, 1982) (Figure 3b). These meso-predators can affect (benthic) prey abundance through direct predation (O'Shea et al., 2012; Pridmore et al., 1990; Reidenauer & Thistle, 1981). For instance, a local increase of red stingrays (*Hemitrygon akajei*, Dasyatidae) in Japan was directly linked to

declines in ghost shrimp (*Neotrypaea harmandi*, Callianassidae) populations (Flach & Tamaki, 2001; Takeuchi et al., 2013; Takeuchi & Tamaki, 2014).

3.2.2 | Indirect effects of elasmobranch predation

Depending on sediment characteristics and water turbidity, feeding activity of elasmobranchs can be monitored both during high and low tide. On more coarse sediment and hard-bottom substrates feeding traces are not preserved, limiting observations of elasmobranch feeding to high tide observations (Kanno et al., 2019; Lim et al., 2018). If water visibility allows these methods can be used to document feeding activity and the duration of intertidal habitat use (Kanno et al., 2019).

Feeding activity of elasmobranchs during high tide on softbottom intertidal flats might still be visible during low tide (Figure 3a). In these areas, the feeding behaviour of stingrays and eagle rays can leave distinct sediment depressions or excavations, so-called 'ray pits' (e.g. Grant, 1983; Lynn-Myrick, 1996; O'Shea et al., 2012; Takeuchi & Tamaki, 2014). With their feeding behaviour, rays can change the biogeomorphology of soft-bottom intertidal habitats through bioturbation and thereby act as ecosystem engineers (Kristensen et al., 2012). O'Shea et al. (2012) determined that up to 42% of the soft-sediment habitat in Mangrove Bay (Australia) is reworked by stingrays every year. On Debidue Flat (United States) researchers estimate excavation activity by rays to turn over the top layer of the entire flat every 100 to 1000 days (D'Andrea et al., 2004), and in Bahía La Choya (Mexico) rays only need about 72 days to overturn the entire top layer (Lynn-Myrick, 1996). Differences in these turnover rates between studies are dependent on ray densities, species, perceived risk (discussed in 3.3. 'Risk effects and avoidance in intertidal habitats') and methodological differences across studies (Flowers et al., 2021). The increased bioturbation by rays can potentially lead to changes in biogeochemistry as a result of bioturbation effects on grain size and sediment stability (Laverock et al., 2011; Lohrer et al., 2004; Meysman et al., 2006). Increased bioturbation can also lead to an increase in primary production in intertidal systems (Giorgini et al., 2019), and cause changes in benthic species composition (Thrush et al., 2006). In addition, newly formed excavations by benthic rays can provide new habitats for other organisms that are using the intertidal. As water in ray pits often remains during low tide, these can act as habitat for smaller, secondary users like small teleost fish, gastropods and (burrowing) crabs (O'Shea et al., 2012; Zajac et al., 2003).

3.2.3 | Predation risk effects and avoidance among elasmobranchs

Shallow, nearshore areas are known to provide refugia for many (early life stages of) fish species, including elasmobranchs (Knip et al., 2010), which are prone to predation from large-bodied

(conspecific) predators in adjacent subtidal waters. Our results show that early life stages of large-bodied elasmobranchs and small-bodied elasmobranchs use the intertidal as a refuge when tides are high (Cerutti-Pereyra et al., 2014; Pierce et al., 2011; Vaudo & Heithaus, 2011). Especially vegetated intertidal habitats such as mangroves and seagrass beds are thought to offer increased protection and lower predation risks, especially in ray species. After feeding activity, refuge behaviour and risk aversion was the most common motivation provided for intertidal habitat use by elasmobranch species (15.5%, Figure S2c). Among ray species, refuge was mostly reported for stingrays (50.0%, Dasyatidae) and sawfishes (25.0%, Pristidae). Shark species using intertidal refugia were mostly young individuals of requiem shark (79.1%, Carcharhinidae) and hammerhead shark species (12.5%, Sphyrnidae). However, authors often provide limited evidence of active prey avoidance, and the motivation of habitat selection remains an important knowledge gap for shallow (intertidal) habitats (Flowers et al., 2021; Knip et al., 2010). In addition, the presence of predators can induce predation risk effects in other, lower trophic species, causing changes in their behaviour, habitat selection and limiting foraging time (Flowers et al., 2021; Hammerschlag et al., 2022; Heithaus & Dill, 2002; Morrissey & Gruber, 1993; Peacor et al., 2020; Wirsing et al., 2007). The presence of large-bodied predators in subtidal waters can potentially increase the usage of adjacent intertidal areas as feeding refugium by meso-predatory species as soon as these are accessible in the tidal cycle.

3.2.4 | Predation risk effects induced by elasmobranchs as predators

Besides facing predation risk effects from larger (conspecific) predators, meso-predatory elasmobranchs may simultaneously induce predation risk effects among prey communities (Flowers et al., 2021; Rasher et al., 2017). Meso-predatory rays induce behavioural and physiological responses among prey species and communities (Flowers et al., 2021). Ex-situ experiments show that the presence of rays influences the movement (Barrios-O'Neill et al., 2017) and feeding times of mussels (Castorani & Hovel, 2016). Sharks and rays utilizing intertidal habitats are forced to move in coherence with the tide, causing the risk effects induced by these predators on intertidal prey to be linked with the tidal cycle (Figure 3c). For example, Rasher et al. (2017) found that the presence of reef-associated sharks significantly lowered browsing and grazing of herbivorous fish during times that sharks had access to the habitat (i.e. high tide). The risk effects for intertidal prey species do not cease when predatory fish and elasmobranchs lose access to these habitats, as the predation risk effects induced by terrestrial and avian predators increases with the lowering tide (Figure 3c).

3.3 | Stranding risk effects and avoidance

Marine predators such as sharks and rays using intertidal habitats are faced with an additional risk: the risk of stranding upon tidal flat

emergence with the receding tide (Brinton & Curran, 2017; Campos et al., 2009). When the receding tide sets in, the stranding risk for sharks and rays seeking refuge or feeding in intertidal habitats increases (Figure 3c) (Wosnick et al., 2022). Sharks feeding in intertidal habitats are thought to limit use of the intertidal until the incoming tide reaches its highest levels, leaving the intertidal as soon as the tide starts to recede, possibly by sensing barometric changes (Campos et al., 2009; Rasher et al., 2017). For example, brown smoothhound sharks (*Mustelus henlei*, Triakidae), a species that is vulnerable to strandings (Wosnick et al., 2022), show more directed movements to leave the intertidal upon the turn of the tide (Campos et al., 2009). To reduce the risk of stranding and/or predation, rays exert directed tidal movements during receding and incoming tidal phases (Brinton & Curran, 2017; Davy et al., 2015; Martins et al., 2020). However, these directed movements could also be motivated due to increased feeding opportunities (Kanno et al., 2019). Hence, intertidal habitat utilization by (early life stages of) sharks and rays is a trade-off between lower predation risk effects, increased feeding opportunities and the risk effects of stranding (Figures 1 and 3).

3.4 | Reproduction and parturition in intertidal habitats

Sharks and rays are known to use nearshore habitats for mating (e.g. Smith, 2005), gestation (e.g. Jirik & Lowe, 2012), parturition (e.g. Feldheim et al., 2014; Mourier & Planes, 2013) and oviparity (e.g. Day et al., 2019). Our results show that some sharks and rays use intertidal habitats for reproduction-related behaviour. Among rays, this has mostly been described for pelagic eagle ray (25.0%, Aetobatidae) and stingray (16.7%, Dasyatidae) species. Reproductive behaviour as motivation for intertidal habitat use of sharks has mostly been described for requiem sharks (46.2%, Carcharhinidae), hammerhead sharks (23.1%, Sphyrnidae) and houndsharks (15.4%, Triakidae). Smith (2005) described that leopard sharks mate on intertidal soft-bottom flats in California. Shortnose guitarfish potentially use tide pools for parturition (Wosnick et al., 2019). This limited evidence suggests that some shark and ray species use the intertidal for reproductive purposes, to maximize mating success, maximize gestational development and for increased survival of egg cases.

3.5 | Thermoregulation in intertidal habitats

Abiotic factors play an important role as drivers of distribution, movement and habitat selection in like sharks and rays (Schlaff et al., 2014). As most shark and ray species are ectotherms, ambient temperatures directly influence metabolic and physiological processes and are therefore considered one of the main drivers of their distribution, movement and habitat selection (Bernal et al., 2012; Morrissey & Gruber, 1993; Schlaff et al., 2014). Elasmobranchs select shallow coastal waters due to their higher temperature to increase digestion rates (Papastamatiou et al., 2015), (embryonic) growth rates and to

shorten gestation times (Jirik & Lowe, 2012; Wosnick et al., 2019). Our review shows that sharks and rays might select intertidal habitats for thermoregulatory purposes, as intertidal water temperatures are often higher than adjacent subtidal waters (Bridges, 1993; Hernández et al., 2002). However, only a limited number of studies describe behavioural thermoregulation of sharks and rays in intertidal habitats. For stingrays, requiem sharks and houndsharks, two studies describe thermoregulation in intertidal habitats for each of the species' groups. Thermoregulation of sawfishes, giant guitarfishes (Glaucostegidae), eagle rays, wedgefish (Rhinidae) and round stingrays (Urotrygonidae) was only described in one study of each of these families. For example, Jirik and Lowe (2012) describe how pregnant round stingrays (*Urobatis helleri*, Urotrygonidae) use intertidal habitats in months of high water temperatures to increase embryonic development. Di Santo and Bennett (2011) describe that the Atlantic stingray (*Hypanus sabinus*, Dasyatidae) may use the thermal variability across habitats to maximize energy uptake by balancing evacuation and absorption rates. This may cause some ray species to use warmer habitats like the intertidal to regulate digestion rates.

Differentiating between different drivers of intertidal habitat use in sharks and rays is challenging due to existing knowledge gaps caused by the challenges of studying these species in such highly dynamic habitats. It is likely that intertidal habitat selection is an interplay of different biotic and abiotic drivers, in which abiotic drives such as salinity, water temperature and emergence time of the habitat likely play a key-role.

3.6 | Physiological adaptations to the challenges of intertidal habitat use

The reason sharks and rays select intertidal habitats is equivocal, with the most likely motivation for intertidal habitat selection being a combination of lower predation risk effects, and increased feeding opportunities. However, elasmobranchs using these shallow and highly dynamic habitats are also faced with extremes in environmental factors like fluctuations in temperature, salinity, pH and oxygen levels (Lam et al., 2005). These challenges require specific physiological adaptations to enable an organism to use intertidal habitats. Intertidal habitats are often located in estuaries with associated fluctuations in salinity due to freshwater outlets (Murray et al., 2019) and high evaporation rates (Lam et al., 2005; Wheatly, 1988). Our overview shows that species using intertidal habitats are often euryhaline species, tolerating wide salinity ranges (Martin, 2005). For example, we show that euryhaline species such as the bull shark, the speartooth shark (*Glyphis glyphis*, Carcharhinidae), stingray species including the Atlantic stingray (*Hypanus sabinus*, Dasyatidae) and sawfish species like the largetooth sawfish (*Pristis pristis*, Pristidae) often use intertidal areas (De Vlaming & Sage, 1973; Martin, 2005). These species are able to tolerate wide ranges of salinities due to their ability to secrete solutes and therefore maintain osmolarity in habitats with lower salinities or even with large freshwater influxes (Ballantyne & Robinson, 2010; Chew et al., 2006). Some species of

elasmobranchs have higher temperature tolerances compared to other species or even compared to conspecifics in other life stages. This allows these species to adapt to the high temperature fluctuations of intertidal habitats. For example, juvenile ribbontail stingrays (*Taeniura lymma*, Dasyatidae) have a small thermal niche with high temperature preferences to sustain high temperature fluctuations in their (intertidal) nursery areas. Sustaining these high temperatures can separate juveniles from older conspecifics in deeper and cooler waters (Dabruzzi et al., 2013). Another example of how some elasmobranch species is adapted to use intertidal habitats is the use of tide pools and intertidal reef flats by the epaulette shark (*Hemiscyllium ocellatum*, Hemiscylliidae). Oxygen levels in these tide pools can drop to as low as 30% of air saturation during low tide phases (Kinsey & Kinsey, 1967). Epaulette sharks have a high hypoxic tolerance, sustaining oxygen levels as low as 5% of air saturation without serious functional impairments (Wise et al., 1998) or even anoxic conditions for up to one hour (Nilsson & Östlund-Nilsson, 2006; Renshaw et al., 2002). Moreover, as intertidal habitats force organisms continuously to move in coherence with the tide, this may select more mobile species (e.g. small shark species, juvenile sharks) or species morphologically adapted for to use shallow (benthic) habitats to be able to move in proximity to the flood line (e.g. benthic rays). Our review shows that the majority of species using intertidal habitats are either benthic rays or small-bodied/juvenile mobile shark species.

4 | ECOLOGICAL INTERACTIONS IN INTERTIDAL HABITATS: A SHARK AND RAY PERSPECTIVE

Traditionally, ecological interactions in the intertidal have been considered from a terrestrial and shorebird perspective, the low-tide predators of intertidal areas (Beninger, 2019). Shorebirds occupy a central niche in intertidal food webs and are considered one of the most important predator guilds in the intertidal (Kuwae et al., 2012; Mathot et al., 2019). Through this global synthesis, we have shown that it is very likely that (meso-)predators such as sharks and rays (i.e. high-tide predators) occupy a similar central niche in intertidal food webs and should therefore be considered in intertidal ecology.

4.1 | Benthic primary consumers

Within the intertidal, the most abundant and common prey species groups are crustaceans, bivalves, polychaetes and benthic teleosts (Jing, Ma, et al., 2007; Philippe et al., 2016; Pridmore et al., 1990) (Figure 3b). These prey species occur in high-density patches or are dispersed across intertidal habitats, creating distinct feeding landscapes for predators. These prey species are accessible to avian and terrestrial predators during low-tide phases and are accessible to meso-predators like benthic rays, small-bodied sharks and teleosts during high tide (Figure 3b) (Smith & Merriner, 1985). The duration that these prey species are accessible to each of these predatory

guilds depends on how long the habitat is exposed or submerged, which is determined by the relative elevation of the habitat and the tidal amplitude. Hence, low intertidal habitats (i.e. low elevation) are accessible for longer periods of time to marine predators as the habitat is submerged during most of the tidal cycle. Contrastingly, habitats with a relatively high elevation are exposed most of the tidal cycle and prey occurring in these habitats are therefore more accessible to avian and terrestrial predators (Figure 1c).

4.2 | Avian and mammalian predators

Shorebirds select intertidal habitats for feeding opportunities along their migratory flyways and depend on the resources provided by these intertidal areas to fuel their long migrations (Ens et al., 1994; Iwamatsu et al., 2007; Jing, Kai, et al., 2007; Wanink & Zwarts, 1993). These shorebirds can have a generalist feeding strategy, such as sanderlings (*Calidris alba*) and American golden plovers (*Pluvialis dominica*, Charadriidae) (Faria et al., 2018; Lourenço et al., 2015), or a more specialist strategy, such as bar-tailed godwits (*Limosa lapponica*, Scolopacidae) and red knots (*Calidris canutus*, Scolopacidae) (Van Gils et al., 2012; Zharikov & Skilleter, 2003). Similar to benthic ray species using the intertidal, these shorebirds occupy a meso-predatory niche in the intertidal food web (Beninger, 2019; Buchanan, 2012; Kuwae et al., 2012), and are in turn preyed upon by bird-of-prey species (Page & Whitacre, 1975; Van Den Hout et al., 2008) (Figure 3b).

The impact of meso-predatory rays on prey populations and community composition is not well understood (Flowers et al., 2021). Some studies indicate no effect of ray foraging on prey abundance (Ajemian et al., 2012), while other studies show that prey densities were negatively impacted by combined predation effects of shorebird and rays (Thrush et al., 1994), or by predation effects of rays alone (Peterson et al., 2001). However, differentiating between predation effects in a multiple-predator system remains challenging and can cause predation effects to be wrongly attributed to a specific species (Flowers et al., 2021; Grubbs et al., 2016). Effects of shorebirds predation have been studied extensively and are better understood (Figure 3b). Shorebirds can locally deplete prey species (Zharikov & Skilleter, 2003) and change benthic community composition (Mendonça et al., 2007; Thrush et al., 1994). A potential overlap in resource use might cause indirect competition by means of common resource depletion with elasmobranch predators (Figure 4a). However, it is likely that some prey species compensate depletion with increased reproduction and survival, potentially masking the effects of resource depletion (Kalejta, 1993). The effects of shorebirds on intertidal prey species can be considered to differ seasonally as many shorebird species are migratory and use intertidal areas as (wintering) stopover sites (Ens et al., 1994; Wanink & Zwarts, 1993).

Benthic rays may also change the foraging landscape for other intertidal predators. For example, sediment depressions, created by rays while feeding, provide habitat for prey species (e.g. O'Shea et al., 2012) and change the bio-geomorphology of the intertidal

habitat (e.g. D'Andrea et al., 2004). Similarly, depressions created by greater flamingos and fiddler crabs, in combination with hydrodynamic forces on an intertidal flat resulted in higher concentrations of organic matter and biofilms, promoting resource availability for other taxa on intertidal habitats (El-Hacen et al., 2019). The mosaic of microhabitats created by benthic rays can therefore be expected to promote resource availability in intertidal habitats, indirectly facilitating other (intertidal) predatory guilds like shorebirds. Bioturbation and the creation of new habitat by rays on a relatively large scale can thus be expected to have an important ecological role in (intertidal) soft-bottom ecosystems.

Although documented observations are scarce, some terrestrial mammals use the intertidal during low tide (Carlton & Hodder, 2003). For example, coyotes (*Canis latrans*, Canidae) have been observed feeding on brachyuran crabs and polychaetes (Carlton & Hodder, 2003; Rose & Polis, 2018), and opossums and rodents have been documented to consume brachyuran crabs, bivalves and gastropods (Carlton & Hodder, 2003). Hence, it is plausible that terrestrial mammals consume similar prey species during low tide compared to elasmobranch predators during high tide, resulting in potential trophic niche overlap between these predatory guilds.

Avian and mammalian predators are also known to feed on sharks and rays within coastal systems. For example, coyotes scavenge stranded or hunt live stingrays along the coast of the Gulf of California (Rose & Polis, 2018). Seabirds such as the Caspian tern (*Hydroprogne caspia*, Laridae) and great blue heron (*Ardea Herodias*, Ardeidae) are known to hunt newborn leopard sharks, brown smoothhound sharks and Atlantic stingrays (Ajemian et al., 2011; Russo, 2015). Gastropods and sea gulls were found to be the main predator of (stranded) egg cases of skates and sharks (Cox & Koob, 1993; Seguel et al., 2022). Given that intertidal areas provide an important shallow-water habitat for elasmobranchs with an elevated risk of stranding, and the importance of these habitats to avian and mammalian species, it is likely that these species groups predate or scavenge on elasmobranchs in the intertidal. How important elasmobranchs are as a food source to these predators or elasmobranchs are only scavenged opportunistically needs more investigation.

4.3 | Humans as intertidal predators

The consumptive effects of (local) human populations should also be considered when determining the impact of predators on benthic prey species (Castilla, 1998; Hockey & Bosman, 1986). Traditionally, humans have targeted shellfish and polychaetes on soft-bottom intertidal flats for consumption and as fishing bait respectively (Beninger, 2019; Watson et al., 2017). de Boer and Longamane (1996) determined that consumption of intertidal prey in Mozambique by both shorebirds and humans was responsible for 18% of the annual biomass removal. However, the authors of this study neglected the consumption of intertidal prey by high-tide predatory guilds like elasmobranchs and teleosts. The intertidal is thus used by human communities around the world for the extraction of food sources

FIGURE 4 Conceptual overview of the influences that elasmobranch overexploitation in intertidal areas can have on low-tide predators like shorebirds, depending on the type of interaction (competition or facilitation) and assuming that decreases in top-predator abundance will lead to increases in mesopredators. (a) the relative abundance of marine top-predators (e.g. large sharks; blue), marine meso-predators (e.g. rays; red) and terrestrial meso-predators (e.g. shorebirds; brown) when there is no interaction between predatory guilds (left), competition (middle) or facilitation (right). In addition, the relative changes in ecological importance of elasmobranchs (green) and the bio-geomorphology of intertidal habitats (dark brown) are given. (b) changes in a simplified intertidal food web between different predator exploitation states (with marine top-predators in blue, terrestrial top-predators in dark brown, marine meso-predators in red, terrestrial meso-predators in brown, primary consumers in light green rand primary producers in green).

(Beninger, 2019; Murray et al., 2019) which has both a direct impact (i.e. resource extraction) and indirect (i.e. disturbances of other predators or bioturbation resulting from extraction activities) impact on these systems. Hence, both trophic and non-trophic effects of these activities should be considered in the field of intertidal ecology (Beninger, 2019).

5 | ELASMOBRANCH INTERTIDAL HABITAT USE IN THE ANTHROPOCENE

The role of elasmobranch contribution to intertidal ecosystem functionality potentially faces rapid changes due to a combination of anthropogenic disturbances.

5.1 | Elasmobranch removal from intertidal areas

Coastal areas harbour a high diversity of elasmobranch species including many endemic species with unique ecological roles, many of which are now severely threatened (Stein et al. 2018). These elasmobranch species face ongoing population declines due to overfishing and habitat degradation (Dulvy et al., 2021; Knip et al., 2010). Sharks and rays in intertidal areas are targeted by (local) fisheries in the intertidal and adjacent shallow subtidal waters (e.g. Adkins et al., 2016; Tobin et al., 2014; White et al., 2013). In addition, these mobile species are also at risk of being captured by industrial fisheries while migrating away from these coastal areas (Leurs et al., 2021). These activities impact intertidal predator abundance and their potential ecological function in intertidal areas (Lemrabott et al. in prep., Leurs et al., in prep.). Of all 88 species that were found to use intertidal habitats, 54.5% are currently threatened with extinction (Figure S3). In total, 21 species are listed as Vulnerable, 16 as Endangered and 11 as Critically Endangered on the IUCN Red List. Two species have been classified as Data Deficient, and thus their population status and trends are unknown. The high proportion of threatened species using intertidal habitats suggests that, if causes of population declines are not reversed, some species might disappear from coastal ecosystems. For example, in the Dutch part of the Wadden Sea, rays were like the common stingray (*Dasyatis pastinaca*, Dasyatidae) and thornback ray (*Raja clavata*, Rajidae) were once common, but have almost disappeared completely due to combined effects of habitat destruction, overexploitation, and pollution (Wolff, 2005). The removal of elasmobranchs from intertidal areas can have different effects depending on the type of interaction (i.e. competition or facilitation) between low-tide and high-tide meso-predators (Figure 4).

The effects of large-bodied shark removal from marine ecosystems are under continuous debate and are likely highly context-dependent. Studies on coastal marine systems conclude that the removal of large-bodied sharks has been linked to population increases of meso-predatory species (i.e. meso-predator release), causing an increase of meso-predation on lower trophic prey species (Ferretti et al., 2010; Heithaus et al., 2008; Ruppert et al., 2013) or changes in the diet of prey species (Barley et al., 2017). Other studies indicate that shark removal does not impact meso-predatory species like cownose rays or coral reef fish (e.g. Casey et al., 2017; Grubbs et al., 2016). For example, on predator-rich coral reefs, large shark removal did not influence prey species possibly due to the presence of large teleost predators that consumed similar prey, making large sharks ecologically redundant (Barley et al., 2020). Ecological redundancy may be common in predator-rich ecosystems in which predators are more likely to share the limited number of available trophic niches (Finke & Denno, 2004; Frisch et al., 2016). In these rich systems, safeguarding ecosystem functioning does not only hinge on the conservation of sharks, since cascading effects of shark removal can be reduced if other predator species with a similar niche are present (Barley et al., 2020). However, predator richness in intertidal areas is expected to be low due to challenges and constraints associated with intertidal habitat use (e.g. risk of stranding, need for physiological

adaptations), making it less likely that large-bodied sharks are ecologically redundant predators in these systems. In addition, current exploitation rates in coastal areas cause whole functional groups (i.e. large-bodied sharks and teleosts, high trophic level species) to be removed, possibly enabling a release of meso-predators due to the removal of multiple non-redundant species groups. Therefore, the removal of large-bodied sharks from intertidal areas can potentially lead to an increase in predation pressure on lower trophic organisms caused by meso-predatory elasmobranchs (Figure 4).

These meso-predatory elasmobranchs may use the same intertidal prey species as terrestrial/avian meso-predatory species. An increase of predation by marine meso-predators can therefore intensify common resource depletion and possibly lead to interspecific competition between species of both guilds (Figure 4). If overexploitation of elasmobranchs continues, and increasingly also targets meso-predatory rays (e.g. Moore et al., 2019), the abundance of these species is also expected to decline (i.e. 'fishing down the food chain', Pauly, 1998). This may result in lower resource depletion by these meso-predatory rays, possibly increasing resource availability for other predatory guilds.

If benthic rays do not overlap or compete for resources with other meso-predatory guilds on intertidal habitats, or if these benthic ray species can be considered trophically redundant, their role as ecosystem engineers (i.e. changing biogeomorphology of intertidal habitats) can still be important in intertidal areas (Figure 4). An increase in benthic rays, and associated bioturbation due to feeding and excavation activity, may cause changes to the biogeomorphology and biogeochemistry of soft-bottom intertidal flats (Laverock et al., 2011; Lohrer et al., 2004; Meysman et al., 2006). In addition, increased bioturbation can increase primary and secondary production in intertidal habitats (Giorgini et al., 2019), affect the displacement of prey species (VanBlaricom, 1982), and provide newly created microhabitats to other (prey) species like brachyuran crabs (O'Shea et al., 2012). Increasing bioturbation has caused shifts in dominant species in benthic communities on soft-bottom intertidal habitats, can impact species richness of these microbenthic communities (Berkenbusch et al., 2000; Thrush et al., 2006), and can negatively impact habitat-building species like seagrass light may be limited in systems with a higher turbidity (Govers et al., 2014; Suykerbuyk et al., 2016). By changing the landscape heterogeneity of intertidal habitats and changing benthic communities, benthic rays may indirectly facilitate other predatory guilds using intertidal habitats, such as migratory shorebirds, who rely on prey species like polychaetes and crustaceans during their stay on wintering grounds (Piersma, 2012). However, if continued overexploitation of elasmobranchs also impacts benthic ray species, the effects of benthic rays on sediment dynamics will likely change (O'Shea et al., 2012). This may lead to changes in the habitat heterogeneity and sediment dynamics of intertidal habitats due to decreased bioturbation. This will in turn also affect biogeochemistry, and likely cause changes in benthic community composition (Giorgini et al., 2019; Thrush et al., 2006). Hence, exploitation may negatively impact the role of benthic rays as facilitators for other predatory guilds use of intertidal habitats (Giorgini et al., 2019).

5.2 | The loss of intertidal habitats

Sharks and rays can have an important ecological role within marine food webs and our review shows that this includes a pivotal role in intertidal food webs. Conversely, intertidal habitat also plays an important role in the lifecycle of coastal shark and ray species. Recent estimates show that the areal extent of soft-bottom intertidal areas has declined by 16% between 1984 and 2016, indicating that intertidal habitats are threatened by human-induced stressors such as coastal development, coastal erosion and sea level rise (Murray et al., 2019). Galbraith et al. (2002) estimated that under a global warming scenario of 2° C, between 20 and 70% of intertidal habitat would be lost to sea level rise. Our review shows that, in addition to shorebirds and other terrestrial predators, the intertidal is especially important to early life stages of many coastal elasmobranch species. These elasmobranchs most likely select intertidal habitats as a trade-off between feeding opportunities and lower predation risk effects. Even if elasmobranchs do not directly use intertidal habitats such as saltmarshes, these habitats can still provide trophic benefits elasmobranchs using habitats in the near vicinity to the intertidal (Niella et al., 2022). Sea level rise will make current intertidal habitats more accessible to marine predators, including larger-bodied predators, which could threaten the role of intertidal habitats as a feeding refugium for early life stages and small-bodied elasmobranchs. In addition to changing intertidal habitats to (shallow) subtidal habitats, sea level rise possibly also influences the duration for which intertidal habitats are accessible to either low-tide or high-tide predators.

Globally sea temperatures are increasing, and the ocean is becoming more acidic (i.e. Ocean Acidification) due to global climate change (IPCC, 2007). As a result, temperatures in intertidal habitats are also expected to increase, likely making intertidal habitats less suitable for many marine species with limited temperature tolerance ranges (IPCC, 2007). This might include not only elasmobranchs (Gervais et al., 2018; Lear et al., 2019) but also intertidal prey species that are sensitive to heat stress due to elevated sea water temperatures (Raymond et al., 2022). In addition, many intertidal prey species like polychaetes, crustaceans and bivalves are negatively impacted by ocean acidification (Ries et al., 2009). Continued temperature increases and acidification can therefore be expected to negatively impact intertidal prey availability, and associated interaction between low-tide and high-tide predatory guilds. The loss of intertidal habitat or the deterioration of habitat quality will therefore not only be a risk to marine species, but also to other terrestrial/avian species (Galbraith et al., 2002), and their mutual ecological interactions. This emphasizes that the conservation of intertidal areas should be considered from both a high-tide and low tide perspective and that the importance of this habitat is recognized for both marine and terrestrial/avian species in the future.

The decline of intertidal areas around the world, given their ecological value, is alarming. Furthermore, the first global assessment of the status of these ecosystems was only conducted in 2019 (Murray et al., 2019, 2022). The presented ecological importance of intertidal areas for both (migratory) shorebirds and vulnerable elasmobranchs should be considered when assessing the risk of collapse of intertidal ecosystems under the IUCN Red List of Ecosystems (Keith et al., 2015). For example, intertidal areas have been considered as a critical habitat in the United States for the critically smalltooth sawfish and have been included in management plans of these species (Strickland, 2009). Although intertidal habitats are recognized to be vital habitat for wading shorebirds, and their decline in the Yellow Sea initiated a situation analysis by IUCN (MacKinnon et al., 2012), intertidal habitats should also be considered as important habitat in risk assessments for coastal sharks and rays.

6 | CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Although the available information on intertidal habitat use by elasmobranchs is limited, our synthesis shows that these habitats are important to a variety of species in this highly threatened species group. We show that elasmobranchs play an important trophic role in intertidal ecosystems. and that these areas provide important habitats for many coastal elasmobranch species at the same time. In addition, we provide novel insights into possible ecological interactions in intertidal systems that include the functional role of elasmobranchs. This emphasizes the importance of an integrative perspective on intertidal food webs that includes both high-tide (e.g. elasmobranchs) and low-tide (e.g. terrestrial and avian species) predators. Furthermore, we identified the ongoing decline of these habitats as a serious threat to elasmobranchs and their ecological interactions with low-tide predator guilds. We propose that future research and conservation efforts focuses on:

1. Determining the motivation for sharks and rays to use these productive, but dynamic and challenging habitats. This contributes to the understanding of how important intertidal habitats are for the lifecycle of specific elasmobranch species, and further elucidates their ecological role in these habitats.
2. Studying how different predator guilds (indirectly) interact in intertidal habitats. Understanding these ecological interactions can improve targeted conservation efforts of these habitats by understanding how population trends of different predatory guilds might affect ecosystem functioning. It will be important to consider the (a) possible ecological redundancy of elasmobranch species, (b) influences of elasmobranchs on (intertidal) prey populations and (c) potential niche overlap between high-tide and low-tide predators.
3. Determining how anthropogenic stressors such as overexploitation, habitat degradation, and climate change impact predatory guilds in intertidal areas.
4. Considering the ecological importance of these habitats from both a low- and high-tide predator perspective, using an approach that integrates the ecology of the diverse species group that use these habitats.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All data associated with this study are available in this manuscript and as supporting information.

ORCID

Guido Leurs https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9111-3902

Brian O. Nieuwenhuis https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4228-6989

REFERENCES

Ackerman, J. T., Kondratieff, M. C., Matern, S. A., & Cech, J. J. (2000). Tidal influence on spatial dynamics of leopard sharks, Triakis semifasciata, in Tomales Bay, California. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *58*(1), 33–43. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007657019696

Adkins, M. E., Simpfendorfer, C. A., & Tobin, A. J. (2016). Large tropical fishes and their use of the nearshore littoral, intertidal and subtidal habitat mosaic. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, *67*(10), 1534–1545. https://doi.org/10.1071/MF14339

Ajemian, M. J., Dolan, D., Graham, W. M., & Powers, S. P. (2011). First evidence of elasmobranch predation by a waterbird: Stingray attack and consumption by the great blue heron (Ardea herodias). *Waterbirds*, *34*(1), 117–120. https://doi.org/10.1675/063.034.0116

Ajemian, M. J., & Powers, S. P. (2012). Habitat-specific feeding by cownose rays (Rhinoptera bonasus) of the northern Gulf of Mexico. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *95*(1), 79–97. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10641-011-9858-3

Ajemian, M. J., Powers, S. P., & Murdoch, T. J. T. (2012). Estimating the potential impacts of large mesopredators on benthic resources: Integrative assessment of spotted eagle ray foraging ecology in Bermuda. *PLoS One*, *7*(7), e40227. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0040227

Atwood, T. B., Connolly, R. M., Ritchie, E. G., Lovelock, C. E., Heithaus, M. R., Hays, G. C., ... Macreadie, P. I. (2015). Predators help protect carbon stocks in blue carbon ecosystems. *Nature Climate Change*, *5*(12), 1038–1045. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2763

Ballantyne, J. S., & Robinson, J. W. (2010). Freshwater elasmobranchs: A review of their physiology and biochemistry. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B*, *180*(4), 475–493. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00360-010-0447-0

Barley, S. C., Clark, T. D., & Meeuwig, J. J. (2020). Ecological redundancy between coral reef sharks and predatory teleosts. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, *30*(1), 153–172. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11160-019-09588-6

Barley, S. C., Meekan, M. G., & Meeuwig, J. J. (2017). Species diversity, abundance, biomass, size and trophic structure of fish assemblages on coral reefs in relation to shark abundance. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.4009686

Barrios-O'Neill, D., Bertolini, C., & Collins, P. C. (2017). Trophic cascades and the transient keystone concept. *Biological Conservation*, *212*(May), 191–195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.06.011

Bascompte, J., Melián, C. J., & Sala, E. (2005). Interaction strength combinations and the overfishing of a marine food web. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *102*(15), 5443–5447. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0501562102

Beninger, P. G. (2019). *Mudflat ecology. Aquatic ecology series* (Vol. 7). Springer.

Berkenbusch, K., Rowden, A., & Probert, P. (2000). Temporal and spatial variation in macrofauna community composition imposed by ghost shrimp Callianassa filholi bioturbation. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *192*, 249–257. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps192249

Bernal, D., Carlson, J. K., Goldman, K. J., & Lowe, C. G. (2012). Energetics, metabolism, and Endothermy in sharks and rays. *Biology of Sharks and their Relatives*, *227–254*, 211–237. https://doi.org/10.1201/b11867-15

Bethea, D. M., Hale, L., Carlson, J. K., Cortés, E., Manire, C. A., & Gelsleichter, J. (2007). Geographic and ontogenetic variation in the diet and daily ration of the bonnethead shark, Sphyrna tiburo, from the eastern Gulf of Mexico. *Marine Biology*, *152*(5), 1009–1020. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-007-0728-7

Boero, F., & Bonsdorff, E. (2007). A conceptual framework for marine biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. *Marine Ecology*, *28*, 134–145. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0485.2007.00171.x

Brandl, S. J., Rasher, D. B., Côté, I. M., Casey, J. M., Darling, E. S., Lefcheck, J. S., & Duffy, J. E. (2019). Coral reef ecosystem functioning: Eight core processes and the role of biodiversity. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, *17*(8), 445–454. https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.2088

Bridges, C. R. (1993). Ecophysiology of intertidal fish. In J. C. Rankin & F. B. Jensen (Eds.), *Fish ecophysiology* (pp. 375–400). Chapman & Hall. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-2304-4_15

Brinton, C. P., & Curran, M. C. (2017). Tidal and diel movement patterns of the Atlantic stingray (Dasyatis sabina) along a stream-order gradient. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, *68*, 1716.

Buchanan, J. B. (2012). Change in merlin hunting behavior following recovery of peregrine falcon populations suggests mesopredator suppression. *Journal of Raptor Research*, *46*(4), 349–356. https://doi.org/10.3356/JRR-11-75.1

Campos, B. R., Fish, M. A., Jones, G., Riley, R. W., Allen, P. J., Klimley, P. A., Cech, J. J., Jr., & Kelly, J. T. (2009). Movements of brown smoothhounds, Mustelus henlei, in Tomales Bay, California. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *85*(1), 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10641-009-9462-y

Carlisle, A. B., & Starr, R. M. (2010). Tidal movements of female leopard sharks (Triakis semifasciata) in Elkhorn Slough, California. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *89*(1), 31–45. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10641-010-9667-0

Carlton, J. T., & Hodder, J. (2003). Maritime mammals: Terrestrial mammals as consumers in marine intertidal communities. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *256*, 271–286.

Casey, J. M., Baird, A. H., Brandl, S. J., Hoogenboom, M. O., Rizzari, J. R., Frisch, A. J., Mirbach, C. E., & Connolly, S. R. (2017). A test of trophic cascade theory: Fish and benthic assemblages across a predator density gradient on coral reefs. *Oecologia*, *183*(1), 161–175. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-016-3753-8

Castilla, J. C. (1998). Coastal marine communities: Trends and perspectives from human-exclusion experiments. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *14*(7), 280–283. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(99)01602-X

Castorani, M. C. N., & Hovel, K. A. (2016). Native predator chemical cues induce anti-predation behaviors in an invasive marine bivalve. *Biological Invasions*, *18*(1), 169–181. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-015-1000-6

Cerutti-Pereyra, F., Thums, M., Austin, C. M., Bradshaw, C. J. A., Stevens, J. D., Babcock, R. C., Pillans, R. D., & Meekan, M. G. (2014). Restricted movements of juvenile rays in the lagoon of Ningaloo reef, Western Australia - evidence for the existence of a nursery. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, 97(4), 371–383. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10641-013-0158-y

Chew, S. F., Wilson, J. M., Ip, Y. K., & Randall, D. J. (2006). Nitrogen excretion and defense against ammonia toxicity. In A. L. Val, V. M. F. Almeida-Val, & D. J. Randall (Eds.), *The physiology of tropical fishes* (pp. 307–396). Acaemic Press.

Chin, A., Heupel, M. R., Simpfendorfer, C. A., & Tobin, A. J. (2016). Population organisation in reef sharks: New variations in coastal habitat use by mobile marine predators. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 544, 197–211. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps11545

Clements, O. N., Leurs, G., Witbaard, R., Pen, I., Verkuil, Y. I., & Govers, L. L. (2022). Growth, maturity, and diet of the pearl whipray (Fontitrygon margaritella) from the Bijagós archipelago, Guinea-Bissau. *PeerJ*, 10, e12894. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.12894

Collins, A. B., Heupel, M. R., Hueter, R. E., & Motta, P. J. (2007). Hard prey specialists or opportunistic generalists? An examination of the diet of the cownose ray, Rhinoptera Bonasus. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, 58(1), 135–144. https://doi.org/10.1071/MF05227

Cox, D. L., & Koob, T. J. (1993). Predation on elasmobranch eggs. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, 38, 117–125. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-3450-9_10

D'Andrea, A. F., Lopez, G. R., & Aller, R. C. (2004). Rapid physical and biological particle mixing on an intertidal sandflat. *Journal of Marine Research*, 62(1), 67–92. https://doi.org/10.1357/00222400460744627

Dabruzzi, T. F., Bennett, W. A., Rummer, J. L., & Fangue, N. A. (2013). Juvenile Ribbontail stingray, Taeniura lymma (Forsskål, 1775) (Chondrichthyes, Dasyatidae), demonstrate a unique suite of physiological adaptations to survive hyperthermic nursery conditions. *Hydrobiologia*, 701(1), 37–49. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-012-1249-z

Davy, L. E., Simpfendorfer, C. A., & Heupel, M. R. (2015). Movement patterns and habitat use of juvenile mangrove whiprays (Himantura granulata). *Marine and Freshwater Research*, 66, 481–492.

Day, J., Clark, J. A., Williamson, J. E., Brown, C., & Gillings, M. (2019). Population genetic analyses reveal female reproductive philopatry in the oviparous port Jackson shark. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, 70(7), 986–994. https://doi.org/10.1071/MF18255

de Boer, W. F., & Longamane, F. A. (1996). The exploitation of intertidal food resources in inhaca bay, Mozambique, by shorebirds and humans. *Biological Conservation*, 78(96), 295–303.

De Vlaming, V. L., & Sage, M. (1973). Osmoregulation in the euryhaline elasmobranch, Dasyatis sabina. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology—Part A: Physiology*, 45(1), 31–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/0300-9629(73)90006-6

Deppe, F. (1999). *Intertidal Mudflats Worldwide*. Wilhelmshaven.

Derrick, D. H., Cheok, J., & Dulvy, N. K. (2020). Spatially congruent sites of importance for global shark and ray biodiversity. *PLoS One*, 15(7), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0235559

Di Santo, V., & Bennett, W. A. (2011). Is post-feeding thermotaxis advantageous in elasmobranch fishes? *Journal of Fish Biology*, 78(1), 195–207. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8649.2010.02853.x

Dulvy, N. K., Pacoureau, N., Rigby, C. L., Pollom, R. A., Jabado, R. W., Ebert, D. A., Finucci, B., Pollock, C. M., Cheok, J., Derrick, D. H., Herman, K. B., Sherman, C. S., VanderWright, W. J., Lawson, J. M., Walls, R. H. L., Carlson, J. K., Charvet, P., Bineesh, K. K., Fernando, D., ... Simpfendorfer, C. A. (2021). Overfishing drives over one-third of all sharks and rays toward a global extinction crisis. *Current Biology*, 31, 4773–4787.e8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2021.08.062 in Press.

El-Hacen, E. H. M., Bouma, T. J., Oomen, P., Piersma, T., & Olff, H. (2019). Large-scale ecosystem engineering by flamingos and fiddler crabs on west-African intertidal flats promote joint food availability. *Oikos*, 128(5), 753–764. https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.05261

Ens, B. J., Piersma, T., & Drent, R. H. (1994). The dependence of waders and waterfowl migrating along the East Atlantic flyway on their coastal food supplies - what is the most profitable research-program. *Ophelia*, 6, 127–151.

Faria, F. A., Albertoni, E. F., & Bugoni, L. (2018). Trophic niches and feeding relationships of shorebirds in southern Brazil. *Aquatic Ecology*, 52(4), 281–296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10452-018-9663-6

Feldheim, K. A., Gruber, S. H., Dibattista, J. D., Babcock, E. A., Kessel, S. T., Hendry, A. P., ... Chapman, D. D. (2014). Two decades of genetic profiling yields first evidence of natal philopatry and long-term fidelity to parturition sites in sharks. *Molecular Ecology*, 23(1), 110–117. https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12583

Ferretti, F., Worm, B., Britten, G. L., Heithaus, M. R., & Lotze, H. K. (2010). Patterns and ecosystem consequences of shark declines in the ocean. *Ecology Letters*, 13(8), 1055–1071. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01489.x

Finke, D. L., & Denno, R. F. (2004). Predator diversity dampens trophic cascades. *Nature*, 429(6990), 407–410. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02554

Flach, E., & Tamaki, A. (2001). Competitive bioturbators on intertidal sand flats in the European Wadden Sea and Ariake Sound in Japan. *Ecological Comparisons of Sedimentary Shores*, 151, 149–171. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-56557-1_8

Flowers, K. I., Heithaus, M. R., & Papastamatiou, Y. P. (2021). Buried in the sand: Uncovering the ecological roles and importance of rays. *Fish and Fisheries*, 22(1), 105–127. https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12508

Frisch, A. J., Ireland, M., Rizzari, J. R., Lönnstedt, O. M., Magnenat, K. A., Mirbach, C. E., & Hobbs, J. P. A. (2016). Reassessing the trophic role of reef sharks as apex predators on coral reefs. *Coral Reefs*, 35(2), 459–472. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-016-1415-2

Galbraith, H., Jones, R., Park, R., Clough, J., Herrod-Julius, S., Harrington, B., & Page, G. (2002). Global climate change and sea level rise: Potential losses of intertidal habitat for shorebirds. *Waterbirds*, 25(2), 173–183. https://doi.org/10.1675/1524-4695(2002)025[0173:gccasl]2.0.co;2

George, L. W., Martins, A. P. B., Heupel, M. R., & Simpfendorfer, C. A. (2019). Fine-scale movements of juvenile blacktip reef sharks Carcharhinus melanopterus in a shallow nearshore nursery. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 623, 85–97. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps13010

Gervais, C. R., Nay, T. J., Renshaw, G., Johansen, J. L., Steffensen, J. F., & Rummer, J. L. (2018). Too hot to handle? Using movement to alleviate effects of elevated temperatures in a benthic elasmobranch, Hemiscyllium Ocellatum. *Marine Biology*, 165(11), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-018-3427-7

Gibson, R. N. (1986). Intertidal Teleosts: Life in a fluctuating environment. *The Behaviour of Teleost Fishes*, 388–408. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-8261-4_15

Gibson, R. N., & Yoshiyama, R. M. (1999). Intertidal Fish communities. In M. H. Horn, K. L. M. Martin, & M. A. Chotkowski (Eds.), *Intertidal fishes: Life in two worlds* (pp. 264–297). Academic Press.

Giorgini, M., Miguez, A., Esquius, K. S., De Astarloa, C. D., Iribarne, O., Fanjul, E., & Escapa, M. (2019). Regenerative bioturbation by intertidal burrowing crabs modifies microphytobenthic composition and enhances primary production in SW Atlantic mudflats. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 632, 43–57. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps13134

Govers, L. L., Pieck, T., Bouma, T. J., Suykerbuyk, W., Smolders, A. J. P., & van Katwijk, M. M. (2014). Seagrasses are negatively affected by organic matter loading and Arenicola marina activity in a laboratory experiment. *Oecologia*, 175(2), 677–685. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-014-2916-8

Graham, J., Hannides, A., Mamnun, N., Sitz, L. E., Walsh, I. D., Wood-Charlson, E. M., & Ponsoni, L. (2022). Ocean sciences

perspectives on integrated, coordinated, open, networked (ICON) science. *Earth and Space Science*, 9(9), e2021EA002124. https://doi.org/10.1029/2021ea002124

Grant, J. (1983). The relative magnitude of biological and physical sediment reworking in an intertidal community. *Journal of Marine Research*, 41(4), 673–689. https://doi.org/10.1357/002224083788520469

Gray, A. E., Mulligan, T. J., & Hannah, R. W. (1997). Food habits, occurrence, and population structure of the bat ray, Myliobatis californica, in Humboldt Bay, California. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, 49(2), 227–238. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007379606233

Grubbs, R. D., Carlson, J. K., Romine, J. G., Curtis, T. H., McElroy, W. D., McCandless, C. T., Cotton, C. F., & Musick, J. A. (2016). Critical assessment and ramifications of a purported marine trophic cascade. *Scientific Reports*, 6(February), 20970. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep20970

Haeseker, S. L., & Cech, J. J. (1994). Food habits of the brown smoothhound shark (Mustelus henlei) from two sites in Tomales Bay. *California Fish and Game*, 79, 96–114.

Halpern, B. S., Walbridge, S., Selkoe, K. A., Kappel, C. V., Micheli, F., D'Agrosa, C., Bruno, J. F., Casey, K. S., Ebert, C., Fox, H. E., Fujita, R., Heinemann, D., Lenihan, H. S., Madin, E. M. P., Perry, M. T., Selig, E. R., Spalding, M., Steneck, R., & Watson, R. (2008). A global map of human impact on marine ecosystems. *Science*, 319(5865), 948–952. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1149345

Hammerschlag, N., Fallows, C., Meÿer, M., Seakamela, S. M., Orndorff, S., Kirkman, S., Kotze, D., & Creel, S. (2022). Loss of an apex predator in the wild induces physiological and behavioural changes in prey. *Biology Letters*, 18(1), 20210476. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2021.0476

Hammerschlag, N., Schmitz, O. J., Flecker, A. S., Lafferty, K. D., Sih, A., Atwood, T. B., Gallagher, A. J., Irschick, D. J., Skubel, R., & Cooke, S. J. (2019). Ecosystem function and Services of Aquatic Predators in the Anthropocene. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 34(4), 369–383. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2019.01.005

Heithaus, M. (2001). The biology of tiger sharks, Galeocerdo cuvier, in Shark Bay, Western Australia: Sex ratio, size distribution, diet, and seasonal changes in catch rates. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, 2, 25–36. https://doi.org/10.1023/A%253A1011021210685

Heithaus, M. R., & Dill, L. M. (2002). Food availability and tiger shark predation risk influence. *Ecology*, 83(2), 1–12 http://www.sfu.ca/biology/faculty/dill/publications/83-i0012-9658-083-02-0480.pdf%5Cnpapers2://publication/uuid/BDF374F7-2E38-4EFF-A65F-9F18E9BD752C.

Heithaus, M. R., Frid, A., Vaudo, J. J., Worm, B., & Wirsing, A. J. (2010). Unraveling the ecological importance of elasmobranchs. In J. C. Carrier, J. A. Musick, & M. R. Heithaus (Eds.), *Sharks and their relatives II: Biodiversity, adaptive physiology, and conservation* (pp. 1–748). CRC Press. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781420080483

Heithaus, M. R., Frid, A., Wirsing, A. J., & Worm, B. (2008). Predicting ecological consequences of marine top predator declines. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 23(4), 202–210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2008.01.003

Hernández, C. E., Neill, P. E., Pulgar, J. M., Ojeda, F. P., & Bozinovic, F. (2002). Water temperature fluctuations and territoriality in the intertidal zone: Two possible explanations for the elevational distribution of body size in Graus nigra. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 61(2), 472–488. https://doi.org/10.1006/jfbi.2002.2054

Heupel, M. R., Knip, D. M., Simpfendorfer, C. A., & Dulvy, N. K. (2014). Sizing up the ecological role of sharks as predators. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 495, 291–298. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps10597

Heupel, M. R., Carlson, J. K., & Simpfendorfer, C. A. (2007). Shark nursery areas: concepts, definition, characterization and assumptions. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 337, 287–297.

Hines, A. H., Whitlatch, R. B., Thrush, S. F., Hewitt, J. E., Cummings, V. J., Dayton, P. K., & Legendre, P. (1997). Nonlinear foraging response of a large marine predator to benthic prey: Eagle ray pits and bivalves in a New Zealand sandflat. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 216(1–2), 191–210. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0981(97)00096-8

Hockey, P. A. R., & Bosman, A. L. (1986). Man as an intertidal predator in Transkei: Disturbance, community convergence and Management of a Natural Food Resource. *Oikos*, 46(1), 3. https://doi.org/10.2307/3565373

Hollensead, L. D., Grubbs, R. D., Carlson, J. K., & Bethea, D. M. (2016). Analysis of fine-scale daily movement patterns of juvenile Pristis pectinata within a nursery habitat. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 26(3), 492–505. https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2556

Hussey, N. E., MacNeil, M. A., Siple, M. C., Popp, B. N., Dudley, S. F. J., & Fisk, A. T. (2015). Expanded trophic complexity among large sharks. *Food Webs*, 4, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fooweb.2015.04.002

IPCC. (2007). Climate change 2007: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. In *Contribution of working group II to the fourth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change*. IPCC. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-008044910-4.00250-9

Iwamatsu, S., Suzuki, A., & Sato, M. (2007). Nereidid polychaetes as the major diet of migratory shorebirds on the estuarine tidal flats at Fujimae-Higata in Japan. *Zoological Science*, 24(7), 676–685. https://doi.org/10.2108/zsj.24.676

Jin, B., Fu, C., Zhong, J., Li, B., Chen, J., & Wu, J. (2007). Fish utilization of a salt marsh intertidal creek in the Yangtze River estuary, China. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 73(3–4), 844–852. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2007.03.025

Jing, K., Ma, Z., Li, B., Li, J., & Chen, J. (2007). Foraging strategies involved in habitat use of shorebirds at the intertidal area of Chongming Dongtan, China. *Ecological Research*, 22(4), 559–570. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11284-006-0302-7

Jing, Z., Kai, J., Xiaojing, G., & Zhijun, M. (2007). Food supply in intertidal area for shorebirds during stopover at Chongming Dongtan, China. *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 27(6), 2149–2159.

Jirik, K. E., & Lowe, C. G. (2012). An elasmobranch maternity ward: Female round stingrays Urobatis halleri use warm, restored estuarine habitat during gestation. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 80(5), 1227–1245. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8649.2011.03208.x

Kaiser, M. J., Attrill, M. J., Jennings, S., Thomas, D. N., Barnes, D. K. A., Brierley, A. S., … Kaartokallio, H. (2020). *Marine ecology: Processes, systems, and impacts* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Kalejta, B. (1993). Intense predation cannot always Be detected experimentally. *Netherlands Journal of Sea Research*, 31(4), 385–393.

Kanno, S., Heupel, M., & Simpfendorfer, C. (2019). Stationary video monitoring reveals habitat use of stingrays in mangroves. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 621, 155–168. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps12977

Keith, D. A., Rodríguez, J. P., Brooks, T. M., Burgman, M. A., Barrow, E. G., Bland, L., Comer, P. J., Franklin, J., Link, J., McCarthy, M. A., Miller, R. M., Murray, N. J., Nel, J., Nicholson, E., Oliveira-Miranda, M. A., Regan, T. J., Rodríguez-Clark, K. M., Rouget, M., & Spalding, M. D. (2015). The IUCN red list of ecosystems: Motivations, challenges, and applications. *Conservation Letters*, 8(3), 214–226. https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12167

Kinsey, D. W., & Kinsey, B. E. (1967). Diurnal changes in oxygen content of the water over the coral reef platform at Heron Island. *Australian Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*, 18, 23–34.

Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., & Simpfendorfer, C. A. (2010). Sharks in nearshore environments: Models, importance, and consequences. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 402, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08498

Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Tobin, A. J., & Moloney, J. (2011). Ontogenetic shifts in movement and habitat use of juvenile pigeye sharks Carcharhinus amboinensis in a tropical nearshore region. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 425, 233–246. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps09006

Koch, E. W., Barbier, E. B., Silliman, B. R., Reed, D. J., Perillo, G. M. E., Hacker, S. D., Granek, E. F., Primavera, J. H., Muthiga, N., Polasky, S., Halpern, B. S., Kennedy, C. J., Kappel, C. V., & Wolanski, E. (2009). Non-linearity in ecosystem services: Temporal and spatial variability in coastal protection. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, *7*(1), 29–37. https://doi.org/10.1890/080126

Kristensen, E., Penha-Lopes, G., Delefosse, M., Valdemarsen, T., Quintana, C. O., & Banta, G. T. (2012). What is bioturbation? The need for a precise definition for fauna in aquatic sciences. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *446*, 285–302. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps09506

Kuwae, T., Miyoshi, E., Hosokawa, S., Ichimi, K., Hosoya, J., Amano, T., Moriya, T., Kondoh, M., Ydenberg, R. C., & Elner, R. W. (2012). Variable and complex food web structures revealed by exploring missing trophic links between birds and biofilm. *Ecology Letters*, *15*(4), 347–356. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01744.x

Lam, K., Tsui, T., Nakano, K., & Randall, D. J. (2005). Physiological adaptations of fishes to tropical intertidal environments. *The Physiology of Tropical Fishes*, *21*, 501–581. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1546-5098(05)21011-7

Laverock, B., Gilbert, J. A., Tait, K., Osborn, A. M., & Widdicombe, S. (2011). Bioturbation: Impact on the marine nitrogen cycle. *Biochemical Society Transactions*, *39*(1), 315–320. https://doi.org/10.1042/BST0390315

Lear, K. O., Whitney, N. M., Morgan, D. L., Brewster, L. R., Whitty, J. M., Poulakis, G. R., Scharer, R. M., Guttridge, T. L., & Gleiss, A. C. (2019). Thermal performance responses in free-ranging elasmobranchs depend on habitat use and body size. *Oecologia*, *191*(4), 829–842. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-019-04547-1

Lecy, J. D., & Beatty, K. E. (2012). Representative literature reviews using constrained snowball sampling and citation network analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1992601

Leurs, G., van der Reijden, K. J., Cheikhna Lemrabott, S. Y., Barry, I., Nonque, D. M., Olff, H., Ledo Pontes, S., Regalla, A., & Govers, L. L. (2021). Industrial fishing near west African marine protected areas and its potential effects on Mobile marine predators. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *8*(March), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.602917

Lim, K. C., Chong, V. C., Lim, P. E., Yurimoto, T., & Loh, K. H. (2018). Feeding ecology of three sympatric species of stingrays on a tropical mudflat. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, *99*(4), 999–1007. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315418000759

Lohrer, A. M., Thrush, S. F., & Gibbs, M. M. (2004). Bioturbators enhance ecosystem function through complex biogeochemical interactions. *Nature*, *431*(7012), 1092–1095. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03042

Lotze, H. K., Lenihan, H. S., Bourque, B. J., Bradbury, R. H., Cooke, R. G., Kay, M. C., … Bay, M. (2006). Depletion, degradation, and recovery potential of estuaries and coastal seas. *Science*, *312*(June), 1806–1809.

Lourenço, P. M., Catry, T., Piersma, T., & Granadeiro, J. P. (2015). Comparative feeding ecology of shorebirds wintering at banc d'Arguin, Mauritania. *Estuaries and Coasts*, *39*(3), 855–865. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-015-0029-1

Lu, Y., Yuan, J., Lu, X., Su, C., Zhang, Y., Wang, C., Cao, X., Li, Q., Su, J., Ittekkot, V., Garbutt, R. A., Bush, S., Fletcher, S., Wagey, T., Kachur, A., & Sweijd, N. (2018). Major threats of pollution and climate change to global coastal ecosystems and enhanced management for sustainability. *Environmental Pollution*, *239*, 670–680. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.04.016

Lynn-Myrick, J. (1996). Bioturbation rates in bahía la choya, Sonora, Mexico. *Ciencias Marinas*, *22*(1), 23–46. https://doi.org/10.7773/cm.v22i1.837

MacKinnon, J., Verkuil, Y. I., & Murray, N. (2012). *IUCN situation analysis on East and Southeast Asian intertidal habitats, with particular reference to the Yellow Sea (including the Bohai Sea). Occasional Paper of the IUCN Species Survival Commission No. 47.*

Martin, R. A. (2005). Conservation of freshwater and euryhaline elasmobranchs: A review. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the UK*, *85*, 1049–1073. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315405012105

Martins, A. P. B., Heupel, M. R., Bierwagen, S. L., Chin, A., & Simpfendorfer, C. A. (2020). Tidal-diel patterns of movement, activity and habitat use by juvenile mangrove whiprays using towed-float GPS telemetry. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, *71*, 89. https://doi.org/10.1071/MF20078

Martins, A. P. B., Heupel, M. R., Chin, A., & Simpfendorfer, C. A. (2018). Batoid nurseries: Definition, use and importance. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *595*, 253–267. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps12545

Matern, S. A., Cech, J. J., & Hopkins, T. E. (2000). Diel movements of bat rays, Myliobatis californica, in Tomales Bay, California: Evidence for behavioral thermoregulation? *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *58*(2), 173–182. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007625212099

Mathot, K., Piersma, T., & Elner, R. W. (2019). Shorebirds as integrators and indicators of mudflat ecology. In *Mudflat ecology* (7th ed., pp. 309–338). Springer.

Matich, P., Heithaus, M. R., & Layman, C. A. (2011). Contrasting patterns of individual specialization and trophic coupling in two marine apex predators. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *80*(1), 294–305. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2010.01753.x

Mendonça, V. M., Raffaelli, D. G., & Boyle, P. R. (2007). Interactions between shorebirds and benthic invertebrates at Culbin Sands lagoon, NE Scotland: Effects of avian predation on their prey community density and structure. *Scientia Marina*, *71*(3), 579–591. https://doi.org/10.3989/scimar.2007.71n3579

Meysman, F. J. R., Middelburg, J. J., & Heip, C. H. R. (2006). Bioturbation: A fresh look at Darwin's last idea. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *21*(12), 688–695. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2006.08.002

Mills, L. S., & Doak, D. F. (1993). The keystone-species concept in ecology and conservation. *Bioscience*, *43*(4), 219–224. https://doi.org/10.2307/1312122

Mitra, A., & Zaman, S. (2016). Threats to marine and estuarine ecosystems. *Basics of Marine and Estuarine Ecology*, 365–417. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-81-322-2707-6_10

Momigliano, P., & Harcourt, R. (2014). Sharks: Conservation, governance and management. In *Sharks: Conservation, governance and management*. (pp. 89–106). https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203750292

Moore, A. B. M., Séret, B., & Armstrong, R. (2019). Risks to biodiversity and coastal livelihoods from artisanal elasmobranch fisheries in a least developed country: The Gambia (West Africa). *Biodiversity and Conservation*, *28*, 0123456789. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-019-01732-9

Morrissey, J. F., & Gruber, S. H. (1993). Habitat selection by juvenile lemon sharks, Negaprion brevirostris. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *38*(4), 311–319. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00007524

Mourier, J., & Planes, S. (2013). Direct genetic evidence for reproductive philopatry and associated fine-scale migrations in female blacktip reef sharks (Carcharhinus melanopterus) in French Polynesia. *Molecular Ecology*, *22*(1), 201–214. https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12103

Munroe, S. E. M., Simpfendorfer, C. A., & Heupel, M. R. (2014). Habitat and space use of an abundant nearshore shark, Rhizoprionodon taylori. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, *65*(11), 959–968. https://doi.org/10.1071/MF13272

Murray, N. J., Phinn, S. R., DeWitt, M., Ferrari, R., Johnston, R., Lyons, M. B., Clinton, N., Thau, D., & Fuller, R. A. (2019). The global distribution and trajectory of tidal flats. *Nature*, *565*(7738), 222–225. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0805-8

Murray, N. J., Worthington, T. A., Bunting, P., Duce, S., Hagger, V., Lovelock, C. E., Lucas, R., Saunders, M. I., Sheaves, M., Spalding, M., Waltham, N. J., & Lyons, M. B. (2022). High-resolution mapping of

losses and gains of Earth's tidal wetlands. *Science*, 376(6594), 744–749. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abm9583

Myers, R. A., Baum, J. K., Shepherd, T. D., Powers, S. P., & Peterson, C. H. (2007). Cascading effects of the loss of apex predatory sharks from a coastal ocean. *Science*, 315(5820), 1846–1850. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1138657

Navia, A. F., Mejía-Falla, P. A., López-García, J., Giraldo, A., & Cruz-Escalona, V. H. (2016). How many trophic roles can elasmobranchs play in a marine tropical network? *Marine and Freshwater Research*, 68(7), 1342–1353. https://doi.org/10.1071/MF16161

Niella, Y., Raoult, V., Gaston, T., Goodman, K., Harcourt, R., Peddemors, V., & Smoothey, A. F. (2022). Reliance of young sharks on threatened estuarine habitats for nutrition implies susceptibility to climate change. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 268(February), 107790. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2022.107790

Nilsson, G. E., & Östlund-Nilsson, S. (2006). Hypoxia tolerance in coral reef fishes. In A. L. Val, V. M. F. Almeida-Val, & D. J. Randall (Eds.), *The physiology of tropical fishes* (pp. 583–596). Academic Press.

Nowicki, R., Heithaus, M., Thomson, J., Burkholder, D., Gastrich, K., & Wirsing, A. (2019). Indirect legacy effects of an extreme climatic event on a marine megafaunal community. *Ecological Monographs*, 89(3), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecm.1365

O'Shea, O. R., Thums, M., Van Keulen, M., & Meekan, M. (2012). Bioturbation by stingrays at Ningaloo reef, Western Australia. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, 63(3), 189–197. https://doi.org/10.1071/MF11180

Page, G., & Whitacre, D. F. (1975). Raptor predation on wintering shorebirds. *The Condor*, 77, 73–83.

Papastamatiou, Y. P., Watanabe, Y. Y., Bradley, D., Dee, L. E., Weng, K., Lowe, C. G., & Caselle, J. E. (2015). Drivers of daily routines in an ectothermic marine predator: Hunt warm, rest warmer? *PLoS One*, 10(6), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127807

Pauly, D., Christensen, V., Dalsgaard, J., Froese, R., & Torres, F., Jr. (1998). Fishing down marine food webs. *Science*, 279(5352), 860–863.

Peacor, S. D., Barton, B. T., Kimbro, D. L., Sih, A., & Sheriff, M. J. (2020). A framework and standardized terminology to facilitate the study of predation-risk effects. *Ecology*, 101(12), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3152

Pendleton, L., Donato, D. C., Murray, B. C., Crooks, S., Jenkins, W. A., Sifleet, S., Craft, C., Fourqurean, J. W., Kauffman, J. B., Marbà, N., Megonigal, P., Pidgeon, E., Herr, D., Gordon, D., & Baldera, A. (2012). Estimating global "blue carbon" emissions from conversion and degradation of vegetated coastal ecosystems. *PLoS One*, 7(9), e43542. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0043542

Peterson, C. H., Fodrie, J. F., Summerson, H. C., & Powers, S. P. (2001). Site-specific and density-dependent extinction of prey by schooling rays: Generation of a population sink in top-quality habitat for bay scallops. *Oecologia*, 129(3), 349–356. https://doi.org/10.1007/s004420100742

Philippe, A. S., Pinaud, D., Cayatte, M. L., Goulevant, C., Lachaussée, N., Pineau, P., Karpytchev, M., & Bocher, P. (2016). Influence of environmental gradients on the distribution of benthic resources available for shorebirds on intertidal mudflats of Yves Bay, France. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 174, 71–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2016.03.013

Pierce, S. J., Scott-Holland, T. B., & Bennett, M. B. (2011). Community composition of elasmobranch fishes utilizing intertidal sand flats in moreton bay, Queensland, Australia. *Pacific Science*, 65(2), 235–247. https://doi.org/10.2984/65.2.235

Piersma, T. (2012). What is habitat quality? Dissecting a research portfolio on shorebirds. In *Birds and Habitat* (pp. 383–407). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139021654.019

Piersma, T., de Goeij, P., & Tulp, I. (1993). An evaluation of intertidal feeding habitats from a shorebird perspective: Towards relevant comparisons between temperate and tropical mudflats. *Netherlands Journal of Sea Research*, 31(4), 503–512. https://doi.org/10.1016/0077-7579(93)90062-W

Power, M. E., Tilman, D., Estes, J. A., Menge, B. A., Bond, W. J., Mills, L. S., Daily, G., Castilla, J. C., Lubchenco, J., & Paine, R. T. (1996). Challenges in the quest for keystones defining keystones. *Bioscience*, 46(8), 609–620.

Pridmore, R. D., Thrush, S. F., Hewitt, J. E., & Roper, D. S. (1990). Macrobenthic community composition of six intertidal sandflats in manukau harbour, New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*, 24(1), 81–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/00288330.1990.9516404

Rafaelli, D., & Hawkins, S. J. (1999). *Intertidal ecology* (1st ed.). Kluwer Academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.2307/1352485

Rangeley, R. W., & Kramer, D. L. (1995). Use of rocky intertidal habitats by juvenile Pollock Pollachius virens. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 126(1–3), 9–17. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps126009

Raoult, V., Broadhurst, M. K., Peddemors, V. M., Williamson, J. E., & Gaston, T. F. (2019). Resource use of great hammerhead sharks (Sphyrna mokarran) off eastern Australia. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 95(6), 1430–1440. https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.14160

Rasher, D. B., Hoey, A. S., & Hay, M. E. (2017). Cascading predator effects in a Fijian coral reef ecosystem. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-15679-w

Raymond, W. W., Barber, J. S., Dethier, M. N., Hayford, H. A., Harley, C. D. G., King, T. L., ... McDonald, P. S. (2022). Assessment of the impacts of an unprecedented heatwave on intertidal shellfish of the Salish Sea. *Ecology*, 103, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3798

Reidenauer, J. A., & Thistle, D. (1981). Response of a soft-bottom harpacticoid community to stingray (Dasyatis sabina) disturbance. *Marine Biology*, 65(3), 261–267. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00397120

Renshaw, G. M. C., Kerrisk, C. B., & Nilsson, G. E. (2002). The role of adenosine in the anoxic survival of the epaulette shark, *Hemiscyllium ocellatum*. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part B: Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*, 131(2), 133–141. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1096-4959(01)00484-5

Ries, J. B., Cohen, A. L., & McCorkle, D. C. (2009). Marine calcifiers exhibit mixed responses to CO2-induced ocean acidification. *Geology*, 37(12), 1131–1134. https://doi.org/10.1130/G30210A.1

Roemer, R. P., Gallagher, A. J., & Hammerschlag, N. (2016). Shallow water tidal flat use and associated specialized foraging behavior of the great hammerhead shark (Sphyrna mokarran). *Marine and Freshwater Behaviour and Physiology*, 49(4), 235–249. https://doi.org/10.1080/10236244.2016.1168089

Rose, M. D., & Polis, G. A. (2018). The Distribution and Abundance of Coyotes: The Effects of Allochthonous Food Subsidies from the Sea Author (s): Michael D. Rose and Gary A. Polis Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Ecological Society of America Stable, 79(3), 998–1007. https://www.jstor.org/s.

Ruiz, D. J., & Wolff, M. (2011). The Bolivar Channel ecosystem of the Galapagos marine reserve: Energy flow structure and role of keystone groups. *Journal of Sea Research*, 66(2), 123–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seares.2011.05.006

Ruppert, J. L. W., Travers, M. J., Smith, L. L., Fortin, M.-J., & Meekan, M. G. (2013). Caught in the middle: Combined impacts of shark removal and coral loss on the Fish communities of coral reefs. *PLoS One*, 8(9), e74648. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0074648

Russo, R. A. (2015). Observations of predation and loss among leopard sharks and brown smoothhounds in san Fransisco Bay, California. *California Fish and Game*, 101(2), 149–157.

Schlaff, A. M., Heupel, M. R., & Simpfendorfer, C. A. (2014). Influence of environmental factors on shark and ray movement, behaviour and habitat use: A review. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 24(4), 1089–1103. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11160-014-9364-8

Seguel, M. E., Sebastián Ramírez-Rivera, S., Concha, F., Espinoza, M., & Hernández, S. (2022). Predation and epibiosis on egg capsules of the

Shorttail fanskate, Sympterygia brevicaudata. *Revista de Biología Marina y Oceanografía*, *57*(Especial), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.22370/rbmo.2022.57.especial.3314

Sievers, M., Brown, C. J., Tulloch, V. J. D., Pearson, R. M., Haig, J. A., Turschwell, M. P., & Connolly, R. M. (2019). The role of vegetated coastal wetlands for marine megafauna conservation. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *34*(9), 807–817. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2019.04.004

Smith, J. W., & Merriner, J. V. (1985). Food habits and feeding behavior of the cownose ray, Rhinoptera bonasus, in lower Chesapeake Bay. *Estuaries*, *8*(3), 305–310. https://doi.org/10.2307/1351491

Smith, R. I. (1956). The ecology of the Tamar estuary. VII. Observations on the interstitial salinity of intertidal muds in the estuarine habitat of Nereis diversicolor. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, *35*(1), 81–104. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315400008985

Smith, S. E. (2005). Leopard shark mating observed off La Jolla, California. *California Fish and Game*, *91*(2), 128–135.

Speed, C. W., Field, I. C., Meekan, M. G., & Bradshaw, C. J. A. (2010). Complexities of coastal shark movements and their implications for management. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *408*, 275–293. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08581

Stein, R. W., Mull, C. G., Kuhn, T. S., Aschliman, N. C., Davidson, L. N. K., Joy, J. B., Smith, G. J., Dulvy, N. K., & Mooers, A. O. (2018). Global priorities for conserving the evolutionary history of sharks, rays and chimaeras. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, *2*(2), 288–298. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0448-4

Strickland, T. L. (2009). Endangered and threatened species; critical habitat for the endangered distinct population segment of the Smalltooth sawfish. *Federal Register*, *74*(169), 45353–45378.

Suykerbuyk, W., Bouma, T. J., Govers, L. L., Giesen, K., de Jong, D. J., Herman, P., Hendriks, J., & van Katwijk, M. M. (2016). Surviving in changing seascapes: Sediment dynamics as bottleneck for long-term seagrass presence. *Ecosystems*, *19*(2), 296–310. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-015-9932-3

Takeuchi, S., Takahara, Y., Agata, Y., Nasuda, J., Yamada, F., & Tamaki, A. (2013). Response of suspension-feeding clams to natural removal of bioturbating shrimp on a large estuarine intertidal sandflat in western Kyushu, Japan. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, *448*, 308–320. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2013.07.018

Takeuchi, S., & Tamaki, A. (2014). Assessment of benthic disturbance associated with stingray foraging for ghost shrimp by aerial survey over an intertidal sandflat. *Continental Shelf Research*, *84*, 139–157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2014.05.007

Talent, L. G. (1982). Food habits of the gray smoothhound, Mustelus californicus, the brown smoothhound, Mustelus henlei, the shovelnose guitarfish, Rhinobatos productus, and the bar ray, Miliobatis californica, in Elkhorn Slough, California. *California Fish & Game*, *68*(4), 224–234.

Thrush, S. F., Hewitt, J. E., Gibbs, M., Lundquist, C., & Norkko, A. (2006). Functional role of large organisms in intertidal communities: Community effects and ecosystem function. *Ecosystems*, *9*(6), 1029–1040. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-005-0068-8

Thrush, S. F., Pridmore, R. D., Hewitt, J. E., & Cummings, V. J. (1994). The importance of predators on a sandflat - interplay between seasonal changes in prey densities and predator effects. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *107*(3), 211–222. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps107211

Tobin, A. J., Mapleston, A., Harry, A. V., & Espinoza, M. (2014). Big fish in shallow water; use of an intertidal surf-zone habitat by large-bodied teleosts and elasmobranchs in tropical northern Australia. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *97*(7), 821–838. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10641-013-0182-y

Van Den Hout, P. J., Spaans, B., & Piersma, T. (2008). Differential mortality of wintering shorebirds on the banc d'Arguin, Mauritania, due to predation by large falcons. *Ibis*, *150*(SUPPL.1), 219–230. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2008.00785.x

Van Gils, J. A., Van Der Geest, M., Jansen, E. J., Govers, L. L., De Fouw, J., & Piersma, T. (2012). Trophic cascade induced by molluscivore predator alters pore-water biogeochemistry via competitive release of prey. *Ecology*, *93*(5), 1143–1152. https://doi.org/10.1890/11-1282.1

VanBlaricom, G. R. (1982). Experimental analyses of structural regulation in a marine sand community exposed to oceanic swell. *Ecological Monographs*, *52*(3), 283–305. https://doi.org/10.2307/2937332

Vaudo, J. J., & Heithaus, M. R. (2011). Dietary niche overlap in a near-shore elasmobranch mesopredator community. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *425*, 247–260. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08988

Vaudo, J. J., & Heithaus, M. R. (2012). Diel and seasonal variation in the use of a nearshore sandflat by a ray community in a near pristine system. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, *63*(11), 1077–1084. https://doi.org/10.1071/MF11226

Vermeulen, E. (2018). Intertidal habitat use of bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops truncatus) in Bahía San Antonio, Argentina. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, *98*(5), 1109–1118. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315417000856

Wanink, J. H., & Zwarts, L. (1993). Environmental effects of the growth rate of intertidal invertebrates and some implications for foraging waders. *Netherlands Journal of Sea Research*, *31*(4), 407–418. https://doi.org/10.1016/0077-7579(93)90057-Y

Ward, P., & Myers, R. A. (2005). Shifts in open-ocean fish communities coinciding with the commencement of commercial fishing. *Ecology*, *86*(4), 835–847. https://doi.org/10.1890/03-0746

Watson, G. J., Murray, J. M., Schaefer, M., & Bonner, A. (2017). Bait worms: A valuable and important fishery with implications for fisheries and conservation management. *Fish and Fisheries*, *18*(2), 374–388. https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12178

Wheatly, M. G. (1988). Integrated responses to salinity fluctuation. *American Zoologist*, *28*(1), 65–77.

White, J., Heupel, M. R., Simpfendorfer, C. A., & Tobin, A. J. (2013). Shark-like batoids in pacific fisheries: Prevalence and conservation concerns. *Endangered Species Research*, *19*(3), 277–284. https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00473

Wilson, S. C., & Jones, K. A. (2018). Behaviour of harbour seal (Phoca vitulina vitulina) mother-pup pairs in irish sea intertidal habitats. *Biology and Environment*, *118B*(1), 13–27. https://doi.org/10.3318/BIOE.2018.02

Wirsing, A. J., Heithaus, M. R., & Dill, L. M. (2007). Fear factor: Do dugongs (Dugong dugon) trade food for safety from tiger sharks (Galeocerdo cuvier)? *Oecologia*, *153*(4), 1031–1040. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-007-0802-3

Wise, G., Mulvey, J. M., & Renshaw, G. M. C. (1998). Hypoxia tolerance in the epaulette shark (Hemiscyllium ocellatum). *Journal of Experimental Zoology*, *281*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-010X(19980501)281:13.0.CO;2-S

Wolff, W. J. (2005). The exploitation of living resources in the Dutch Wadden Sea: A historical overview. *Helgoland Marine Research*, *59*(1), 31–38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10152-004-0204-4

Wosnick, N., Leite, R. D., Giareta, E. P., Morick, D., & Musyl, M. (2022). Global assessment of shark strandings. *Fish and Fisheries*, *23*(4), 786–799. https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12648

Wosnick, N., Rios, R. M., Rincon, G., & Nunes, J. L. S. (2019). Evidence of tide pool use by a viviparous elasmobranch as a parturition site. *Acta Ichthyologica et Piscatoria*, *49*(2), 189–193. https://doi.org/10.3750/AIEP/02546

Zajac, R. N., Lewis, R. S., Poppe, L. J., Twichell, D. C., Vozarik, J., & DiGiacomo-Cohen, M. L. (2003). Responses of infaunal populations to benthoscape structure and the potential importance of transition zones. *Limnology and Oceanography*, *48*(2), 829–842. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2003.48.2.0829

Zharikov, Y., & Skilleter, G. A. (2003). Depletion of benthic invertebrates by bar-tailed godwits Limosa lapponica in a subtropical

estuary. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *254*, 151–162. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps254151

Zwarts, L., & Piersma, T. (1990). How important is the banc d'Arguin, Mauritania, as a temporary staging area for waders in spring? *Ardea*, *78*(1–2), 113–121.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.