



# The potential of microphytobenthos in sediment biostabilisation of aquatic ecosystems: an overview

<sup>1</sup>Nurul S. Redzuan, <sup>2</sup>Pozi Milow

<sup>1</sup> School of Marine and Environmental Science, University Malaysia Terengganu, 21030 Kuala Nerus, Terengganu, Malaysia; <sup>2</sup> Institute of Biological Science, Faculty of Science, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Corresponding author: N. S. Redzuan,  
[catalunalynx@hotmail.com](mailto:catalunalynx@hotmail.com)

**Abstract.** Microphytobenthos represents microscopic primary producers, primarily diatoms that often form heterogeneous biofilms on sediment surface. Microphytobenthos assemblages have been documented and reported to be closely linked with the biostabilisation of the sediment surface in the intertidal flat of Europe. Flood and ebb tides cause vertical movement of the benthic diatoms in the surface of the top sediment, which contributes to stabilizing the sediment. Light, salinity and other environmental stressors further initiate microphytobenthos to move up and down vertically in the surface of the top sediment. Diatoms produce and secrete extracellular polymeric substances in response to their locomotion, which favorably stabilize the sediment surface during high tide immersion. Frequent storms caused by climate change have intensified the erosion problem along coastlines. Unfortunately, structures such as wave breakers and breakwaters that are built along some coastlines have proven to worsen the erosion rate. More environmental and biological-friendly solutions are needed to tackle the erosion problem worldwide. The widely distributed tidal flats and mangrove forests along the coastlines must harbor the diatom species that have biostabilisation potential. This review presents data that supports the biostabilisation of sediment by diatoms, provides information on this process and initiates more studies regarding the potential of microphytobenthos in biologically reducing sediment erosion along the coastlines, rather than structurally.

**Key Words:** biostabilisation, chlorophyll *a*, diatom, erosion, microphytobenthos.

**Introduction.** Microphytobenthos biomass (MPB) or benthic microalgae has been long known as the base of the food chain for sub-tidal and intertidal ecosystems. The MPB communities consists of the diatoms, cyanobacteria, chlorophytes and some other divisions of microscopic algae that normally inhabit the sediment. Diatoms however, are often the most common (Mann 1999). Viable MPB inhabits the top 10 cm of the sediment (Brito et al 2012), but it normally accumulates in the top 2 mm of the surficial sediment (Blanchard & Forster 2006). Nonetheless, even located and restricted in the uppermost part of sediment, MPB still has a significantly high impact on the functioning of whole intertidal flats and estuarine ecosystems (Colijn et al 1984; Aberle-Malzahn 2004; Blanchard & Forster 2006).

MPB is composed of autotrophic microorganisms and plays a vital role as a processor for atmospheric carbon dioxide as it takes up greenhouse gas to photosynthesize. Webster et al (2002) suggested that the photosynthetic activity of MPB also aids in the production of oxygen and the return of nutrients to the sediment. Both oxygen and nutrients are crucial to ensure the survival and sustainability of organisms in both intertidal and aquatic ecosystems. Other ecological functions of MPB include the ability to retain the nutrients in sediment by preventing the nutrients release into the water column (Underwood & Kromkamp 1999; Tyler et al 2003). In addition, photosynthesizing MPB also influences nitrogen turnover processes and helps in the phosphate exchanging process between water and sediment (Risgaard-Peterson 2003).

Motile or epipellic diatoms, which are the major constituents of MPB communities, are also vital as sediment stabilizers. These microalgae display vertical migratory rhythm that is often synchronized to the diurnal tidal activity. During the emersion (low tide) period, diatoms migrate vertically upwards, towards the photic zone, to photosynthesize and thereby accumulate on the sediment surface (Cartaxana et al 2016). Prior to high tide period, these unique microorganisms migrate downward into the sediment. This may be a survival mechanism to reduce the 'wash away' effect of the tidal action (Koh et al 2007). The upward and downward migrations of motile diatoms in the top 5 mm of the sediment surface are an important regime aiding the sediment biostabilisation. Movement of diatoms in sediment involves the production of extracellular polymeric substances (EPS) that act as an organic glue and stabilize the sediment (Underwood et al 1995), and potentially inhibit the resuspension or wash away of sediment by tidal currents and wave energy (Ubertini et al 2015). The formation of physical mats of diatoms and associated bacteria called 'MPB biofilms' on the sediment surface is reported to effectively retain sediment during tidal activity by preventing the sediment from being suspended and carried away during high tide period (Underwood & Paterson 1993; Ciutat et al 2007; Fang et al 2014). The functions of EPS on the intertidal flat ecosystem can be surmised by understanding its relationship with the physiology and biological processes of diatom communities and other microorganisms.

Chlorophyll *a*, a colloidal carbohydrate (CC), and EPS concentrations in the top 3 to 5 mm (Defew et al 2002; De Brouwer et al 2003) sediment surfaces are biomass proxies that can be used as indicators in studying diatoms. Although it is EPS that reportedly aids the sediment stability (Underwood et al 1995; Underwood & Paterson 2003), most researchers are still using either chlorophyll *a* and/or CC concentrations to study this subject. This is because the extraction of EPS from diatoms cell requires complex protocols that could lead to unreliable measurements. Samples storage procedure, medium of extraction, centrifugation timing and sulfuric acid addition process must be done with high precaution or else it may potentially lead to errors (Underwood et al 1995). Regardless, studies conducted by Taylor et al (2013) and Redzuan (2017) successfully found a strong correlation between chlorophyll *a* and EPS concentrations. This further supported the fact that the use of chlorophyll *a*, although not the substance that directly contributes to sediment stability, is still a useful proxy in studying biostabilisation.

Some important ecosystems, such as mangroves, tidal flats and estuaries, lie along coastlines. Therefore, loss of coastlines due to erosion can potentially cause catastrophic ecosystem instability. Sediment erosion has attracted the attention of many researchers. Studies have been done to characterize coastal erosion models (Awang et al 2014; Ariffin et al 2016) and morphology (Muslim et al 2011). This undoubtedly provides vital information on the nature of erosion along coastlines, especially in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries. For instance, in Malaysia, construction of coastal defense structures is one of the approaches that is used to reduce the erosion effect by wave energy along its coastline. However, the structures only reduce the wave energy intensity and decrease the erosion rate at the shoreline behind it, but increase the wave energy effect and possibly erosion on other parts of the shore (Awang et al 2014).

Mangrove, intertidal flat and salt marsh restoration could be one of the natural approaches to control the loss of coastline to erosion. But a restoration program can be very costly. For instance, the cost to effectively restore a fully-functional mangrove ecosystem is reported to range from 225 to 216,000 USD per hectare (Lewis III 2001). In mangrove restoration projects, attention is often only given to planting mangrove trees and hydrology restoration, with the functional aspect of the mangroves as an ecosystem being neglected. One way to understand the mangroves as a fully functional ecosystem is to investigate the ability of MPB to naturally increase the erosion threshold of the ecosystem sediment. To our knowledge, no research has been carried out to exclusively reveal the biostabilisation effect of MPB on not only the sediment of mangrove ecosystem, but at a larger scale, perhaps along the active erosion that takes place in most of the world's coastlines. Therefore, this review aims not to discuss only the potential of MPB in sediment biostabilisation, but also to promote teamwork with various

members of the scientific community to reveal other ecological aspects of the MPB potential.

**MPB biomass and Sediment Stability.** The presence of diatoms on the sediment surface of an intertidal flat can be directly depicted by the biomass, while chlorophyll *a* concentrations serve as a proxy. Basically, high chlorophyll *a* indicates high diatom biomass that can be responsible for the formation of sturdier physical mats, called biofilms. Studies carried out by Du et al (2010) revealed outstandingly high diatom biomass (by means of chlorophyll *a* concentration) on the sediment surface, even during tidal coverage (Table 1). These findings could be attributed to the thick diatom mats formed during the emersion period prior to incoming tides. This well-structured mats or biofilms were reported by Woelfel et al (2007) to form a mucous-like laminated layer on the sediment surface that can potentially hold sediment aggregates together during high tide periods. Findings by Weerman et al (2012) regarding the positive correlation between the MPB content on sediment surface and sediment bed level, further supported the diatom potential in stabilising the sediment. The work also reported that excessive grazing of diatoms by herbivorous grazers degraded the sediment biofilms and consequently led to a poor relationship between the MPB and sediment beds. Therefore, the removal of MPB from sediment surface may lead to sediment instability and sediment erosion.

Table 1  
Qualitative approach in studying biostabilisation effect of diatoms in MPB biofilm

Reference	Study site	Observations	Biomass proxy
Weerman et al (2012)	Keppelbank, Waterschelde estuary, Netherlands	Herbivore grazers significantly degrade diatom biofilms; small biofilms patches are formed leading to bare mudflat.	Aerial photographs of MPB biofilms
Du et al (2010)	Nakdong estuary, Korea	The formation of high biomass during emersion (low tide) results in high diatom biomass even during high tide.	Chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration in $\mu\text{g cm}^{-3}$ dry sediment
Woelfel et al (2007)	Baltic Sea Wind flat, Germany	Laminated mat with mucous-like material and consisted of 90 % of diatom species potentially contributed to sediment stabilization.	Species composition and diatom frustule numbers

Diatom potential in biostabilising sediments attracts not only diatomists and phycologists, but also microbial ecologists (Bohórquez et al 2017), geologists and environmentalists. Collaborations between experts in various fields have made studies on this subject more interesting and informative. Comprehensive studies on the relationship between the ecology, physiology and biology of diatoms on the sediment surface and sediment particles, sediment size and sediment types provide more information about the biostabilisation properties of diatom.

Table 2 presents some of the few studies investigating the correlation between diatom biomass with sediment proxies and incorporation of sediment stability measurements, in terms of erosion thresholds. Defew et al (2002) and Tolhurst et al (2003) reported the positive effect of the vertical migration of diatoms on sediment stability. Both works measure the sudden increase in the erosion threshold due to the accumulation of diatom cells (based on chlorophyll *a* concentration) in the top 2 mm sediment surface at the beginning of low tide. Diatom biomass does not activate only in fine sediment, such as mud and clay; it also showed to increase mud and sand stability, by having the ability to stick and bind the particles even when they are suspended in the water column during high tide (Orvain et al 2012). EPS that is produced by diatoms even when suspended in water column proved to have the ability stick sediment particles, aggregating the particles (Sutherland et al 1998; Fang et al 2014). Consequently, larger sediment particles will be returned and deposited onto sediment surface by means of gravity (Fang et al 2014).

Van De Lageweg et al (2017) reported that natural MPB biofilms (extracted EPS) in sandy sediment improve the biostabilisation index of the sediment up to 21 points. In the study, the biostabilisation index was the mean value of the ratio of the erosion steer stress of MPB biofilms originated from extracted EPS and the un-colonized sandy sediment. The potential of diatoms in biostabilising sediments is proved by higher erosion threshold recorded at areas colonized with diatoms when compared to erosion thresholds from un-colonized areas. The 21 biostabilisation index score is higher than the biostabilisation index displayed by artificial industrial polysaccharides such as the xanthan gum and carrageenan (Van De Lageweg et al 2017). The sediment biostabilisation by diatoms proved to be efficient in the previously mentioned study; however, some disturbances that usually occur naturally were absent, like grazer feeders, since it was an experimental (ex-situ) output that was carried out in the laboratory.

Diatom biomass on sediment surface thickens MPB biofilms and strongly affects the incipient motion of the sediment (Fang et al 2014). Fang et al (2014) successfully modeled and theorized that diatom biofilms affect the cohesion and adhesion of sediment particles, which influence the sediment erosion threshold. The biofilms comprised of benthic pennate *Nitzschia* sp. have higher adhesion properties than cyanobacteria biofilms (Larson et al 2009). Differences in the adhesion properties between these two microalgae groups are possibly attributed to the fact that diatoms produce EPS with stickier properties than cyanobacteria. This can be confirmed by the fact that each microalgae group, species and even cell, produce different types of carbohydrates and EPS (Aslam et al 2012).

Dupuy et al (2014) carried out sequential erosion experiments of sediment biofilms including viruses, prokaryotes, nanoflagellates and diatoms using sediment samples obtained from the Marennes-Oleron Bay. They found viruses, bacteria and nanoflagellates suspended in the water column even at low friction velocities ( $< 2 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$ ). Only diatoms remained unsuspended in the biofilms. The diatoms were found to associate with sediment and bacteria. Biofilms with diatoms and bacteria were suspended only after being exposed to high friction velocities ( $> 2 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$ ), which eventually disrupted the sediment bed. Friction velocities higher than  $5 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$  were required to suspend diatoms in lower sediment biofilms ( $> 2 \text{ mm}$  in the top sediment). The findings may be related to the downward migration of diatoms in the sediment biofilms, which were reported to significantly produce large amounts of EPS (Smith & Underwood 1998; Consalvey et al 2004).

Another study carried out by Austen et al (1999) investigates the relationships among MPB biomass (diatoms), grazers, sediment erosion thresholds and suspended sediments. The study reported the following: the significant positive correlation between chlorophyll *a* (biomass proxy) and erosion threshold; the significant negative correlation between chlorophyll *a* and *Hydrobia ulvae* (grazers); the significant negative correlation between *H. ulvae* and erosion threshold; the significant positive correlation between *H. ulvae* density and the concentration of suspended sediments.

For an effective biostabilisation, a biofilm needs to be associated with diatom assemblages that consists of more than 50 percent living epipelagic diatoms (Underwood et

al 1995; Underwood & Paterson 2003; Woelfel et al 2007). Only then, the biofilms will have sufficient EPS produced by the movement of the epipelagic species. This type of MPB biofilms was also reported by Underwood (1997) to successfully trap newly-deposited sediment of newly restored salt marsh in Blackwater, Essex, UK. It is reported that the biofilms stick to sediment particles and prevent them from being washed away during incoming tide (ebb tide) and high tide periods.

Table 2  
Studies done to investigate the relationship between diatoms biomass and sediment erosion threshold

Reference	Study site	Findings	Biomass proxy	Sediment proxy
Defew et al (2002)	Eden estuary, Scotland and Molenplaat mudflats, The Netherlands	Diatom biomass significantly positively correlates with erosion thresholds	Minimum fluorescence	Erosion threshold ( $\text{Nm}^{-2}$ )
Tolhurst et al (2003)	Tagus estuary, Portugal	Significantly positive correlation between Chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentrations of diatom biofilms and erosion thresholds	Chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration in $\text{mg m}^{-3}$ and LTSEM images	Erosion threshold ( $\text{Nm}^{-2}$ )
Larson et al (2009)	Ex-situ and experimental	Biofilms associated with benthic <i>Nitzschia</i> sp. are more resistant to erosion due to high adhesion/cohesion compared to Cyanobacteria biofilms	MPB biofilm thickness over time	Magnetic flux density (unit: mTesla) that measured adhesion property
Orvain et al (2012)	Baie des Veys, France	Positive correlation between silt accumulations (stickiness) and diatom biofilm development	Chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentrations in $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ dry sediment	Sediment categories (clay, silt, sand), diameter ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) and fraction (%)
Van De Lageweg et al (2017)	Total environment simulator flume (Ex-situ)	Sandy sediments colonized with diatoms biofilms present higher erosion thresholds (up to $3.5 \text{ Nm}^{-2}$ ) compared with those of uncolonized sediments ( $0.18 \text{ Nm}^{-2}$ )	EPS	Erosion threshold ( $\text{Nm}^{-2}$ ) and biostabilization index

EPS - extracellular polymeric substance; MPB – microphytobenthos.

**Sediment biostabilization by MPB in different types of sediment.** Ubertini et al (2015) present one of the few works that measures EPS as a biomass proxy when studying the relationship between diatoms and sediment erosion thresholds on an intertidal flat. The study carried out using different sediment types (pure mud and mixture of mud and sand) highlights that diatom biofilms in pure mud are more unstable than in the mixed sediment types. Sand enrichment in pure mud probably provides less favorable conditions (stress) for diatoms. The different conditions are due to different sediment sizes, aggregates and permeability. This creates stress that potentially stimulates the diatoms to secrete more EPS (Taylor et al 2013). Therefore, the mix of mud and sand has higher EPS concentrations than pure mud, and also higher erosion thresholds.

Other than particle size, another factor that affects the ability of MPB for biostabilisation is the ecosystem in which it is produced. Spears et al (2008) demonstrate that even in higher MPB biomass and higher EPS concentrations, MPB

biofilms in freshwater ecosystems still display lower sediment stability than MPB biofilms of estuarine ecosystems. The high ionic concentration due to sodium and chloride ions of estuarine water enhances EPS function in sediment cohesion (Spears et al 2008; Fang et al 2014). The lower sediment cohesion ability by EPS produced in freshwater is also detailed and discussed by Larson et al (2009). The ionic nature of the seawater creates physicochemical attractions between sediment particles and causes sediment aggregation (Larson et al 2009). The force of gravity ensures that the aggregated sediment particles remain on the sediment surface (Fang et al 2014). This consequently increases the sediment erosion threshold. Although diatom-produced EPS in freshwater is not as efficient as the one from estuaries in biostabilising sediments, the substance still plays a significant role in carrying out other ecosystem functions (Gerbersdorf et al 2009).

**Conclusion.** MPB sediment biostabilisation has been reported in many studies, but still at an initial stage, especially in ASEAN countries. More studies on the ecology of the MPB are needed to fully understand the role as a functional sediment biostabilisation agent. This short review hopefully will inform researchers to appreciate these microorganisms that, although microscopic, have valuable potential to replace the engineered structures in reducing the shoreline erosion issue. It is strongly believed that a sustainable plan for shoreline or coastline stabilization must also include the role of MPB. Initially, it is crucial to ensure the sustainability of MPB by carrying out inter-annual monitoring and by unveiling its ecological importance.

**Acknowledgements.** The first author would like to thank her PhD supervisor (Prof. Graham Underwood) and University of Essex's microbial ecology team for introducing her to the mesmerizing world of microphytobenthos.

## References

- Aberle-Malzahn N., 2004 The microphytobenthos and its role in aquatic food webs. Ph.D. Dissertation. Der-Christian-Albrechts-Universitat, 150 p.
- Ariffin E. H., Sedrati M., Akhir M. F., Yaacob R., Husain M. L., 2016 Open sandy beach morphology and morphodynamic as response to seasonal monsoon in Kuala Terengganu, Malaysia. *Journal of Coastal Research* 75:1032–1036.
- Aslam S. N., Cresswell-Maynard T., Thomas D. N., Underwood G. J. C., 2012 Production and characterization of the intra and extracellular carbohydrates and polymeric substances (EPS) of three sea-ice diatom species, and evidence for a cryoprotective role for EPS. *Journal of Phycology* 48(6):1494–1509.
- Austen I., Andersen T. J., Edelvang K., 1999 The influence of benthic diatoms and invertebrates on the erodibility of an intertidal a mudflat, the Danish Wadden Sea. *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science* 49(1):99–111.
- Awang N., Hasliza Wan Jusoh W., Abdul Hamid M. R., 2014 Coastal erosion at Tanjung Piai, Johor, Malaysia. *Journal of Coastal Research* 71:122–130.
- Blanchard G. F., Forster R. M., 2006 Functioning of microphytobenthos in estuaries. *Proceedings of the Microphytobenthos Symposium*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, pp. 89–98.
- Bohórquez J., McGenity T. J., Papaspyrou S., García-Robledo E., Corzo A., Underwood G. J. C., 2017 Different types of diatom-derived extracellular polymeric substances drive changes in heterotrophic bacterial communities from intertidal sediments. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 20(7):785–806.
- Brito A. C., Fernandes T. F., Newton A., Facca C., Tett P., 2012 Does microphytobenthos resuspension influence phytoplankton in shallow systems? A comparison through a Fourier series analysis. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 110:77–84.
- Cartaxana P., Cruz S., Gameiro C., Kuhl M., 2016 Regulation of intertidal microphytobenthos photosynthesis over a diel emersion period is strongly affected by diatom migration patterns. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 7:1–11.

- Ciutat A., Widdow J., Pope N. D., 2007 Effect of *Cerastoderma edule* density on near-bed hydrodynamics and stability of cohesive muddy sediments. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 346(1-2):114–126.
- Colijn F., de Jonge V., Jonge V. D., 1984 Primary production of microphytobenthos in the Ems-Dollard Estuary. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 14:185–196.
- Consalvey M., Paterson D. M., Underwood G. J. C., 2004 The ups and downs of life in a benthic biofilm: Migration of benthic diatoms. *Diatom Research* 19(2):181–202.
- De Brouwer J. F. C., De Deckere E. M. G. T., Stal L. J., 2003 Distribution of extracellular carbohydrates in three intertidal mudflats in Western Europe. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 56(2):313–324.
- E. C., Tolhurst T. J., Paterson, D. M., 2002 Site-specific features influence sediment stability of intertidal flats. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions* 6(6):971–982.
- Du G. Y., Son M., An S., Chung I. K., 2010 Temporal variation in the vertical distribution of microphytobenthos in intertidal flats of the Nakdong River estuary, Korea. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 86(1):62–70.
- Dupuy C., Mallet C., Guizien K., Montanié H., Bréret M., Mornet F., Orvain F., 2014 Sequential resuspension of biofilm components (viruses, prokaryotes and protists) as measured by erodimetry experiments in the Brouage mudflat (French Atlantic coast). *Journal of Sea Research* 92:56–65.
- Fang H., Shang Q., Chen M., He G., 2014 Changes in the critical erosion velocity for sediment colonized by biofilm. *Sedimentology* 61(3):648–659.
- Gerbersdorf S. U., Westrich B., Paterson D. M., 2009 Microbial extracellular polymeric substances (EPS) in fresh water sediments. *Microbial Ecology* 58(2):334–349.
- Koh C. H., Khim J. S., Araki H., Yamanishi H., Koga K., 2007 Within-day and seasonal patterns of microphytobenthos biomass determined by co-measurement of sediment and water column chlorophylls in the intertidal mudflat of Nanaura, Saga, Ariake Sea, Japan. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 72(1-2):42–52.
- Larson F., Lubarsky H., Gerbersdorf S. U., Paterson D. M., 2009 Surface adhesion measurements in aquatic biofilms using magnetic particle induction: MagPI. *Limnology and Oceanography Methods* 7:490–497.
- Lewis III R. R., 2001 Mangrove restoration - costs and benefits of successful ecological restoration. *Proceedings of the Mangrove Valuation Workshop*, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia.
- Mann D. G., 1999 The species concept in diatoms. *Phycologia* 38(6):437–495.
- Muslim A. M., Ismail K. I., Razman N., Zain K., Khalil I., 2011 Detection of shoreline changes at Kuala Terengganu, Malaysia from multi-temporal satellite sensor imagery. *Proceedings 34th International Symposium on Remote Sensing of Environment - The GEOSS Era: Towards Operational Environmental Monitoring*, Sydney, Australia.
- Orvain F., Lefebvre S., Montepini J., Sébire M., Gangnery A., Sylvand, B., 2012 Spatial and temporal interaction between sediment and microphytobenthos in a temperate estuarine macro-intertidal bay. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 458:53–68.
- Redzuan N. S., 2017 Microphytobenthos (MPB) Biomass Variability and Sediment Water-Column Exchanges on an Intertidal flat: Influence of Weather-related Abiotic Factors across Neap-spring-neap Tidal Cycle. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Essex, United Kingdom, 238 p.
- Risgaard-Peterson N., 2003 Coupled nitrification denitrification in autotrophic and heterotrophic estuarine sediments on the influence of the benthic microalgae. *Limnology and Oceanography* 48:93–105.
- Smith D. J., Underwood G. J. C., 1998 Exopolymer production by intertidal epipelagic diatoms. *Limnology and Oceanography* 43(7):1578–1591.
- Spears B. M., Saunders J. E., Davidson I., Paterson D. M., 2008 Microalgal sediment biostabilisation along a salinity gradient in the Eden Estuary, Scotland: Unravelling a paradox. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 59(4):313–321.

- Sutherland T. F., Grant J., Amos C. L., 1998 The effect of carbohydrate production by the diatom *Nitzschia curvilineata* on the erodibility of sediment. Limnology and Oceanography 43:65-72.
- Taylor J. D., McKew B. A., Kuh A., McGinity T. J., Underwood G. J. C., 2013 Microphytobenthic extracellular polymeric substances (EPS) in intertidal sediments fuel both generalist specialist EPS-degrading bacteria. Limnology and Oceanography 58(4):1463-1480.
- Tyler A. C., McGlathery K. J., Anderson I. C., 2003 Benthic algae control sediment-water column fluxes of organic and inorganic nitrogen compounds in a temperate lagoon. Limnology and Oceanography 48:2125-2137.
- Tolhurst T. J., Jesus B., Brotas V., Paterson D. M., 2003 Diatom migration and sediment armouring - An example from the Tagus Estuary, Portugal. Hydrobiologia 503:183-193.
- Ubertini M., Lefebvre S., Rakotomalala C., Orvain F., 2015 Impact of sediment grain-size and biofilm age on microphytobenthos resuspension. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 467:52-64.
- Underwood G. J. C., 1997 Microalgal colonization in a saltmarsh restoration scheme. Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science 44:471-481.
- Underwood G. J. C., Kromkamp J., 1999 Primary production by phytoplankton and microphytobenthos in estuaries. Advanced Ecological Research 29:93-153.
- Underwood G. J. C., Paterson D. M., 1993 Recovery of intertidal benthic diatoms after biocide treatment and associated sediment dynamics. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the UK 73:25-45.
- Underwood G. J. C., Paterson D. M., 2003 The importance of extracellular carbohydrate production by marine epipelagic diatoms. Advanced Botanical Research 40:183-240.
- Underwood G. J. C., Paterson D. M., Parkes R. J., 1995 The measurement of microbial carbohydrate exopolymers from intertidal sediments. Limnology Oceanography 7:1243-1253.
- Van De Lageweg W. I., Mclelland S. J., Parsons D. R., 2017 Quantifying biostabilisation effects of biofilm-secreted and synthetic extracellular polymeric substances (EPS) on sandy substrate. Earth Surface Dynamic Discussion 59:203-215.
- Webster I., Ford P., Hodgson B., 2002 Microphytobenthos contribution to nutrient-phytoplankton dynamics in a shallow coastal lagoon. Estuaries 25:540-551.
- Weerman E. J., Van Belzen J., Rietkerk M., Temmerman S., Kéfi S., Herman P. M. J., Van De Koppel J., 2012 Changes in diatom patch-size distribution and degradation in a spatially self-organized intertidal mudflat ecosystem. Ecology 93(3):608-618.
- Woelfel J., Schumann R., Adler S., Hübener T., Karsten U., 2007 Diatoms inhabiting a wind flat of the Baltic Sea: Species diversity and seasonal succession. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 75(3):296-307.

Received: 17 January 2019. Accepted: 17 April 2019. Published online: 11 June 2019.

Authors:

Nurul Shahida Redzuan, School of Marine and Environmental Science, University Malaysia Terengganu, 21030

Kuala Nerus, Malaysia, e-mail:catalunalynx@hotmail.com

Pozi Milow, Institute of Biological Sciences, faculty of Science, University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, e-mail: [pozimilow@um.edu.my](mailto:pozimilow@um.edu.my)

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

How to cite this article:

Redzuan N. S., Milow P., 2019 The potential of microphytobenthos in sediment biostabilisation of aquatic ecosystems: an overview. AACL Bioflux 12(3):748-755.