Pocillopora spp. growth analysis on restoration structures in an Eastern Tropical Pacific upwelling area

Lisa Combillet[1], Sònia Fabregat-Malé[2], Sebastián Mena[3], José Andrés Marín-Moraga[4], Monica Gutierrez[5] and Juan José Alvarado[3,6,7]

[1] Master Sciences pour l'Environnement, parcours Gestion de l'environnement et écologie Littorale, Université de La Rochelle, La Rochelle, France
[2] Posgrado en Biología, Sistema de Estudios de Posgrado, Universidad de Costa Rica, San Pedro de Montes de Oca, San José, Costa Rica
[3] Escuela de Biología, Universidad de Costa Rica, San Pedro de Montes de Oca, San José, Costa Rica
[4] Raising Coral Costa Rica, San José, Costa Rica
[5] Sostenibilidad, Península Papagayo, Guanacaste, Costa Rica
[6] Centro de Investigación en Biodiversidad y Ecología Tropical (CIBET) (Previously Museo de Zoología), Universidad de Costa Rica, San Pedro de Montes de Oca, San José, Costa Rica
[7] Centro de Investigación en Ciencias del Mar y Limnología (CIMAR), Universidad de Costa Rica, San Pedro de Montes de Oca, Costa Rica

Corresponding author
Lisa Combillet,
lisa.combillet@etudiant.univ-lr.fr

ABSTRACT

Coral reefs in Culebra Bay (North Pacific of Costa Rica) are threatened by multiple anthropogenic disturbances including global warming, overfishing, eutrophication, and invasive species outbreaks. It is possible to assist their recovery by implementing ecological restoration techniques. This study used artificial hexagonal steel structures, called "spiders" to compare growth of *Pocillopora* spp. coral fragments of different sizes. Three initial fragment class sizes were used: 2, 5 and 8 cm, with each class size having 42 initial fragments. Changes in fragment length, width and area were measured monthly from January to December 2020. Results showed an overall survivorship of 70.21%, and no significant differences in survivorship and linear growth rate were detected between class sizes. The linear growth rates are 4.49 ± 1.19 cm year^{-1}, 5.35 ± 1.48 cm year^{-1} and 3.25 ± 2.22 cm year^{-1} for the 2, 5 and 8 cm initial class sizes, respectively. Our results do not show significant differences in growth rates between the different initial fragment sizes. However, since small fragments (2 cm) present higher mortality during the first month, we recommend using larger fragments. In addition, coral fragments grew 48% more during the non-upwelling season, which may suggest that it might be more effective and safer to start the restoration efforts during this period.

INTRODUCTION

Coral reefs are highly diverse ecosystems that provide essential goods and services to hundreds of millions of people (*Knowlton et al., 2021*), such as food, livelihoods through fisheries and tourism, protection from coastal erosion and storms, and cultural practices

(*Woodhead et al., 2019*). Nevertheless, in the last decades, many reefs around the world have collapsed, and live coral cover has declined due to several factors, such as climate change, acidification and unplanned coastal development (*Hughes et al., 2017*; *El-Naggar, 2020*; *Knowlton et al., 2021*). The rapid deterioration of these ecosystems threatens the stability of marine environments and human well-being (*Eddy et al., 2021*).

Due to this intense degradation of coral reefs worldwide and in the face of future climate change, ecological restoration of coral reefs is becoming an increasingly important management approach (*McLeod et al., 2021*). Restoration of degraded coral reefs can be achieved through different means, using either sexual or asexual coral recruits in order to enhance coral populations (*Rinkevich, 1995*; *Rinkevich, 2019*). During the last 20 years, several restoration techniques have been developed, and coral gardening has been one of the most widely used. This approach is based on the asexual propagation of corals by the fragmentation of wild donor colonies. The collected fragments are later put into coral nurseries, where they grow until they become larger colonies which are later outplanted onto a degraded reef (*Rinkevich, 2006*). A wide variety of structures have been used as coral nurseries, from floating (suspended in the water column) to fixed structures (on the seafloor) (*Shafir & Rinkevich, 2010*; *Rinkevich, 2019*).

Most restoration projects have been developed in the Caribbean and Indo-Pacific (*Boström-Einarsson et al., 2020*). In the Eastern Tropical Pacific (ETP), however, coral reef restoration is still in its infancy, and very few projects are based on coral gardening (*Bayraktarov et al., 2020*). Conditions in the ETP are different from those in the Caribbean and Indo-Pacific. Coral reefs are relatively small (a few hectares), discontinuous, and are built by few coral species, predominantly of the genera *Pocillopora*, *Porites* and *Pavona* (*Guzmán & Cortés, 1993*; *Glynn et al., 2017*). The region comprises three seasonal upwelling areas (Gulf of Tehuantepec, Gulf of Papagayo and Gulf of Panama), with incursions of deep, cold and nutrient-rich waters (*Cortés, 1997*; *Fiedler & Lavín, 2017*). The ETP is also affected by the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO), which causes an increase in sea surface temperatures that can lead to coral bleaching and high mortality, with loss of live coral cover (*Glynn, 1984*; *Guzmán et al., 1987*; *Jiménez et al., 2001*; *Jiménez & Cortés, 2001*; *Brainard et al., 2018*).

The North Pacific coast of Costa Rica was considered as one of the best regions for the development of coral reefs in the country (*Cortés & Jiménez, 2003*; *Alvarado et al., 2018*). Within it, the reefs in Culebra Bay (Fig. 1) were considered as the most diverse, but in the last two decades various disturbances caused severe degradation that led to the collapse and loss of many reefs around the bay. Red tides and macroalgal proliferation induced coral bleaching and mortality (*Cortés et al., 2010*). The following increase in sea urchin populations (*Diadema mexicanum*) resulted in high bioerosion rates and caused the loss of the reefs' structural complexity and framework (*Alvarado, Cortés & Reyes-Bonilla, 2012*; *Alvarado et al., 2016*), which in turn had an impact on diversity of reef-associated organisms and ecosystem functions (*Arias-Godinez et al., 2019*; *Salas-Moya et al., 2021*).

The particular environmental conditions, combined with the relatively low experience on coral reef restoration in the region, means that little is known about restoration

Figure 1 Study and sampling site in Culebra Bay, North Pacific of Costa Rica.

techniques and specific considerations about the species used. However, some studies (mostly in Mexico and Colombia) have been carried out using the coral genus *Pocillopora* (*Liñan-Cabello et al., 2011*; *Tortolero-Langarica, Cupul-Magaña & Rodriguez-Troncoso, 2014*; *Nava & Figueroa-Camacho, 2017*; *Lizcano-Sandoval, Londoño-Cruz & Zapata, 2018*; *Ishida-Catañeda et al., 2020*; *Vargas-Ugalde et al., 2020*). The restoration project implemented in Culebra Bay, which was initiated in 2019, could help determine the optimal initial coral fragment size and the suitability of a new technique and thus, help respond to specific research questions for the development of coral restoration projects in the ETP. Coral fragments of *Pocillopora* spp. of three different initial sizes were attached to the structures, and their growth was monitored monthly for one year. The aim of the present study is to determine whether coral fragment growth and survival is affected by initial fragment size and presence of upwelling, in order to establish the optimal fragment size and best period to start restoration efforts for *Pocillopora* dominated reefs.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area

Culebra Bay, in the Gulf of Papagayo, is located in the Guanacaste province of Costa Rica, in the Northwest Pacific of the country. This bay consists of a series of islets, beaches, cliffs and estuaries with important economic marine resources, and it is subject to a seasonal upwelling between December and April, which brings up colder and nutrient-rich waters (*Jiménez, 2001*; *Alfaro & Cortés, 2012*). During this period, seawater temperatures can

decrease by 8 to 9 °C from the annual average (27.9 °C) (*Alfaro & Cortés, 2012*; *Alfaro et al., 2012*). The bay is naturally exposed to lower pH (pH = 7.8) than other regions, with high temporal variability following the dry and rainy seasons (*Sánchez-Noguera, Jiménez & Cortés, 2018*). Even during the non-upwelling season (from May to November) there is a reduced pH that impacts photosynthesis, respiration, and calcification processes (*Rixen, Jiménez & Cortés, 2012*; *Sánchez-Noguera, Jiménez & Cortés, 2018*). Sedimentation in the area is low (3.0 ± 0.78 mg cm^{-2} day; *Fernández-García et al., 2012*) and without any sign of human stress (*Rogers, 1990*). Coral reefs in the bay are dominated by the genus *Pocillopora*, which forms monospecific patches that used to cover several hectares along the bay in the 1990s. On some reefs, corals covered between 40% and 80% of the substrate (*Jiménez, 2001*; *Cortés & Jiménez, 2003*). In 2010, however, live coral cover was only 1% to 4% (*Sánchez-Noguera et al., 2018*). The main *Pocillopora* species in the region are *Pocillopora damicornis* (Linnaeus, 1758) and *Pocillorpora elegans* (Dana, 1846). In this study, these two species were grouped under the name of *Pocillopora* spp. because the morphologies are similar, with intermediate shapes, which make their precise identification in the field difficult. The experiment took place in the coral reef patch in front of Playa Jícaro (10.619830°N, 85.675810°W) (Fig. 1).

Experimental design

Pocillopora spp. fragments (*n* = 126) were obtained from colonies on three sites around Culebra Bay: Palmitas, Marina and Güiri-Güiri (Fig. 1). Healthy large donor colonies (>30 cm in diameter and without observable injuries) were randomly selected at depths between 3 to 8 m, and no more than three fragments were obtained from each donor. Three different initial fragment sizes categories were considered: small (2 cm, 2.57 ± 0.38 cm), medium (5 cm, 5.35 ± 0.78 cm) and large (8 cm, 8.26 ± 1.63 cm). Forty-two fragments from each size class were attached using plastic cable ties to three "spider" restoration structures, one for each fragment size class. These hexagonal metallic structures are 90 cm high and have three levels, 25, 35 and 45 cm long from top to bottom, and 30 cm apart. Arrangement of the coral fragments within the structure (for each of the six sides of the "spider", two fragments on the top level, two in the middle and three in the lowest) was based on fragments having enough space to grow and not competing with each other (Fig. 2A). This design also allows coral fragments to grow on the external side of the structure and if they break and fall from it, they can continue to grow surrounded by other fragments on the seafloor, forming a three-dimensional structure. With this method, corals are not necessarily destined to be outplanted to the reef afterwards, but to stay on the structures, where they can keep growing. Thus, "spiders" have a double purpose, as they can act as both a nursery and a substrate on which to permanently attach corals to contribute to the structural complexity of the reef. The three "spiders" were placed at 6 m depth, on the front reef area.

Data collection

The experiment was conducted from January to December 2020. March 2020 is excluded from the results because of the COVID-19 sanitary crisis, which prevented data collection

Figure 2 "Spider" structures used for coral restoration in Playa Jícaro, Culebra Bay, North Pacific of Costa Rica. Side view of the "spider" structure (A) and method used to monitor *Pocillopora* coral fragments attached to the structure (B).

in Costa Rica. The study site was visited monthly and each *Pocillopora* fragment was photographed with an underwater Nikon COOLPIX W300 camera, using a calliper as a scale (Fig. 2B). Photographs were later analysed using ImageJ software, which allows for a 0.001 cm precision, and height (cm), width (cm) and area (cm^2) of each fragment was determined. This allowed us to estimate a growth rate in terms of linear extension (cm year^{-1}) and tissue area (cm^2 year^{-1}). Linear extension was calculated by measuring the vertical length between the two longest coral branches, while the area of the coral was estimated by outlining the contour of the coral fragment, and subsequently calculating the average. Mortality was visually determined; a fragment was considered dead if it had no living tissue left and/or was covered by other organisms such as algae, barnacles or ascidians. If the fragment was partially dead, only the part with living tissue was measured. The number of dead fragments was established and used to calculate fragment survival rates. Seawater temperature in the restoration area was recorded using HOBO® data loggers, which were set to record data every 30 min.

Data analysis

Survival rates of each initial size class were calculated and compared with a Chi-squared contingency test in order to determine the influence of the initial size of the fragment. Lost fragments were excluded from this calculation since it is not possible to establish whether they survived. Means of fragments length, width, and area at initial time (January 2020) and every month until December 2020 were estimated for each "spider" and then, the relative growth between initial and final time was calculated. These estimations considered only fragments that survived until the last month of the experiment and excluded fragments that broke during the course of the experiment. Means of fragment length, width and area of each month are compared with a one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey HSD post-hoc tests. To compare the absolute growth and growth rate between the three different initial class sizes, a two-way ANOVA test was used followed by a Tukey HSD post-hoc test. Finally, a t-test was used to compare the difference in growth between two periods: from January to April and from May to December, according to the presence and absence of seasonal upwelling, respectively. Monthly average,

Table 1 Survival by initial fragment size of *Pocillopora* spp. fragments at the end of the experiment in Jícaro reef, Culebra Bay.

Initial size	Alive	Dead	Lost
A (2 cm)	15 (35.71%)	12 (28.57%)	15 (35.71%)
B (5 cm)	23 (54.76%)	8 (19.05%)	11 (26.19%)
C (8 cm)	28 (66.67%)	8 (19.05%)	6 (14.29%)
Total	66 (52.38%)	28 (22.22%)	32 (25.39%)

Note:
Survival is not affected by initial fragment size ($X^2 = 3.993$, df = 2, $p > 0.05$).

minimum and maximum seawater temperature was calculated from Hobo data. Statistical analyses were performed using R, including the package "stats" (*R Core Team, 2018*).

RESULTS

Coral fragment survival

At the end of the experiment, 66 fragments survived (52.38%), 28 died (22.22%), and 32 were lost (25.39%) due to fragmentation or cable tie break during the experimentation (Table 1). Excluding lost fragments, coral fragment survival is not affected by the initial fragment size ($X^2 = 3.993$, df = 2, $p > 0.05$). The overall survival rate from January to December 2020 is 70.21%. The highest number of death fragments (9) appeared in February, whilst the number of dead fragments during other months ranged from 0 to 5. In order to determine whether upwelling had an effect on coral mortality, a Pearson's chi-squared test was also performed between upwelling season (January to April) and non-upwelling season (May to December). No significant differences in mortality were observed between the two periods ($X^2 = 1.5345$, df = 1, $p > 0.05$). The test also showed no statistical differences when considering initial fragment size ($X^2 = 3.247$, df = 2, $p > 0.05$ and $X^2 = 0.812$, df = 2, $p > 0.05$).

Coral fragment growth

During the period of observation, *Pocillopora* fragments grew significantly in terms of length ($F_{10,953} = 35.2$, $p > 0.001$), width ($F_{10,935} = 40.8$, $p > 0.001$) and area ($F_{10,953} = 46.5$, $p > 0.001$), independently of their initial class size (Fig. 3). On average, fragments grew 4.12 ± 2.77 cm year^{-1} and quadrupled their surface over one year (438%). *Pocillopora* fragments grew more in terms of length than width (Table 2). For some fragments, negative growth between months was observed. Growth rate in length and width does not significantly differ by initial class size, but it does for area measurements: A is significatively different from B and C, and B is significatively different from C (Table 2).

Comparison between upwelling and non-upwelling periods

Coral growth is significantly impacted by seasonal upwelling for the 2 and 5 cm initial class size. However, no significant difference between periods was observed for 8 cm coral fragments (Table 3). Regardless of the initial size, *Pocillopora* fragments grow 48% faster on average during the non-upwelling season, coinciding with a higher mean temperature during this period (Fig. 4).

Figure 3 Boxplot compilation of fragment length growth over a year depending on their initial size in Jícaro reef, Culebra Bay (A = 2 cm, B = 5 cm, C = 8 cm, D = all sizes). The ANOVA test followed by the Tukey HSD test shows a significant difference between, at least, January and December for all the initial fragment sizes ((A) $p < 0.001$, $F_{10,261} = 39.9$; (B) $p < 0.001$, $F_{10,321} = 56.5$; (C) $p < 0.001$, $F_{10,349} = 9.5$; (D) $p < 0.001$, $F_{10,953} = 35.2$).

Table 2 Mean growth rate of *Pocillopora* spp. fragments from January to December 2020 depending on their initial class size in Jícaro reef, Culebra Bay.

Initial class size	Length		Width		Area	
	Growth rate (cm year^{-1})	Relative growth (%)	Growth rate (cm year^{-1})	Relative growth (%)	Growth rate (cm² year^{-1})	Relative growth (%)
A	4.49 ± 1.19	164 ± 78	3.38 ± 1.19	222 ± 181	21.08 ± 6.32*	752 ± 493
B	4.28 ± 1.48	92 ± 43	4.28 ± 1.53	162 ± 93	46.36 ±12.67*	526 ± 303
C	3.25 ± 2.22	45 ± 59	3.05 ± 2.15	73 ± 83	36.32 ± 18.73*	189 ± 161
Total average	4.12 ± 2.77	87 ± 74	3.51 ± 2.47	139 ± 130	34.97 ± 23.01	438 ± 384

Note:
A = 2 cm, B = 5 cm, C = 8 cm (*represent the significant differences between class sizes). The two-way ANOVA and Tukey HSD tests for the area measures show significant differences between all class sizes ($F_{4,186}$ = 5.49): A and B ($p < 0.001$); A–C ($p < 0.05$); B and C ($p < 0.05$).

Table 3 Comparison of month relative length means difference in growth between upwelling season (January to April) and non-upwelling season (May to December).

Initial class size	Length (cm month^{-1})		Width (cm month^{-1})		Area (cm² month^{-1})	
	Upwelling	No upwelling	Upwelling	No upwelling	Upwelling	No upwelling
A	0.27 ± 0.12	0.39 ± 0.47*	0.19 ± 0.10	0.35 ± 0.25*	0.60 ± 0.39	2.3 ± 2.24*
B	0.32 ± 0.17	0.49 ± 0.82*	0.31 ± 0.02	0.48 ± 0.83*	2.08 ± 0.64	4.85 ± 8.84*
C	0.22 ± 0.03	0.32 ± 0.51	0.27 ± 0.06	0.28 ± 0.44	3.22 ± 0.58	3.22 ± 3.99
Total	0.27 ± 0.60	0.4 ± 0.59*	0.26 ± 0.08	0.37 ± 0.54*	1.97 ± 1.23	3.46 ± 3.99*

Note:
T-tests show significant difference of mean growth (represented by "*" in the table) between the upwelling season and the non-upwelling season for all initial class sizes (A = 2 cm, B = 5 cm and C = 8 cm). Total: A ($t = -5.8$; $p < 0.001$; df = 57), B ($t = -6.02$; $p < 0.001$; df = 57) and C ($t = -6.93$; $p < 0.001$; df = 57).

Figure 4 Average seawater temperatures in Culebra Bay over the year 2020. Gray lines represent standard deviations, red line represents 2020 mean temperature and area between dashed lines represent the upwelling period. The mean temperature for the upwelling period (January to April) is 25.97 ± 2.16 °C (min = 18.53 °C; max = 29.91 °C) and 27.92 ± 1.62 °C (min = 22.2 °C; max = 31.08 °C) for the non-upwelling period (May to December).

DISCUSSION

Coral reef management is a key issue in the current context of global change. Assessing the resilience of coral species and identifying sites conducive to the survival of corals is thus crucial in order to improve management actions (*McLeod et al., 2021*). While whether corals will have the ability to acclimate rapidly enough to the new environmental conditions is still under debate (*Maynard et al., 2008*; *Eakin, 2014*; *Torda et al., 2017*; *Coles et al., 2018*), active coral reef restoration is emerging worldwide as a tool for assisting coral reef recovery and rehabilitation (*Rinkevich, 2019*). Several restoration strategies have been developed, such as structural complexity enhancement by artificial substrates, which increase coral recruitment and can be used as an alternative or addition to coral transplantation for reef restoration purposes (*Yanovski & Abelson, 2019*; *Hein et al., 2020*). This type of structures has mainly been used in the Indo-Pacific, specifically in the Maldives and Thailand, where metallic structures called "frames" were set up (*Hein, Couture & Scott, 2018*; *Hein et al., 2020*). However, their use is recent, the coral species used are not the same, and environmental conditions in those areas are different from those in the ETP (*Kench, 2009*; *Lizano & Alfaro, 2014*). This makes comparisons difficult and obtained data are not necessarily transferable to other reefs in other oceanic regions (*Sherman, Gilliam & Spieler, 2001*). Therefore, it appears necessary to generate data on the performance of this kind of structures under the conditions in the ETP, in order to assess their viability in this oceanic region.

Evaluating this strategy involves monitoring fragment mortality and growth, and associating the data with environmental information from the area. In this study, *Pocillopora* fragment mortality was not significantly influenced by initial fragment size. The month with the highest mortality was February, just one month after the fragmentation event and start of the experiment, with nine dead fragments, 66% of which were 2 cm long. A positive relationship between coral fragment survival and size has been established in several studies (*Connell, 1973*; *Hughes, 1984*; *Lizcano-Sandoval,*

Londoño-Cruz & Zapata, 2018; *Ishida-Catañeda et al., 2020*). Research on *Pocillopora* has found that smaller coral fragments are more vulnerable to detrimental factors due to their greater surface/volume ratio. This means that a lesion on the coral tissue can cause greater damage than in larger fragments, and thus it makes them more sensitive to manipulation, competition with other organisms and predation (*Raymundo & Maypa, 2004*; *Lizcano-Sandoval, Londoño-Cruz & Zapata, 2018*; *Ishida-Catañeda et al., 2020*). According to the micro fragmentation theory, this can be compensated by small fragments growing more rapidly at first compared to larger fragments or colonies, so that they can quickly reach a size which makes them less vulnerable to impacts (*Forsman, Rinkenvich & Hunter, 2006*; *Page, Muller & Vaughan, 2018*; *Tortolero-Langarica et al., 2020*). However, our results show no significant differences between linear growth rates of 2 cm fragments and the other class sizes. The bay possesses a great productivity (*Fernández-García, 2007*; *Stuhldreier et al., 2015a*) making the structures a suitable substrate for the settlement of benthic, fast-growing, opportunistic species, such as barnacles, ascidians, and sponges. These benthic organisms compete with coral fragments and can affect their growth and survival (*Glynn et al., 2017*). Although monthly maintenance of the structures limits this effect, their great abundance and presence on the "spiders" could have had an effect on coral fragments, especially on the smaller class size, because of their limited surface. These smaller coral fragments might not have been able to compete for space against these other organisms. Due to their small size, several of their energy reserves were probably not available, and therefore were presumably being used to recover from fragmentation stress, and not for growth and defense against competitors (*Leuzinger, Anthony & Williw, 2003*; *Henry & Hart, 2005*). Hence, it is assumed that the small fragments used in this study were the most fragile and affected by these detrimental factors, and thus did not resist the stress of fragmentation and change in environment during the first weeks of the experiment.

The loss of 32 coral fragments during the course of the experiment could be explained by several reasons: (i) cable ties being either too tight and resulting in fragment break, or too loose cable ties, causing them to fall, especially small (2 cm) fragments; or (ii) clumsiness during the manual cleaning and maintenance of the restoration structures. These lost fragments are not included in the survivorship results, since it is not possible to determine whether they survived in the reef or not. The observed decrease in growth and fragment size between two consecutive months in some coral fragments can possibly be a result of intrinsic variations of the colony, either by partial mortality of coral tissue, or natural fragmentation processes.

The growth rates of *P. damicornis* and *P. elegans* in Culebra Bay were determined in 1995–1996, with a mean of 5.3 ± 0.4 cm year^{-1} and 4.1 ± 0.6 cm year^{-1}, respectively, using 13 cm long fragments (*Jiménez & Cortés, 2003*). Under stressful conditions, in the presence of the competitor macroalgae *Caulerpa sertularioides*, *Pocillopora* corals (no initial size reported) in the bay show a lower growth rate (2.5 cm year^{-1}) than without it (4.2 cm year^{-1}) (*Fernández-García, 2007*). In the present study, a length growth rate of 4.49 ± 1.19 cm year^{-1}, 5.35 ± 1.48 cm year^{-1} and 3.25 ± 2.22 cm year^{-1} respectively for the 2, 5 and 8 cm initial size was established (Table 2), along with and an overall growth

rate of 4.12 ± 2.77 cm year^{-1}. These results seem to follow the rate calculated by *Jiménez & Cortés (2003)* on the reef in the 1990s, when coral reef ecosystems in the bay were considered healthier. This means that fragments on the "spiders" are growing at a similar rate to corals growing naturally in the reef. These results are quite high compared to other reefs of the ETP: for example, in Caño Island (South Pacific of Costa Rica), the rate for 15–25 cm long fragments is 2.9 ± 0.3 cm year^{-1} for *P. damicornis* and 3.17 ± 0.3 cm year^{-1} for *P. elegans* (*Guzmán & Cortés, 1989*). In the Central Mexican Pacific, the growth rate is 3.5 ± 0.6 cm year^{-1}, with no initial size being mentioned (*Tortolero-Langarica et al., 2017*). The lowest *Pocillopora* growth rates reported for the ETP are in the Gulf of Chiquiri (Panama) and Colombia, with 2.6 cm year^{-1} (initial size = 6.3 ± 1.4 cm) (*Randall et al., 2020*) and 2.3 cm year^{-1} (no initial size mentioned) (*Zapata & Vargas-Angel, 2003*), respectively. It is hypothesized that the higher growth rate in Culebra Bay is linked to the specific conditions of the bay, with the seasonal upwelling bringing up more productive waters, which could lead to an increase of the corals heterotrophic feeding (*Jiménez & Cortés, 2003*). These results also show that the corals of Culebra Bay are particularly acclimated to the specific environmental conditions of the bay, which make them an example of growth under suboptimal conditions, with incursions of colder and more acidic waters (*Rixen, Jiménez & Cortés, 2012*; *Sánchez-Noguera et al., 2018*).

Understanding the best initial fragment size is vital for efficient restoration activities. Even though this has been established for many species in other regions, information on *Pocillopora* corals and under ETP conditions is limited (but see *Lizcano-Sandoval, Londoño-Cruz & Zapata, 2018*; *Ishida-Catañeda et al., 2020*). Moreover, even though initial fragment size seems to be an important factor for coral growth, most studies do not consider it in their analysis. Based on our results, it can be assumed that 2 cm fragments are not of an optimal size when rearing as many corals as possible onto the reef, since they experience high mortality during the first months after fragmentation, and are more fragile and prone to breaking. On the other hand, it was found that larger fragments (between 5 and 8 cm) grow at a similar rate while experiencing lower mortality. However, extracting larger fragments and repeated fragmentation of coral colonies can compromise the survival of these donor colonies, and it may lead to reduced sexual reproduction (*Zakai, Levy & Chadwick-Furman, 2000*), which could in turn impact the development of the whole coral reef ecosystem. The recovery of donor colonies after fragmentation events should also be assessed in order to evaluate the impact of extracting large coral fragments.

Corals from Culebra Bay have already been confronted by stressing episodes which have had an effect on the coral reef ecosystem (*Jiménez, 2001*; *Alvarado, Cortés & Reyes-Bonilla, 2012*; *Fernández-García et al., 2012*). Nonetheless, ETP reefs have shown a high resilience to stressing events (*Romero-Torres et al., 2020*), which would allow large-scale rehabilitation even after severe disturbances, such as El Niño events (*Williams et al., 2018*). Culebra Bay is located in one of the three seasonal upwelling areas of the ETP, which from December to April brings colder and more acidic waters to the surface, with a higher concentration of nutrients (*Rixen, Jiménez & Cortés, 2012*; *Stuhldreier et al., 2015a*; *Sánchez-Noguera et al., 2018*). The decrease in seawater

temperature and increase in productivity can have an effect on coral growth and survival (*Clausen & Roth, 1975*; *Coles & Jokiel, 1978*). Our results show a difference in growth between the upwelling and non-upwelling periods: coral growth increased 48% on average during the non-upwelling period (May to December) compared to the upwelling period. Similar results were obtained in the bay when comparing the growth rate of *Pocillopora* spp. during seasons, with higher rates occurring during the non-upwelling season (*Fernández-García, 2007*). However, 8 cm fragments were not found to be significantly impacted by the presence of the seasonal upwelling. These fragments also correspond to the size class with the lowest growth rate. It is thus hypothesised that since these coral fragments are already large, they allocate less energy to their growth rather than in other physiological processes. The lower temperatures during upwelling, with incursions of 18.5 °C waters, could also be responsible for the higher mortality of coral fragments during the first months of the experiment, coinciding with the possible stress caused by fragmentation and smaller size of the coral fragments. Studies on the effect of cold water on branching corals have found that in the short term, low temperatures can be more damaging than warm temperatures, but acclimatation is possible after a few weeks, and corals can recover quickly when temperatures rise back (*Jokiel & Coles, 1977*; *Roth, Goericke & Deheyn, 2012*; *Rodríguez-Troncoso et al., 2014*). Even though it has been suggested that in case of stress, corals preferentially use heterotrophic feeding and use lipids stored in their tissues (*Grottoli, Rodrigues & Juarez, 2004*; *Grottoli, Rodrigues & Palardy, 2016*; *Rodríguez-Troncoso, Carpizo-Ituarte & Cupul-Magaña, 2010*), it seems that this type of feeding is less efficient in terms of nutrition than autotrophy. Considering this, we suggest that restoration activities in Culebra Bay, such as fragmentation of new corals, should take place after the upwelling season; thus, smaller newly generated fragments would have higher chances of surviving the initial months and could reach a larger size before the upwelling begun and temperatures decreased again. Restoration efforts in these areas of the ETP where seasonal upwelling is present should thus take into account these considerations for the optimal growth of *Pocillopora* spp. fragments.

Considering our results, the use of "spiders" is a viable option for coral reef rehabilitation and restoration, and their effect could be scaled up by increasing the number of structures in order to cover a greater extension and add more structural complexity to the reef. Even though 47.61% of initial coral fragments were either lost or died during the experiment, it allowed us to determine the most resistant fragment sizes, and thus those that should be used on future restoration efforts. Other factors must also be considered, such as the location of the structures and the donor sites for coral fragments. Beyond the technical aspects of a restoration project, two main limiting factors exist: the economic aspect—which includes the costs of setting up and maintaining the structures (*Dunning, 2015*; *Hesley et al., 2017*)—and the communication about conservation strategy (*Dunning, 2015*). These structures have a relatively lower cost to other underwater coral nurseries, only costing around US$25 per structure (US$0.66 per coral fragment, excluding indirect costs). Moreover, they require less time to clean and maintain: one "spider" can be cleaned by one diver in around 15 min, which is considerably less time than what is needed for other structures in the same restoration project, such as rope nurseries

or PVC and glass fiber coral trees (1.6 m long × 1.2 m wide) (S. Fabregat-Malé, 2021, personal communication). These limitations can be bypassed with the involvement of local communities and tourists by creating a participative program (*Hein et al., 2019*) in which the cost of the project will be reduced and there will be an increase in public awareness and workforce, allowing for larger-scale restoration efforts. The restoration project in Culebra Bay, which started on August 2019 with coral gardening techniques (S. Fabregat-Malé et al., 2020, unpublished data), is now complemented by the use of artificial structures in this project, leading towards its expansion through greater restoration efforts and the implementation of a participatory program. This study complements those already carried out and in progress, allowing an improvement of the techniques used to optimise the restoration efforts of reefs in Culebra Bay.

CONCLUSIONS

Active restoration has become a key management tool to rehabilitate anthropogenically deteriorated coral reefs. In Culebra Bay, North Pacific of Costa Rica, coral reefs have suffered several degrading episodes in the last decades but are currently subject to ecological restoration actions. Various transplantation techniques are used with the genus *Pocillopora*, including the coral gardening approach. Here, a new technique in the ETP was tested, consisting in rearing coral fragments on artificial structures ("spiders"), which not only work as a nursery and substrate for coral fragments to grow on, but also add structural complexity to the reef. Our findings show that small *Pocillopora* fragments are especially vulnerable and sensitive to environmental stresses during the first months after fragmentation, which results in higher mortality rates. Even though we found no significant differences in linear growth between size classes, the smallest class size appears to be less optimal than larger ones if restoration efforts are to be scaled. The presence of a seasonal upwelling in the bay has an effect on coral growth, most likely due to cold temperatures. The upwelling brings up deeper and nutrient-rich waters, resulting in the proliferation of opportunistic and highly competitive benthic organisms (*Fernández-García et al., 2012*; *Stuhldreier et al., 2015b*), which could potentially have an effect on coral growth and survival. This information is key in order to plan restoration activities in areas affected by seasonal upwelling, since fragments will grow more optimally if transplanted at the end of the upwelling season, and will be robust enough to cope with the next upwelling period as they will have reached a larger size. Our data also show how corals can survive under suboptimal conditions when acclimated to such an environment. Studying the particular characteristics of these areas is essential to understanding, optimising and innovating reef restoration strategies at local scales, especially in the ETP region, where information is still scarce.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present investigation would not have been possible without the logistical and scientific support of Centro de Investigación en Ciencias del Mar y Limnología (CIMAR) of the University of Costa Rica and students who helped during fieldwork and data collection for this project. We would also like to thank José Francisco Cascante, who built the structures

used in this experiment. We especially thank Península Papagayo for their logistical support. Fieldwork would not have been possible without the help from Carlos Marenco and the staff of Marina Papagayo, to whom we are really thankful.

Funding

This work was supported by the University of Costa Rica. Península Papagayo provided economic support. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Grant Disclosures

The following grant information was disclosed by the authors:
University of Costa Rica.
Península Papagayo.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author Contributions

- Lisa Combillet conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.
- Sònia Fabregat-Malé conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.
- Sebastián Mena conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.
- José Andrés Marín-Moraga conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.
- Monica Gutierrez performed the experiments, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.
- Juan José Alvarado conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.

Data Availability

The raw data is available in the Supplemental Files. The code is available on RPubs by R Studio: https://rpubs.com/LisaCom/806915.

Supplemental Information

Supplemental information for this article can be found online at http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.13248#supplemental-information.

REFERENCES

Alfaro EJ, Cortés J. 2012. Atmospheric forcing of cool subsurface water events in Bahia Culebra, Gulf of Papagayo, Costa Rica. *Revista de Biologia Tropical* **60**:173–186 DOI 10.15517/RBT.V60I2.20001.

Alfaro EJ, Cortés J, Alvarado JJ, Jiménez C, León A, Sánchez-Noguera C, Nivia-Ruiz J, Ruiz E. 2012. Clima y temperatura sub-superficial del mar en Bahía Culebra, Golfo de Papagayo, Costa Rica. *Revista de Biología Tropical* **60**:159–171 DOI 10.15517/rbt.v60i2.20000.

Alvarado JJ, Beita-Jiménez A, Mena S, Fernandez-Garcia C. 2018. Cuando la conservación no puede seguir el ritmo del desarrollo: estado de salud de los ecosistemas coralinos del Pacífico Norte de Costa Rica. *Revista de Biología Tropical* **66**:S280–S308 DOI 10.15517/rbt.v66i1.33300.

Alvarado JJ, Cortés J, Guzman HM, Reyes-Bonilla H. 2016. Bioerosion by the sea urchin *Diadema mexicanum* along Eastern Tropical Pacific coral reef. *Marine Ecology* **37**:1088–1102 DOI 10.1111/maec.12372.

Alvarado JJ, Cortés J, Reyes-Bonilla H. 2012. Reconstruction of *Diadema mexicanum* bioerosion impact on three Costa Rican Pacific coral reefs. *Revista de Biología Tropical* **60**:121–132 DOI 10.15517/rbt.v60i2.19975.

Arias-Godinez G, Jiménez C, Gamboa C, Cortés J, Espinoza M, Alvarado JJ. 2019. Spatial and temporal changes in reef fish assemblages on disturbed coral reefs, north Pacific coast of Costa Rica. *Marine Ecology* **40(1)**:e12532 DOI 10.1111/maec.12532.

Bayraktarov E, Banaszak AT, Montoya Maya P, Kleypas J, Arias-González JE, Blanco M, Calle-Trivino J, Charuvi N, Cortés-Useche C, Galvan V, Garcia Salgado MA, Gnecco M, Guendulain-Garcia SD, Hernandez E, Moraga JAM, Maya MF, Quiroz SM, Cervantes SM, Morikawa M, Nava G, Pizarro V, Sellares R, Suleimán-Ramos SE, Villalobos T, Villalpando M, Frías-Torres S. 2020. Coral reef restoration efforts in Latin American countries and territories. *PLOS ONE* **15(8)**:e0228477 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0228477.

Boström-Einarsson L, Babcock RC, Bayraktarov E, Ceccarelli D, Cook N, Ferse SCA, Hancock C, Hein M, Shaver E, Smith A, Suggett D, Stewart-Sinclair PJ, Vardi T, McLeod IM. 2020. Coral restoration-a systematic review of current methods, successes, failures and future directions. *PLOS ONE* **15**:e0226631 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0226631.

Brainard RE, Oliver T, McPhaden MJ, Cohen A, Venegas R, Heenan A.Vargas-Angel B, Rotjan R, Mangubhai S, Flint E, Hunter SA. 2018. Chapter 5: ecological impacts of the 2015/16 El Nino in the central equatorial Pacific. In: *Explaining extreme events of 2016 – from a climate perspective.* 21–26 Special supplement to the Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society.

Clausen CD, Roth AA. 1975. Effect of temperature and temperature adaptation on calcification rate in the hermatypic coral *Pocillopora damicornis*. *Marine Biology* **33**:93–100 DOI 10.1007/BF00390713.

Coles SL, Bahr KD, Rodgers KS, May SL, McGowan AE, Tsang A, Bumgarner J, Han JH. 2018. Evidence of acclimatization or adaptation in Hawaiian corals to higher ocean temperatures. *PeerJ* **6**:e5347 DOI 10.7717/peerj.5347.

Coles SL, Jokiel PL. 1978. Synergistic effects of temperature, salinity and light on the hermatypic coral *Montipora verrucosa*. *Marine Biology* **49**:187–195 DOI 10.1007/BF00391130.

Connell JH. 1973. Population ecology of reef building corals. In: Jones OA, Endean R, eds. *Biology and Geology of Coral Reefs.* Vol. 2. New York (NY): Academic Press, 205–245.

Cortés J. 1997. Biology and geology of Eastern Pacific coral reefs. *Coral Reefs* **16**:39–S46 DOI 10.1007/s003380050240.
Cortés J, Jiménez C. 2003. Corals and coral reefs of the Pacific of Costa Rica: history, research and status. *Latin America Coral Reefs* 2003:361–385 DOI 10.1016/B978-044451388-5/50017-5.

Cortés J, Jiménez C, Fonseca AC, Alvarado JJ. 2010. Status and conservation of coral reefs in Costa Rica. *Revista de Biologia Tropical* 58:33–50 DOI 10.15517/rbt.v58i1.20022.

Dunning KH. 2015. Ecosystem services and community-based coral reef management institutions in post blast-fishing Indonesia. *Ecosystem Services* 16:319–332 DOI 10.1016/j.ecoser.2014.11.010.

Eakin CM. 2014. Lamarck was partially right—and that is good for corals. *Science* 344(6186):798–799 DOI 10.1126/science.1254136.

Eddy TD, Lam VWY, Reygondeau G, Cisneros-Montemayor AM, Greer K, Palomares MLD, Bruno JF, Ota Y, Cheung WWL. 2021. Global decline in capacity of coral reefs to provide ecosystem services. *One Earth* 4:1278–1285 DOI 10.1016/j.oneear.2021.08.016.

El-Naggar HA. 2020. Human impacts on coral reef ecosystems. In: *Natural Resources Management and Biological Sciences*. London: Intech Open.

Fernández-García C. 2007. Propagación del alga *Caulerpa sertularioides* (Chlorophyta) en Bahía Culebra, Golfo de Papagayo, Pacífico norte de Costa Rica. Master Thesis, Universidad de Costa Rica. San Pedro, Costa Rica.

Fernández-García C, Cortés J, Alvarado JJ, Nivia-Ruiz J. 2012. Physical factors contributing to the benthic dominance of the alga *Caulerpa sertularioides* (Caulerpaceae, Chlorophyta) in the upwelling Bahía Culebra, north Pacific of Costa Rica. *Revista de Biología Tropical* 60(Suppl. 2):93–107 DOI 10.15517/RBT.V60I2.19970.

Fiedler PC, Lavín MF. 2017. Oceanographic conditions of the Eastern Tropical Pacific. In: Glynn PW, Manzello DP, Enochs IC, eds. *Coral Reefs of the Eastern Tropical Pacific: Persistence and Loss in a Dynamic Environment*. Berlin: Springer, 59–83.

Forsman ZH, Rinkenvich B, Hunter CL. 2006. Investigating fragment size for culturing reef-building corals (*Porites lobata* and *P. compressa*) in ex situ nurseries. *Aquaculture* 261:89–97 DOI 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2006.06.040.

Glynn PW. 1984. Widespread coral mortality and the 1982–83 El Nino warming event. *Environmental Conservation* 11(2):133–146 DOI 10.1017/S0376892900013825.

Glynn PW, Reyes-Bonilla H, Cortés J, Jiménez C, Maté J, Vargas A, Zapata F, Wieters EA, Navarrete S, Hubbard DK, Alvarado JJ. 2017. Eastern Pacific coral reef regions, coral community composition and reef structure: an overview. In: Glynn PW, Manzello DP, Enochs IC, eds. *Coral Reefs of the Eastern Tropical Pacific: Persistence and Loss in a Dynamic Environment*. Berlin: Springer, 107–176.

Grottoli AG, Rodrigues LJ, Juarez C. 2004. Lipids and stable carbon isotopes in two species of Hawaiian corals *Porites compressa* and *Montipora verrucosa*, following a bleaching event. *Marine Biology* 145(3):621–631 DOI 10.1007/s00227-004-1337-3.

Grottoli AG, Rodrigues LJ, Palardy J. 2016. Heterotrophic plasticity and resilience in bleached corals. *Nature* 440:1186–1189 DOI 10.1038/nature04565.

Guzmán HM, Cortés J. 1989. Growth rates of eight species of Scleratinian corals in the Eastern Pacific (Costa Rica). *Bulletin of Marine Science* 44:1186–1194.

Guzmán HM, Cortés J. 1993. Arrecifes coralinos del Pacífico Oriental Tropical: revisión y perspectivas. *Revista de Biologia Tropical* 41:535–557.

Guzmán HM, Cortés J, Richmond RH, Glynn PW. 1987. Efectos del fenómeno de "El Niño Oscilación Sureña" 1982/83 en los arrecifes coralinos de la Isla del Caño, Costa Rica. *Revista de Biologia Tropical* 35:325–332.

Hein MY, Beeden R, Birtles A, Gardiner NM, Le Berre T, Levy J, Marshall N, Scott CM, Terry L, Willis BL. 2020. Coral restoration effectiveness: multiregional snapshots of the long-term responses of coral assemblages to restoration. *Diversity* **12(4)**:153–175 DOI 10.3390/d12040153.

Hein MY, Birtles A, Willis BL, Gardiner N, Beeden R, Marshall NA. 2019. Coral restoration: socio-ecological perspectives of benefits and limitations. *Biological Conservation* **229(1669)**:14–25 DOI 10.1016/j.biocon.2018.11.014.

Hein MY, Couture F, Scott CM. 2018. Ecotourism and coral reef restoration: case studies from Thailand and the Maldives. In: Prideaux B, Pabel A, eds. *Coral Reefs: Tourism, Conservation, and Management*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 137–150.

Henry LA, Hart M. 2005. Regeneration from injury and resource allocation in sponges and corals —a review. *International Review of Hydrobiology* **90**:125–158 DOI 10.1002/(ISSN)1522-2632.

Hesley D, Burdeno D, Drury C, Schopmeyer S, Lirman D. 2017. Citizen science benefits coral reef restoration activities. *Journal for Nature Conservation* **40(11)**:94–99 DOI 10.1016/j.jnc.2017.09.001.

Hughes TP. 1984. Population dynamics based on individual size rather than age: a general model with a reef coral example. *The American Naturalist* **123(6)**:778–795 DOI 10.1086/284239.

Hughes TP, Kerry JT, Álvarez-Noriega M, Álvarez-Romero JG, Anderson KD, Baird AH, Babcock RC, Beger M, Bellwood DR, Berkelmans R, Bridge TC, Butler IR, Byrne M, Cantin NE, Comeau S, Connolly SR, Cumming GS, Dalton SJ, Diaz-Pulido G, Eakin CM, Figueira WF, Gilmour JP, Harrison HB, Heron SF, Hoey AS, Hobbs J-PA, Hoogenboom MO, Kennedy EV, Kuo C-Y, Lough JM, Lowe RJ, Liu G, McCulloch MT, Malcolm HA, McWilliam MJ, Pandolfi JM, Pears RJ, Pratchett MS, Schoepf V, Simpson T, Skirving WJ, Sommer B, Torda G, Wachenfeld DR, Willis BL, Wilson SK. 2017. Global warming and recurrent mass bleaching of corals. *Nature* **543(7645)**:373–377 DOI 10.1038/nature21707.

Ishida-Catañeda J, Pizarro V, Lopez-Victoria M, Zapata FA. 2020. Coral reef restoration in the Eastern Tropical Pacific: feasibility of the coral nursery approach. *Restoration Ecology* **28(1)**:22–28 DOI 10.1111/rec.13047.

Jiménez C. 2001. Arrecifes y ambientes coralinos de Bahía Culebra, Pacífico de Costa Rica: aspectos biológicos, económico-recreativos y de manejo. *Revista de Biología Tropical* **49**:S215–S231.

Jiménez C, Cortés J. 2001. Changes in reef community structure after fifteen years of natural disturbances in the eastern Pacific (Costa Rica). *Bulletin of Marine Science* **69(1)**:133–149.

Jiménez C, Cortés J. 2003. Growth of seven species of Scleratinian corals in an upwelling environment of the Eastern Pacific (Golfo de Papagayo, Costa Rica). *Bulletin of Marine Science* **72**:187–198.

Jiménez C, Cortés J, Leon A, Ruiz E. 2001. Coral bleaching and mortality associated with the 1997–98 El Nino in an upwelling environment in the Eastern Pacific (Gulf of Papagayo, Costa Rica). *Bulletin of Marine Science* **69**:151–169.

Jokiel PL, Coles SL. 1977. Effects of temperature on the mortality and growth of Hawaiian reef corals. *Marine Biology* **43**:201–208 DOI 10.1007/BF00402312.

Kench P. 2009. Maldives. In: Gillespie R, Clague D, eds. *Encyclopedia of Islands*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 586–587.

Knowlton N, Grottoli AG, Kleypas J, Obura D, Corcoran E, de Goeij J, Felis T, Harding S, Mayfield A, Miller M, Osuka K, Peixoto R, Randall CJ, Voolstra CR, Wells S, Wild C, Ferse S. 2021. Rebuilding coral reefs: a decadal grand challenge. *Waco, Bremen: International Coral Reef Society and Future Earth Coasts* DOI 10.53642/NRKY9386.

Leuzinger S, Anthony KRN, Williw BL. 2003. Reproductive energy investment in corals: scaling with module size. *Oecologia* **136**:524–531 DOI 10.1007/s00442-003-1305-5.

Lizano OG, Alfaro EJ. 2014. Dinámica atmosférica y oceánica en algunos sitios del Área de Conservación Guanacaste (ACG), Costa Rica. *Revista de Biología Tropical* **62(4)**:17–31 DOI 10.15517/rbt.v62i4.20018.

Lizcano-Sandoval LD, Londoño-Cruz E, Zapata FA. 2018. Growth and survival of *Pocillopora damicornis* (Scleractinia: Pocilloporidae) coral fragments and their potential for reef restoration in the Tropical Eastern Pacific. *Marine Biology Research* **14**:887–897 DOI 10.1080/17451000.2018.1528011.

Liñan-Cabello MA, Flores-Ramirez LA, Laurel-Sandoval MA, Garcia Mendoza E, Soriano Santiago O, Delgadillo-Nuño MA. 2011. Acclimatation in *Pocillopora* spp. during a coral restoration program in Carrizales Bay, Colima, Mexico. *Marine and Freshwater Behaviour and Physiology* **44**:61–72 DOI 10.1080/10236244.2010.537440.

Maynard JA, Anthony KRN, Marshall PA, Masiri I. 2008. Major bleaching events can lead to increased thermal tolerance in corals. *Marine Biology* **155**:173–182 DOI 10.1007/s00227-008-1015-y.

McLeod E, Shaver EC, Beger M, Koss J, Grmsditch G. 2021. Using resilience assessments to inform the management and conservation of coral reef ecosystems. *Journal of Environmental Management* **277**:111384 DOI 10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111384.

Nava H, Figueroa-Camacho AG. 2017. Rehabilitation of damaged reefs: outcome of the use of recently broken coral fragments and healed coral fragments of pocilloporids corals on rocky boulders. *Marine Ecology* **38**:1–10 DOI 10.1111/maec.12456.

Page CP, Muller EM, Vaughan DE. 2018. Microfragmenting for the successful restoration of slow growing massive corals. *Ecological Engineering* **123**:86–94 DOI 10.1016/j.ecoleng.2018.08.017.

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

Randall CJ, Toth LT, Leichter JJ, Maté JL, Aronson RB. 2020. Upwelling buffers climate change impacts on coral reefs of the eastern tropical Pacific. *Ecology* **101(2)**:e02918 DOI 10.1002/ecy.2918.

Raymundo LR, Maypa AP. 2004. Getting bigger faster: mediation of size-specific mortality via fusion in juvenile coral transplants. *Ecological Applications* **14(1)**:281–295 DOI 10.1890/02-5373.

Rinkevich B. 1995. Restoration strategies for coral reefs damaged by recreational activities: the use of sexual and asexual recuits. *Restoration Ecology* **3(4)**:241–251 DOI 10.1111/j.1526-100X.1995.tb00091.x.

Rinkevich B. 2006. The coral gardening concept and the use of underwater nurseries: lessons learned from silvics and silviculture. In: Precht WF, ed. *Coral Reef Restoration Handbook*. Boca Raton: CRC Press, 291–301.

Rinkevich B. 2019. The active reef restoration toolbox is a vehicle for coral resilience and adaptation in a changing world. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering* **7(7)**:201 DOI 10.3390/jmse7070201.

Rixen T, Jiménez C, Cortés J. 2012. Impact of upwelling events on the seawater carbonate chemistry and dissolved oxygen concentration in the Gulf of Papagayo (Culebra Bay), Costa Rica: implications for coral reefs. *Revista de Biologia Tropical* **60(Suppl. 2)**:187–195 DOI 10.15517/rbt.v60i2.20004.

Rodríguez-Troncoso AP, Carpizo-Ituarte E, Cupul-Magaña AL. 2010. Differential response to cold and warm water conditions in Pocillopora colonies from the Central Mexican Pacific.

Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology **391**:57–64
DOI 10.1016/j.jembe.2010.06.006.

Rodríguez-Troncoso AP, Carpizo-Ituarte E, Pettay DT, Warner ME, Cupul-Magaña AL. 2014.
The effects of an abnormal decrease in temperature on the Eastern Pacific reef-building coral
Pocillopora verrucosa. Marine Biology **161**:131–139 DOI 10.1007/s00227-013-2322-5.

Rogers CS. 1990. Response of coral reefs and reef organisms to sedimentation. *Marine Ecology
Progress Series* **62**:185–202 DOI 10.3354/MEPS062185.

**Romero-Torres M, Acosta A, Palacio-Castro AM, Treml EA, Zapata FA, Paz-Garcia DA,
Porter JW. 2020.** Coral reef resilience to thermal stress in the Eastern Tropical Pacific. *Global
Change Biology* **26**:3880–3890 DOI 10.1111/gcb.15126.

Roth MS, Goericke R, Deheyn DD. 2012. Cold induces acute stress but heat is ultimately more
deleterious for the reef-building coral *Acropora yongei. Scientific Reports* **2(1)**:240
DOI 10.1038/srep00240.

**Salas-Moya C, Fabregat-Malé S, Vargas-Castillo R, Valverde JM, Vasquez-Fallas F,
Sibaja-Cordero J, Alvarado JJ. 2021.** Pocillopora cryptofauna and their response to host coral
mortality. *Symbiosis* **84(1)**:91–103 DOI 10.1007/s13199-021-00771-7.

Shafir S, Rinkevich B. 2010. Integrated long-term mid-water coral nurseries: a management
instrument evolving into a floating ecosystem. *Mauritius Research Journal* **16**:365–379.

Sherman RL, Gilliam DS, Spieler RE. 2001. Site dependent differences in artificial reef function:
implications for coral reef restoration. *Bulletin of Marine Science* **69**:1053–1056.

Stuhldreier I, Sánchez-Noguera C, Roth F, Cortés J, Rixen T, Wild C. 2015a. Upwelling increases
net primary production of corals and reef-wide gross primary production along the pacific coast
of Costa Rica. *Frontiers in Marine Science* **2**:113 DOI 10.3389/fmars.2015.00113.

Stuhldreier I, Sánchez-Noguera C, Roth F, Jiménez C, Rixen T, Cortés J, Wild C. 2015b.
Dynamics in benthic community composition and influencing factors in an upwelling-exposed
coral reef on the Pacific coast of Costa Rica. *PeerJ* **3(Suppl. 2)**:e1434 DOI 10.7717/peerj.1434.

Sánchez-Noguera C, Jiménez C, Cortés J. 2018. Desarrollo costero y ambientes marino-costeros
en Bahía Culebra, Guanacaste, Costa Rica. *Revista de Biología Tropical* **66(1)**:S309–S327
DOI 10.15517/rbt.v66i1.33301.

Sánchez-Noguera C, Stuhldreier I, Cortés C, Morales A, Wild C, Rixen T. 2018. Natural ocean
acidification at Papagayo upwelling system (north Pacific Costa Rica): implications for reef
development. *Biogeosciences* **15(8)**:2349–2360 DOI 10.5194/bg-15-2349-2018.

**Torda G, Donelson JM, Aranda M, Barshis DJ, Bay L, Berumen ML, Bourne DG, Cantin N,
Foret S, Matz M, Miller DJ, Moya A, Putnam HM, Ravasi T, van Oppen MJH,
Vega-Thurber R, Vidal-Dupiol J, Voolstra CR, Watson SA, Whitelaw E, Willis BL,
Munday PL. 2017.** Rapid adaptive responses to climate change in corals. *Nature Climate Change*
7(9):627–636 DOI 10.1038/nclimate3374.

Tortolero-Langarica JJA, Cupul-Magaña AL, Rodriguez-Troncoso AP. 2014. Restoration of a
degraded coral reef using a natural remediation process: a case study from a Central Mexican
Pacific National Park. *Ocean & Coastal Management* **96(1)**:12–19
DOI 10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2014.04.020.

**Tortolero-Langarica JJA, Rodriguez-Troncoso AP, Cupul-Magaña AL, Carricart-Ganivet JP.
2017.** Calcification and growth rate recovery of the reef-building Pocillopora species in the
northeast tropical Pacific following an ENSO disturbance. *PeerJ* **5**:e3191
DOI 10.7717/peerj.3191.

Tortolero-Langarica JJA, Rodríguez-Troncoso AP, Cupul-Magaña AL, Rinkevich B. 2020.
Micro-fragmentation as an effective and applied tool to restore remote reefs in the Eastern

Tropical Pacific. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **17(18)**:6574 DOI 10.3390/ijerph17186574.

Vargas-Ugalde R, Gómez-Salas C, Pérez-Reyes C, Umaña-Vargas E, Acosta-Nassar M. 2020. Jardinería para la restauración coralina en el Golfo Dulce, Costa Rica: una prueba práctica. *UNED Research Journal* **12(1)**:e2809 DOI 10.22458/urj.v12i1.2809.

Williams SL, Sur C, Janetski N, Hollarsmith JA, Rapi S, Barron L, Heatwole SJ, Yusuf AM, Yusuf S, Jompa J, Mars F. 2018. Large-scale coral reef rehabilitation after blast-fishing in Indonesia. *Restoration Ecology* **27**:447–456 DOI 10.1111/rec.12866.

Woodhead AJ, Hicks CC, Norström AV, Williams GJ, Graham NA. 2019. Coral reef ecosystem services in the Anthropocene. *Functional Ecology* **33**:1023–1034 DOI 10.1111/1365-2435.13331.

Yanovski R, Abelson A. 2019. Structural complexity enhancement as a potential coral-reef restoration tool. *Ecological Engineering* **132(1)**:87–93 DOI 10.1016/j.ecoleng.2019.04.007.

Zakai D, Levy O, Chadwick-Furman NE. 2000. Experimental fragmentation reduces sexual reproductive output by the reef-building coral *Pocillopora damicornis*. *Coral Reefs* **19(2)**:185–188 DOI 10.1007/s003380000091.

Zapata FA, Vargas-Angel B. 2003. Corals and coral reefs of the Pacific coast of Colombia. In: Cortés J, ed. *Latin American Coral Reefs*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science B.V, 419–447.