**A critical review of the effect of water storage reservoirs on
organic matter decomposition in rivers**

Journal:	<i>Environmental Reviews</i>
Manuscript ID	er-2016-0041.R2
Manuscript Type:	Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Oct-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Mbaka, John; University of koblez landau, environmentalscience Wanjiru Mwaniki, Mercy; University of Bamberg, 2Department of Geography
Keyword:	dam, organic matter decomposition, energy source, ecological integrity, environment.

A critical review of the effect of water storage reservoirs on organic matter decomposition in rivers

John Gichimu Mbaka^{1*} & Mercy Wanjiru Mwaniki²

Running head: Reservoirs and organic matter decomposition

¹ Department of Biological Sciences, Egerton University, Kenya

² Department of Geography, University of Bamberg, Bamberg, Bayern, Germany; Department of Geomatic Engineering and Geospatial Information Sciences, J.K.U.A.T., Nairobi, Kenya

Contact information

mbakagichimu@gmail.com - *Corresponding author e-mail

+254 (0)718010396 – phone

mercymwaniki01@gmail.com – co-author e-mail

+4915731808923 - phone

Abstract

Organic matter decomposition is vital in sustaining river food webs. However, little is known about the effect of water storage reservoirs on organic matter decomposition in rivers. In this paper, we reviewed and analyzed 37 studies that investigated the effect of man-made reservoirs on organic matter decomposition in rivers. Most studies focused on decomposition of tree leaf litter (54.1%) and macrophytes litter (43.2%), while fewer studies evaluated decomposition of wood (2.7%). Based on qualitative analysis, the effect of small weirs on organic matter decomposition is local and the effect on most habitat variables is minimal. Mean effect sizes (Hedge's d) for organic matter decomposition were -1.98 for small weirs, -1.31 for small reservoirs and -0.66 for large reservoirs. In conclusion, this review demonstrates that in general reservoirs have a negative effect on litter decomposition. Litter decomposition, an important ecosystem process, is sensitive to impacts of reservoirs in different types of rivers.

Key words: dam, organic matter decomposition, energy source, ecological integrity, environment.

1. Introduction

Reservoirs are one of the most common human impacts on rivers worldwide (Nilsson et al. 2005). Reservoirs are constructed to supply water for purposes such as agriculture, domestic use, hydroelectric power generation and recreation. As a result of increased demand for water, the number of reservoirs increased dramatically in the last 100 years (WCD 2000). This has resulted in regulation of flow for more than half of all rivers globally (WCD 2000). Despite the various benefits that are provided by reservoirs, they may increase abiotic factors such as water temperature and nutrients and decrease biotic factors such as fungi and invertebrates, and functional ecosystem processes (e.g., litter decomposition) (Elosegi and Sabater 2013; Mbaka and Mwaniki 2015; von Shiller et al. 2015).

Most studies on the effect of reservoirs on rivers focused on habitat factors and biotic communities, such as invertebrates, fish and algae (Rosenberg et al. 1997; Ellis and Jones 2013; Mbaka and Mwaniki 2015). However, depending on the impact of reservoirs on river habitat factors and biotic communities, reservoirs also have negative or positive effects on riparian vegetation and fundamental ecosystem processes, such as organic matter decomposition; an important source of energy in rivers and greenhouse gases in the environment (Fischer and Likens 1973; Jansson et al. 2000; Abril et al. 2013). Allochthonous organic matter can contribute more than 90% carbon in headwater streams (Fischer and Likens 1973). This observation led to conceptualization of ecosystem processes, where organic matter is initially decomposed by microorganisms (e.g., fungi), and subsequently by macroinvertebrate shredders, that breakdown coarse particulate organic matter into fine organic particles (Vannote et al. 1980; Graça 2001;

Pascoal and Cássio 2004). The fine organic matter becomes a crucial food source for primary consumers, such as filtering-collectors, that are consumed by predators. Therefore, any alteration of organic matter transfer and decomposition in rivers would modify the food web structure and energy flow (Muehlbauer et al. 2009; Mendoza-Lera et al. 2012).

Given that reservoirs may cause habitat factors (e.g., nutrients, flow) to increase or decrease, their effect on biotic communities (e.g., fungi, bacteria and invertebrates) and organic matter decomposition process may be either positive or negative (Menéndez et al. 2012). Depending on study design (e.g., longitudinal location of study sites), type of organic matter, litter bags mesh size and characteristics related to reservoirs, such as trophic status, water release mechanism, size and water residence time, reservoirs may have varied effects on biotic and abiotic factors and organic matter decomposition process (Nelson and Roline 2000; Menéndez et al. 2012; Quintão et al. 2013; Mbaka and Mwaniki 2015). Differences in response of biotic and abiotic factors among rivers may increase or decrease organic matter decomposition rates in reservoirs, upstream sites flooded by reservoirs or downstream sites (Short and Ward 1980; Casas et al. 2000; Menéndez et al. 2012). For example, Quintão et al. (2013) evaluated the effect of two large reservoirs (i.e., reservoirs with water storage capacity greater than 3,000,000 m³, WCD 2000), with different trophic status, on aquatic macrophytes (*Eichhornia* sp., *Typha* sp.) leaves decomposition rates using 10 mm mesh size litter bags. The authors found the highest decomposition rates in the eutrophic reservoir. Leaf litter decomposition was mainly influenced by microorganisms (i.e., fungi and bacteria), than invertebrate shredders, and water temperature, oxygen, and nutrient concentrations influenced microbial development. Short and Ward (1980)

assessed the effect of a reservoir that released deep water on alder tree leaf (*Alnus* sp.) packs decomposition rate and found that although the mean abundance of invertebrate shredders was reduced at the downstream site, high temperature increased leaf packs breakdown rate, through increased microbial processing. Mendoza-Lera et al. (2012) evaluated the effect of small reservoirs ($14 - 64 \times 10 \text{ m}^3$) on decomposition rates of alder tree leaves, using 5 mm mesh size bags, and found that although the reservoirs had minor effects on factors such as temperature, nutrients, flow and fungi abundance, leaf litter decomposition rates were reduced at the downstream sites of reservoirs due to low abundance of invertebrate shredders. In contrast, Mbaka and Schäfer (2015), using 8 mm mesh size bags, reported that small weirs ($80 - 720 \text{ m}^3$) that released surface water caused a reduction in the abundance of invertebrate shredders and alder tree leaf litter decomposition rates at the sites located immediately upstream of the area flooded by the weirs, although factors such as temperature and nutrients did not differ significantly among sites.

The organic matter decomposition process is useful in evaluation of the effect of disturbance on ecological integrity of lotic ecosystems (Castela et al. 2008; Young et al. 2008). Moreover, organic matter decomposition can help to disentangle the ecological effect of reservoirs in the presence of multiple stressors (Colas et al. 2013). However, little is known about the effect of reservoirs on organic matter decomposition in rivers (Menéndez et al. 2012). This review paper, therefore, aimed to conduct a synthesis of case studies, by qualitative and quantitative analysis, to gain further insights on the effect of different types of reservoirs on organic matter decomposition in rivers. We hypothesized that reservoirs would have a negative effect on litter

decomposition rate by decreasing habitat variables, such as water flow rate, and densities of invertebrate shredders and microorganisms (e.g., fungi).

2. Literature survey and data analysis

The databases “Web of Knowledge”, “Pubmed”, “Google Scholar”, and “Scopus” were searched for publications on the effect of man-made water storage reservoirs on organic matter decomposition in rivers. The search was limited to papers published between 1980 and 2016. Papers were searched using the following terms: (dam OR impoundment OR reservoir OR pond OR weir) AND (decomposition OR decay OR processing OR breakdown) AND (leaf litter OR wood OR organic matter) AND (stream OR river). Moreover, the searches were enhanced by scanning reference lists of identified papers for additional literature. A total of 47 papers based on this criteria were found. Out of these papers, ten papers were excluded from further analysis because the research was conducted in dammed rivers, but focused on other stressors (e.g., metals or green house gases, e.g., Abril et al. 2013), or involved laboratory mesocosm studies (e.g., Bonanomi et al. 2015) and lakes. The remaining 37 papers were read thoroughly and qualitative information such as study design, type of organic matter (e.g., leaf litter), mesh size of litter bags and reservoir details (e.g., volume) was obtained (Table S1 in the supplementary data file). The biotic and abiotic factors (e.g., invertebrates, fungi, temperature, nutrients and flow velocity), and organic matter decomposition, were divided into three groups based on significant increase and decrease, or no significant effect of reservoirs (Table S2 in the supplementary data file); although non-significance may sometimes be as a result of low statistical power (Lieber 1990). The longitudinal location of study sites was coded as FU (further

upstream), for study sites not impacted (control) by reservoirs; IU (immediate upstream), for study sites located less than 50 m from the area flooded by reservoirs; RES (reservoir), for study sites located within reservoirs; ID (immediate downstream), for study sites located within 50 m from the dam wall; and FD (further downstream), for study sites potentially impacted by reservoirs, but located further downstream (Table S2 in the supplementary data file). Reservoirs were categorised into: (i) large reservoirs (volume greater than 3,000,000 m³, WCD 2000); (ii) small reservoirs (volume between 50,000 and 3,000,000 m³); and (iii) small weirs (volume less than 50,000 m³).

The effect of water storage reservoirs on habitat variables and organic matter decomposition was quantified by calculating standardised mean differences, Hedge's *d* (Gurevitch & Hedges 1993); using means and standard errors and means and standard deviations. A 95% confidence interval (CI) was used to evaluate whether *d* was statistically significantly different from zero, with significant results having a CI without a zero (Gurevitch & Hedges 1993). Data analysis was performed using MetaWin statistical software package version 2.0 (Rosenberg et al. 2000).

3. Literature survey findings

3.1 Database description

Our survey of the literature resulted in 37 papers that satisfied our search criteria (Table S1 in the supplementary data file) on the effect of reservoirs on organic matter decomposition in rivers. The majority of studies assessed large reservoirs (51.5%) and small reservoirs (39.4%), with fewer studies focusing on small weirs (9.1%). Most of the studies targeted decomposition of tree leaf litter (54.1%) and macrophytes (43.2%), whereas fewer studies (2.7%) dealt with

decomposition of wood. Litter was mainly collected after natural abscission (44.8%) and before abscission (44.8%), than during (10.4%) abscission period. Coarse mesh litter bags were more (68.8%) frequently used than leaf packs (18.7%) or fine mesh litter bags (12.5%); and decomposition was mainly evaluated using the negative exponential model (63.3%) than the linear model (26.7%), or both models (10%). Evaluation of the effect of reservoirs on rivers was primarily conducted through comparison of reference conditions to further downstream (27.5%) and reservoir reaches (27.5%), while fewer studies assessed immediate upstream (5.3%) and immediate downstream (12.2%) reaches.

3.2 Qualitative review

Generally, small weirs had no significant effect on most habitat variables, compared to large reservoirs (Table 1). For example, studies on small weirs found that they had no significant effect on chemical variables whereas large reservoirs were reported to significantly increase conductivity, nitrates, phosphates and ammonium. Additionally, small weirs were primarily reported to significantly decrease the densities of invertebrate shredders and organic matter decomposition rates at study sites located within the vicinity of reservoirs (IU,RES,ID), while small reservoirs were reported to increase or decrease the two variables at study sites located in reservoirs (RES) and further downstream (FD) (Table 1).

3.3 Quantitative analysis

Results of analysis of the effect sizes of physico-chemical variables, biotic communities (e.g., invertebrates) and litter decomposition are presented in Table 2. With regard to chemical variables, large reservoirs caused a significant increase in conductivity ($d = 3.34$, CI = 1.05 to

5.62) at the immediate and further downstream reaches. However, large reservoirs had a negative and non-significant effect on pH ($d = -1.27$, CI = -3.08 to 0.54). Small reservoirs had negative and non-significant effects on phosphates ($d = -0.18$, CI = -1.28 to 0.91), conductivity ($d = -0.04$, CI = -1.14 to 1.06) and oxygen ($d = -0.09$, CI = -1.23 to 1.04). A similarly negative trend was observed for chemical variables such as phosphates, oxygen, nitrates and pH at the immediate upstream, reservoir and immediate downstream sites of small weirs. With regard to physical variables, small weirs had a non-significant effect on water velocity ($d = -1.82$, CI = -3.85 to 0.21). Large reservoirs had a larger positive effect ($d = 0.49$) on water temperature than small weirs ($d = 0.04$). Small reservoirs had a negative effect on invertebrate density ($d = -0.55$), shredders density ($d = -0.65$) and fungi density ($d = -0.34$). Small weirs had the largest negative effect ($d = -1.98$) on litter decomposition rate, followed by small reservoirs ($d = -1.31$) and large reservoirs ($d = -0.66$). In general, the effect of small weirs and reservoirs on most habitat variables was smaller than that of large reservoirs. Small weirs primarily had an effect on variables at the reaches located in close proximity to the reservoirs whereas small reservoirs affected sites located further downstream.

4. Impact of reservoirs on organic matter decomposition in rivers

Based on qualitative review, small weirs had no significant effect on most water variables and affected organic matter decomposition process at the study sites located near the reservoirs. On the other hand, small and large reservoirs caused many variables to significantly increase or decrease at the reservoir, immediate downstream and further downstream sites (Table 1). Large reservoirs have bigger effects on river physico-chemical conditions than small weirs, due to their

greater volume and water retention time (Poff and Hart 2002; Maxted et al. 2005). Consequently, this will affect the spatial extent to which habitat variables are affected (Poff and Hart 2002).

Quantitative analysis showed that small weirs ($d = -1.98$, CI = -3.82 to -0.14) and small reservoirs ($d = -1.31$, CI = -1.82 to -0.79) had significant negative effects on leaf litter decomposition rate. Large reservoirs had a non-significant effect ($d = -0.66$, CI = -1.65 to 0.34) on leaf litter decomposition rate (Table 2). This suggests that water storage reservoirs have varied effects on litter decomposition process. For example, Tuch and Gasith (1989) evaluated the effect of a large reservoir (volume: $4 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$) on macrophyte (*Typha* sp.) leaf litter decomposition rate and found that study sites located further downstream (1.5 km) had significantly slower decomposition rates than reference sites. In contrast, Casas et al. (2000) investigated the effect of a large reservoir ($70 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$) that released deep water on tree leaf litter decomposition rate and found that the reservoir did not have a significant effect. The authors suggested that although high nutrient concentrations (up to 14 fold) at the downstream side could have accelerated decomposition rates (Suberkropp and Chauvet 1995), high hydrological variability at the upstream side may have caused greater physical breakdown of leaf litter (Rueda-Delgado et al. 2006). González et al. (2013) investigated the effect of a small reservoir ($90 - 710 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$) on alder tree leaf litter decomposition process and found that the decomposition rate was significantly reduced at the downstream side. The authors suggested that modification in the structure of invertebrate (e.g., shredders) and fungi communities could be responsible for the observed differences. The strong negative effect ($d = -1.98$) of small weirs on leaf litter decomposition rate can be attributed to the negative effect of weirs on water velocity ($d = -1.82$),

nitrates ($d = -0.11$), phosphates ($d = -0.02$) or fine sediment deposition (Belančić et al. 2009; Avilés and Niell 2007; Sanpera-Calbet et al. 2012; Ágoston-Szabó et al. 2016).

Other factors that influence organic matter decomposition in regulated rivers include reservoir typology (e.g., water release mechanism), activities in the catchment area, season of investigation and size of river (Menéndez et al. 2012; Colas et al. 2013; Arroita et al. 2015; Abril et al. 2015). For example, Menéndez et al. (2012) investigated the effect of four small surface and deep release reservoirs on alder tree leaf litter decomposition rates and found that the reservoir that released deep water caused decomposition rate to significantly increase at the downstream site, as a result of increase in water temperature, concentration of dissolved inorganic nitrogen, and density of macroinvertebrate shredders. However, the reservoirs that released surface water caused decomposition rates to decrease at the downstream sites, as a result of reduction in densities of shredding invertebrates. The activities (e.g., metal contamination) taking place in an area also influence organic matter decomposition rates in reservoirs. For example, Colas et al. (2013) investigated tree leaf litter decomposition rates in small reservoirs located in areas that received different levels of metal contamination and found that decomposition rates were reduced in contaminated reservoirs. With regard to size of river, Abril et al. (2015) evaluated the effect of small weirs and reservoirs, located on low and high order (Strahler 1957) streams, on commercial wood sticks (*Populus* sp.) decomposition rates and found that decomposition rates were only significantly different between lotic and lentic reaches in high order streams. Seasonal differences in decomposition rates were also more pronounced in high order streams. The discrepancies between streams in decomposition rates were attributed to

variability in factors such as water temperature, nutrient concentrations and water residence time. Similarly, Arroita et al. (2015) investigated the effect of small weirs on leaf litter decomposition rates, during different seasons, and found that decomposition rates were only significantly different between impact and reference reaches in winter. The authors also found that damming significantly reduced water discharge, width, and water depth, but did not affect water quality. These effects on wetted river width and hydraulic depth are termed “ecosystem contraction”, and have been reported to significantly influence biotic communities and lotic ecosystem functions (Dewson et al. 2007; Elosegí and Sabater 2013; Mbaka and Schäfer 2015). In summary, studies assessing the effect of water storage reservoirs should take into account the different factors that affect organic matter decomposition in rivers.

Most studies (80%) evaluated decomposition of tree leaf litter. This finding could be due to studies selectively focusing on the most common and abundant riparian vegetation type in a study area (Quintão et al. 2013; Mbaka and Schäfer 2015). Nevertheless, decomposition of plant detritus is affected differently by reservoirs (Carpenter et al. 1983; Quintão et al., 2013). For example, Pinna et al. (2003) evaluated decomposition rates of reed (*Phragmites* sp.) and alder tree leaves in streams affected by reservoirs. The authors reported that alder tree leaves decomposed significantly faster than reed leaves, and decomposition rates for both plants were slower at the study sites affected by reservoirs. Pomeroy et al. (2000) compared leaf litter decomposition rates of native willow (*Salix* sp.) and cottonwood (*Populus* sp.) to those of non-native cedar (*Tamarix* sp.) at the downstream side of a large reservoir. The study showed that leaf litter decomposition rates were slower than in non-regulated river systems, and that there were

significant differences in the decomposition rates of different plant leaves, with cottonwood having the fastest decay rate.

The leaf litter used in the reviewed studies was primarily (44.8%) collected before or after natural abscission. Given that plant leaves greatly change their constituents (e.g., secondary compounds and nutrients) and quality during abscission (Sanger 1971; Lee and Gould 2002), collection of leaf litter during different times can have varied effects on breakdown of leaves by biotic communities, and affect comparability of decomposition rates across different dammed river systems. Ideally, leaf litter for assessment of decomposition process in dammed river systems should be collected when litter falls naturally, by using methods such as traps (Muehlbauer et al. 2009).

The negative exponential decay model was more frequently (63.3%) applied in organic matter decomposition studies. This finding could be due to the reviewed studies mainly focusing on parameters reflecting the speed of litter breakdown, although models based on such parameters may not take into account other aspects that influence the decomposition process (e.g., temperature) (Gessner & Chauvet 2002; Menéndez et al. 2012). Use of different models may be more useful because decomposition rates may be better adjusted to certain models (Pozo et al. 2011; Menéndez et al. 2012; González et al. 2013). For example, Menéndez et al. (2012) evaluated the effect of four small reservoirs on alder tree leaf litter decomposition rate and found that the decomposition dynamics between control and impacted sites were better explained by a linear than by an exponential model. Cho and Kong (1998) evaluated the effect of reservoirs on ten emergent macrophyte species decomposition rates using four decay models. The authors

found that an asymptotic decay model provided a better estimate of the litter decomposition process in the littoral zone of a reservoir.

Coarse mesh litter bags were more frequently (68.8%) used in organic matter decomposition studies than fine mesh bags. This finding may be due to studies primarily focusing on the decomposition process mediated by invertebrate shredders. Nevertheless, use of fine mesh bags help to identify organic matter breakdown by microorganisms (Nelson and Roline 2000). For example, Nelson and Roline (2000) evaluated the decomposition rate of aspen (*Populus* sp.) in a stream impacted by a large reservoir using fine and coarse mesh litter bags. The authors found that the leaves protected from macroinvertebrates with fine mesh litter bags did not demonstrate differences in decomposition rates between study sites, suggesting that decomposition by microorganisms was not significantly different. However, there were significant differences in leaf litter decomposition rates in coarse mesh litter bags between sites, suggesting that differences in macroinvertebrate communities played a vital role in the decomposition process.

Organic matter decomposition is an important source of energy for river food webs and has been proposed as a tool for assessing ecosystem health (Gessner & Chauvet 2002). Therefore, for studies to comprehensively investigate the effect of water storage reservoirs on rivers, they should take into consideration the effect on habitat conditions, composition of organisms, and functional processes, such as ecosystem metabolism and organic matter decomposition (Rosenberg et al. 1997; Death et al. 2009; Aristi et al. 2014). Importantly, the effect of small reservoirs on river health may be better revealed by assessing organic matter decomposition because effects on water quality may be limited (e.g., Mendoza-Lera et al. 2012; González et al.

2013; Mbaka and Schäfer 2015). In conclusion, it is vital to assess the effect of water storage reservoirs on ecosystem function, and structure, to better the detection of ecological impacts, and conservation of different types of regulated river systems.

Acknowledgments

We thank Egerton University, Kenya, for providing working space and online internet access to the papers used in this review. This work was not funded.

Draft

References

- Abril, G., Parize, M., Pérez, M. A. P., and Filizola, N. 2013. Wood decomposition in Amazonian hydropower reservoirs: an additional source of greenhouse gases. *J. S. Am. Earth. Sci.* **44**: 104–107. doi:10.1016/j.jsames.2012.11.007.
- Abril, M., Muñoz, I., Casas-Ruiz, P., Gómez-Gener, L., Barceló, M., Oliva, F., and Menéndez, M. 2015. Effects of water flow regulation on ecosystem functioning in a Mediterranean river network assessed by wood decomposition. *Sci. Tot. Environ.* **517**: 57–65. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.02.015.
- Ágoston-Szabó, Schöll, K., Kiss, A., and Dinka, M. 2016. Mesh size and site effects on leaf litter decomposition in a side arm of the River Danube on the Gemenic floodplain (Danube-Drava National Park, Hungary). *Hydrobiologia* **774**: 53-68. doi: 10.1007/s10750-015-2626-3.
- Aristi, I., Arroita, M., Larranaga, A., Ponsati, L., Sabater, S., Von Schiller, D., Elozegi, A., and Acuña, V. 2014. Flow regulation by dams affects ecosystem metabolism in Mediterranean rivers. *Freshwater Biol.* **59**: 1816–1829. doi:10.1111/fwb.12385.
- Arroita, M., Aristi, I., Diez, J., Martinez, M., Oyarzun, G., and Elozegi, A. 2015. Impact of water abstraction on storage and breakdown of coarse organic matter in mountain streams. *Sci. Tot. Environ.* **503-504**: 233–240. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.06.124.
- Belančić, A., Kepčija, R.M., Miliša, M., Moraj, A.P., and Habdija, I. 2009. Flow velocity effect on leaf litter breakdown in Tufa depositing system (Plitvice lakes, Croatia). *Internat. Rev. Hydrobiol.* **94**: 391-398. doi: 10.1002/iroh.200811162.
- Bonanomi, G., Senatore, M., Migliozzi, A., De Marco, A., Pintimalli, A., Lanzotti, V., and

- Mazzoleni, S. 2015. Decomposition of submerged plant litter in a Mediterranean reservoir: A microcosm study. *Aquat. Bot.* **120**: 169-177. doi:0.1016/j.aquabot.2014.05.006.
- Carpenter, J., Odum, W.E., and Mills, A. 1983. Leaf litter decomposition in a reservoir affected by acid mine drainage. *Oikos* **41**: 165-172. doi: 10.2307/3544260.
- Casas, J. J., Zamora-Muñoz, C., Archila, F., Alba-Tercedor, J. 2000. The effect of a headwater dam on the use of leaf bags by invertebrate communities. *Regul. Rivers. Res. Manage.* **16**: 577–591. doi: 10.1002/1099-1646(200011/12)16:6<577::AID-RRR587>3.0.CO;2-P.
- Castela, J., Ferreira, V., and Graca, M. A. 2008. Evaluation of stream ecological integrity using leaf litter decomposition and benthic invertebrates. *Envir. Pollut.* **153**: 440–449. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2007.08.005.
- Cho, K., and Kong, H. 1998. A comparative study on leaf litter decomposition of emergent macrophytes in the littoral zone of reservoir. *Korean J. Biol. Sci.* **2**: 333-339. doi:10.1080/12265071.1998.9647427.
- Colas, F., Baudoin, J., Danger, M., Usseglio-Polatera, P., Wagner, P., and Devin, S. 2013. Synergistic impacts of sediment contamination and dam presence on river functioning. *Freshwater Biol.* **58**: 320–336. doi:10.1111/fwb.12060.
- Death, R. G., Dewson, Z. S., and James, A. B. W. 2009. Is structure or function a better measure of the effects of water abstraction on ecosystem integrity? *Freshwater Biol.* **54**: 2037–2050. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02182.
- Dewson, Z. S., James, A. B. W., and Death, R. G. 2007. Stream ecosystem functioning under reduced flow conditions. *Ecol. Appl.* **17**: 797–808. doi:10.1890/06-1901.1.

- Ellis, L. E., and Jones, N. E. 2013. Longitudinal trends in regulated rivers: a review and synthesis within the context of the serial discontinuity concept. *Environ. Rev.* **21**: 136–148. doi: 10.1139/er-2012-0064.
- Elosegi, A., and Sabater, S. 2013. Effects of hydromorphological impacts on river ecosystem functioning: a review and suggestions for assessing ecological impacts. *Hydrobiologia*, **712**: 129–143. doi:10.1007/s10750-012-1226-6.
- Fischer, S. G., and Likens, G. E. 1973. Energy flow in Bear Brook, New Hampshire: an integrative approach to stream ecosystem metabolism. *Ecol. Monogr.* **43**: 421–439. doi: 10.2307/1942301.
- Gessner, M. O., and Chauvet, E. 2002. A case of using litter breakdown to assess functional stream integrity. *Ecol. Appl.* **12**: 498–510. doi:10.1890/1051-0761(2002)012[0498:ACFULB]2.0.CO;2.
- González, M. J., Mollá, S., Roblas, N., Descals, E., Moya, Ó., and Casado, C. 2013. Small dams decrease leaf litter breakdown rates in Mediterranean mountain streams. *Hydrobiologia* **712**: 117–128. doi:10.1007/s10750-012-1144-7.
- Graça, M. A. 2001. The role of invertebrates on leaf litter decomposition in streams - a Review. *Int. Rev. Hydrobiol.* **86**: 383–393. doi: 10.1002/1522-2632(200107)86:4/5<383::AID-IROH383>3.0.CO;2-D.
- Graça, M. A. S., Bärlocher, F., and Gessner, M. O. 2005. Methods to study litter decomposition. A Practical Guide. Springer, AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands. 314 pages.
- Gurevitch, J., and Hedges, L.V. 1993. Meta-analysis: combining the results of independent

- experiments. *In* Design and analysis of ecological experiments. *Edited by* S.M. Scheiner and J. Gurevitch. Chapman and Hall, New York. pp. 378-398.
- Jansson, R., Nilsson, C., Dynesius, M., and Anderson, E. 2000. Effects of river regulation on river-margin vegetation: a comparison of eight boreal rivers. *Ecol. Appl.* **10**: 203–224. doi: 10.2307/2640996.
- Lee, D. W., and Gould, K. S. 2002. Why leaves turn red. *Am. Sci.* **90**: 524–531. doi: 10.1511/2002.6.524.
- Lieber, R.L.1990. Statistical significance and statistical power in hypothesis testing. *J. Orthop. Res.* **8**: 304-309. doi: 10.1002/jor.1100080221.
- Maxted, J. R., McCready, C.H., and Scarsbrook, M.R. 2005. Effects of small ponds on stream water quality and macroinvertebrate communities. *New Zeal. J. Mar. Fresh.* **39**: 1069-1084. doi: 10.1080/00288330.2005.9517376
- Mbaka, J. G., and Schäfer, R. B. 2015. Effect of small impoundments on leaf litter decomposition in streams. *River. Res. Appl.* doi:10.1002/rra.2924.
- Mbaka, J. G., and Mwaniki, M. W. 2015. A global review of the downstream effects of small impoundments on stream habitat conditions and macroinvertebrates. *Environ. Rev.* **23**: 257–262. doi:10.1139/er-2014-0080.
- Mendoza-Lera, C., Larranaga, A., Pérez, J., Descals, E., Martínez, C., Moya, O., Arostegui, I., and Pozo, J. 2012. Headwater reservoirs weaken terrestrial-Aquatic linkage by slowing leaf litter processing in downstream regulated reaches. *River. Res. Appl.* **28**: 13–22. doi: 10.1002/rra.1434.

- Menéndez, M., Descals, E., Riera, T., and Moya, O. 2012. Effect of small reservoirs on leaf litter decomposition in Mediterranean headwater streams. *Hydrobiologia* **691**: 135–146. doi: 10.1007/s10750-012-1064-6.
- Muehlbauer, J. D., LeRoy, C. J., Lovett, J. M., Flaccus, K. K., Vlieg, J. K., and Marks, J. C. 2009. Short-term responses of decomposers to flow restoration in Fossil Creek, Arizona, USA. *Hydrobiologia* **618**: 35–45. doi: 10.1007/s10750-008-9545-3.
- Nelson, S. M., and Roline, R. A. 2000. Leaf litter breakdown in a mountain stream impacted by a hypolimnetic release reservoir. *J. Freshwater Ecol.* **15**: 479–490. doi:10.1080/02705060.2000.9663770.
- Nilsson, C., Reidy, C. A., Dynesius, M., and Revenga, C. 2005. Fragmentation and flow regulation of the world's large river systems. *Science*, **308**: 405–408. doi:10.1126/science.1107887.PMID:15831757.
- Pascoal, C., and Cássio, F. 2004. Contribution of fungi and bacteria to leaf litter decomposition in a polluted river. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **70**: 5266–5273. doi:10.1128/AEM.
- Pinna, M., Sangiorgio, F., Fonnesu, A., and Basset, A. 2003. Spatial analysis of plant detritus processing in a Mediterranean river type: the case of the River Tirso Basin, Sardinia, Italy. *J. Environ. Sci.* **15**: 227–240. doi: 1001-074202-0227-14.
- Poff, N. L., and Hart, D. D. 2002. How dams vary and why it matters for the emerging science of dam removal. *BioScience* **52**: 659–668. doi:10.1641/0006-3568(2002)052[0659:HDVAWI]2.0.CO;2.
- Pomeroy, K.E., Shannon, J.P., and Blinn, D.W. 2000. Leaf breakdown in a regulated desert river:

- Colorado River, Arizona, U.S.A. *Hydrobiologia* **434**: 193-199. doi:10.1023/A:1004081309986.
- Pozo, J., Casas, J., Menéndez, M., Mollá, S., Arostegui, I., Basaguren, A., Casado, C., Descals, E., García-Avilés, J., González, J. M., Larrañaga, A., Løpez, E., Lusi, M., Moya, O., Pérez, J., Riera, T., Roblas, N., and Salinas, M. J. 2011. Leaf-litter decomposition in headwater streams: a comparison of the process among four climatic regions. *J. N. Am. Benthol. Soc.* **30**: 935–950. doi:10.1899/10-153.1.
- Quintão, J. M., Rezende, R. S., and Junior, J. F. G. 2013. Microbial effects in leaf breakdown in tropical reservoirs of different trophic status. *Freshw. Sci.* **32**: 933–950. doi:10.1899/12-112.1.
- Rosenberg, D. M., Berkes, F., Bodaly, R. A., Hecky, R. E., Kelly, C. A., and Rudd, J.W.M. 1997. Large-scale impacts of hydroelectric development. *Environ. Rev.* **5**: 27–54. doi:10.1139/a97-001.
- Rosenberg, M.S., Adams, D.C., and Gurevitch, J. 2000. MetaWin: statistical software for meta-analysis, version 2.0. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts, USA.
- Rueda-Delgado, G., Wantzen, K. M., and Tolosa, M. B. 2006. Leaf-litter decomposition in an Amazonian floodplain stream: effects of seasonal hydrological changes. *J. N. Am. Benthol. Soc.* **25**: 233–249. doi:10.1899/0887-3593(2006)25[233:LDIAAF]2.0.CO;2.
- Sanger, J. E., 1971. Quantitative investigations of leaf pigments from their inception in buds through autumn coloration to decomposition in falling leaves. *Ecology* **52**: 1075–1089. doi:10.2307/1933816.

- Sanpera-Calbet, I., Chauvet, E., and Richardson, J.S. 2012. Fine sediment on leaves: shredder removal of sediment does not enhance fungal colonisation. *Aquat. Sci.* **74**: 527-538. doi: 10.1007/s00027-011-0245-0.
- Short, R. A., and Ward, J. V. 1980. Leaf litter processing in a regulated rocky mountain stream. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **37**: 123–127. doi:10.1139/f80-015.
- Strahler, A. N., 1957. Quantitative analysis of watershed geomorphology. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **38**: 913–920. doi:10.1029/TR038i006p00913.
- Suberkropp, K., and Chauvet, E. 1995. Regulation of leaf breakdown by fungi in streams: influences of water chemistry. *Ecology* **76**: 1433–1445. doi:10.2307/1938146.
- Tuch, K., and Gasith, A. 1989. Effects of an upland impoundments on structural and functional properties of a small stream in a basaltic plateau (Golan heights, Israel). *Regul. Rivers. Res. Manage.* **3**: 153–167. doi:10.1002/rrr.3450030115.
- Vannote, R. L., Minshall, G. W., Cummins, K. W., Sedell, J. R., and Cushing, C. E. 1980. The River Continuum Concept. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **37**: 130–137. doi:10.1139/f80-017.
- von Schiller, D., Aristi, I., Ponsatí, L., Arroita, M., Acuña, V., Elosegí, A., and Sabater, S. 2015. Regulation causes nitrogen discontinuities in Mediterranean Rivers. *Sci. Total Environ.* **540**: 168–177. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.07.017.
- WCD. 2000. World Commission on Dams. Dams and Development. A New Framework for Decision-making: the report of the World Commission on Dams. Earthscan. Available from <http://www.unep.org/dams/WCD/report.asp>.
- Young, R. G., Matthaei, C. D., and Townsend, C. R. 2008. Organic matter breakdown and

ecosystem metabolism: functional indicators for assessing river ecosystem health. J. N. Am. Benthol. Soc. **27**: 605–625. doi:10.1899/07-121.1.

Draft

Draft

Tables

Table 1: Number of studies that reported effect of reservoirs on biotic and abiotic factors and organic matter decomposition in rivers (IU,RES, ID and FD refers to immediate upstream, reservoir, immediate and further downstream sites, respectively).

Variable	Small weir			Small reservoir			Large reservoir		
	Increase	Decrease	No change	Increase	Decrease	No change	Increase	Decrease	No change
Width	—	1 _{ID}	—	—	—	4	—	—	—
Velocity	—	2 _{ID}	1	—	2 _{FD}	3	—	—	2
Temperature	—	—	3	1 _{FD}	1 _{FD}	4	—	—	2
pH	—	—	3	1 _{FD}	—	2	—	—	3
Canopy cover	—	—	1	—	—	3	—	1 _{FD}	—
Fine sediment	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—
Oxygen	—	—	3	1 _{FD}	—	5	—	—	2
Conductivity	—	—	2	—	1 _{FD}	6	2 _{FD,ID}	—	1
Alkalinity	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	2
Nitrates	—	—	3	—	—	5	2 _{FD,ID}	—	—
Phosphates	—	—	2	—	—	4	1 _{FD}	—	—
Ammonium	—	—	1	—	—	2	1 _{ID}	—	—
Fungi diversity	—	—	—	1 _{FD}	—	3	—	—	—
Fungi abundance	—	—	—	1 _{FD}	1 _{FD}	3	—	—	—
Invertebrate diversity	—	—	—	—	3 _{FD}	2	—	—	1
Invertebrate density	—	—	1	—	—	5	—	—	2
Invertebrate shredders density	—	2 _{IU,ID}	—	1 _{FD}	1 _{FD}	3	—	1 _{ID}	1
Decomposition rate	—	3 _{IU,RES,ID}	—	1 _{FD}	5 _{FD,RES}	—	—	3 _{ID,RES}	1

Table 2: Effect size (Hedge's *d*) mean values and associated 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the effect of water storage reservoirs on habitat variables, biotic communities (e.g., invertebrates) and organic matter decomposition in rivers. *n* = number of studies. (IU, RES, ID, FD and CMB refers to immediate upstream, reservoir, immediate downstream, further downstream sites and coarse mesh bag, respectively).

Variable	Small weir		Small reservoir		Large reservoir	
	<i>n</i>	Effect size (95% CI)	<i>n</i>	Effect size (95% CI)	<i>n</i>	Effect size (95% CI)
Width	—	—	3	0.34 (−1.4 to 2.0) _{FD}	—	—
Velocity	3	−1.82 (−3.85 to 0.21) _{IU,RES,ID}	4	−0.27 (−1.38 to 0.83) _{FD}	3	−0.02 (−1.96 to 1.92) _{ID,FD}
Temperature	3	0.04 (−1.43 to 1.52) _{IU,RES,ID}	4	−0.13 (−1.24 to 0.98) _{FD}	3	0.49 (−1.25 to 2.24) _{ID,FD}
pH	3	−0.20 (−1.69 to 1.28) _{IU,RES,ID}	3	0.29 (−1.29 to 1.87) _{FD}	3	−1.27 (−3.08 to 0.54) _{RES,ID,FD}
Fine sediment	—	—	3	0.58 (−1.08 to 2.25) _{FD}	—	—
Oxygen	3	−0.34 (−1.86 to 1.16) _{IU,RES,ID}	4	−0.09 (−1.23 to 1.04) _{FD}	3	0.83 (−0.77 to 2.44) _{ID,FD}
Conductivity	3	0.04 (−1.43 to 1.52) _{IU,RES,ID}	4	−0.04 (−1.14 to 1.06) _{FD}	3	3.34 (1.05 to 5.62) _{ID,FD}
Alkalinity	—	—	3	0.28 (−1.35 to 1.93) _{FD}	—	—
Nitrates	3	−0.11 (−1.68 to 1.46) _{IU,RES,ID}	4	0.18 (−0.91 to 1.28) _{FD}	—	—
Phosphates	3	−0.02 (−1.78 to 1.73) _{IU,RES,ID}	4	−0.18 (−1.28 to 0.91) _{FD}	—	—
Invertebrate density	—	—	4	−0.55 (−1.21 to 0.11) _{FD}	—	—
Invertebrate shredders density	—	—	4	−0.65 (−1.32 to 0.01) _{FD}	—	—
Fungi density	—	—	4	−0.34 (−1.0 to 0.33) _{FD}	—	—
Fungi diversity	—	—	3	0.21 (−0.71 to 1.13) _{FD}	—	—
Leaf litter decomposition rate	3	−1.98 (−3.82 to −0.14) _{IU,ID,RES,CMB}	6	−1.31 (−1.82 to −0.79) _{FD,CMB}	3	−0.66 (−1.65 to 0.34) _{RES,ID,FD,CMB}