1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

**Microbial plankton community in the Ría de Vigo (NW
Iberian upwelling system): impact of the culture of *Mytilus
galloprovincialis***

M. Froján *, B. Arbones, D. Zúñiga, C.G. Castro, F.G. Figueiras
Instituto de Investigaci3n Mariñas (IIM), CSIC, Vigo, 36208, Spain.

*Corresponding author
E-mail address: mariafrojan@iim.csic.es
Phone: +34 986231930
Fax: +34 986292762

RUNNING HEAD: Microbial plankton and mussel culture

ABSTRACT: Variability in size-structure and composition of the microbial plankton community in the Ría de Vigo (NW Iberian coastal upwelling system) was studied as a function of the prevailing oceanographic conditions during four seasonal sampling periods (autumn, winter, spring and summer). The impact of mussel culture on this microbial plankton community was also evaluated by comparing the results obtained in a reference station (ReS) located outside the farming area with those found inside the farming area (raft station, RaS). Integrated microbial plankton biomass remained relatively constant ($2.5 \pm 0.4 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$) at ReS during autumn, spring and summer, when microplankton clearly dominated, accounting for $64 \pm 13\%$ of the total microbial plankton biomass. Pico- and nanoplankton were present in the microbial community all year round, with mean biomass values of $0.32 \pm 0.09 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$ and $0.42 \pm 0.23 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$, respectively. These two fractions became more relevant during winter, when the contribution of microplankton to total microbial plankton biomass decreased ($23 \pm 9\%$) and a balanced trophic structure between autotrophs and heterotrophs was established. At RaS it was observed a significant decrease in the biomass of microplankton ($46 \pm 32\%$) and nanoplankton ($35 \pm 22\%$) compare to ReS, regardless of their trophic nature. Picoplankton biomass did not experience any decrease at this site. These results suggest that mussel farming exerts a top-down control over the microbial plankton community by consuming micro- and nanoplankton without affecting picoplankton. An excess of ammonium, probably excreted by mussels, and a lower autotrophic carbon:chlrophyll ratio at RaS suggest that mussel culture could also exert a “bottom-up”-like control on the phytoplankton that escape mussel consumption in farming zones.

Keywords: microbial plankton, size structure, *Mytilus galloprovincialis*, mussel impact, coastal upwelling, NW Iberia

INTRODUCTION

The size-structure of the microbial plankton community is one of the main factors controlling the transfer of matter and energy through marine food webs. In the open ocean, where nutrient levels are low, small phytoplankton dominates and the recycling of the photosynthesised organic matter prevails (Pomeroy 1974, Azam et al. 1983). In contrast, where nutrients are abundant, as usually happens in coastal areas, the dominance of large diatoms in the microbial community implies the existence of a short food web (Cushing 1989), which means that a significant fraction of the biogenic carbon is available to be exported outside the microbial community and fuel higher trophic levels (Eppley & Peterson 1979, Wasmann 1990).

Food webs in coastal upwelling systems have been traditionally considered to be short and efficient (Ryther 1969). Indeed, these ecosystems are highly productive areas that support the most important fisheries of the world's oceans (Pauly & Christensen 1995). However, coastal upwelling systems are particularly dynamic and the structure of the microbial community is affected by this environmental variability. Small organisms dominate during downwelling and upwelling relaxation moments while microplankton thrives during upwelling events (Varela et al. 1991, Iriarte & González 2004, Espinoza-González et al. 2012). Moreover, upwelling can be intensified or weakened in response to the interaction of the wind field with coastal singularities, such as bays or capes, generating multiple environments in which different microbial communities develop (Castro et al. 1997, Pitcher et al. 2010). The NW Iberian Peninsula is one of these highly dynamic coastal upwelling zones, where northerly winds prevail from March to October inducing upwelling and during the rest of the year the dominant southerly winds cause downwelling (Fraga 1981). It is known that changes in the structure and composition of the microbial plankton community in shelf

waters occur in response to this environmental variability on seasonal and short-term scales (Varela et al. 1991; Crespo et al. 2011, Espinoza-González et al. 2012).

On the NW Iberian coast are located the Rías Baixas (Fig. 1), four V-shaped bays with a NE-SW orientation that exchange water with the adjacent shelf. The singular topography of the Rías, shallower and narrower inward, and its estuary-like circulation enhance upwelling and downwelling processes occurring at the continental shelf (Figueiras et al. 2002). However, instead of their uniqueness, size and trophic structure of the microbial plankton community as a whole have not received much attention in the Rías Baixas. Studies conducted until now are either focused on composition and dynamics of microplankton (Figueiras et al. 1994, Tilstone et al. 1994, Fermín et al. 1996) or are limited to indirectly address the size-structure of phytoplankton through chlorophyll fractionation (Cormeño et al. 2006, Arbones et al. 2008). Therefore, there is no comprehensive characterisation of the microbial plankton community in the Rías Baixas in relation to the environmental conditions recorded at annual scale.

Being important this characterisation by itself, it is even more important considering the intensive culture of the edible mussel *Mytilus galloprovincialis* Lamark that exists in the Rías. The Galician Rías support the highest mussel production in Europe (250 x 106 kg yr⁻¹) with a total of 3335 mussel rafts enclosed in areas called polygons (Labarta 2004). Although previous research suggests that the mussel culture significantly alters the food web in the Rías (Tenore et al. 1982), very few studies have been conducted to assess this issue (Cabanac et al. 1979, Maar et al. 2008, Petersen et al. 2008, Zúñiga et al. 2013). In terms of chlorophyll, Cabanac et al. (1979) and Petersen et al. (2008) showed a reduction inside the mussel area between 20 and 60% of the outside concentration, mainly affecting chlorophyll *a* in the fraction >2µm. More recently Zúñiga et al. (2013) have showed strong correlations between microbial plankton

carbon biomass and ingestion rate or absorption efficiency of *Mytilus galloprovincialis*. These results point to the important role that the microbial plankton community plays on mussel growth and production in the Rías Baixas. Nevertheless, more research is required to establish to what extent mussel culture causes modifications in the structure and composition of the microbial plankton community originally dependent on the prevailing oceanographic conditions. Thus, the aim of this work was to characterise the structure and composition of the microbial plankton community in the Ría de Vigo in relation to the hydrographic conditions recorded during four seasonal campaigns and to analyse the impact of mussel culture on this microbial plankton community for each study period. This knowledge should contribute to improve the management capacity of the mussel culture in this upwelling region.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sampling strategy

The study was carried out at two sampling stations, reference station (ReS) and raft station (RaS) in the Ría de Vigo (Fig. 1) between 2007 and 2008. The ReS was positioned at the central channel of the Ría, well outside of the mussel farming area. The RaS was located slightly inner in the Ría within a group of rafts usually named polygon. Four seasonal periods, autumn (September 17 – October 04), winter (January 28 – February 14), spring (April 14 – May 01) and summer (June 26 – July 14) were sampled. The two stations were visited aboard the RV *Mytilus* every 2-3 days during each period, providing 6 sampling days per period. Water samples at both stations were collected at 5 depths (surface, 5, 10, 15, 20 m) using a CTD SBE 9/11 fitted to an oceanographic rosette equipped with 12 Niskin bottles. Subsamples were taken to determine nitrate, ammonium and chlorophyll *a* (Chl *a*) concentrations, and to evaluate

picoplankton ($< 2 \mu\text{m}$), nanoplankton ($2\text{--}20 \mu\text{m}$) and microplankton ($>20 \mu\text{m}$) biomass. Daily values of the Ekman transport ($-Q_x$, $\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1} \text{km}^{-1}$) perpendicular to the coast were calculated according to Bakun (1973) using the daily average of shelf winds available for the seawatch buoy off Cape Silleiro, belonging to “Puertos del Estado” (www.puertos.es).

Nutrients and Chl *a*

Nitrate and ammonium concentrations ($\mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$) were determined by segmented flow analysis using an Alpkem autoanalyser following Hansen & Grasshoff (1983). For Chl *a* 250 ml of seawater were filtered through 25 mm Whatman GF/F filters. The filters were then frozen (-20°C) until pigments were extracted in 90% acetone for 24 hours in dark at 4°C . Chl *a* concentrations (mg m^{-3}) were determined by measuring the fluorescence of the extracted pigments in a Turner Designs fluorometer calibrated with pure Chl *a* (Sigma).

Picoplankton biomass

Subsamples of 1.8 ml were collected in sterile cryovials to determine the biomass of heterotrophic bacteria (HB) and autotrophic picoplankton (APP). After fixation with a P+G solution (1% paraformaldehyde + 0.05% glutaraldehyde) 10% final concentration, samples were frozen and kept in liquid nitrogen at -80°C until analysis in the laboratory. The analysis was performed in a FACScalibur flow cytometer using aliquots of 0.6 ml for APP and 0.4 ml for HB and 10 μl of yellow-green 1 μm Polyscience latex beads as an internal standard (Calvo-Díaz & Morán 2006). HB were previously stained with 4 μl of SybrGreen dye. Abundances of HB, *Synechococcus* and autotrophic eukaryotic picoflagellates (APF) were obtained. *Prochlorococcus* did not appear in any sample, revealing that their presence in the Ría is insignificant as previously pointed by Rodríguez et al. (2003). HB biomass was calculated using a conversion factor of 20 fg

C cell⁻¹ (Lee & Fuhrman 1987) and the biomass of *Synechococcus* was estimated following Bratbak & Dundas (1984). The biomass of APF was determined according to Verity et al. (1992).

Heterotrophic eukaryotic picoflagellates (HPF) were determined in subsamples of 10 ml fixed with buffered 0.2 µm filtered solution of formaldehyde (2% final concentration) and stained with DAPI (0.1 µg ml⁻¹ final concentration) for 10 minutes in the dark (Porter & Feig 1980). The samples were then filtered through 0.2 µm black Millipore-Isopore filters and HPF abundance was obtained using an epifluorescence microscope, illuminating the filters with UV light. The biomass was estimated according to Verity et al. (1992).

Nanoplankton biomass

Subsamples of 30 ml were used to determine abundance and biomass of autotrophic nanoflagellates (ANF) and heterotrophic nanoflagellates (HNF). The subsamples were fixed and stained as previously described for HPF. Subsequently, these subsamples were filtered through 0.8 µm black Milipore-Isopore to enumerate ANF and HNF by epifluorescence microscopy. Autotrophic organisms were distinguished by their reddish colour when the sample was illuminated with blue light, whereas heterotrophic organisms were distinguished by their blue colour under UV light illumination. At least 300 cells were counted in each sample. The biovolumes of ANF and HNF were calculated by measuring the diameter of several individuals (at least 25 in each group and sample) and assuming a spherical shape. Biomass in carbon units was calculated according to Verity et al. (1992).

Microplankton biomass

Subamples of 100 ml preserved in Lugol's iodine were sedimented in composite sedimentation chambers and observed with an inverted microscope to identify and count

microplankton cells. The organisms were counted and identified at species level when possible. The smaller species ($< 20 \mu\text{m}$) were enumerated from two perpendicular transects scanned at 400x, medium-size individuals (20-50 μm) were counted in one or two transects at 200x and larger organisms ($> 50 \mu\text{m}$) were counted by scanning the whole slide at 100x. At least 500 cells were counted in each sample. Differentiation between autotrophic microplankton (AMP) and heterotrophic microplankton (HMP) was made following Lessard & Swift (1986), Larsen & Sournia (1991) and also using our historical records of epifluorescence microscopy. Cell volumes were estimated according to Hillebrand et al. (1999) and the biovolumes of diatoms and dinoflagellates were converted to carbon biomass following Strathmann (1967). However, the cell carbon of *Noctiluca scintillans* was estimated applying the correction suggested by Tada et al. (2000). Carbon biomass was estimated following Verity et al. (1992) for flagellates other than dinoflagellates and Putt & Stoecker (1989) for ciliates. Diatoms, dinoflagellates, flagellates and ciliates $< 20 \mu\text{m}$ were included in the nanoplankton fraction, whereas chain forming diatoms $< 20 \mu\text{m}$ were ascribed to microplankton.

The biomass values of all microbial plankton components are presented integrated over a 12 m water column because this is the length of the ropes containing mussels in the rafts. In this way, biomass comparisons between ReS and RaS stations are done for the environment (upper part of the water column) potentially affected by mussels. Although biomass values integrated over the entire water column were higher than the biomass values integrated over the upper 12 m depth of the water column, both values showed in all cases (size classes and trophic structure) strong correlation ($r^2 > 0.9$; $P < 0.001$), indicating that the structure of the microbial community did not change in the water column.

Statistical analysis

A non-parametric analysis of variance (Kruskal-Wallis test) was applied to test significant effects of location (ReS vs RaS) and season (autumn, winter, spring and summer) over the environmental variables and microbial plankton components using the statistical software SPSS.

RESULTS

Wind forcing and water column response

The evolution of the thermohaline properties and nitrate, ammonium and Chl *a* levels at ReS for the four study periods (Fig. 2) showed the seasonal and short-time variability usually recorded in the Ría de Vigo in response to dominant winds.

Upwelling favourable winds ($-Q_x$ positive values) prevailed during the first half of autumn shifting to southerly winds in the second one. These changes in wind regime modified the water column structure, from an initial stratification ($>16\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ and nutrients $< 1\text{ }\mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ at sea surface), to an upwelling of subsurface cold ($<14\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$), saline (> 35.6) and nutrient rich water and finally to the occurrence of an intense downwelling. The subsurface Chl *a* maximum on September 24th (6 mg m^{-3}) was probably associated with phytoplankton accumulation at the pycnocline during the upwelling pulse, whereas the following downwelling caused a homogeneous Chl *a* distribution ($\sim 4\text{ mg m}^{-3}$). Weak winds prevailed throughout the winter sampling, especially in the second half when the water column displayed thermal homogeneity and weak saline stratification. Nitrate levels were high ($5 - 6\text{ }\mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$) and Chl *a* concentration remained low ($< 1\text{ mg m}^{-3}$). In spring winds were relatively weak. The hydrographic conditions evolved from a well-mixed water column to a thermohaline stratification favoured by an intense continental input ($161\text{ m}^3\text{ s}^{-1}$ data provided by “Aguas de Galicia”) during the second half of this period. High nitrate levels supplied by continental input enhanced

phytoplankton increase at the halocline ($> 4 \text{ mg Chl } a \text{ m}^{-3}$). The June- July cruise captured the characteristic summer situation when strong upwelling-favourable winds alternate with relaxation periods. Thus, upwelling of cold ($< 14^{\circ}\text{C}$) and nutrient rich water ($> 5 \text{ } \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ for nitrate and $> 3 \text{ } \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ for ammonium) stimulated phytoplankton growth ($> 5 \text{ mg m}^{-3}$) at sea surface. Once upwelling subsided, the surface Chl *a* was redistributed throughout the water column. After that, wind relaxation left nutrient poor water with low Chl *a* at sea surface.

Thermohaline conditions and nitrate concentrations found at RaS (Fig. S1) were not different to those recorded at ReS (Fig. 2), as evidenced by the fact that the statistical analysis did not reveal significant differences between temperature, salinity and nitrate concentrations measured at the two locations (Kruskal-Wallis test, $n = 240$, $p \geq 0.57$). However, differences were significant (Kruskal-Wallis test, $n = 240$, $p < 0.001$) in ammonium and Chl *a* concentrations at RaS (Fig. 3) and at ReS (Fig. 2). Integrated (12 m depth) ammonium concentrations were higher at RaS ($33 \pm 14 \text{ mmol m}^{-2}$) than at ReS ($20 \pm 9 \text{ mmol m}^{-2}$) and integrated Chl *a* concentration was lower at RaS ($24 \pm 17 \text{ mg m}^{-2}$) than at ReS ($36 \pm 22 \text{ mg m}^{-2}$).

Variability in microbial plankton biomass: trophic, size and structure

The observed variability in microbial plankton biomass at ReS (Fig. 4a, Table 1) was linked to the hydrographic variability (Fig. 2). Total microbial plankton biomass expressed as total carbon (TC) remained around 2.5 g C m^{-2} during autumn, spring and summer, contrasting with the winter situation when TC ($0.69 \pm 0.18 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$) was substantially lower. Integrated autotrophic carbon biomass (AC) experienced continuous fluctuations over time, reaching highest values in autumn and spring. In contrast, integrated heterotrophic carbon biomass (HC) was characterized by lower

variability and only exceeded AC in summer (Fig. 4a, Table 1) due to the presence of the large heterotrophic dinoflagellate *Noctiluca scintillans*, which accounted for $43 \pm 15\%$ of HC. Even though HC and AC were not related ($r^2 = 0.029$, $P > 0.05$), both biomasses showed a significant linear relationship when the summer sampling, with the dominance of *Noctiluca scintillans*, was not considered. ($HC = (0.30 \pm 0.11) + (0.17 \pm 0.06) AC$; $r^2 = 0.32$, $P < 0.05$).

Changes in the size structure of the microbial plankton community were also evident (Fig. 4b). Microplankton dominated during three of the four periods: autumn, spring and summer. This dominance was especially noticeable in spring with microplankton accounting for $72 \pm 8\%$ of TC. However, microplankton only accounted for $23 \pm 9\%$ of TC in winter, when picoplankton grew in importance representing $41 \pm 4\%$ of TC. Variability was less evident in nanoplankton, which represented $24 \pm 11\%$ of TC over time.

Differences were also detected regarding the trophic structure in each size fraction and their seasonal evolution (Figs. 5abc). Within picoplankton the evolution of autotrophic (APP) and heterotrophic (HPP) biomasses showed low variability. HPP biomass slightly exceeded APP (Fig. 5a). Instead, autotrophic nanoplankton biomass (ANP) exceeded the heterotrophic nanoplankton biomass (HNP) in all samplings (Fig. 5b). Microplankton exhibited high variability (Fig. 5c), with heterotrophic microplankton biomass (HMP) lower than autotrophic microplankton biomass (AMP) in autumn, winter and spring. The situation was completely different in summer, with HMP representing $73 \pm 18\%$ of total microplankton biomass due to the presence of *Noctiluca scintillans*.

A significant decrease in TC was detected at RaS when compared to TC at ReS (Fig. 4c, Table 1, Table S1). Especially important was the reduction observed in autumn with

57 ± 20 % less TC at RaS, with both AC and HC being significantly lower (Table S1). HC and AC showed a significant linear relationship at this RaS location ($HC = (0.25 \pm 0.08) + (0.27 \pm 0.08) AC$; $r^2 = 0.33$, $P < 0.01$).

The size structure of the microbial community also experienced modifications at RaS (Fig. 4d). Thus, the dominance of microplankton was not so evident at mussel influenced site, though it remained as the main component of the microbial community in spring and summer (57 ± 18 % of TC). Picoplankton exceeded nanoplankton in the four samplings, being nanoplankton the fraction of the microbial plankton with lower contribution to TC.

Within picoplankton both APP and HPP did not show significant differences (Table S1) at RaS (Fig. 5d) in relation to the distribution and values registered at ReS (Fig. 5a). However, within nanoplankton HNP biomass was significantly lower at RaS (Fig. 5e) than at ReS (Fig. 5b) in autumn, winter and summer, whereas ANP biomass showed significant reductions only in autumn and spring (Table S1). Concerning microplankton (Fig. 5f), AMP experienced a significant reduction at RaS in autumn, when its biomass was 61 ± 41% lower than AMP biomass recorded at ReS. HMP biomass was also significantly lower in winter and summer at RaS, with a reduction of 54 ± 23% in summer due to the lower abundance of *Noctiluca scintillans* (Table S1). At RaS, total nanoplankton (ANP + HNP) and total microplankton (AMP + HMP) showed decreases of (35 ± 22%) and (46 ± 32%) compare to ReS.

Structure and variability of the autotrophic microbial plankton community

The autotrophic microbial plankton community at ReS was dominated by diatoms (49 ± 26% of AC), ANP (30 ± 19% of AC) and APP (17 ± 12% of AC) (Fig. S2, Table 2). Total APP biomass was relatively stable over time, whereas variability was higher

in ANP with mean biomass in autumn doubling the values registered in the other three samplings (Table 2). Nevertheless, the greatest variability was observed in diatoms (Fig. S1b, Table 2), with biomass values being particularly high in autumn and spring. Autotrophic picoflagellates (APF) dominated within APP, accounting for $89 \pm 10\%$ of APP biomass. *Synechococcus* were only relatively important in autumn and winter. Much of the ANP biomass during winter ($87 \pm 8\%$) and summer ($76 \pm 13\%$) could be attributed to ANF (Fig. S1c). However, ANF only represented $48 \pm 21\%$ of ANP in autumn, when the presence of an unidentified small centric diatom was important. This centric diatom accounted for 75% of all ANP biomass on October 1st, and was also an important part of the ANP community during the second half of the spring sampling.

The autotrophic microbial community at RaS was also dominated by diatoms, ANP and APP, together accounting for $98 \pm 3\%$ of all AC (Fig. S1, Table 2). Nonetheless, diatom biomass found at RaS was significantly lower ($60 \pm 43\%$ of reduction) than diatom biomass recorded at ReS during the autumn sampling (Table S1). On the other hand, ANP biomass was significantly reduced at RaS during autumn ($44 \pm 25\%$) and spring ($50 \pm 16\%$) (Table 2, Table S1). During these two sampling periods the small centric diatom found at ReS was not observed at RaS, and ANF were always the major component of the ANP biomass at RaS (Fig. S1f).

Water column integrated AC and Chl *a* (Table 1) were linearly related at ReS ($AC = (-0.12 \pm 0.2) + (40 \pm 5) \text{ Chl } a$, $r^2 = 0.76$, $P < 0.001$) and at RaS ($AC = (0.07 \pm 0.12) + (29 \pm 4) \text{ Chl } a$, $r^2 = 0.69$, $P < 0.001$) but in this last case with a lower slope ($AC: \text{ Chl } a = 29 \pm 4$).

Structure and variability of the heterotrophic microbial plankton community

Within the heterotrophic community, HNP and heterotrophic picoplankton (HPP), the latter mainly composed of HB ($81 \pm 7\%$; Table 3), showed low temporal variability at ReS (Fig. S2a). HB biomass was especially important in autumn and spring (Table 3) whereas HNP biomass, which was low in winter, remained relatively stable during the other three samplings (Table 3). HB and HNP jointly accounted for more than 65% of total HC in autumn and winter, but heterotrophic ciliates (HCil) in spring ($45 \pm 12\%$ of HC) and heterotrophic dinoflagellates (HD) in summer ($61 \pm 10\%$ of HC) became more relevant (Fig. S2b). An unidentified peritrich ciliate and *Noctiluca scintillans* accounted for $54 \pm 36\%$ of the HCil biomass and $72 \pm 23\%$ of the HD biomass in spring and summer, respectively.

Although biomass values of HB registered at RaS (Fig. S2c) and at ReS (Fig. S2a) were not significantly different (Table S1), the biomass values of HNP and HD were significantly lower at RaS in autumn, winter, and summer (Fig. S2; Table 3; Table S1). The decline in HD biomass was particularly evident in summer ($59 \pm 21\%$). As observed at ReS for this summer period, *Noctiluca scintillans* accounted for a substantial fraction ($83 \pm 8\%$) of the total HD biomass at RaS. During the spring sampling, HCil experienced a remarkable reduction at RaS (Fig. S2b, d), when their mean biomass was half of that recorded at ReS (Table 3).

DISCUSSION

The microbial plankton community in the Ría de Vigo: importance of microplankton.

The size structure of the microbial plankton community reported in this study follows a similar pattern to that previously described for phytoplankton in the Ría de Vigo derived from studies based only on Chl *a* fractionation (Cermeño et al. 2006,

Arbones et al. 2008). Microplankton clearly dominated in the microbial plankton community during three (autumn, spring and summer) of the four hydrographic situations sampled, representing $64 \pm 13\%$ of the microbial plankton biomass. Pico- and nanoplankton were part of the planktonic community throughout the year with a relatively constant biomass of $0.32 \pm 0.09 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$ and $0.42 \pm 0.23 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$, respectively. These two fractions become more relevant during winter, when microplankton abundance decreased. This size structure contrasts with that described for the microbial plankton community in shelf waters in front of the Ría de Vigo (Espinoza-González et al. 2012) and in shelf waters of other upwelling systems (Böttjer & Morales 2007) where small plankton ($< 20 \mu\text{m}$) dominates and microplankton (mainly diatoms) add in moments of intense upwelling. As small sized plankton ($< 20 \mu\text{m}$) is also present in the microbial plankton community of the Ría de Vigo, the main difference between the Ría and the adjacent continental shelf waters relies on the greater importance and continuous presence of microplankton in the Ría.

Concerning the trophic structure (pigmented vs unpigmented plankton) the microbial plankton community in the Ría de Vigo can be considered fundamentally autotrophic, particularly due to the contribution of AMP which remarkably increased the autotrophic plankton biomass in autumn, spring and summer, when AC averaged $1.60 \pm 1.06 \text{ g C m}^{-2}$ and AMP accounted for $62 \pm 23\%$. Although diatoms, ANP and APP were always present (Table 2), the largest variations in autotrophic biomass were due to changes in diatoms in spring and during intense upwelling events (autumn). This variability in the trophic structure throughout the year support previous studies based on oxygen production / respiration measurements (Moncoiffé et al. 2000, Cermeño et al. 2006, Arbones et al. 2008). Such studies show us the microbial community of Ría de Vigo as net autotrophic all year round but approaching metabolic balance in winter when the

autotrophic and heterotrophic plankton biomass are balanced, diatoms are scarce (Table 2, Fig. S1b) and pico- and nanoplankton attain higher importance (Fig. 4b). Again, this situation contrasts with that reported for the adjacent shelf (Espinoza-González et al. 2012), where the microbial community is net heterotrophic but shifting to autotrophy in moments of intense upwelling (Teira et al. 2001). The summer sampling deserves a specific mention since during this sampling the heterotrophic biomass exceeded autotrophic biomass (Fig. 4a) due to the presence of *Noctiluca scintillans*. The occurrence of this species took place in a moment of upwelling relaxation (Fig. 2), a time of the year (summer) when is common to find heterotrophic dinoflagellates within the microbial plankton community (Figueiras et al. 2002). Upwelling relaxation causes a considerable slowing down in the circulation of the Ría that frequently favours the accumulation of dinoflagellates with swimming or floating capacity in surface waters (Fermín et al. 1996), as probably was the case for *Noctiluca scintillans*.

The importance of microplankton and particularly the relevance of diatoms within the microbial community in the Ría de Vigo can be attributed to the high impact (frequency and intensity) that upwelling has on this coastal system. The estuarine circulation of the Ría and its bathymetric configuration, with depth continuously decreasing from its mouth towards the interior (Fig. 1), favours the intrusion of upwelled waters on the shelf along the bottom and the uplift of these waters at the inner part of the Ría (Figueiras et al. 2002, Crespo et al. 2007). In this way, even a weak upwelling that does not cause detectable response in the plankton on the continental shelf, however provides the nutrients needed to trigger an appreciable response of the plankton community inside the Ría; response that is mainly characterised by an increase in diatom abundance (Figueiras et al. 2002, Teixeira et al. 2011). Hence, the positive estuarine circulation of the Ría de Vigo together with its unique topography, contributes

to intensify the effects of upwelling promoting diatom growth and the export of organic matter to the adjacent shelf during the upwelling season (Tilstone et al. 2000, Crespo et al. 2007). Conversely, the dominance of smaller plankton cells in the Ría during winter indicates that the microbial loop prevails in this season (Teixeira et al. 2011), favouring the *in situ* remineralisation of photosynthesised organic matter.

Impact of mussel culture on the microbial plankton community

Our results show, through comparing Chl *a* and TC values at RaS and ReS, that mussel culture significantly affects the microbial community in the Ría de Vigo. The significant decrease that we recorded in Chl *a* concentration at RaS lies within the range observed by Petersen et al. (2008) during a previous study conducted in the Ría de Vigo under summer stratification conditions and it is also comparable to that described for other culture areas (Ogilvie et al. 2000, Strohmeier et al. 2008). Nevertheless, this result contrasts with that obtained by Trottet et al. (2008) in Grande-Entrée lagoon (Canada) who reported not significant mussel impact on phytoplankton and microbial heterotrophic plankton community. These authors considered that the low bivalve production (180 t yr^{-1}) in Grande-Entrée lagoon was responsible for the lack of impact on the microbial plankton community. In the Ría de Vigo, where we detected a significant impact on the microbial plankton community, mussel production (34500 t yr^{-1}) is substantially higher (Labarta et al. 2004).

Our study also shows that in areas with mussels (RaS) there was a significant decrease in the biomasses of nanoplankton and microplankton, but not in the biomass of picoplankton (Fig. 5), which lead us to assume that the smallest plankton seems to be less efficiently retained on the gills of mussels and do not constitute a suitable food for them (Norén et al. 1999, Newell 2004, Petersen et al. 2008). This selective effect on

microbial plankton was also observed in mesocosm experiments (Prins et al. 1998), where mussel feeding caused changes in phytoplankton composition leading to the predominance of the smallest fraction. Therefore, it can be concluded that the reduction in plankton biomass that we observed at RaS resulted in a modification in the size-structure of the microbial planktonic community (Fig. 4b, d). In all cases, the reduction in biomass affected the main components of the population, regardless of its trophic nature (pigmented or unpigmented): diatoms during upwelling, diatoms and ANP in spring (Fig. S1e), and the heterotrophic dinoflagellate *Noctiluca scintillans* in summer (Fig. S2d). Furthermore, HCil also experienced a remarkable reduction in spring, just when their contribution to HMP was the highest (Fig. S2d). This fact would support the idea that HCil could constitute an important food source for mussels (Trottet et al. 2007).

According to these results, we can infer that mussel culture exerts a “top-down” control over the microbial plankton population (Dame 1996), modifying its structure by consuming microplankton and nanoplankton without affecting picoplankton. At the same time, mussel farming could be exerting a “bottom-up” control on phytoplankton populations that escape mussel consumption (Prins et al. 1998, Newell 2004) by means of supplying regenerated nutrients, as suggest the significantly higher ammonium levels recorded at RaS (Figs. 2 & 3). In this sense, Zuñiga et al. (2013) evidenced that ammonium excretion rates by *Mytilus galloprovincialis* generated ammonium excess in the mussel farming zone. In addition, the lower AC:Chl *a* ratio at RaS than at ReS points to an stimulation of phytoplankton growth at RaS, a view that supports our interpretation about a certain degree of bottom-up control of phytoplankton in the mussel zones. This view also agrees well with the results obtained in Grande-Entrée lagoon-Canada (Trottet et al. 2008), which showed that the rates of primary production

in the culture area were significantly higher than outside this zone. Similarly, the increase in nutrient availability due to mussel feeding activity probably allowed the relative higher phytoplankton growth rates recorded in mussel areas in Beatrix Bay in New Zealand (Ogilvie et al. 2000) when outside the farming area there was nitrogen limitation. Even though this “bottom-up” control of phytoplankton is expected to be more effective in oligotrophic environments (Asmus & Asmus 1993), our results suggest that it could also exists in upwelling zones without nutrient limitation.

Acknowledgements. We thank the crew of the ‘R/V Mytilus’ and the members of the Oceanography and Physiology and Culture of Bivalve Molluscs Groups from the Instituto de Investigacións Mariñas de Vigo (CSIC) for their valuable help. Financial support came from MICINN RAFTING project (CTM2007–61983/MAR, CTM2007-30624-E/MAR). M.F. was financed by a research grant (BI/PTDC/MAR/102045/2008/2010- 022) from Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT) in the framework of CALIBERIA project (FCOMP-01-0124-FEDER-010599). D.Z. was funded by a postdoctoral fellowship (Jae-Doc) from the CSIC

LITERATURE CITED

- Arbones B, Castro CG, Alonso-Pérez F, Figueiras FG (2008) Phytoplankton size structure and water column metabolic balance in a coastal upwelling system: the Ría de Vigo, NW Iberia. *Aquat Microb Ecol* 50:169-179
- Asmus H, Asmus RM (1993) Phytoplankton-mussel bed interactions in intertidal ecosystems. In: Dame RF (ed) *Bivalve Filter Feeders in Estuarine and Coastal Ecosystems Processes*. NATO ASI Series 33:57-84
- Azam F, Fenchel T, Field JG, Gray JS, Meyer-Reil LA, Thingstad F (1983) The ecological role of water-column microbes in the sea. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 10:257-263
- Bakun A (1973) Coastal upwelling indices, west coast of North America. NOAA Tech Rep NMFS SSRF-671. US Dept. of Commerce, Washington, DC
- Böttjer D, Morales CE (2007) Nanoplanktonic assemblages in the upwelling area off Concepción (~36°S), central Chile: abundance, biomass, and grazing potential during the annual cycle. *Prog Oceanogr* 75:415-434
- Bratbak G, Dundas I (1984) Bacterial dry matter content and biomass estimation. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 48:755-757
- Cabanas JM, Gonzalez JJ, Mariño J, Perez A, Roman G (1979). Estudio del mejillón y de su epifauna asociada en los cultivos flotantes de la Ría de Arosa. III. Observaciones preliminares sobre la retención de partículas y la biodeposición de una batea. *Boletín del IEO* 268:45-50
- Calvo-Díaz A, Morán XAG (2006) Seasonal dynamics of picoplankton in shelf waters of southern Bay of Biscay. *Aquat Microb Ecol* 42:159-174
- Castro CG, Álvarez-Salgado XA, Figueiras FG, Pérez FF, Fraga F (1997) Transient hydrographic and chemical conditions affecting microplankton populations in

488 the coastal transtion zone of the Iberian upwelling system (NW Spain) in
 489 September (1986) J Mar Res 55:321-352
 490 Cermeño P, Marañón E, Pérez V, Serret P, Fernández E, Castro CG (2006)
 491 Phytoplankton size structure and primary production in highly dynamic coastal
 492 ecosystem (Ría de Vigo, NW-Spain): seasonal and short-time scale variability.
 493 Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 67:251-266
 494 Crespo BG, Figueiras FG (2007) A spring poleward current and its influence on
 495 microplankton assemblages and harmful dinoflagellates on the western Iberian
 496 coast. Harmful Algae 6:686-699
 497 Crespo BG, Espinoza-González O, Teixeira IG, Castro CG, Figueiras FG (2011)
 498 Possible mixotrophy of pigmented nanoflagellates: Microbial plankton biomass,
 499 primary production and phytoplankton growth at the NW Iberian upwelling in
 500 spring. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 94:172-181
 501 Cushing DH (1989) A difference in structure between ecosystems in strongly stratified
 502 waters and in those that are only weakly stratified. J Plankton Res 11:1-13
 503 Dame RF (1996) Ecology of marine bivalves: an ecosystem approach. CRC Press, Boca
 504 Raton. Florida
 505 Eppley RW, Peterson BJ (1979) Particulate organic matter flux and planktonic new
 506 production in the deep ocean. Nature 282:677-680
 507 Espinoza-González O, Figueiras FG, Crespo BG, Teixeira IG, Castro CG (2012)
 508 Autotrophic and heterotrophic microbial plankton biomass in the NW Iberian
 509 upwelling: seasonal assessment of metabolic balance. Aquat Microb Ecol 67:77-
 510 89

511 Fermín EG, Figueiras FG, Arbones B, Villarino ML (1996) Short-time scale
 512 development of a *Gymnodinium catenatum* population in the Ría de Vigo (NW
 513 Spain). J Phycol 32:212-221

514 Figueiras FG, Jones KJ, Mosquera AM, Álvarez-Salgado XA, Edwards A, MacDougall
 515 N (1994) Red tide assemblage formation in an estuarine upwelling ecosystem:
 516 Ría de Vigo. J Plankton Res 16:857-878

517 Figueiras FG, Labarta U, Fernández-Reiriz MJ (2002) Coastal upwelling, primary
 518 production and mussel growth in the Rías Baixas of Galicia. Hydrobiologia
 519 484:121-131

520 Fraga F (1981) Upwelling off the Galician coast, Northwest Spain. In: Richards FA (ed)
 521 Coastal Upwelling. AGU, Washington DC p 176-182

522 Hansen HP, Grasshoff K (1983) Automated chemical analysis. In: Grasshoff K,
 523 Ehrhardt M, Kremling K (eds) Methods of seawater analysis. Verlag Chemie,
 524 Weinheim p 347-379

525 Hillebrand H, Dürselen C, Kirschtel D, Pollinger U, Zohary T (1999) Biovolume
 526 calculation for pelagic and benthic microalgae. J Phycol 35:403-424

527 Iriarte JL, González HE (2004) Phytoplankton size structure during and after the
 528 1997/98 El Niño in a coastal upwelling area of the northern Humboldt current
 529 system. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 269:83-90

530 Labarta U, Fernández-Reiriz MJ, Pérez-Camacho A, Pérez Corbacho E (2004)
 531 Bateiros, Mar, Mejillón. Una Perspectiva Bioeconómica. CIEF. Fundación
 532 Caixagalicia, Santiago de Compostela, ISBN 84-95491-69-9

533 Larsen J, Sournia A (1991) The diversity of heterotrophic dinoflagellates. In: Patterson
 534 DJ, Larsen J (eds) The biology of free-living heterotrophic flagellates. Oxford
 535 University Press, New York, 313-332

536 Lee S, Fuhrman JA (1987) Relationships between biovolume and biomass of naturally
537 derived marine bacterioplankton. Appl Environ Microbiol 53:1298-1303

538 Lessard EJ, Swift E (1986) Dinoflagellates from the North Atlantic classified as
539 phototrophic or heterotrophic by epifluorescence microscopy. J Plankton Res 8:
540 1209-1215

541 Maar M, Nielsen TG, Petersen JK (2008) Depletion of plankton in a raft culture
542 of *Mytilus galloprovincialis* in Ría de Vigo, Spain. II. Zooplankton Aquat Biol
543 4: 127-141

544 Moncoiffé G, Álvarez-Salgado XA, Figueiras FG, Savidge G (2000) Seasonal and
545 short-time scale dynamics of microplankton community production and
546 respiration in an inshore upwelling system. Mar Ecol Progr Ser 196:111-126

547 Newell (2004) Ecosystem influences of natural and cultivated populations of
548 suspension-feeding bivalve molluscs: a review. J Shellfish Res 23:51-61

549 Norén F, Haamer J, Lindahl O (1999) Changes in the plankton community passing a
550 *Mytilus edulis* mussel bed. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 191:187-194

551 Ogilvie SC, Ross AH, Schiel DR (2000) Phytoplankton biomass associated with mussel
552 farms in Beatrix Bay, New Zealand. Aquaculture 181:71-80

553 Pauly D, Christensen V (1995) Primary production required to sustain global fisheries.
554 Nature 374:255-257

555 Petersen JK, Nielsen TG, Van Duren L, Maar M (2008) Depletion of plankton in a raft
556 culture of *Mytilus galloprovincialis* in Ría de Vigo, NW Spain. I. Phytoplankton.
557 Aquat Biol 4:113–125

558 Pitcher GC, Figueiras FG, Hickey BM, Moita MT (2010) The physical oceanography of
559 upwelling systems and the development of harmful algal blooms. Prog Oceanogr
560 85:5-32

561 Pomeroy LR (1974) The ocean's food web, a changing paradigm. *Bioscience* 24:499-
562 504

563 Porter KG, Feig YS (1980) The use of DAPI for identifying and counting aquatic
564 microflora. *Limnol Oceanogr* 25:943-948

565 Prins TC, Smaal AC, Dame RF (1998) A review of the feedbacks between bivalve
566 grazing and ecosystem processes. *Aquatic Ecol* 31:349-359

567 Putt M, Stoecker DK (1989) An experimentally determined carbon: volume ratio for
568 marine “oligotrichous” ciliates from estuarine and coastal waters. *Limnol*
569 *Oceanogr* 34:1097-1103

570 Rodríguez F, Pazos Y, Maneiro J, Zapata M (2003) Temporal variation in
571 phytoplankton assemblages and pigment composition at a fixed station of the
572 Ría of Pontevedra. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci* 58:499-515

573 Ryther JH (1969) Photosynthesis and fish production in the sea. *Science* 166:72-76.

574 Strathmann R (1967) Estimating the organic carbon content of phytoplankton from cell
575 volume or plasma volume. *Limnol Oceanogr* 12:411-418

576 Strohmeier T, Duinker A, Strand Ø, Aure J (2008) Temporal and spatial variation in
577 food availability and meat ratio in a longline mussel farm (*Mytilus edulis*).
578 *Aquaculture* 276:83-90

579 Tada K, Pithakpol S, Yano R, Montani S (2000) Carbon and nitrogen content of
580 *Noctiluca scintillans* in the Seto Inland Sea, Japan. *J Plankton Res* 22:1203-1211

581 Teira E, Serret P, Fernández E (2001) Phytoplankton size structure, particulate and
582 dissolved organic carbon production and oxygen fluxes through microbial
583 communities in the NW Iberian coastal transition zone. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser*
584 219:65-83

585 Teixeira IG, Figueiras FG, Crespo BG, Piedracoba S (2011) Microzooplankton feeding
 586 impact in a coastal upwelling system on the NW Iberian margin: the Ría de
 587 Vigo. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci* 91:110-120
 588 Tenore KR (1982) Coastal upwelling in the Rías Bajas, NW Spain: contrasting the
 589 benthic regimes of the Rías de Arosa and Muros. *J Mar Res* 40:701-772
 590 Tilstone GH, Figueiras FG, Fraga F (1994) Upwelling/downwelling sequences in the
 591 generation of red tides in a coastal upwelling system. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser*
 592 112:241-253
 593 Tilstone GH, Míguez BM, Figueiras FG, Fermín EG (2000) Diatom dynamics in a
 594 coastal ecosystem affected by upwelling: coupling between species succession,
 595 circulation and biogeochemical processes. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 205:23-41
 596 Trottet A, Roy S, Tamigneaux E, Lovejoy C (2007) Importance of heterotrophic
 597 planktonic communities in a mussel culture environment: the Grande-Entrée
 598 Lagoon, Magdalen Islands (Québec, Canada). *Mar Biol* 151:377–392
 599 Trottet A, Roy S, Tamigneaux E, Lovejoy C, Tremblay R (2008) Influence of
 600 suspended mussel farming on planktonic communities in Grande-Entree Lagoon,
 601 Magdalen Islands (Quebec, Canada). *Aquaculture* 276:91–102
 602 Varela M, Díaz del Río G, Álvarez-Ossorio MT, Costas E (1991) Factors controlling
 603 phytoplankton size class distribution in the upwelling area of the Galician
 604 continental shelf (NW Spain). *Sci Mar* 55:505-518
 605 Verity PG, Robertson CY, Tronzo CR, Andrews MG, Nelson JR, Sieracki ME (1992)
 606 Relationships between cell volume and the carbon and nitrogen content of
 607 marine photosynthetic nanoplankton. *Limnol Oceanogr* 48:357-366
 608 Wassman P (1990) Relationship between primary and export production in the boreal
 609 coastal zone of the North Atlantic. *Limnol Oceanogr* 35:464-471

Zúñiga D, Froján M, Castro CG, Alonso-Pérez F, Labarta U, Figueiras FG, Fuentes-
Santos I, Fernández- Reiriz MJ (2013) Feedback between physiological activity
of *Mytilus galloprovincialis* and biogeochemistry of the water column. Mar Ecol
Prog Ser 476:101-114

Table 1. Average (± 1 SD) (g C m^{-2}) biomass of total microbial plankton (TC), autotrophic plankton (AC), heterotrophic plankton (HC) and chlorophyll *a* (Chl *a*) concentration (mg m^{-2}) integrated in the upper 12 m of the water column, for the four seasonal periods (autumn, winter, spring and summer) at reference (ReS) and raft station (RaS).

	Season	TC	AC	HC	Chl <i>a</i>
ReS	Autumn	2.63 ± 1.31	2.07 ± 1.27	0.56 ± 0.16	47 ± 23
	Winter	0.69 ± 0.18	0.46 ± 0.12	0.23 ± 0.09	13 ± 4
	Spring	2.82 ± 1.05	1.94 ± 0.91	0.88 ± 0.32	49 ± 18
	Summer	2.02 ± 0.75	0.80 ± 0.46	1.22 ± 0.47	34 ± 21
RaS	Autumn	0.99 ± 0.51	0.67 ± 0.42	0.32 ± 0.1	21 ± 15
	Winter	0.49 ± 0.09	0.33 ± 0.08	0.17 ± 0.02	8 ± 2
	Spring	2.04 ± 0.95	1.39 ± 0.79	0.65 ± 0.31	42 ± 19
	Summer	1.30 ± 0.56	0.62 ± 0.4	0.68 ± 0.19	23 ± 11

Table 2. Average (± 1 SD) (g C m^{-2}) biomass of autotrophic plankton integrated in the upper 12 m of the water column for the four seasonal periods (autumn, winter, spring and summer) at reference (ReS) and raft station (RaS). Autotrophic picoflagellates (APF), autotrophic nanoplankton (ANP), large ($>20 \mu\text{m}$) autotrophic dinoflagellates (AD), large ($>20 \mu\text{m}$) autotrophic ciliates (ACil).

	Season	<i>Synechococcus</i>	APF	ANP	Diatoms	AD	ACil
ReS	Autumn	0.03 ± 0.02	0.13 ± 0.05	0.50 ± 0.29	1.32 ± 1.03	0.07 ± 0.11	0.002 ± 0.003
	Winter	0.02 ± 0.01	0.13 ± 0.04	0.20 ± 0.10	0.11 ± 0.06	0.003 ± 0.002	0.001 ± 0.001
	Spring	0.001 ± 0.001	0.12 ± 0.07	0.24 ± 0.10	1.50 ± 0.81	0.01 ± 0.01	0.06 ± 0.09
	Summer	0.008 ± 0.002	0.12 ± 0.05	0.24 ± 0.14	0.38 ± 0.41	0.01 ± 0.003	0.017 ± 0.017
RaS	Autumn	0.02 ± 0.01	0.11 ± 0.04	0.23 ± 0.07	0.31 ± 0.31	0.01 ± 0.01	0.0001 ± 0.0003
	Winter	0.02 ± 0.01	0.10 ± 0.03	0.13 ± 0.05	0.06 ± 0.03	0.003 ± 0.002	0.001 ± 0.001
	Spring	0.001 ± 0.001	0.09 ± 0.04	0.12 ± 0.05	1.15 ± 0.82	0.005 ± 0.003	0.03 ± 0.04
	Summer	0.01 ± 0.003	0.15 ± 0.12	0.20 ± 0.11	0.25 ± 0.35	0.01 ± 0.005	0.005 ± 0.004

Table 3. Average (± 1 SD) (g C m^{-2}) biomass of heterotrophic microbial plankton integrated in the upper 12 m of the water column for the four seasonal periods (autumn, winter, spring and summer) at reference (ReS) and raft station (RaS). Heterotrophic bacteria (HB), heterotrophic picoflagellates (HPF); heterotrophic picoplankton (HPP), heterotrophic nanoplankton (HNP), large ($> 20\mu\text{m}$) heterotrophic dinoflagellates (HD), large ($> 20\mu\text{m}$) heterotrophic ciliates (HCil).

	Season	HB	HPF	HPP	HNP	HD	HCil
ReS	Autumn	0.20 ± 0.04	0.03 ± 0.01	0.23 ± 0.04	0.15 ± 0.05	0.08 ± 0.06	0.10 ± 0.13
	Winter	0.11 ± 0.07	0.03 ± 0.005	0.14 ± 0.08	0.05 ± 0.01	0.02 ± 0.01	0.02 ± 0.01
	Spring	0.20 ± 0.07	0.03 ± 0.01	0.23 ± 0.07	0.15 ± 0.06	0.08 ± 0.04	0.42 ± 0.24
	Summer	0.10 ± 0.02	0.03 ± 0.01	0.13 ± 0.03	0.16 ± 0.02	0.77 ± 0.40	0.15 ± 0.06
RaS	Autumn	0.17 ± 0.06	0.02 ± 0.01	0.20 ± 0.05	0.06 ± 0.03	0.02 ± 0.01	0.03 ± 0.03
	Winter	0.09 ± 0.01	0.02 ± 0.01	0.11 ± 0.01	0.03 ± 0.01	0.01 ± 0.003	0.01 ± 0.01
	Spring	0.24 ± 0.08	0.03 ± 0.01	0.28 ± 0.08	0.10 ± 0.04	0.06 ± 0.04	0.21 ± 0.21
	Summer	0.15 ± 0.06	0.04 ± 0.02	0.19 ± 0.07	0.11 ± 0.04	0.29 ± 0.20	0.10 ± 0.06

Figure legends

Fig. 1. Map of the Ría de Vigo showing the two sampling sites (◆): reference station (ReS) and raft station (RaS). The location of the raft polygons is also shown in the figure as dark grey areas.

Fig. 2. Seasonal evolution of (a) upwelling index ($10^3 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ km}^{-1}$), (b) temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$), (c) salinity, (d) nitrate concentration ($\mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$), (e) ammonium concentration ($\mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$) and (f) chlorophyll *a* (Chl *a*) concentration (mg m^{-3}) at ReS.

Fig. 3. Seasonal evolution of (a) ammonium concentration ($\mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$) and (b) chlorophyll *a* (Chl *a*) concentration (mg m^{-3}) at RaS.

Fig. 4. Seasonal evolution of autotrophic carbon biomass (AC) and heterotrophic carbon biomass (HC) integrated in the upper 12 m of the water column at (a) ReS and (c) RaS, and contribution of picoplankton (Pico), nanoplankton (Nano) and microplankton (Micro) to total microbial plankton biomass at (b) ReS and (d) RaS.

Fig. 5. Seasonal evolution of autotrophic (APP) and heterotrophic (HPP) picoplankton biomass, autotrophic (ANP) and heterotrophic (HNP) nanoplankton biomass and autotrophic (AMP) and heterotrophic (HMP) microplankton biomass integrated in the upper 12 m of the water column at ReS (a,b,c) and RaS (d, e, f). Note different scales.

Fig. 1
Froján et al.

Fig. 2
Froján et al.

Fig. 3
Froján et al.

Fig. 4
Froján et al.

Fig. 5
Froján et al.

Supplementary material

Fig. S1. Seasonal evolution of (a) temperature (°C), (b) salinity and (c) nitrate concentration ($\mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$) at RaS.

Fig. S2. Seasonal evolution of the biomass of *Synechococcus* and autotrophic picoflagellates (APF), diatoms ($>20 \mu\text{m}$), total autotrophic nanoplankton (ANP) and autotrophic nanoflagellates (ANF) integrated in the upper 12 m of the water column at ReS (a,b,c) and RaS (d,e,f). Note different scales.

Fig. S3. Seasonal evolution of the biomass of heterotrophic bacteria (HB), heterotrophic nanoplankton (HNP), heterotrophic dinoflagellates (HD) and heterotrophic ciliates (HCil) integrated in the upper 12 m of the water column at ReS (a, b) and RaS (c, d).

28

29

Fig. S1
Froján et al.

Fig. S2
Froján et al.

Fig. S3
Froján et al.

Table S1. Results from Kruskal-Wallis tests for Location (ReS vs RaS) and season (autumn, winter, spring and summer) effects on the microbial plankton community. Analyses were performed on biomasses integrated in the upper 12 m of the water column. Significant values are in bold ($p < 0.05$). Total microbial plankton (TC), autotrophic plankton (AC), heterotrophic plankton (HC), autotrophic picoplankton (APP), heterotrophic picoplankton (HPP), autotrophic nanoplankton (ANP), heterotrophic nanoplankton (HNP), autotrophic microplankton (AMP), heterotrophic microplankton (HMP), autotrophic picoflagellates (APF), heterotrophic bacteria (HB), heterotrophic picoflagellates (HPF), large ($> 20\mu\text{m}$) heterotrophic dinoflagellates (HD), large ($> 20\mu\text{m}$) heterotrophic ciliates (HCil).

Kruskal-Wallis test	TOTAL ReS vs RaS	Autumn ReS vs RaS	Winter ReS vs RaS	Spring ReS vs RaS	Summer ReS vs RaS
TC	0.011	0.016	0.055	0.337	0.078
AC	0.021	0.016	0.078	0.262	0.522
HC	0.035	0.010	0.078	0.200	0.055
APP	0.063	0.262	0.337	0.150	0.631
HPP	0.711	0.150	0.873	0.423	0.150
ANP	0.007	0.025	0.078	0.025	0.631
HNP	0.002	0.006	0.025	0.200	0.010
AMP	0.061	0.025	0.150	0.423	0.337
HMP	0.027	0.055	0.025	0.078	0.016
<i>Synechococcus</i>	0.496	0.078	0.749	0.997	0.262
APF	0.087	0.522	0.337	0.150	0.631
Diatoms	0.076	0.025	0.150	0.423	0.423
HB	0.606	0.200	0.521	0.337	0.109
HPF	0.180	0.109	0.423	0.631	1.000
HD	0.041	0.010	0.004	0.337	0.037
HCil	0.103	0.337	0.631	0.055	0.150