

IMPACT OF NUTRIENT AND LIGHT LIMITATION ON THE TOXIC DINOFLAGELLATE KARENIA BREVIS

Teodora Negru (1,2) (t.negru@students.uu.nl), Suzanne de Zwaan (1,3), Francesca Sangiorgi (1), Laura Villanueva (3), Susanne Wilken (2)

1, Utrecht University, Faculty of Geosciences; 2, University of Amsterdam, IBED (Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Dynamics); 3,NIOZ (Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research)

BACKGROUND

• Harmful algal blooms (**HABs**) pose significant ecological and economic challenges globally, with Florida serving as a hotspot. These blooms, driven nutrient inputs and complex environmental by factors, particularly affect coastal regions.

METHODOLOGY

- **5** experimental conditions: Control (**C**), Nitrogen limited (N), Phosphate limited (P), Intermediate light (IL) and Low light (LL).











- *Karenia brevis*, a toxic mixotrophic (photoautotrophy and heterotrophy) dinoflagellate, contributes notably to HAB occurrences in Florida.
- Understanding the dynamics of HABs formation, including the role of **nutrients** and **prey** availability, is critical. This study investigates the effects of nutrient light limitation on *Karenia brevis* growth, and alongside its grazing behavior on **Synechococcus** sp.

OBJECTIVES

reduced nutrient effects • What are the of concentrations and diminished light intensities on the growth and population densities of *Karenia brevis* in laboratory cultures?

Nutrient ratios:	Light conditions:
C,IL,LL: N:P= 16:1	C,N,P: 120 µmol m-2s -1 photons
N: N:P= 3:1	IL: 60 µmol m-2s -1 photons
P: N:P= 85:1	LL: 30 µmol m-2s -1 photons

- 1: Experiment Light microscopy, Nutrient analysis, Pigment analysis;
- Experiment 2: Grazing assay, Fluorescence microscopy.

FINDINGS

• EXPERIMENT 1 - LIMITING CONDITIONS

Statistically differences significant were observed in cell yield between control and nutrient-limited treatments. Light intensity did not significantly affect cell yield, although low light conditions delayed exponential phase growth. There results are reflected in the chlorophyll-a analysis.

EXPERIMENT 2 - GRAZING ASSAY

Unexpected lower yields observed in the

Figure 1. Cell counts of the experimental groups (C, N, P) plotted against time. Error bars are representative for the value range (standard deviation) of the replicates within each group.



🔶 Control 📥 Intermediate light 🔶 Low light

Figure 2. Cell counts of the experimental groups (C, IL, LL) plotted against time. Error bars are representative for the value range (standard deviation) of the replicates within each group.



how does the introduction of • Additionally, Synechococcus sp. as prey influence the behaviour and growth of *Karenia brevis* under the same conditions of environmental limitation?

presence of **Synechococcus sp.** Fluorescence microscopy indicated no active feeding of Karenia brevis.

Figure 3. Concentration of chlorophyll-a pigments during the experiment. The values were averaged between the replicates in each group, with the error bars representing the standard deviation.



Figure 5. Cell counts for the experimental groups: Control (n=2), Control+Synechococcus sp. (n=3). Error bars are representative for the value range (standard deviation) of the replicates within each group.





Figure 4. Confocal fluorescence microscopy images of Karenia brevis. Left: Low light + Synechococcus sp. treatment; Right: N-limited + Synechococcus sp. treatment. In blue emission are shown the nucleus, in red emission the chloroplasts and in green emission an unidentified organelle.

TAKE-HOME MESSAGE

CONCLUSIONS

🔶 N limited 📥 N limited + Synechococcus sp

Figure 6. Cell counts for the experimental groups: N-limited (n=2), N-limited+Synechococcus sp. (n=3). Error bars are representative for the value range (standard deviation) of the replicates within each group.



Low light + Synechococcus sp.

Figure 7.Cell counts for the experimental groups: Low light (n=2), Low light+Synechococcus sp. (n=3). Error bars are representative for the value range (standard deviation) of the replicates within each group • Nitrogen scarcity significantly reduced cell densities. but unclear response to **phosphate** limitation.

• Contrary to initial hypotheses, the addition of Synechococcus sp. resulted in slightly lower maximum cell yields, challenging the anticipated benefits of mixotrophic feeding. • Fluorescence microscopy analysis further

details the absence of mixotrophic interactions.

• The current study is a first step, leading to a more in-depth analysis aimed at the production toxins and lipid biomarkers by Karenia of brevis.

• The observed effects of nutrient and light limitations offer implications for understanding influencing the ecological factors the proliferation of *Karenia brevis* and the potential formation of HABs in natural environments.

Anderson, D. M., Cembella, A. D., & Hallegraeff, G. M. (2012). Progress in understanding harmful algal blooms: paradigm shifts and new technologies for research, monitoring, and management. Annual review of marine science, 4, 143-176; Glibert, P. M., & Burkholder, J. M. (2018). Causes of harmful algal blooms. Harmful algal blooms: A compendium desk reference, 1-38; Guillard, R. R. (1975). Culture of phytoplankton for feeding marine invertebrate animals greenport (pp. 29-60). Boston, MA: Springer USHardison, D. R., Sunda, W. G., Shea, D., & Litaker, R. W. (2013). Increased toxicity of Karenia brevis during phosphate limited growth: ecological and evolutionary implications. PLoS One, 8(3), e58545; Jeong, H. J., Yoo, Y. D., Kim, J. S., & Kim, T. H. (2010). Growth, feeding and ecological roles of the mixotrophic and heterotrophic and heterotrophic and heterotrophic and heterotrophic and evolutionary implications. PLoS One, 8(3), e58545; Jeong, K. A., Kang, N. S., & Kim, T. H. (2010). Growth, feeding and ecological roles of the mixotrophic and heterotrophic and heterotrophic and heterotrophic and evolutionary implications. PLoS One, 8(3), e58545; Jeong, K. A., Kang, N. S., & Kim, T. H. (2010). Growth, feeding and ecological roles of the mixotrophic and heterotrophic and heterotrophic and evolutionary implications. dinoflagellates in marine planktonic food webs. Ocean science journal, 45, 65-91.; Landsberg, J. H., Flewelling, L. J., & Naar, J. (2009). Karenia brevis red tides, brevetoxins in the food web, and impacts on natural resources: Decadal advancements. Harmful Algae, 8(4), 598-607.; https://www.vox.com/2021/8/4/22606025/florida-red-tide-dead-fish-beach-algae-bloom