



HAL
open science

delta C-13, delta N-15, and C:N ratios as nutrition indicators of zooxanthellate jellyfishes: insights from an experimental approach

Nicolas Djeghri, Herwig Stibor, Oanez Lebeau, Philippe Pondaven

► To cite this version:

Nicolas Djeghri, Herwig Stibor, Oanez Lebeau, Philippe Pondaven. delta C-13, delta N-15, and C:N ratios as nutrition indicators of zooxanthellate jellyfishes: insights from an experimental approach. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 2020, 522, pp.151257. 10.1016/j.jembe.2019.151257 . hal-02921198

HAL Id: hal-02921198

<https://hal.science/hal-02921198>

Submitted on 3 Dec 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

$\delta^{13}\text{C}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, and C:N ratios as nutrition indicators of zooxanthellate jellyfishes: insights from an experimental approach

Djehri Nicolas ^{1,*}, Stibor Herwig ², Lebeau Oanez ³, Pondaven Philippe ¹

¹ Université de Brest, UBO, Institut Universitaire Européen de la Mer, IUEM, Laboratoire des sciences de l'Environnement Marin, UMR 6539 LEMAR, Technopôle Brest Iroise, Rue Dumont d'Urville, 29280 Plouzané, France

² Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Department Biologie II, Aquatische Ökologie, Großhaderner Str. 2, 82152, Planegg, Martinsried, Germany

³ Université de Brest, UBO, Institut Universitaire Européen de la Mer, IUEM, UMS 3113, Technopôle Brest Iroise, Rue Dumont d'Urville, 29280 Plouzané, France

* Corresponding author : Nicolas Djehri, email address : nicolas.djehri@univ-brest.fr

Abstract :

Some jellyfish host zooxanthellae in their tissues (mostly from the family Symbiodiniaceae; Dinophyceae) and supplement their heterotrophic nutrition with their symbiont's photosynthates. The mixotrophy of zooxanthellate jellyfishes (as holobionts) renders the study of their nutrition, growth, and population dynamics complicated. Here, we used an experimental approach to assess how carbon and nitrogen stable isotopes ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$) as well as the elemental composition (C:N ratios) of zooxanthellate jellyfishes are affected by variations in nutrition sources: i. e. predation (heterotrophic) versus photosynthesis (autotrophic). Our laboratory experiment, conducted on the zooxanthellate jellyfish *Cassiopea* sp. medusae (including symbionts) in the presence or absence of light and prey during 24 days, showed conclusive results. Presence of light decreased $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, increased $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and C:N ratios, whereas presence of prey increased $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, and decreased $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and C:N ratios. The medusae incubated with both light and prey had intermediate $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and C:N ratios. Variations in zooxanthellate jellyfishes' nutrition sources (autotrophy vs. heterotrophy) are thus reflected by their isotopic and elemental composition. By disentangling the effects of autotrophy and of heterotrophy on zooxanthellate jellyfish isotopic and elemental compositions, these results would help to interpret the values of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and C:N ratios that can be observed on these organisms in fieldwork studies.

Highlights

► First experimental study on the effect of nutrition sources on $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and C:N ratios in zooxanthellate jellyfishes. ► $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values were higher in light. ► $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values were lower in light and higher with prey. ► C:N ratios were higher in light and lower with prey. ► $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and C:N ratios could be valuable indicators of the nutrition of zooxanthellate jellyfishes in the field.

Keywords : Stable isotopes, C:N ratios, Photosymbiosis, Mixotrophy, Scyphozoa, Zooxanthellae

31 1. Introduction

32 Jellyfishes are increasingly acknowledged as an important component of marine ecosystems. Population
33 dynamics of the pelagic life stages are often characterized by important fluctuations with dramatic
34 biomass increases followed by sudden collapses (Lucas and Dawson 2014, Pitt et al. 2014). These
35 fluctuations can have important consequences for pelagic community dynamics and nutrient cycling (Pitt
36 et al. 2009a), or for human activities (Purcell et al. 2007). One of the key factors controlling jellyfish
37 population dynamics, is nutrition (e. g. Lucas and Dawson 2014, Pitt et al. 2014). One way to study
38 jellyfish nutrition is to use their stable isotopes signatures (mainly $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, see Pitt et al. 2009b).
39 Many recent studies have focused on jellyfish stable isotopes and have provided precisions of their diets
40 as well as competition relationships (e. g. Fleming et al. 2015, Javidpour et al. 2016, Vansteenbrugge et
41 al. 2016, D'Ambra et al. 2018, Milisenda et al. 2018). Most of these studies have strictly focused on
42 heterotrophic jellyfishes. However, some jellyfishes are known to live in symbiosis with zooxanthellae.
43 Comparatively, the zooxanthellate jellyfishes have received less interest (see however Freeman et al.
44 2017, Zeman et al. 2018).

45 Zooxanthellate jellyfishes (mostly Rhizostomeae, Scyphozoa, see Djeghri et al. 2019) are characterized by
46 their photosymbiotic relationship with zooxanthellae (generally from the family Symbiodiniaceae,
47 Dinophyceae; LaJeunesse 2001, LaJeunesse et al. 2018). This symbiotic relationship is thought to be
48 similar to the one well known in corals with the zooxanthellae providing their host with photosynthates
49 while recycling the host's respiration and excretion products (see Davy et al. 2012). In such symbiosis,
50 both carbon and nitrogen can be obtained via heterotrophy and autotrophy and are recycled between
51 the host and its zooxanthellae. Carbon dioxide (CO_2) and nitrogen from host respiration and excretion
52 are used and metabolized by the zooxanthellae. Simultaneously, complex molecules (including
53 carbohydrates, lipids and amino acids) are transferred from one partner to the other (Davy et al. 2012).
54 Zooxanthellate jellyfishes, as holobionts (host + symbionts), are thus mixotrophs, deriving their nutrition
55 from both predation and zooxanthellae's photosynthesis (Kremer 2005, Welsh et al. 2009). Generally,
56 the symbiosis provides most if not all of the carbon needed for respiration (Kremer et al. 1990, Kikinger
57 1992, McCloskey et al. 1994, Verde and McCloskey 1998) while predation is still needed to meet nitrogen
58 and phosphorus requirements (Kremer 2005, Welsh et al. 2009). However, the relative contribution to
59 nutrition of the predation versus the photosynthesis might be variable across species, populations,
60 environments, or during growth (see e. g. Sugiura 1969, McCloskey et al. 1994, Verde and McCloskey

61 1998, Bolton and Graham 2004, reviewed in Djeghri et al. 2019). Studies using stable isotopes, in this
62 context might be valuable tools to understand these variations.

63 Numerous studies on other photosymbiotic cnidarians (mainly corals), have shown that variations of
64 nutrition affect the isotopic and elemental composition (see e. g. Muscatine et al. 1989a, Muscatine and
65 Kaplan 1994, Alamaru et al. 2009, Reynaud et al. 2009, Ferrier-Pagès et al. 2011, reviewed by Ferrier-
66 Pagès and Leal 2018). Similar effects can be expected in zooxanthellate jellyfishes. To date, only few
67 fieldwork studies have focused on the isotopic composition of zooxanthellate jellyfishes (see Freeman et
68 al. 2017, Zeman et al. 2018). The conclusions of these studies have, however, been limited due to the
69 lack of data on the interplay between autotrophy and heterotrophy of zooxanthellate jellyfishes as
70 reflected in their isotopic and elemental composition (Zeman et al. 2018). To better understand this,
71 controlled experiments are needed where the resources for heterotrophy (prey), and for autotrophy
72 (light) can be manipulated and their effect on stable isotopes signatures and elemental composition can
73 be assessed. In this study, we aim to provide experimental insights on how isotopic and elemental
74 composition of zooxanthellate jellyfishes are affected by different food regimes, and, more specifically,
75 by variations of the relative importance of autotrophy and heterotrophy. In order to achieve this, we
76 assessed the changes in the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, and C:N ratios in young specimens of zooxanthellate *Cassiopea*
77 sp. medusae (Scyphozoa: Rhizostomeae) over a period of 24 days and in the presence or absence of prey
78 and light.

79

80 **2. Materials and Methods**

81 *2.1. Experimental set-up*

82 Small specimens of *Cassiopea* sp. medusae (ca. 6 mm in bell diameter and 1 month old) were acquired
83 from the Trocadéro Aquarium (Paris, France). In this aquarium, the medusae were kept at 25 °C with a
84 daily light cycle, and were fed *Artemia* sp. nauplii twice a day. After their arrival to the laboratory the
85 medusae were acclimatized to local heated (25-26 °C) filtered (1 μm pore size) sea-water during one day.
86 In the following day, five medusae were randomly sampled to represent the initial state and then, the
87 experiment was set up. A total of 72 medusae specimens were individually placed in 75 ml glass flasks
88 filled with 50 mL of filtered sea-water. The flasks were then randomly assigned to one of the four
89 experimental treatments (18 medusae per treatment). The experimental treatments were as follows: (1)
90 fed and in light, (2) fed and in the dark, (3) starved and in light, and (4) starved and in the dark. The goal

91 of these different treatments was to target respectively: mixotrophy, heterotrophy, and autotrophy, the
92 fourth treatment being a control. The flasks containing the medusae were kept in water baths, which
93 regulated a fixed temperature (25-26 °C). Two water baths were used, one for the medusae kept in light,
94 and the other for the medusae kept in the dark. The temperature changed little during the experiment
95 and between the two water baths (25.6 ± 0.4 °C and 25.3 ± 0.4 °C respectively in the lighted and
96 darkened water baths; mean \pm s.d.). The light was provided by a fluorescent lamp on a 12:12 hours
97 day:night cycle at an intensity of ca. $110 \mu\text{mol photons}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$. Food consisted of 2 h of feeding *ad libitum*
98 every two days on *Artemia* sp. young nauplii (< 24 h after hatching). The medusae full guts and numerous
99 remaining prey in the flasks confirmed a proper *ad libitum* feeding. Every two days, and after the
100 feeding, the incubation water of the medusae was entirely changed. During the latter process, the flasks
101 were also washed to prevent fouling.

102 Every four days, and before the feeding (ensuring empty guts), three medusae were randomly sampled
103 from each treatment. Thus the sampling occurred at the following days: 4, 8, 12, 16, 20 and 24; plus the
104 initial state being represented by the five medusae sampled before setting the treatments.

105

106 2.2. Processing of medusae

107 Immediately after sampling, presence and physiological state of the symbionts were assessed. For this
108 purpose, the medusae were put in the dark for at least 20 minutes allowing the opening of the
109 photosystem reactive centers of zooxanthellae. The photosynthetic parameters of the zooxanthellae
110 were assessed by pulse amplitude modulatory (PAM) fluorometry using the “OJIP protocol” of an
111 AquaPen-C-AP-C100 (® Photon Systems Instruments, PSI, Brno, Czech Republic), at a 450 nm excitation
112 wavelength. This protocol measures the fluorescence emitted after a flash of saturating light. This yields
113 the estimation of several variables among which the maximum photosystem II quantum yield (F_v/F_m),
114 which is a proxy of the photosystem II efficiency. With F_m the maximum fluorescence under saturating
115 light, and $F_v = F_m - F_0$ with F_0 the initial fluorescence (Strasser et al. 2000). The measures were performed
116 on whole medusae specimens. Prior to the measurement, it was ensured that the medusae were settled
117 at the cuvette bottom to insure proper exposition to the saturating flash. Additionally, along each
118 medusae measure, a blank was realized by using the “OJIP protocol” on incubation water without
119 medusae (75 blanks total).

120 Preparation for elemental and isotopic analysis started first by quickly rinsing the medusae in deionized
121 water in order to remove the sea salt. The whole medusae were then placed in pre-weighted tin capsules
122 (10.5 × 9 mm EMAL technology, United Kingdom) and oven-dried at 60 °C for ca. 48 h. After drying, the
123 tin capsules containing the medusae were locked and weighted again to obtain the medusae dry mass,
124 which varied between 0.2 and 3.2 mg (0.9 ± 0.6 mg; mean \pm s.d.). In the preparation procedure, the
125 medusae were unpreserved before the isotopic analysis, following the recommendations of Fleming et
126 al. (2011). Due to the small size of the medusae specimens, it was not possible in this experiment to
127 follow the recommendations of MacKenzie et al. (2017) by dissecting, washing and rubbing the mesoglea
128 before conservation. In addition, due to their small size, it was not possible to separate the animal tissue
129 from the zooxanthellae. This would have resulted to acquiring an insufficient biomass for the isotopic
130 analysis. Thus, the results presented here are measures on the holobiont (animal host + zooxanthellae).

131

132 *2.3. Processing of prey nauplii*

133 In order to assess the isotopic and elemental composition of the *Artemia* sp. nauplii given as food for the
134 medusae, we sampled them two times during the experiment (at days 8 and 14) plus a sampling at day
135 28, slightly after the end of the experiment (protocol unchanged). At each sampling, concentrated
136 nauplii were divided in five aliquots, and oven-dried at 60 °C for ca. 48 h in clean glass flasks. The dried
137 nauplii were then scratched from the flasks and ground into a powder. Finally, between 0.5 and 1.5 mg
138 of the powder were inserted and locked in tin capsules (10.5 × 9 mm EMAL technology, United
139 Kingdom).

140

141 *2.4. Elemental and stable isotopes composition*

142 The analyses of medusae and nauplii samples were performed using an Elemental analyzer (Thermo
143 Scientific EA Flash 2000), coupled to a Mass Spectrometer (Thermo Scientific DELTA V Plus) at the Stable
144 Isotopes Laboratory of the “Pôle Spectrométrie Océan” (PSO-IUEM, Plouzané, France). The nitrogen and
145 carbon mass of medusae samples ranged respectively from 15 to 109 μgN (35 ± 22 μgN ; mean \pm s.d.) and
146 from 60 to 543 μgC (175 ± 120 μgC ; mean \pm s.d.). As the whole medusae were inserted in the tin
147 capsules, these values are representative of their total weights. The nitrogen and carbon mass of nauplii
148 samples ranged respectively from 40 to 105 μgN (64 ± 18 μgN ; mean \pm s.d.) and from 200 to 522 μgC
149 (326 ± 90 μgC ; mean \pm s.d.). The samples were calibrated for mass bias using casein (IVA-33802155,

150 Analysentechnik, Germany) as the elemental standard (range: 5-108 μgN ; 16-377 μgC). Some material-
 151 rich samples were automatically diluted during the analysis process (Thermo Scientific ConFlo IV).

152 Stable isotopes values are expressed as permil (‰) using the δ notation (normalized to Vienna Pee Dee
 153 Belemnite and atmospheric N_2 for respectively carbon and nitrogen):

$$154 \quad \delta X = \left(\frac{X_{sample}^H / X_{sample}^L}{X_{std}^H / X_{std}^L} - 1 \right) \times 1000$$

155 With X the element measured, X^H the amount of the heavy isotope and X^L the amount of the light
 156 isotope from the samples (X_{sample}) and the standard (X_{std}).

157 As some of our samples had a low (< 20 μgN) nitrogen mass, we analyzed five replicates of casein
 158 standards with a low nitrogen mass ($13.4 \pm 1.9 \mu\text{gN}$; mean \pm s.d.) to check whether this low mass have
 159 led to uncertainties in our measures. We found only a low variability on the obtained $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ measures
 160 (0.04 ‰ s.d., n=5) indicating that our measures were consistent even at low biomass levels.

161 Unless indicated otherwise, all C:N ratios are expressed by mass (following Ikeda 2014 and Molina-
 162 Ramírez et al. 2015). As the C:N ratios of both the medusae and their prey were higher than 3.5, a
 163 normalization of the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ for lipid content was advisable (Post et al. 2007). For the nauplii, we used the
 164 general normalization for aquatic animals given by Post et al. (2007) and for the medusae, we used the
 165 normalization specific to scyphozoans proposed by D'Ambra et al. (2014). For comparison, raw data is
 166 still presented as supplementary material (see discussion).

167

168 *2.5. Statistics*

169 The data collected during the experiment (carbon masses, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, C:N ratios and F_v/F_m) were
 170 analyzed using linear mixed-effects models (LME) (e. g. Crawley 2012). The presence or absence of prey
 171 and light were considered as fixed effects while time was considered as random effect. Model
 172 assumptions (mean of residuals = 0, linearity and normality) were checked using model-checking plots. If
 173 the model assumptions were not met, the data were log transformed. If the fixed effects affected
 174 significantly the results (if p-value < 0.05), subsequent Tukey post-hoc tests were performed on least-
 175 square means (i. e. means adjusted for the effect of time) to assess which combination of the fixed
 176 effects (light and prey) led to different responses.


177 One-way ANOVAs were used to assess possible variations in prey $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, and C:N ratios over time.
 178 Normality and homoscedasticity assumptions were checked using the Shapiro-Wilk normality test and
 179 Bartlett homogeneity of variance test (threshold: $\alpha = 0.05$). If the assumptions were not met, the data
 180 were Box-Cox transformed. All statistical analyses were performed in R (R Core Team 2017).

181

182 3. Results

183 3.1. Mass variation in medusae

184 The carbon mass of the medusae (Fig. 1) was significantly affected by light alone (LME, t-value = 7.5, p-
 185 value < 0.001) and by the interaction between light and prey (LME, t-value = 3.4, p-value < 0.01). At the
 186 beginning of the experiment, the carbon mass of *Cassiopea* sp. medusae was of $115.1 \pm 27.0 \mu\text{g C}$ (mean
 187 \pm s.d.). Only the carbon mass of the medusae in the treatment with both light and prey did noticeably
 188 increased, reaching $449.3 \pm 68.2 \mu\text{g C}$ (mean \pm s.d.) at the end of the experiment. The carbon mass of the
 189 medusae in the treatment with only light did not increased significantly reaching a carbon mass value of
 190 $133.9 \pm 27.9 \mu\text{g C}$ (mean \pm s.d.) at the end of the experiment. The carbon mass values of the medusae in
 191 the treatments with only prey or without resources tended to decrease, dropping to respectively $88.0 \pm$
 192 $26.1 \mu\text{g C}$ and $71.1 \pm 15.7 \mu\text{g C}$ (mean \pm s.d.) at the end of the experiment. In the treatment without
 193 resources, one medusae specimen died. Thus for this treatment, there remained two replicates instead
 194 of three at day 24.



195

196 **Fig. 1.** (A) Changes in the *Cassiopea* sp. medusae carbon mass ($\mu\text{g C}$) (means \pm s.e.m.) over the course of
197 the experiment as a function of the experimental conditions. (B) Comparison of least-square means
198 obtained from each treatment (\pm 95 % C. I.). The letters (a, b, and c) indicate statistically different
199 treatments (Tukey post hoc test, p-value < 0.05).

200

201 3.2. $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$

202 The medusae $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values (Fig. 2 A, B) were significantly affected by light (LME, t-value = 22.5, p-value <
203 0.001) and by the interaction of light and prey (LME, t-value = -6.2, p-value < 0.001). At the beginning of
204 the experiment $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of the medusae were of -18.7 ± 0.9 ‰ (mean \pm s.d.). In the treatment with
205 both light and prey the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of the medusae increased quickly (in less than four days) reaching ca.
206 -15 ‰. This trend was even more pronounced in the treatment with only light where the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of
207 the medusae reached ca. -13 ‰. Conversely, in the treatments with only prey or without resources the
208 $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of the medusae remained similar or decreased slightly throughout the experiment (generally
209 comprised between -19 ‰ and -21 ‰). It should be noted that the distinction between the medusae
210 from the treatments with light alone and with light and prey is not as distinct with data not normalized
211 for lipids (Fig. S1).

212 The medusae $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values (Fig. 2 C, D) were significantly affected by both light (LME, t-value = -8.7, p-
213 value < 0.001) and prey (LME, t-value = 2.2, p-value < 0.05), but not by their interaction. At the beginning
214 of the experiment, the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values of medusae was of 8.9 ± 1.1 ‰ (mean \pm s.d.). These values decreased
215 slightly in the treatment with light and prey reaching 8.0 ± 0.3 ‰ (mean \pm s.d.) at the end of the
216 experiment. The decrease was more pronounced in the treatment with light only which reached $5.5 \pm$
217 0.4 ‰ at the end of the experiment. Finally, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values did not change in the treatments with only prey
218 or without resources (values at the end of the experiment of 9.0 ± 0.3 ‰ and 8.8 ± 1.0 ‰ respectively;
219 mean \pm s.d.).


220

221 The $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ obtained in *Artemia* sp. nauplii prey did not vary significantly during the experiment
222 (ANOVAs, p-values > 0.05) averaging respectively -19.4 ± 0.2 ‰ and 10.7 ± 0.5 ‰ (mean \pm s.d.) (Fig. 2 A,
223 C).

224


225 3.3. C:N ratios

226 The C:N ratios obtained in the medusae (Fig. 3) were significantly affected by light (LME, t-value = 27.5,
 227 p-value < 0.001) and by the interaction of light and prey (LME, t-value = -6.6, p-value < 0.001). At the
 228 beginning of the experiment, the C:N ratios of medusae were of 4.5 ± 0.1 . These values increased in the
 229 treatment with both light and prey (4.8 ± 0.1 at the end of experiment; mean \pm s.d.). A similar, but more
 230 pronounced increased was seen in the C:N ratios of the medusae exposed to only light (5.9 ± 0.2 at the
 231 end of experiment; mean \pm s.d.). By opposition, C:N ratios decreased slightly in the treatments with only
 232 prey or without resources (respectively reaching 4.1 ± 0.1 and 3.9 ± 0.1 at the end of the experiment;
 233 mean \pm s.d.).



235 **Fig. 2.** Changes in the *Cassiopea* sp. medusae $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ (‰) (A) and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ (‰) (C) (means \pm s.e.m.) over the
 236 course of the experiment as a function of the experimental conditions. Solid and dashed blue lines
 237 represent the mean \pm s.d. of the isotopic signatures of *Artemia* sp. nauplii used as prey in fed treatments.
 238 (B and D) Comparison of least-square means obtained for each treatment (\pm 95 % C. I.). The letters (a, b,
 239 and c) indicate statistically different treatments (Tukey post hoc test, p-value < 0.05). $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of have
 240 been normalized for lipid content according to Post et al. (2007) for nauplii, and D'Ambra et al. (2014) for
 241 *Cassiopea* sp. medusae.

242



243 **Fig. 3.** (A) Changes in the *Cassiopea* sp. medusae mass C:N ratios (means \pm s.e.m.) over the course of the
 244 experiment as a function of the experimental conditions. The blue error bar indicate the range of C:N
 245 ratios in nauplii prey measured in the course of the experiment (see text). (B) Comparison of the least-
 246 square means obtained for each treatment (\pm 95 % C. I.). The letters (a, b, and c) indicate statistically
 247 different treatments (Tukey post hoc test, p-value < 0.05).
 248

249
 250 The C:N ratios obtained in *Artemia* sp. nauplii did vary significantly during the experiment (ANOVA, F =
 251 25.9, p-value < 0.001). However, these variations were of small amplitudes (minimum: 4.97, maximum:
 252 5.20) compared to the variations observed in *Cassiopea* sp. medusae following the different experimental
 253 treatments (Fig. 3 A). Therefore, these small variations of the C:N ratios of the prey are unlikely to have

254 significantly affected the outcome of the experiment. Throughout the experiment, C:N ratios in *Artemia*
255 sp. nauplii averaged 5.1 ± 0.1 (mean \pm s.d.).

256

257 3.4. PAM parameters of zooxanthellae

258 The blanks always yielded low values of F_0 (90 ± 9 ; mean \pm s.e.m.) as compared to the F_0 values of the
259 medusae (5270 ± 630 ; mean \pm s.e.m.). This equates to a signal-to-noise ratio of ca. 60, which is sufficient
260 to have a reliable estimate of photosynthetic activity. Two outliers were removed from the medusae's
261 PAM data (F_v/F_m below 0.4, similar to a blank, most likely due to a lack of exposition of the medusae to
262 the saturating flash). With the exception of this two outliers, the F_v/F_m of medusae remained very stable
263 in all conditions and during the whole experiment averaging an overall value of 0.70 ± 0.06 (mean \pm s.d.;
264 Fig. S2). The LME models did not indicate any effect of presence or absence of prey and light on the
265 zooxanthellae F_v/F_m . Independently of this lack of effect of the experimental treatments on PAM
266 parameters (discussed in Supplementary Material 2), high F_0 values as compared to the blanks
267 demonstrate the presence of zooxanthellae in the *Cassiopea* sp. medusae in all treatments and during
268 the whole experiment.

269

270 4. Discussion

271

272 4.1. Isotopic composition

273 In this study, the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values obtained in the medusae were the highest in the treatment with light only,
274 lowest in the treatments with only prey and without resources, and intermediate in the treatment with
275 both prey and light (Fig. 2A, B). Similar effects of heterotrophic feeding on $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values have been
276 reported for corals (e. g. Reynaud et al. 2002, Ferrier-Pagès et al. 2011). As in this study, the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ of the
277 predator tended towards the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ of the prey when fed. However, some caution should be taken when
278 interpreting the results of this study concerning the effects of heterotrophic feeding on zooxanthellate
279 jellyfish's $\delta^{13}\text{C}$. Indeed, it is unsure that the lipid normalization used here can be applied to a
280 photosymbiotic holobiont as it has been derived from the heterotrophic *Aurelia* sp. (D'Ambra et al.
281 2014). Without this normalization, the effect of heterotrophic feeding on $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ is less clear (Fig. S1). Thus,
282 albeit an effect of heterotrophic feeding on zooxanthellate jellyfishes' $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ is likely, our results should be

283 taken with caution regarding this point. In contrast, light had a clear positive effect on $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ of
284 zooxanthellate jellyfishes whether the normalization for lipid content is made or not (Fig. 2A, B; Fig. S1).
285 These conclusions are consistent with the previous findings on corals (e. g. Muscatine et al. 1989a, Swart
286 et al. 2005, Alamaru et al. 2009, Ferrier-Pagès et al. 2011).

287 In the experiment, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values were the lowest in the medusae exposed to only light, compared to the
288 other treatments (Fig. 2C, D). This is different from what is known in tropical scleractinian corals in which
289 photosynthesis tend to increase, or have little effect on $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ rather than decrease it, like seen here (see
290 Muscatine and Kaplan 1994, Alamaru et al. 2009, Reynaud et al. 2009). Our results are more comparable
291 to what is observed in more heterotrophic temperate corals (Ferrier-Pagès et al. 2011). The treatment
292 with no resources and the treatment with only prey presented the same $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ (Fig. 2C, D). However, the
293 effect of predation is clear as the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values in the treatment with prey and light were intermediate
294 between those of the treatment with only light, and the treatment with only prey (Fig. 2C, D). The
295 similitude between the treatment without resources and the treatment with only prey would thus be
296 explained by the initial condition (i. e. at day 0, medusae already had high $\delta^{15}\text{N}$). Thus, overall, predation
297 would have led to higher $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ of medusae (Fig. 2C, D). Interestingly however, the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values in medusae
298 were never higher than those obtained on prey (Fig. 2C), which suggests that no measurable
299 fractionation occurred between the holobiont and their prey. This is most likely due to high recycling of
300 nitrogen between the host and its symbionts (see also Reynaud et al. 2009).

301

302 These patterns seen in $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ can be explained through two main processes affecting stable
303 isotopes signatures in photosymbiotic organisms (reviewed in Ferrier-Pagès and Leal 2018):

304 The first process is the mixing of carbon or nitrogen coming from two contrasted sources;
305 autotrophic uptake of dissolved inorganic nutrients, on one hand, and heterotrophic predation—mainly
306 on zooplankton—on the other hand (Reynaud et al. 2002, Alamaru et al. 2009, Ferrier-Pagès et al. 2011,
307 Ferrier-Pagès and Leal 2018). The uptake of dissolved inorganic carbon by zooxanthellae generally leads
308 to higher $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values (typically -10 ‰ to -14 ‰) than those of typical oceanic particulate organic matter
309 and plankton (ca. -20 ‰; Muscatine et al. 1989a, Ferrier-Pagès et al. 2011, Ferrier-Pagès and Leal 2018).
310 Thus, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values obtained through zooxanthellae's autotrophy would be higher than those obtained
311 through predation on zooplankton (Fig. 4A). For nitrogen, the pattern is reversed; zooxanthellae take up
312 dissolved inorganic nitrogen with a low $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ value (ca. 5 ‰ Ferrier-Pagès and Leal 2018) while predation
313 leads the uptake of nitrogen with higher $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values due to fractionation through the food web (Post

314 2002, Ferrier-Pagès et al. 2011, Ferrier-Pagès and Leal 2018, Fig. 4B). For both carbon and nitrogen, the
315 isotopic signature of the two sources (inorganic nutrient uptake, and predation) is then exchanged and
316 recycled between the zooxanthellae and the host (e. g. Reynaud et al. 2009).

317 The second process involves the depletion of *in-hospite* nutrient pools due to photosynthesis.
318 Zooxanthellae tend to take up preferentially inorganic nutrients with light isotopes resulting in
319 fractionation (Ferrier-Pagès and Leal 2018). However, at high photosynthesis rates, the host's pool of
320 inorganic nutrients can get depleted. Thus, to meet their photosynthetic requirements, zooxanthellae
321 take up more heavy isotopes, reducing fractionation ("depletion-diffusion hypothesis", see Muscatine et
322 al. 1989a, Fig. 4A and B). This results in a tendency for isotopic signature to correlate with
323 photosynthesis levels. The higher the photosynthesis, the higher the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ (Muscatine et al. 1989a, Swart
324 et al. 2005, Alamaru et al. 2009) or the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values (Muscatine and Kaplan 1994, Baker et al. 2011;
325 reviewed in Ferrier-Pagès and Leal 2018).

326 It is important to notice that these two processes—mixing of the heterotrophic and autotrophic sources,
327 and reduced fractionation at high photosynthesis levels—would have similar consequences on $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, but
328 not on $\delta^{15}\text{N}$. For $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, a predominantly autotrophic nutrition would imply a decreased fractionation *in-*
329 *hospite* due to high photosynthesis and a predominant uptake of dissolved inorganic nutrients. Both of
330 these processes result in high $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ (and *vice-versa* for a predominantly heterotrophic nutrition, Fig. 4A).
331 By opposition, for $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, reduced fractionation due to high photosynthesis levels would result in high
332 $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, but high uptake of dissolved inorganic nutrients would result in low $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ (and *vice-versa* for a
333 predominantly heterotrophic nutrition, Fig. 4B). Thus, to understand how $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ would react to change in
334 holobiont nutrition, it is important to know which of the above-mentioned processes controls its
335 dynamics.

336


337

338 In the context of this study, the increase in $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ due to light, could be explained by both increased
339 uptake of CO_2 and reduced fractionation at higher photosynthesis (and conversely in the dark, Fig. 4A).
340 The results obtain on $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values in this study, suggest that, in zooxanthellate jellyfishes, of the two
341 processes above-mentioned—mixing of autotrophic and heterotrophic sources, and reduced
342 fractionation at high photosynthesis—the former is the dominant one (Fig. 4B). Hence, in zooxanthellate
343 jellyfishes, a predominantly autotrophic nutrition would imply that most nitrogen comes from the

344 fixation of dissolved inorganic nitrogen (see e. g. Muscatine and Marian 1982, Wilkerson and Kremer
 345 1992, Freeman et al. 2016), and would result in low $\delta^{15}\text{N}$. On the contrary, a predominantly
 346 heterotrophic nutrition would imply that more nitrogen comes from predation (mainly on zooplankton)
 347 resulting in a comparatively higher $\delta^{15}\text{N}$. Thus, values of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ can be considered as a good indicator of
 348 the relative importance of autotrophy and heterotrophy in zooxanthellate jellyfishes.

349

350



351

352 **Fig. 4.** Conceptual diagram illustrating how $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ (A) and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ (B) are affected by the relative importance
 353 of heterotrophic (blue circles and arrows, C_{hetero} and N_{hetero}) and autotrophic (orange circles and arrows,
 354 C_{auto} and N_{auto}) nutrition pathways in zooxanthellate jellyfishes. DIC = dissolved inorganic carbon, DIN =
 355 dissolved inorganic nitrogen, Phyto = phytoplankton, Zoo = zooplankton, Phot = photosynthesis, Frac =
 356 fractionation (more photosynthesis tend to decrease fractionation, this effect, in zooxanthellate

357 jellyfishes, is unlikely to be significant for nitrogen, see text). Values on the axes are provided for
358 illustrative purpose only. See also Ferrier-Pagès and Leal (2018).

359

360 4.2. C:N ratios

361 In our experiment, light increased C:N ratios of the *Cassiopea* sp. holobionts whereas prey generally
362 decreased it, with intermediate C:N ratios in the treatment with both light and prey (Fig. 3A, B). As with
363 $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, C:N ratios of the treatment with no resources and with prey only were similar. This similarity may
364 be again explained by the initial condition. Another potential explanation would be that starved
365 zooxanthellate jellyfishes use first reserves accumulated by photosynthesis (generally carbon rich, e. g.
366 Muller-Parker et al. 1996). Such preferential degradation would make their C:N ratios decrease and get
367 similar to the ones typically reported for non-zooxanthellate jellyfishes (Ikeda 2014, Molina-Ramírez et
368 al. 2015). Independently of the treatment with no resources, our results suggest that predation would
369 tend to decrease C:N ratios (Fig. 3A, B). Such a decrease of C:N ratios due to predation have already
370 been reported for the zooxanthellae of a sea anemone (Cook et al. 1988). However, other studies have
371 pointed out that a similar decrease of C:N ratios can also be due to an enrichment by dissolved inorganic
372 nitrogen (e. g. Muscatine et al. 1989b, Belda et al. 1993). As zooxanthellate jellyfishes are able to take up
373 dissolved inorganic nutrients via their symbionts (see e. g. Muscatine and Marian 1982, Wilkerson and
374 Kremer 1992, Pitt et al. 2005, Welsh et al. 2009, Freeman et al. 2016, see Pitt et al. 2009a for a review), it
375 is likely that their C:N ratios would react to nutrient enrichment too. This suggests that C:N ratios of
376 zooxanthellate jellyfishes might be impacted by nitrogen availability (either as prey or as dissolved
377 inorganic nitrogen).

378

379 4.3. Remarks on tissue turnover

380 One of the advantages of the study of the elemental and isotopic composition over e.g. gut content
381 analyses, is that it provides a more time-integrated information (Pitt et al. 2009b). The time frame
382 represented by isotopic composition is, however, dependent on tissue turnover which can be variable as
383 function of, e. g. taxonomy, organ, body size, or temperature (Thomas and Crowther 2015, Vander
384 Zanden et al. 2015). In another scyphozoan jellyfish, *Aurelia* sp., the isotopic half-life was determined to
385 be ca. 10 days for both carbon and nitrogen (D'Ambra et al. 2014). In the present experiment, changes of
386 $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and C:N ratios occurred very fast (within the first four days, Figs. 2A, 3). This was apparently less

387 true for the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values which may have experienced slower changes (Fig. 2B). These fast changes may
388 have several explanations: First, the medusae used here were of small size and, additionally, some of
389 them grew (Fig. 1, see also Supplementary Material 2) which can explain the fast changes (Fry and Arnold
390 1982, Thomas and Crowther 2015, Vander Zanden et al. 2015). In its natural environment, *Cassiopea* sp.
391 can grow up to ca. 20-25 cm in bell diameter (see e. g. Morandini et al. 2017). It is unlikely that such large
392 specimens would display such fast change in composition. Another aspect that could explain the fast
393 change in elemental and isotopic composition observed here, is that *Cassiopea* sp. is zooxanthellate. The
394 zooxanthellae are also likely to impact residence time of elements within the holobiont, possibly
395 differently for nitrogen and carbon, due to recycling (Reynaud et al. 2009).

396

397 4.4. Implications for fieldwork studies

398 One of the challenges to understand the nutrition of zooxanthellate jellyfishes in their natural
399 environments relates to their mixotrophy. As zooxanthellate jellyfishes obtain their nutrition from
400 predation and photosynthesis (Kremer 2005, Welsh et al. 2009), both processes must be investigated.
401 Ideally, predation, photosynthesis, respiration, nutrient uptake and excretion have all to be measured
402 which may represent an intensive amount of work rarely carried out in its entirety (see however, Kremer
403 et al. 1990, Kremer 2005). Studies of stable isotopes and elemental composition are comparatively easier
404 and have the advantage of providing more time-integrated information (Pitt et al. 2009b). The findings of
405 this study provide baseline information on how C:N ratios, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ can be interpreted in fieldwork
406 studies focusing on the nutrition sources of zooxanthellate jellyfishes.

407 To summarize, our results suggest that both $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ vary with the relative balance of autotrophy
408 vs. heterotrophy (although, the effect of heterotrophy on $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ is less well supported by our results). It
409 would be expected that, if dominantly heterotrophic, zooxanthellate jellyfishes would have $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values
410 close to those of their prey (see e. g. Zeman et al. 2018). By opposition, if dominantly autotrophic,
411 zooxanthellate jellyfishes would have $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values close (or lower) than those of primary producers (see
412 e. g. Freeman et al. 2017). The $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values would display opposite trends. Finally, C:N ratios may be
413 indicators of the efficiency of nitrogen supplies. Future fieldwork studies would be able to build on these
414 results to better characterize zooxanthellate jellyfishes' nutrition.

415

416 **Funding**

417 This work is part of the Ph.D. research program of ND, funded by the Université de Bretagne Occidentale
418 (UBO, Brest, France). This work was also supported by the Labex Mer (ANR-10-LABX-19-01, IUEM, Brest,
419 France).

420

421 **Acknowledgements**

422 The authors would like to thank Eric Dabas, Leslie Gager and William Handal for providing technical
423 assistance during the experiments. We also thank Gauthier Schaal and Rudolph Corvaisier for their
424 valuable comments on the first version of this manuscript. Finally, we wish to thank two anonymous
425 reviewers for their helpful comments.

426

427 **References**


- 428 1. Alamaru, A., Loya, Y., Brokovich, E., Yam, R., Shemesh, A., 2009. Carbon and nitrogen utilization
429 in two species of Red Sea corals along a depth gradient: Insights from stable isotope analysis of
430 total organic material and lipids. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 73, 5333-5342.
- 431 2. Baker, D.M., Kim, K., Andras, J.P., Sparks, J.P., 2011. Light-mediated ¹⁵N fractionation in
432 Caribbean gorgonian octocorals: implications for pollution monitoring. *Coral Reefs* 30, 709-717.
- 433 3. Belda, C.A., Lucas, J.S., Yellowlees, D., 1993. Nutrient limitation in the giant clam-zooxanthellae
434 symbiosis: effects of nutrient supplements on growth of the symbiotic partners. *Mar. Biol.* 117,
435 655-664.
- 436 4. Brodeur, R.D., Sugisaki, H., Hunt Jr., G.L., 2002. Increases in jellyfish biomass in the Bering Sea:
437 implications for the ecosystem. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 233, 89-103.
- 438 5. Bolton, T.F., Graham, W.M., 2004. Morphological variation among populations of an invasive
439 jellyfish. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 278, 125–139.
- 440 6. Cook, C.B., D'Elia, C.F., Muller-Parker, G., 1988. Host feeding and nutrient sufficiency for
441 zooxanthellae in the sea anemone *Aiptasia pallida*. *Mar. Biol.* 98, 253-262.
- 442 7. Crawley, M.J., 2012. *The R book*. John Wiley & Sons.
- 443 8. D'Ambra, I., Carmichael, R.H., Graham, W.M., 2014. Determination of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and trophic
444 fractionation in jellyfish: implications for food web ecology. *Mar. Biol.* 161(2), 473-480.
- 445 9. D'Ambra, I., Graham, W.M., Carmichael, R.H., Hernandez Jr., F.J., 2018. Dietary overlap between
446 jellyfish and forage fish in the northern Gulf of Mexico. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 587, 31-40.

- 447 10. Davy, S.K., Allemand, D., Weis, V.M., 2012. Cell biology of Cnidarian-Dinoflagellate symbiosis.
448 Microbiol. Mol. Biol. R. 76(2), 229-261.
- 449 11. Djeghri, N., Pondaven, P., Stibor, H., Dawson, M.N., 2019. Review of the diversity, traits, and
450 ecology of zooxanthellate jellyfishes. Mar. Biol. 166,147.
- 451 12. Ferrier-Pagès, C., Leal, M.C., 2018. Stable isotopes as tracers of trophic interactions in marine
452 mutualistic symbioses. Ecol. Evol. 9, 723-740.
- 453 13. Ferrier-Pagès, C., Peirano, A., Abbate, M., Cocito, S., Negri, A., Rottier, C., Riera, P., Rodolfo-
454 Metalpa, R., Reynaud, S., 2011. Summer autotrophy and winter heterotrophy in the temperate
455 symbiotic coral *Cladocora caespitosa*. Limnol. Oceanogr. 56(4), 1429-1438.
- 456 14. Fleming, N.E.C., Houghton, J.D.R., Magill, C.L., Harrod, C., 2011. Preservation methods alter
457 stable isotope values in gelatinous zooplankton: implications for interpreting trophic ecology.
458 Mar. Biol. 158, 2141-2146.
- 459 15. Fleming, N.E.C., Harrod, C., Newton, J., Houghton, J.D.R., 2015. Not all jellyfish are equal: isotopic
460 evidence for inter- and intraspecific variation in jellyfish trophic ecology. PeerJ 3, e1110.
- 461 16. Freeman, C.J., Stoner, E.W., Easson, C.G., Matterson, K.O., Baker, D.M., 2016. Symbiont carbon
462 and nitrogen assimilation in the *Cassiopea-Symbiodinium* mutualism. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 544,
463 281-286.
- 464 17. Freeman, C.J., Stoner, E.W., Easson, C.G., Matterson, K.O., Baker, D.M., 2017. Variation in $\delta^{13}\text{C}$
465 and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values suggests a coupling of host and symbiont metabolism in the *Symbiodinium-*
466 *Cassiopea* mutualism. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 571, 245-251.
- 467 18. Fry, B., Arnold, C., 1982. Rapid $^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$ turnover during growth of brown shrimp (*Penaeus*
468 *aztecus*). Oecologia, 54(2), 200-204.
- 469 19. Ikeda, T., 2014. Synthesis toward a global model of metabolism and chemical composition of
470 medusae and ctenophores. J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 456, 50-64.
- 471 20. Javidpour, J., Cipriano-Maack, A.N., Mittermayr, A., Dierking, J., 2016. Temporal dietary shift in
472 jellyfish revealed by stable isotope analysis. Mar. Biol. 163, 112.
- 473 21. Kikinger, R. 1992. *Cotylorhiza tuberculata* (Cnidaria: Scyphozoa) – Life history of a stationary
474 population. Mar. Ecol. 13(4), 333-362.
- 475 22. Kremer, P., 2005. Ingestion and elemental budgets for *Linuche unguiculata*, a scyphomedusa
476 with zooxanthellae. J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. UK 85, 613-625.

- 477 23. Kremer, P., Costello, J., Kremer, J., Canino, M. 1990. Significance of photosynthetic
478 endosymbionts to the carbon budget of the scyphomedusa *Linuche unguiculata*. *Limnol.*
479 *Oceanogr.* 35(3), 609-624.
- 480 24. LaJeunesse, T.C., 2001. Investigating the biodiversity, ecology, and phylogeny of endosymbiotic
481 dinoflagellates in the genus *Symbiodinium* using the ITS region: in search of a "species" level
482 marker. *J. Phycol.* 37, 866-880.
- 483 25. LaJeunesse, T.C., Parkinson, J.E., Gabrielson, P.W., Jeong, H.J., Reimer, J.D., Voolstra, C.R., Santos,
484 S.R., 2018. Systematic revision of Symbiodiniaceae highlights the antiquity and diversity of coral
485 endosymbionts. *Curr. Biol.* 28, 2570-2580.
- 486 26. Lucas, C.H., Dawson, M.N. 2014. What are jellyfish and Thaliaceans and why do they bloom?, in:
487 Pitt, K.A., Lucas, C.H. (Eds.), *Jellyfish blooms*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 9-44.
- 488 27. MacKenzie, K.M., Trueman, C.N., Lucas, C.H., Bortoluzzi, J., 2017. The preparation of jellyfish for
489 stable isotope analysis. *Mar. Biol.* 164, 219.
- 490 28. McCloskey, L.R., Muscatine, L., Wilkerson, F.P., 1994. Daily photosynthesis, respiration, and
491 carbon budgets in a tropical marine jellyfish (*Mastigias* sp.). *Mar. Biol.* 119, 13-22.
- 492 29. Milisenda, G., Rossi, S., Vizzini, S., Fuentes, V., Purcell, J.E., Tilves, U., Piraino, S., 2018. Seasonal
493 variability of diet and trophic level of the gelatinous predator *Pelagia noctiluca* (Scyphozoa). *Sci.*
494 *Rep.-U.K.* 8, 12140.
- 495 30. Molina-Ramírez, A., Cáceres, C., Romero-Romero, S., Bueno, J., González-Gordillo, J.I., Irigoien,
496 X., Sostres, J., Bode, A., Monpeán, C., Fernández Puelles, M., Echevarria, F., Duarte, C.M., Acuña,
497 J.L. 2015. Functional differences in the allometry of the water, carbon and nitrogen content of
498 gelatinous organisms. *J. Plankton Res.* 37(5), 989-1000.
- 499 31. Morandini, A.C., Stampar, S.N., Maronna, M.M., Silveira, F.L. da 2017. All non-indigenous species
500 were introduced recently? The case study of *Cassiopea* (Cnidaria: Scyphozoa) in Brazilian waters.
501 *J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. U.K.* 97, 321-328.
- 502 32. Muller-Parker, G., Lee, K.W., Cook, C.B., 1996. Changes in the ultrastructure of symbiotic
503 zooxanthellae (*Symbiodinium* sp., Dinophyceae) in fed and starved sea anemones maintained
504 under high and low light. *J. Phycol.* 32:987-994.
- 505 33. Muscatine, L., Marian R.E., 1982. Dissolved inorganic nitrogen flux in symbiotic and nonsymbiotic
506 medusae. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 27(5), 910-917.

- 507 34. Muscatine, L., Kaplan, I.R., 1994. Resource partitioning by reef corals as determined from stable
508 isotope composition II. $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ of zooxanthellae and animal tissue versus depth. *Pac. Sci.* 48(3), 304-
509 312.
- 510 35. Muscatine, L., Porter, J.W., Kaplan, I.R., 1989a. Resource partitioning by reef corals as
511 determined from stable isotope composition I. $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ of zooxanthellae and animal tissue versus
512 depth. *Mar. Biol.* 100, 185-193.
- 513 36. Muscatine, L., Falkowski, P.G., Dubinsky, Z., Cook, P.A., McCloskey, L.R., 1989b. The effect of
514 external nutrient resources on the population dynamics of zooxanthellae in a reef coral. *Proc. R.*
515 *Soc. London B* 236, 311-324.
- 516 37. Pitt, K.A., Koop, K., Rissik, D., 2005. Contrasting contributions to inorganic nutrient recycling by
517 the co-occurring jellyfishes, *Catostylus mosaicus* and *Phyllorhiza punctata* (Scyphozoa,
518 Rhizostomeae). *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* 315, 71-86.
- 519 38. Pitt, K.A., Welsh, D.T., Condon, R.H., 2009a. Influence of jellyfish blooms on carbon, nitrogen and
520 phosphorus cycling and plankton production. *Hydrobiologia* 616, 133-149.
- 521 39. Pitt, K.A., Connolly, R.M., Meziane, T., 2009b. Stable isotope and fatty acid tracers in energy and
522 nutrient studies of jellyfish: a review. *Hydrobiologia* 616, 119-132.
- 523 40. Pitt, K.A., Budarf, A.C., Browne, J.G., Condon, R.H., 2014. Bloom and bust: Why do blooms of
524 jellyfish collapse? In: Pitt, K.A., Lucas, C.H. (Eds.), *Jellyfish blooms*. Springer, Netherlands, pp. 79-
525 103.
- 526 41. Post, D.M., 2002. Using stable isotopes to estimate trophic position: models, methods, and
527 assumptions. *Ecology* 83, 703-718.
- 528 42. Post, D.M., Layman, C.A., Arrington, D.A., Takimoto, G., Quattrochi, J., Montaña, C.G., 2007.
529 Getting to the fat of the matter: models, methods and assumptions for dealing with lipids in
530 stable isotopes analyses. *Oecologia* 152, 179-189.
- 531 43. Purcell, J.E., Uye, S.-I., Lo, W.-T., 2007. Anthropogenic causes of jellyfish blooms and direct
532 consequences for humans: a review. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 350, 153-174.
- 533 44. R Core Team, 2017. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
534 392 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 535 45. Reynaud, S., Ferrier-Pagès, C., Sambrotto, R., Juillet-Leclerc, A., Jaubert, J., Gattuso, J.-P., 2002.
536 Effect of feeding on the carbon and oxygen isotopic composition in the tissues and skeleton of
537 the zooxanthellate coral *Stylophora pistillata*. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 238, 81-89.


- 538 46. Reynaud, S., Martinez, P., Houlbrèque, F., Billy, I., Allemand, D., Ferrier-Pagès, C., 2009. Effect of
539 light and feeding on the nitrogen isotopic composition of a zooxanthellate coral: role of nitrogen
540 recycling. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 392, 103-110.
- 541 47. Strasser, R.J., Srivastava, A., Tsimilli-Michael, M., 2000. The fluorescence transient as a tool to
542 characterize and screen photosynthetic samples. in: Yunus, M., Pathre, U., Mohanty, P. (Eds.),
543 Probing Photosynthesis: Mechanism, Regulation and Adaptation. Taylor and Francis, U.K., pp.
544 445-483.
- 545 48. Sugiura, Y., 1969. On the life-history of Rhizostome medusae V. On the relation between
546 zooxanthellae and the strobilation of *Cephea cephea*. *Bull. Mar. Biol. Stn. Asamushi* 8(3), 227-
547 233.
- 548 49. Swart, P.K., Saied, A., Lamb, K., 2005. Temporal and spatial variation in the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ of coral
549 tissue and zooxanthellae in *Montastraea faveolata* collected from the Florida reef tract. *Limnol.*
550 *Oceanogr.* 50, 1049-1058.
- 551 50. Thomas, S.M., Crowther T.W., 2015. Predicting rates of isotopic turnover across the animal
552 kingdom: a synthesis of existing data. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 84,861-870.
- 553 51. Vander Zanden, M.J., Clayton, M.K., Moody, E.K., Solomon, C.T., Weidel, B.C., 2015. Stable
554 isotopes turnover and half-life in animal tissues: a literature synthesis. *PLoS ONE*, 10(1),
555 e0116182.
- 556 52. Vansteenbrugge, L., Hostens, K., Vanhove, B., De Backer, A., De Clippele, L., De Troch, M., 2016.
557 Trophic ecology of *Mnemiopsis leidyi* in the southern North Sea: a biomarker approach. *Mar.*
558 *Biol.* 163, 25.
- 559 53. Verde, E.A., McCloskey, L.R., 1998. Production, respiration, and photophysiology of the
560 mangrove jellyfish *Cassiopea xamachana* symbiotic with zooxanthellae: effect of jellyfish size and
561 season. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 168, 147-162.
- 562 54. Welsh, D.T., Dunn, R.J.K., Meziane, T., 2009. Oxygen and nutrient dynamics of the upside down
563 jellyfish (*Cassiopea* sp.) and its influence on benthic nutrient exchanges and primary production.
564 *Hydrobiologia* 635, 351-362.
- 565 55. Wilkerson, F.P., Kremer, P., 1992. DIN, DON and PO_4 flux by medusa with algal symbionts. *Mar.*
566 *Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 90, 237-250.
- 567 56. Zeman, S.M., Corrales-Ugalde, M., Brodeur, R.D., Sutherland, K.R., 2018. Trophic ecology of the
568 neustonic cnidarian *Velella velella* in the northern California Current during an extensive bloom
569 year: insight from gut contents and stable isotope analysis. *Mar. Biol.* 165, 120.

570 **Supplementary Material 1: Raw $\delta^{13}\text{C}$** 

571
 572 **Fig. S1.** (A) Changes in the *Cassiopea* sp. medusae $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ (‰) without normalization for lipids (means \pm
 573 s.e.m.) over the course of the experiment as a function of the experimental conditions. Solid and dashed
 574 blue lines represent the mean \pm s.d. of the isotopic signatures of *Artemia* sp. nauplii used as prey in fed
 575 treatments. (B) Comparison of least-square means obtained for each treatment (\pm 95 % C. I.). The letters
 576 (a and b) indicate statistically different treatments (Tukey post hoc test, p -value < 0.05).

577
 578 **Supplementary Material 2: Notes on growth of medusae and PAM parameters**
 579 Medusae grew only in the treatment with both light and prey (i. e. increase in carbon mass of the
 580 holobiont, Fig. 1 in main text; and increase in medusae bell diameter from ca. 6 mm to 8-10 mm, data
 581 not shown). The absence of carbon mass increase (Fig. 1 in main text) in the other treatments confirmed
 582 previous findings stipulating that both predation and zooxanthellae's photosynthates are necessary for
 583 some zooxanthellate jellyfishes (Kremer 2005, Welsh et al. 2009). The F_v/F_m ratio can be used as a proxy
 584 of photosynthetic organism's performance (e. g. Strasser et al. 2000, Long et al. 2018), and was
 585 constantly high (0.70, higher or equal to values typically reported for coral zooxanthellae: e. g. Iglesias-
 586 Prieto et al. 2004, Roth et al. 2012) in our experiment, independently of treatments (Fig. S2). The
 587 absence of decreasing F_v/F_m ratio in the treatments kept in the dark, suggests that zooxanthellae within
 588 their *Cassiopea* sp. host stayed photochemically competent for several days without light. We
 589 hypothesize that, in such conditions, as their nutrition can only be provided by the host (e. g. in the form
 590 of fatty acids; Imbs et al. 2014), zooxanthellae were heterotrophic (see Steen 1986, Jeong et al. 2012).

591



592

593 **Fig. S2.** F_v/F_m ratios of the whole *Cassiopea* sp. medusae (including symbionts) over the course of the
 594 experiment and as a function of the experimental treatments (means \pm s.e.m.). The dotted line
 595 represents the mean of all points.

596

597 **References**

- 598 1. Iglesias-Prieto, R., Beltrán, V.H., LaJeunesse, T.C., Reyes-Bonilla, H., Thomé, P.E., 2004. Different
 599 algal symbionts explain the vertical distribution of dominant reef corals in the eastern Pacific.
 600 Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B 271, 1757-1763.
- 601 2. Imbs, A.B., Yakovleva, I.M., Dautova, T.N., Bui, L.H., Jones, P., 2014. Diversity of fatty acid
 602 composition of symbiotic dinoflagellates in corals: evidence for the transfer of host PUFAs to the
 603 symbionts. Phytochemistry 101, 76-82.
- 604 3. Jeong, H.J., Yoo, Y.D., Kang, N.S., Lim, A.S., Seong, K.A., Lee, S.Y., Lee, M.J., Lee, K.H., Kim, H.S.,
 605 Shin, W., Nam, S.W., Yih, W., Lee, K., 2012. Heterotrophic feeding as a newly identified survival
 606 strategy of the dinoflagellate *Symbiodinium*. P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 109(31), 12604-12609.
- 607 4. Kremer, P., 2005. Ingestion and elemental budgets for *Linuche unguiculata*, a scyphomedusa
 608 with zooxanthellae. J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. UK 85, 613-625.
- 609 5. Long, M., Tallec, K., Soudant, P., Lambert, C., Le Grand, F., Sarthou, G., Jolley, D., Hégaret, H.,
 610 2018. A rapid quantitative fluorescence-based bioassay to study allelochemical interactions from
 611 *Alexandrium minutum*. Environ. Pollut. 242, 1598-1605.

- 612 6. Roth, M.S., Goericke, R., Deheyn, D.D., 2012. Cold induces acute stress but heat is ultimately
613 more deleterious for the reef-building coral *Acropora yongei*. *Sci. Rep.* 2, 240.
- 614 7. Steen, R.G., 1986. Evidence for heterotrophy by zooxanthellae in symbiosis with *Aiptasia*
615 *pulchella*. *Biol. Bull.* 170, 267-278.
- 616 8. Strasser, R.J., Srivastava, A., Tsimilli-Michael, M., 2000. The fluorescence transient as a tool to
617 characterize and screen photosynthetic samples. in: Yunus, M., Pathre, U., Mohanty, P. (Eds.),
618 Probing Photosynthesis: Mechanism, Regulation and Adaptation. Taylor and Francis, U.K., pp.
619 445-483.
- 620 9. Welsh, D.T., Dunn, R.J.K., Meziane, T., 2009. Oxygen and nutrient dynamics of the upside down
621 jellyfish (*Cassiopea* sp.) and its influence on benthic nutrient exchanges and primary production.
622 *Hydrobiologia* 635, 351-362.
- 623