

# Microbial enzymatic assays in environmental water samples: Impact of inner filter effect and substrate concentrations

Marion Urvoy, Claire Labry, Daniel Delmas, Layla Creac'H, Stéphane L'Helguen

## ► To cite this version:

Marion Urvoy, Claire Labry, Daniel Delmas, Layla Creac'H, Stéphane L'Helguen. Microbial enzymatic assays in environmental water samples: Impact of inner filter effect and substrate concentrations. Limnology and Oceanography: Methods, 2020, 18, pp.725-738. 10.1002/lom3.10398 . hal-02989835

# HAL Id: hal-02989835 https://hal.science/hal-02989835

Submitted on 19 Nov 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.

1	Microbial enzymatic assays in environmental water samples: impact of Inner
2	Filter Effect and substrate concentrations
3	Urvoy M. <sup>1,2*</sup> , Labry C. <sup>1</sup> , Delmas D. <sup>1</sup> , Creac'h L. <sup>1</sup> , L'Helguen S. <sup>2</sup>
4	<sup>1</sup> Ifremer, DYNECO, F-29280 Plouzané, France
5	*Correspondence: murvoy@ifremer.fr
6	<sup>2</sup> Univ Brest, CNRS, IRD, Ifremer, LEMAR, F-29280 Plouzané, France
7	Running head
8	Enzymatic assays in environmental water samples
9	Key words

10 Microbial enzymatic activities, Fluorimetry, Inner Filter Effect, Biogeochemical studies

## 11 Abstract

12 As microbial enzymatic activities initiate the mineralization of organic matter through the microbial 13 loop, it is important to correctly measure those activities and be able to perform inter-study comparisons. 14 Enzymatic activity assays are typically carried out using fluorogenic substrate analogs, such as 4-15 Methylumbelliferone and 7-Amino-4-methylcoumarin linked to sugar monomers, phosphate group or 16 amino acids. However, methodological divergences can be found in aquatic science literature, 17 potentially leading to misestimated activities. To highlight some of those methodological key points, we 18 first addressed the potential occurrence of an Inner Filter Effect (IFE), a fluorometric artifact that affects 19 the relationship between fluorophore concentration and fluorescence intensity, due to absorption of 20 exciting or emitted light. It has never been considered in the context of environmental waterstudies 21 before, despite significantly affecting measured activities. IFE occurred with 2 out of 3 tested 22 spectrofluorometers when assaying proteases, although no IFE was detected for phosphatase assays. We 23 also evaluated how substrate concentration ranges might affect kinetic parameters estimation, revealing 24 that a many existing studies might use insufficient maximum substrate concentration. Finally, for single 25 substrate concentration assays, we argued for the use of saturating substrate concentration, as naturally 26 occurring substrates might compete with the fluorogenic analog at trace level. The amendment of a 27 molecule mimicking natural substrates generated a significant inhibition of natural seawater 28 phosphatases and proteases assayed with trace concentrations of fluorogenic substrate, while almost no 29 inhibition occurred at higher concentrations. Those key points need to be addressed in order to assess 30 enzymatic rates and allow inter-study comparison.

## 31 Introduction

Extracellular enzymes are mostly produced by heterotrophic prokaryotes that hydrolyse polymeric organic matter into units smaller than 600 Dalton, transportable across their cell membranes (Payne 1980). Although they are the only entity capable to significantly affect both dissolved and particulate organic matter (Chrost 1990), other organisms can release extracellular enzymes as well. For instance, phytoplankton, phototrophic prokaryotes, metazoa and macroalgae are able to contribute to the pool of alkaline phosphatases (Hoppe 2003; Niell et al. 2003; Labry et al. 2005).

38 Microbial enzymes play a major role in the ocean: they initiate the mineralization of complex 39 organic matter through the microbial loop, transforming both dissolved and particulate organic matter 40 into living biomass, dissolved organic carbon or carbon dioxide. The activity and specificity of 41 extracellular enzymes therefore affect global carbon and nutrient cycling, carbon flow through aquatic 42 food web as well as carbon export to the deep ocean (Azam et al. 1983; Azam 1998; Bidle 2010). As 43 hydrolysis is considered the limiting step of organic matter utilization, any factors affecting enzyme 44 activity might affect the entire mineralization pathway. As such, enzymatic assays are widespread and 45 degradation capacity has been investigated in relation to diverse factors, such as for instance: substrate 46 composition and size, microbial community structure or environmental conditions (Azam et al. 1983; 47 Chróst 1990; Kirchman 2008).

48 Measurements of enzyme activity are typically carried out using fluorogenic molecules consisting 49 of a substrate moiety covalently linked to a fluorophore (or fluorochrome). Non-hydrolysed substrate 50 has a low background fluorescence, while upon hydrolysis the fluorescence spectra of the released 51 fluorophore is considerably modified, allowing its selective detection (Fig. 1). The most commonly used 52 molecules include 4-Methylumbelliferone (MUF) linked to monosaccharides (glycosidase assays) or 53 phosphate groups (phosphatase assays) and 7-Amino-4-methylcoumarin (MCA) linked to amino acids 54 (protease assays) (Arnosti 2003; Hoppe 1983; Kirchman 2008). Enzymatic activity is determined by following the increase in fluorescence over time and using standards of known fluorophore 55 56 concentration. Even though the use of simple substrate analogs suffers from limitations (Arnosti 2011; 57 Steen et al. 2015), they have been widely used thanks to their sensitivity and ease of use (Chróst 1990).



59 Fig. 1. (A) Normalized fluorescence spectra of MUF-P (alkaline phosphatase substrate, dashed lines) and MUF (product, solid 60 lines) over emission (gray lines) or excitation wavelength (black lines). Excitation spectra of MUF and MUF-P were obtained 61 using a constant emission wavelength (460 nm) while excitation wavelength varied. Emission spectra were obtained using a 62 constant excitation wavelength (364 nm) with variable emission wavelength. (B) Normalized fluorescence spectra of LLMCA 63 (protease substrate, dashed lines) and MCA (product, solid lines) over emission (gray lines) or excitation wavelength (black 64 lines). To obtain excitation spectra of MCA and LLMCA, emitted light was respectively collected at a wavelength of 440 and 65 410 nm while excitation wavelength varied. To obtain emission spectra, emitted light was collected over a range of wavelength 66 while excitation wavelength was set to 350 and 325 nm for MCA and LLMCA, respectively. em: emission, ex: excitation. 67 Vertical lines represent excitation and emission wavelengths used during enzymatic assays.

68 However, several biases might affect result interpretation and impede inter-study comparison. The first 69 one is a measurement artifact intrinsic to fluorimetry known as the Inner Filter Effect (IFE), which has 70 been completely overlooked in the literature assaying enzymatic activity in environmental water 71 samples. With conventional spectrofluorometers, a fluorescent molecule is excited by a light source at 72 a specific wavelength, selected by a monochromator. The emitted fluorescence is collected at right 73 angle with respect to the incident beam and detected by a photomultiplier at the emission wavelength, 74 also selected by a monochromator (Valeur 2001). The IFE reduces the fluorescence signal due to the 75 absorption of excitation IFE) or emitted light (emission IFE), which affects the relationship 76 between fluorophore concentration and fluorescence intensity (Kao et al. 1998; Valeur 2001; Eccleston 77 et al. 2005, see Fig. 2 for a conceptual representation). IFE can result from the fluorophore itself or any 78 other light-attenuating molecules naturally present in the analysed sample.



Fig. 2. Conceptual illustration of excitation IFE (also termed primary IFE) and emission IFE (also termed secondary IFE)
using a right angle geometry, one of the most common for cuvette system.

79

82 The predominant effect, excitation or primary IFE, is caused by the absorption of the exciting light, 83 which is attenuated as it progresses through the solution, inefficiently exciting the fluorophore. 84 Absorption can be performed by the hydrolysis product, but also by the non-hydrolysed substrate. For 85 instance, in the case of phosphatase assays, both MUF-Phosphate (MUF-P, alkaline phosphatase substrate) and MUF (hydrolysis product) absorb exciting light at the routinely used excitation 86 87 wavelength ( $\lambda_{ex} = 364$  nm, Fig. 1). Substrate absorption seems minimal and is often completely 88 neglected by investigators, but it can be significant in enzymatic assays performed with a high substrate 89 to product ratio. Excitation IFE is favored by the use of concentrated solutions (absorbance > 0.1), which 90 are almost inevitable in enzymatic assays (Valeur 2001; Eccleston et al. 2005). IFE is likely to occur 91 with the conventional right angle geometry as detection system collects light on an area restricted to the 92 center of the cuvette: light might be absorbed before even reaching the collection area (Kao et al. 1998; 93 Valeur 2001). Different cell configurations, such as front face illumination, were specifically developed 94 in order to avoid this and reduce IFE. Long optic path systems (i.e. 1 cm cuvette) are especially affected 95 by IFE, although shorter optic path systems such as microtiter plate spectrofluorometers can be impacted 96 as well (Pinto et al. 2015, Marathe et al. 2013). The age and efficiency of the exciting lamp can also 97 play a role in the occurrence of this effect (Valeur 2001).

A secondary IFE might also arise if the emitted light is re-absorbed by surrounding molecules.
Absorption by the fluorophore itself depends on its Stokes shift, which is the difference between

emission and excitation maxima (Eccleston et al. 2005). A small Stokes shift implies that absorption
and emission spectra strongly overlap, so the emitted light might be absorbed by non-excited
fluorophore molecules, decreasing the measured signal. For molecules with large Stokes shift, such as
MUF and MCA, emission IFE is not likely to occur (Fonin et al. 2014).

104 The IFE has been described before in biochemical studies using substrate analogs (Liu et al. 1999; 105 Palmier and Van Doren 2007; Puchalski et al. 1991) but, to our knowledge, has never been considered 106 in the context of marine studies. Sebastián and Niell (2004)reported a reduction of the reaction velocity 107 by excess of substrate when assaying high substrate concentrations. . However, they did not mention a 108 possible IFE.

109 The second bias is linked to the wide differences in substrate concentrations used, for both Michaelis-110 Menten kinetics and single point assays. Before performing a single point enzymatic assay, kinetic 111 parameters (maximum velocity - V<sub>max</sub> - and Michaelis affinity constant - K<sub>m</sub>) should ideally be 112 determined with a kinetic experiment using several substrate concentrations. However, there are wide 113 differences in maximum substrate concentration used in the literature. They vary between 0.1 and 300 114 µM for alkaline phosphatase activities (APA) assayed with MUF-P (see Table 1 for references) and 115 between 25 and 1000 µM for exoproteolytic activities (EPA) assayed with L-Leucine-MCA (LLMCA, 116 see Table 2 for references). Insufficient maximum substrate concentration can affect parameters 117 determination as the saturation of enzymatic active sites might not be reached.

118 As kinetics are laborious, time consuming, expensive and require large sample volume, they are 119 often set aside in favor of single point assays, using a single substrate concentration. A huge variability 120 in the concentrations used is also noticed: between 0.1 and 250 µM for APA assayed with MUF-P (see 121 Table 1 for references) and between 2.5 and 1000 µM for EPA assayed with LLMCA (see Table 2 for 122 references). Those differences may be related to the existence of different perspectives in the current 123 oceanographic community. Trace substrate concentration (<  $1 \mu M$ ) might be used in order to determine 124 enzymatic rates and substrate turnover in conditions as close as possible to those prevailing in situ. This 125 is opposed to a more conventional approach using a saturating substrate concentration, several times 126 higher than the enzymes K<sub>m</sub> which allows the determination of maximal velocity rate (Chróst 1990; 127 Hoppe 2003). Single point assays using low substrate concentration results in several issues. (i) The substrate might not greatly exceed the enzyme concentration, which is a necessary condition to satisfy 128 129 the steady-state assumption made by Michaelis-Menten. (ii) Slow product formation leads to 130 fluorometric sensitivity issue (Chróst 1990). (iii) Those assays are subject to higher errors as velocities 131 correspond to the first order part of the Michaelis-Menten equation, which is the most variable region. 132 In consequence, small pipetting errors could result in large differences in estimated activity. (iv) At low 133 concentration, naturally occurring substrates might compete with the fluorogenic substrate analog, 134 leading to significantly underestimated activities (Chróst 1990). Consequently, measured activities 135 might be dependent on natural substrate concentration, potentially altering results and preventing intra 136 and inter-study comparison.

137 Table 1. Literature examples showing phosphatase activity assay conditions used in different environments. All

138	measurements were	carried out using	4-Methylumbelliferyl	phosphate (	MUF-P) substrate.
-----	-------------------	-------------------	----------------------	-------------	-------------------

	Study	Environment	Substrate range for kinetic (µM)	Substrate concentration for single point assay (µM)
	Sohm and Capone 2006	Tropical and sub tropical north Atlantic	-	0.1
₽Ë	Sisma-Ventura and Rahav 2019	Mediterranean Sea (microcosms)	-	0.1
로ố	Duhamel et al. 2014	North pacific subtropical gyre	0.025 - 1	1
μŇ	Sala et al. 2001	Mediterranean Sea	-	200
<u>5</u>	Van Wambeke et al. 2002	Mediterranean sea	0.025 - 1	-
5, 5,	Thingstad et al. 1998	Mediterranean sea	0.005 - 0.2	-
Ц С	Yamaguchi et al. 2019	Central north Pacific	0.100 - 2	-
	Bogé et al. 2012	North west Mediterranean	0.03 - 30	-
	Rees et al. 2009	English channel	-	0.25
ωĔ	Strojsova et al. 2008	Eutrophic reservoir	-	100
Ξü	Carlsson et al. 2012	Coastal tropical Atlantic	-	250
₽₹	Koch et al. 2009	Coastal waters Florida bay	0.05 - 2	-
ĸö	Davis et al. 2014	Celtic sea	0.8 - 2	-
5.5	Chrost and Overbeck 1987	Eutrophic Lake	10 - 200	-
"ž	Labry et al. 2005	Coastal estuarine waters	0.5 - 250	250
	Nausch et al. 2004	Baltic sea	0.1 - 300	-

- 140 Table 2. Literature examples showing exoproteolytic activity assay conditions used in different environments. All
- 141 measurements were carried out using L-Leucine-7-amido-4-methylcoumarin (LLMCA) substrate.

			Substrate range	Substrate concentration for
	Study	Environment	for kinetic (µM)	single point assay (µM)
의 IS	Van Wambeke et al. 2009	Mediterranean Sea	0.05 - 100	50
MEN	Talbot et al. 1997	Strait of Magellan	-	200
N NO	Fukuda et al. 2000	Subartic Pacific	-	200
VIR	Misic et al. 2002	Antartica	1 - 100	-
EN OI	Caruso et al. 2019	Mediterranean Sea	20 - 160	-
လ	Gonnelli et al. 2013	Arno river mouth (Italy)	0.05 - 8.5	-
E S	Song et al. 2019	Brackish water microcosms	0.1 - 20	-
ME	Karner et al. 1992	Adriatic Sea	-	2.5
Z	Rath et al. 1993	Caribbean Sea	0.1 - 25	2.5
RC	Chappell et al. 1995	Ouse and Derwent Rivers (UK)	0.5 - 100	50
Ę	Foreman et al. 1998	Maumee River (USA)	-	120
Ξū	Bullock et al. 2017	Neuse and Tar-Pamlico Rivers (USA)	-	400
<b>⊇</b>	Cunha et al. 2001	Estuarine ecosystem (Portugal)	-	1000
4	Patel et al. 2000	Semi-enclosed coastal ecosystem	2.5 - 40	-
S S	Sinsabaugh et al. 1997	Ottawa, Maumee and Hudson Rivers (USA)	5 - 120	-
5	Shi et al. 2019	Coastal waters, Northern South China Sea	1 - 350	-
<u></u>	Ory et al. 2011	Charente River (France)	2 - 1000	-

The accumulation of these experimental biases might lead to severely misestimated enzymatic activities. 143 The purpose of this study is to address these issues by quantifying their effect on fluorometric enzymatic 144 145 assays. First, we will show how to detect the IFE occurrence, its effect on enzymatic measurements and 146 how it can be corrected. Secondly, we will address the effect of the substrate concentration ranges upon the determination of kinetic parameters of pure enzymes, phytoplankton cultures and natural bacterial 147 148 communities. We will finally argue in favor of using saturating substrate concentrations when 149 performing single point assays, which allows the determination of the enzymatic equipment of the cells, 150 rather than the in situ degradation rate.

## 151 Material and procedures

### 152 **Reagents and solutions**

153 All chemical products were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich.

Substrate solutions. Stock solutions of 10 mM 4-Methylumbelliferyl-phosphate (MUF-P) and 40 mM L-Leucine-7-amido-4-methylcoumarin (LLMCA) were prepared in half a volume of 2-methoxyethanol, dissolved using sonication and volume was adjusted to final concentration with Milli-Q water (Millipore purification system). Working solutions from 0.5 to 500  $\mu$ M for MUF-P and from 3.9 to 1000  $\mu$ M for LLMCA were obtained by successive dilutions of stock solutions in Milli-Q water and stored at – 20 °C.

160 Product solutions. Stock solutions of 2 mM 4-Methylumbelliferone (MUF) and 4 mM 7-Amino-4-161 methylcoumarin (MCA) were prepared as described previously and used to prepare standards, as 162 described in the following section.

163 Competitors for inhibition tests. Stock solutions of 4.2 mM Glucose-6-phosphate (G6P), 10 mM
164 Leucyl-glycine (Leu-gly), 10 mM L-Leucyl-glycyl-glycine (Leu-gly-gly) and 10 mM Hexaglycine
165 (Hexagly) were made in Milli-Q water, serially diluted to appropriate concentrations and stored at – 20
166 °C.

#### 167 **IFE detection**

168 Standards preparation. As non-hydrolysed substrate may affect fluorescence measurement, 169 calibration curves of each product (MUF and MCA) were prepared in various concentration of substrate 170 (MUF-P and LLMCA, respectively). Substrate concentrations are the ones used when determining enzymatic parameters. In practice, standards of MUF ranging from 8 nM to 2 µM were prepared in 171 Milli-Q water or MUF-P concentration ranging from 0.5 to 500 µM, resulting in 12 calibrations for 172 173 APA. Buffered formaldehyde (18%, pH 8) was added to each standard to respect assay dilution 174 conditions (3.3% final concentration), as formaldehyde was used here to stop APA (C. Labry unpubl.). 175 Standards of MCA ranging from 20 nM to 2 µM were prepared in Milli-Q water and in LLMCA concentration ranging from 3.9 to 500 µM resulting in 9 calibrations for EPA. 10% sodium dodecyl 176

sulfate (SDS) was added to each standard to respect assay dilution conditions (1% final) as it is used to stop EPA. This is particularly important for EPA as 1% SDS was shown to result in a 20% increase in MCA fluorescence (Delmas and Garet 1995). All standards were stored at -20 °C.

180 Fluorometric measurements. In this study, we compared classical cuvette readings with Flow Injection 181 Analysis (FIA) reading (Delmas et al. 1994). Briefly, FIA is a liquid chromatography injection system 182 (without the chromatographic column), connected to a Kontron SFM25 fluorescence spectrometer with 183 a 1 mm optic path. This system allows a quick, sensitive and reproducible sample processing (Delmas 184 et al. 1994). The use of a carrier fluid (here a 0.1 M buffered borate solution adjusted to pH 10.5 and 185 delivered at 1 mL min<sup>-1</sup>) provides the possibility of setting the pH during fluorescence reading, independently from the pH of incubation. This is important as MUF fluorescence yield greatly varies 186 187 with pH and is maximum at pH > 10 (Chróst and Krambeck 1986). For cuvette readings, pH was 188 adjusted to 10 by adding 0.98 and 0.20 mL of a 0.5 M pH 12 buffered borate solution per 4 mL sample 189 (containing preservative) for APA and EPA respectively. Measurements were carried out in a 1 cm 190 cuvette using two spectrofluorometers, SFM25 and Perkin Elmer LS50.

All measurements were performed with a 90° angle illumination. Excitation and emission
wavelength were respectively 364 nm and 460 nm for APA and 380 nm and 440 nm for EPA.

### 193 Michaelis-Menten kinetics

194 Michaelis-Menten kinetics were carried out on various samples to evaluate the impact of IFE and of 195 substrate concentration ranges on kinetic parameters determination.

196 **Sample preparation.** Tested samples were either purified enzymes, phytoplankton cultures or natural 197 microbial communities. Purified enzymes from *Escherichia coli* and shrimp (acquired from 198 Sigma/Aldrich) were diluted to a stock concentration of 10 mU mL<sup>-1</sup> in Milli-Q water and stored at 4 199 °C. For each activity assay, stock enzyme was diluted to  $250 \,\mu$ U mL<sup>-1</sup> in 0.2  $\mu$ m filtered natural seawater 200 (Whatman Nucleopore filters).

Alexandrium minutum and Thalassiosira weissflogii were precultured in F/4 medium (Guillard and
 Ryther 1962) and inoculated in phosphate-free F/4 medium for 3 days at 18 °C, under a 12:12 light cycle

203 (120  $\mu$ mol photons m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>). Activities were measured on total fraction comprising algal-attached and 204 dissolved enzymes.

Natural seawater was collected from the Brest station of the Service d'Observation en Milieu
LITtoral program (SOMLIT, French marine monitoring network, http://somlit.epoc.u-bordeaux1.fr).
and filtered through 0.8 µm Whatman Nucleopore filters to remove eukaryotes and larger cells.

208 Incubations. In order to determine kinetic parameters, 2 mL samples were incubated in the dark with 209 50  $\mu$ L substrate solutions, with final concentrations ranging from 0.5 to 500  $\mu$ M for MUF-P and from 210 1.95 to 1000  $\mu$ M for LLMCA). Incubation time for each type of sample was previously determined so 211 that less than 25% of the substrate was hydrolysed, in order to measure initial linear velocity. Natural 212 bacterial communities were incubated at in situ temperature (between 12 and 16 °C), purified enzymes 213 and phytoplankton cultures at 20 °C. At the end of the incubation, reaction was stopped by adding 18% 214 buffered formaldehyde (pH 8, 3.3% final concentration) for APA or 10% SDS for EPA (1% final 215 concentration). Samples were then frozen at - 20 °C until fluorescence measurement, which was 216 performed as previously described. These preservatives stop enzymatic activities and allow storage at -217 20°C for deferred sample analysis, if necessary, without any changes on the kinetic parameters (APA: 218 C. Labry unpubl., EPA: Delmas and Garet 1995).

219 **Controls**. As natural seawater and substrates (MUF-P and LLMCA) do produce fluorescence, a blank 220 sample was prepared for each substrate concentration by directly mixing samples, substrate and reaction 221 inhibitor (formaldehyde for APA, SDS for EPA) and immediately freezing them at -20 °C. Blank 222 fluorescence was then subtracted from sample fluorescence and results were converted to degradation 223 rates using product standards diluted in Milli-Q water.

Statistical analysis. Affinity constant ( $K_m$ ) and maximum velocity ( $V_{max}$ ) and their standard deviations were calculated using nonlinear least squares regression of the data fitted to the Michaelis-Menten equation, using R ("nls" function in the "stats" package). Non-linear regression seems to be the best method to estimate kinetic parameters (Chróst 1990).

#### 228 Inhibition tests

229 To assess the effect of natural competitors on APA and EPA of natural bacterial samples, we monitored 230 the fluorescence emitted by 3 mL seawater sample amended with 75  $\mu$ L substrate (0.125 to 2  $\mu$ M of 231 MUF-P, 0.125 and 2 µM of LLMCA) in a 1 cm optic path cuvette (SFM25 spectrofluorometer) during 232 short periods of time (2 to 10 min). A molecule competing with the substrate analog was then added and 233 fluorescence was monitored using the same procedure. The competitor used for APA was G6P (75 µL, 234 final concentration from 50 nM to 1.5 µM), a natural compound involved in bacterial metabolism which 235 is susceptible to be present in both natural environments and cultures. For EPA, three competitors were 236 tested: Leu-gly, Leu-gly-gly and Hexagly (30 µL, final concentration of 8 and 16 µM). Fluorescence 237 increased linearly over time and the presence of competitors visibly affected the slopes, which 238 correspond to reaction velocities. pH was not adjusted during this measurement as slopes were not 239 converted to actual velocities. Slopes were corrected for the dilution due to competitor's addition.

## 240 Assessment and discussion

#### 241 Influence of IFE on activity assays

242 IFE occurs when exciting or emitted light is absorbed, decreasing the fluorescence signal and resulting 243 in underestimated enzymatic activities. It includes all light-attenuating processes, caused by the 244 fluorogenic substrate analog itself or by any other chromophores naturally present in samples. This study 245 is limited to IFE caused by fluorogenic substrate as it is important during enzymatic assays using large 246 concentration of substrate, but IFE resulting from natural organic matter may also affect fluorometric 247 assays (Kothawala et al. 2013). IFE resulting from natural compounds should theoretically be corrected 248 using calibration curves prepared in the same matrix as the samples (for instance 0.2 µm filtered 249 seawater).

250

#### Detection of IFE caused by fluorogenic substrate

MUF-P/MUF and LLMCA/MCA have similar excitation and emission spectra, characterized by a large
Stokes shift, meaning that emission IFE should not occur. However, both non-hydrolysed substrates and
hydrolysis products can absorb exciting light and produce an excitation IFE.

The occurrence of an excitation IFE from fluorescent products was tested by measuring calibration standards of products (MUF and MCA) diluted in Milli-Q water. If this effect occurs, the released product will absorb exciting light, with a greater impact at high product concentration. Consequently, the emitted signal will not be linear over the product range of concentration. As the curves obtained were linear (determination coefficient for linear fitting:  $R^2 > 0.999$ , data not shown) for the three instruments (FIA-SFM25, SFM25 and LS50), it appears that there is no IFE from the product between 0 and 2  $\mu$ M, for both MUF and MCA.

Excitation IFE resulting from non-hydrolysed substrates can be detected by measuring fluorescence of the reaction product in varying substrate concentrations. If an IFE occurs, we expect that a given substrate concentration will affect the fluorescence of all product concentrations in a similar way. The linearity of the relationship between fluorescence and product concentration would be unaffected. However, the IFE would increase with increasing substrate concentration which would result in a reduction of the calibration slope. 267 Figure 3 shows the results obtained for APA (no IFE detected, Fig. 3a, c, e) and EPA (IFE detected, 268 Fig. 3b, d, f) with LS50 spectrofluorometer. Without IFE, the slope of those calibration curves is independent from MUF-P concentration (slope = - 6.77 x  $10^{-6}$ , correlation coefficient r = 0.236, df = 10, 269 270 not significant, Fig. 3c) as MUF-P substrate does not affect fluorescence reading. The intercept is 271 linearly proportional to this concentration (slope = 0.25, r = 1.000, df = 10, significant at 0.1%, Fig. 3e), 272 reflecting the natural fluorescence of the substrate. These results also show the necessity of using a blank for each substrate concentration assayed. When an IFE occurred, the slope of the calibration curves 273 274 decreases with increasing LLMCA concentration (slope = -  $4.37 \times 10^{-5}$ , r = 0.742, df = 8, significant at 275 5%, Fig. 3d): as exciting light is absorbed, it becomes limiting and the fluorochrome is not fully excited. 276 As expected, this effect is more pronounced at higher concentration of LLMCA, affecting calibration 277 curve slopes in a greater manner. For similar reasons, the intercept does not vary linearly at high LLMCA 278 concentrations (Fig. 3f).

279 Overall, no IFE was detected when assaying APA with all three tested instruments. An IFE was 280 detected for proteases assays performed using cuvettes (SFM25 and LS50) but not using FIA-SMF25. 281 The absence of IFE using FIA-SFM25, compared to the cuvette systems, might be due to both the sample 282 dilution by hydraulic system (as sample is diluted about 10 times by carrier fluid) and by the 10 times 283 shorter optic path, resulting in 100 times less substrate interfering with light flux. A greater overlap of 284 fluorescence spectra, as well as different samples dilution (see following discussion), might favor the 285 occurrence of IFE with the EPA assays compared to the APA assays.. Those results illustrate the fact 286 that this effect greatly depends on the type of substrate, concentrations and equipment used and should 287 be regularly tested for each assay protocol.



289 Fig. 3. Detection of IFE using calibration curves of MUF (a, c, e) and MCA (b, d, f), with cuvette operated LS50 290 spectrofluorometer. Calibration curves (a, b) were determined from solutions prepared in varying concentration of non-291 hydrolysed substrate (MUF-P, LLMCA). On panel a and b, only four calibration curves are shown to facilitate readability 292 although 12 and 9 curves were respectively measured for APA and EPA. All calibrations are displayed on other panels. 293 Calibration of MUF shows no IFE as the slope of each calibration is not dependent on MUF-P concentration (c) and intercept 294 varies linearly with MUF-P concentration (e). Calibration of MCA exhibits an IFE as the slope of each calibration varies 295 significantly with LLMCA concentration (d) and intercept does not vary linearly above 60 µM of LLMCA (f). r: correlation 296 coefficient. Error bars (c, d, e, f) represent 95% confidence interval of the fitted parameters.

#### 297 *Consequences and correction of IFE*

To assess the consequences of the detected IFE on natural samples, we carried out a kinetic measurement of natural bacterial communities EPA. The samples were measured using both FIA-SFM25 and cuvette operated LS50 with pH correction.

301 With FIA-SFM25, unweighted hyperbolic regression gave a  $V_{max}$  of 3386 ± 198 nM h<sup>-1</sup> and a K<sub>m</sub> 302 of 275 ± 40 µM. When carried out with LS50 for which IFE occurs,  $V_{max}$  only reached 2668 ± 154 nM 303 h<sup>-1</sup> and K<sub>m</sub> equalled 205 ± 32 µM, hence a respective difference of 21 and 26% on each parameter (Fig. 304 4a). The correlation between the two measurements shows that, for the tested spectrofluorometers, the 305 IFE appears at a LLMCA concentration of 125 µM (Fig. 4a), which roughly corresponds to a rate of 306 1000 nM h<sup>-1</sup>.Below this threshold, the two spectrofluorometers results correlate well (slope of 1.05, Fig. 307 4b) whereas above, cuvette measurements yield lower activities (slope of 0.70, Fig. 4b).

308



grey line). (b) Correlation between EPA measured with LS50 (using cuvette) and using FIA-SFM25. Dashed line highlights
the substrate concentration threshold.

This threshold value is close to the 150 µM self-quenching threshold observed by Saifuku et al.
(1978) in the original method of LLMCA assay.

314 IFE can be avoided by using diluted solutions, shorter optic path, horizontal over vertical slits, a change 315 in lamp geometry or in excitation/emission wavelengths (Valeur 2001; Eccleston et al. 2005; Fonin et 316 al. 2014). However, it is not always possible to modify those parameters and this effect cannot always 317 be avoided. In such cases, it should be corrected either experimentally or mathematically. If mathematic 318 corrections are available, they can be quite complicated to implement (see Fonin et al. 2014 or Puchalski 319 et al. 1991 for references). To experimentally correct the IFE in a simple way, each fluorescence value 320 obtained with a given substrate concentration was converted into a concentration using the calibration 321 curve of product prepared in the same given substrate concentration, instead of the usual calibration 322 curve prepared in Milli-Q water. For instance, the values measured when assaying EPA with 1000  $\mu$ M 323 of LLMCA were converted using the MCA standards prepared in 1000  $\mu$ M of LLMCA. The corrected 324 values with LS50 are: V<sub>max</sub> = 3267 ± 183 nM h<sup>-1</sup> and K<sub>m</sub> = 288 ± 40  $\mu$ M, hence a respective difference 325 of 4 and 5% on each parameter, which is within standard error inherent to fluorometric measurement 326 and model fitting.

#### 327 Importance of protocol and equipment used

328 We would like to draw specific attention to the fact that IFE greatly depends on protocol as well as 329 equipment used.

The first methodological key point would be the preparation of calibration curves, which are necessary to correctly assess and correct IFE. As this effect is dependent on dilution, calibration solutions should be prepared in the exact same manner as the samples. In our protocol, all samples were diluted 1.2 times by the preservative (formaldehyde or SDS), which was consequently also added to the standards. Preservative is, to our knowledge, almost never amended in calibration solutions.

The second methodological key point concerns the pH adjustment when fluorescence is measured using cuvette. Our samples were further diluted by buffered borate amendment (1.24 times for APA, 1.05 times for EPA) to adjust pH to 10, which maximizes MUF and MCA fluorescence and allows the comparison between FIA and cuvette measurements. As such, IFE is minimized in our protocol. This is especially true for APA, for which larger volumes of buffer were necessary to reach pH = 10. However, in the literature, it is often unclear if pH adjustment is performed when using cuvettes or microplates. If not, IFE could be much more severe.

Another methodological key point would be the choice of excitation wavelength. For instance, Christie et al. (1978) noted that an excitation wavelength of 350 nm was necessary to overcome an IFE that was observed at 320 nm (maximum excitation wavelength) with MUF- $\alpha$ -D-mannopyranoside and MUF- $\alpha$ -D-glucopyranoside with a spectrofluorometer using cuvette. This is especially important for MCA as an excitation wavelength of 360 nm (maximum of excitation) will favor IFE due to a bigger absorbance by LLMCA (Fig. 1).

The occurrence of IFE strongly depends on the equipment used. For instance, Briciu-burghina et al.
(2015) encountered a pronounced IFE in 1 cm optic path cuvette using MUF-β-D-glucuronide substrate,

whose fluorescence spectra resemble MUF-P spectra, for which we found no IFE. This could be due,
for example, to differences in cell geometry, slits orientation, fluorescence observation angle, lamp
power and age (Valeur 2001; Eccleston et al. 2005; Fonin et al. 2014).

353 Microplate spectrofluorometer have been increasingly used as they allow high throughput assays and limit the substrate volume, although the small incubation volume and long incubation time may lead 354 355 to bottle wall-effects (higher enzyme and substrate adsorption). IFE seems less likely to occur with those 356 set-ups thanks to front-face optics and small optic path. However, studies using 96-wells microplates 357 have shown its occurrence with MUF derivative substrates. For instance, Pinto et al. (2015) reported an 358 IFE using MUF-galactoside, without specifying the importance of the effect. Marathe et al. (2013) found 359 an IFE using 2'-(4-methylumbelliferyl)- $\alpha$ -D-N-acetylneuraminic acid, which was an important 360 interference in their assay. Even though microplates are less prone to IFE, its occurrence should be 361 checked in every spectrofluorometer.

#### 362 Influence of substrate concentration range on kinetic parameters determination

363 To illustrate the effect of substrate concentration range on kinetic parameters determination, we 364 conducted APA measurements on purified enzymes (E. coli and shrimp), phytoplankton cultures (A. 365 minutum and T. weissflogii) and natural bacterial populations. Several fittings were consecutively made 366 on each kinetics to determine V<sup>n</sup><sub>max</sub> and K<sup>n</sup><sub>m</sub> each time eliminating the highest concentration of substrate 367  $(S_{max})$ . This process aims to illustrate the impact of substrate concentration range by decreasing the 368 maximum concentration used from  $S_{max} = 500 \ \mu M \ (n = 11 \ points)$  to  $S_{max} = 2 \ \mu M \ (n = 3)$ . The resulting 369 variation of parameters is due to fitting artifact. It should be noted that only an apparent K<sub>m</sub> can be 370 determined, as natural substrates might be present in the medium, competing with the substrate analog. 371 Figure 5 shows the results obtained for the purified E. coli APA. Both V<sup>n</sup><sub>max</sub> and K<sub>m</sub> increase 372 (respectively + 61% and + 157%) when  $S_{max}$  increases from 2  $\mu$ M to 60  $\mu$ M. Both parameters then tend to plateau at higher  $S_{max}$ , reaching what can be considered as their "true" value when  $S_{max} = 500 \ \mu M$ 373 374  $(V_{max}^{t} = 952 \text{ nM h}^{-1} \text{ and } K_{m}^{t} = 6.5 \mu \text{M})$ , even though  $K_{m}^{n}$  still seems to vary consequently. The threshold 375 concentration of 60 µM roughly corresponds to 10 K<sup>t</sup><sub>m</sub>. This value is generally recommended as a 376 saturating concentration even though it deviates from true enzyme saturation since "only" 91% of active





378

Fig. 5. Evolution of kinetic parameters ( $V^n_{max}$ ,  $K^n_m$ ) of purified E. coli alkaline phosphatase over the maximum substrate concentration ( $S_{max}$ ) used. Several fittings were done on the same assay data, iteratively removing the highest substrate concentration. Correlation coefficient indicated significant results for n > 4 (at 0.1%).

382 In order to compare the results of consecutive fittings performed on different enzymes, kinetic parameters ( $V_{max}^{n}$  and  $K_{m}^{n}$ ) were normalized by the "true" kinetic parameters ( $V_{max}^{t}$  and  $K_{m}^{t}$ ) determined 383 384 using the largest substrate concentration range ( $S_{max} = 500 \mu M$ ). Figure 6 presents the normalized 385 velocities ( $V_{max}^{n} / V_{max}^{t}$ ) plotted against the normalized maximum substrate concentration ( $S_{max} / K_{m}^{t}$ ), which allows to observe the impact of S<sub>max</sub> independently from the enzyme's affinity. It clearly shows 386 387 the same pattern as before: V<sup>n</sup><sub>max</sub> greatly varies with low S<sub>max</sub>, then tends to stabilize around the correct 388 parameter estimation at higher S<sub>max</sub> (> 25 K<sup>t</sup><sub>m</sub>). Normalized K<sub>m</sub> follows the exact same pattern (data not 389 shown).



391 Fig. 6. Normalized  $V_{max} / V_{max}^{i}$  over normalized maximum substrate concentration  $(S_{max} / K_{m}^{i})$  of APA assays conducted 392 on various samples (purified enzymes from shrimp and E. coli, cultures of T. weissflogii and A. minutum and natural bacterial 393 communities). Each dot represent a non-linear fitting done on the same kinetic experiment data, but iteratively reducing  $S_{max}$ , 394 which is represented normalized on the X-axis. Velocities are normalized by the "true"  $V_{max}$  obtained at  $S_{max} = 500 \ \mu M$  and 395 substrate concentrations are normalized by the "true"  $K_{m}^{i}$  obtained at  $S_{max} = 500 \ \mu M$ .

396 This experiment illustrates the consequences of the use of insufficient  $S_{max}$  to determine kinetic 397 parameters. Both low and high substrate concentration are necessary to correctly fit all parts of the 398 Michaelis-Menten equation (0 and 1<sup>st</sup> order, Chróst 1990). The width of the range depends on the 399 enzyme affinity, since enzymes with low  $K_m$  are easily saturated and the curve's plateau will be reached 400 even at low  $S_{max}$ . High affinity enzymes (low  $K_m$ ) are usually thought to occur in oligotrophic 401 environments since they are supposed to process substrates at very low concentrations (Chróst 1991; Rath et al. 1993). However, even in those environments, S<sub>max</sub> should be carefully chosen. For instance, 402 403 all five studies determining enzymatic parameters in oligotrophic environments listed in Table 1 404 contained at least one experiment where  $K_m$  was equal or greater than  $S_{max}$ . In contrast, enzymes are 405 considered to have lower substrate affinity (high K<sub>m</sub>) in eutrophic environments (Chróst 1991; Rath et al. 1993), so substrate ranges should be even wider. Similar results were obtained for EPA (not shown). 406

407 As the variation of kinetic parameters results from a fitting artifact, it should logically occur for all408 enzymatic kinetics.

Effect of natural substrates competition at trace concentration of analog substrate 409 Substrate concentration used for single point assays varied from 0.1 µM to 250 µM for APA assayed 410 411 with MUF-P (see Table 1 for references) and from 2.5 to 1000 µM for EPA assayed with LLMCA (see 412 Table 2 for references). Low substrate concentrations are usually used in oligotrophic conditions, in 413 order to mimic mean environmental conditions. However, in such assays, naturally occurring substrates 414 might compete with the analog substrate. To illustrate this effect, we performed APA assays on natural 415 seawater microbial communities using trace substrate concentrations of MUF-P ( $0.125 - 2 \mu M$ , similar 416 to those in studied literature) amended with different concentrations of G6P ( $0.1 - 1.5 \,\mu$ M). G6P was 417 arbitrarily chosen to mimic dissolved organic phosphorus (DOP), the natural substrate of phosphatases. 418 Concentrations were chosen to be representative of DOP concentration in natural environments: it 419 usually ranges from 0 to 0.2 µM in open ocean surface waters (Ridal and Moore 1992; Karl and 420 Björkman 2015) while coastal and estuarine waters often contain more than 0.25 µM DOP (Karl and 421 Björkman 2015; Labry et al. 2016), with values sometimes exceeding 2 µM (Rinker and Powell 2006). 422 Activities were measured as slopes of fluorescence over time (in mV min<sup>-1</sup>) and expressed as 423 percentage of maximum activity, measured without inhibitors, for each substrate concentration (Fig. 7). 424 With a MUF-P concentration of 0.125 µM, G6P concentrations of 0.1, 0.2, 0.6 and 1.5 µM decrease 425 MUF-P hydrolysis by 11, 18, 22 and 38%, respectively. Inhibition patterns are quite similar with 0.25, and 0.5 µM MUF-P, while those effects are lower at 1 µM and tend to disappear at 2 µM MUF-P (1-8% 426 reduction). As measurement are carried out in seawater, naturally occurring DOP is also competing for 427 the enzymes' active sites, so the actual effect of G6P might be underestimated. However, results clearly 428 429 show that competition depends on the ratio of competitor to MUF-P and is not susceptible to happen at 430 saturating concentration of MUF-P.



Fig. 7. APA measured using trace MUF-P concentrations with various concentrations of G6P, a natural non-fluorescent
competitor. Results are given in mV min<sup>-1</sup> and normalized by the maximum activity obtained for each MUF-P concentration
(without competitor).

435 Although G6P was used as a single competitor, samples often contain a mixture of compounds with 436 their own affinity and inhibition constant, affecting enzymatic assays in different ways. The competitor's 437 affinity for the enzyme (hence its effect on measurement) might especially vary for polymeric substances 438 given their huge diversity (peptides or carbohydrates for example). We conducted similar tests on EPA, 439 amending 8 and 16 µM Leu-Gly, Leu-Gly-Gly or Hexagly to 0.125 and 2 µM LLMCA. Although high, 440 those competitor concentrations are representative of natural environments as combined dissolved 441 amino acids may vary from 0.2 to 8 µM in oligotrophic to coastal waters (Keil and Kirchman 1991). As 442 a result, 8 µM of Leu-Gly, Hexagly and Leu-Gly-Gly generated an inhibition of 18, 19 and 34%, while 16 µM generated respectively 25, 33 and 41% of inhibition (Fig. 8a). Those results might be explained 443 444 by the fact that measurements using peptidase substrates actually represent the concerted action of many 445 distinct enzymes, as suggested by Steen et al. (2015), who performed competition experiments between 446 12 amino acid-p-nitroanilide compounds and 3 fluorogenic substrates (LLMCA, L-arginine-MCA, L-447 proline-MCA). As expected, the use of higher concentration of LLMCA (2 µM) reduced the inhibition: 448 8 µM of Leu-GLy, Hexagly and Leu-Gly-Gly generated 5, 10 and 8% inhibition respectively while 16





454 Several other studies have shown the competition between natural and fluorogenic substrates when 455 assaying APA (see for instance Chróst 1990; Fernley and Walker 1967; Hoppe 1983), EPA (Hoppe 456 1983; Somville and Billen 1983; Christian and Karl 1998) or glycosidases (Hoppe 1983; Somville 457 1984), which confirms our results showing that natural substrates may significantly alter the measured 458 enzymatic activites at low analog substrate concentrations.

459 This issue arises from the legitimate need to measure in situ degradation rates. However, as natural substrates compete with the fluorogenic analog, those measurements are unreliable and depend on 460 461 sample composition, which completely impedes inter-study comparison. It raises questions regarding 462 what we really are interested in quantifying when measuring enzyme activity rates. Single point assays 463 using a saturating substrate concentration (>  $10 \text{ K}_{m}$ ) allow the determination of a potential degradation rate ( $V_{max}$ ). This can be considered as a determination of enzyme concentration (Billen 1991). When it 464 465 is normalized by the biomass or number of cells, it reflects the enzymatic equipment of the cells. Those 466 measurements are comparable across studies and allow, for instance, to study the regulation of enzyme 467 synthesis in response to environmental trophic conditions. In any case, fluorogenic substrate assays 468 should be interpreted cautiously in terms of real substrate utilization, keeping in mind that activities are 469 measured with respect to naturally occurring substrates (Billen 1991).

## 470 Conclusion and recommendations

471 The starting point of this study was the comparison of existing literature on enzymatic activity 472 measurement in aquatic environments. We noticed substantial divergences in existing methodologies, 473 the most notable one being the difference in substrate concentrations used for assays. Furthermore, the 474 occurrence of IFE, a fluorometric artifact, has never been considered despite being likely to occur, 475 especially at saturating concentrations of substrate. Those factors might alter results and therefore, 476 investigation of past articles and inter-study comparison should be carried out cautiously. In this study, 477 we tried to highlight several methodological key points of enzymatic assays, illustrating them with APA 478 and EPA, although results should apply to all fluorometric enzymatic assays.

479 (1) We would like to emphasize the possible occurrence of IFE, a fluorometric artifact that has been 480 completely ignored in environmental water studies until now, despite having the potential to 481 significantly affect measurements. In this study, it was not detected for APA assays but occurred 482 for EPA assays with the two cuvette based spectrofluorometers tested, at a LLMCA threshold 483 concentration of 125  $\mu$ M. This effect can also occur with microplate readers, to a lesser extent. 484 IFE depends on sample dilution and the equipment used and can be corrected by using 485 appropriate calibration curves.

486 (2) Ideally, before any single substrate assay, a kinetic analysis should be performed to determine 487 the apparent  $K_m$  and to choose a saturating concentration. In practice, this step is laborious. 488 However, when such experiments are carried out, a wide substrate concentration range (up to 489 several hundred micromolar) should be used in order to reach the enzyme's active sites 490 saturation and correctly fit both first and zero-order part of enzyme reaction. The maximum 491 substrate concentration should be at least 10 K<sub>m</sub> to ensure that most enzymes are sufficiently 492 saturated.

493 (3) Finally, when performing a single substrate assay, saturating substrate concentrations (> 10 K<sub>m</sub>)
 494 should be preferred, rather than trace concentrations mimicking natural conditions. Indeed, this
 495 latter approach might not fulfill Michaelis-Menten conditions (i.e. excess substrate compared to

enzyme concentration) and may lead to higher uncertainties. Furthermore, it is highly dependent
on both natural substrate concentrations and composition, as natural substrate might compete
with the substrate analog for the enzyme active sites. Up to 34% and 38% inhibition was
observed in the present study inhibition tests with natural substrates for EPA and APA,
respectively.

All these methodological issues must be addressed in order to correctly measure enzymatic rates andallow inter-study comparison.

## 503 **References**

504Arnosti, C. 2003. Microbial extracellular enzymes and their role in dissolved organic matter cycling.505Aquat. Ecosyst. Interactivity dissolved Org. matter **342**: 315–342. doi:10.1016/B978-012256371-

506 3/50014-7

- Arnosti, C. 2011. Microbial extracellular enzymes and the marine carbon cycle. Ann. Rev. Mar. Sci. 3:
  401–425. doi:10.1146/annurev-marine-120709-142731
- Azam, F., T. Fenchel, J. G. Field, J. Gray, L. Meyer-Reil, and T. F. Thingstad. 1983. The Ecological Role of
   Water-Column Microbes in the Sea. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 10: 257–263. doi:10.3354/meps010257
- 511 Azam, F. 1998. Microbial control of oceanic carbon flux: The plot thickens. Science. **280**: 694–696.
- 512 doi:10.1126/science.280.5364.694
- Bidle, K. D. 2010. Phytoplankton-Bacteria Interactions: Ectohydrolytic Enzymes and Their Influence on
   Biogeochemical Cycling. Limnol. Oceanogr. e-Lectures. doi:10.4319/lol.2010.kbidle.4
- 515 Billen, G. 1991. Protein Degradation in Aquatic Environments, p. 332. *In* R.J. Chróst [ed.], Microbial
- 516 Enzymes in Aquatic Environments. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- 517 Bisswanger, H. 2014. Enzyme assays. Perspect. Sci. 1: 41–55. doi:10.1016/j.pisc.2014.02.005
- 518 Bogé, G., M. Lespilette, D. Jamet, and J. L. Jamet. 2012. Role of sea water DIP and DOP in controlling
- 519 bulk alkaline phosphatase activity in N.W. Mediterranean Sea (Toulon, France). Mar. Pollut. Bull.
- 520 **64**: 1989–1996. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2012.07.028
- 521 Briciu-burghina, C., B. Heery, and F. Regan. 2015. Continuous fluorometric method for measuring β-
- 522 glucuronidase activity: comparative analysis of three fluorogenic substrates. Analyst 140: 5953–
  523 5964. doi:10.1039/c5an01021g
- 524 Bullock, A., K. Ziervogel, S. Ghobrial, S. Smith, B. McKee, and C. Arnosti. 2017. A multi-season 525 investigation of microbial extracellular enzyme activities in two temperate coastal North Carolina

526 rivers: Evidence of spatial but not seasonal patterns. Front. Microbiol. 8: 2589.
527 doi:10.3389/fmicb.2017.02589

- 528 Carlsson, P., E. Granéli, W. Granéli, E. G. Rodriguez, W. F. de Carvalho, A. Brutemark, and E. Lindehoff.
- 529 2012. Bacterial and phytoplankton nutrient limitation in tropical marine waters, and a coastal
- 530 lake in Brazil. J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. **418–419**: 37–45. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2012.03.012
- Caruso, G., R. Caruso, and G. Maimone. 2019. Microbial enzymatic activity measurements by
   fluorogenic substrates: Evidence of inducible enzymes in oligotrophic Mediterranean areas. J.
   Clin. Microbiol Biochem. Technol. 5: 19–24. doi:10.17352/jcmbt
- 534 Chappell, K. R., and R. Goulder. 1995. A between-river comparison of extracellular-enzyme activity.
- 535 Microb. Ecol. **29**: 1–17. doi:10.1007/BF00217419
- Christian, J. R., and D. M. Karl. 1998. Ectoaminopeptidase specificity and regulation in Antarctic marine
   pelagic microbial communities. Aquat. Microb. Ecol. 15: 303–310. doi:10.3354/ame015303
- 538 Christie, D. J., G. M. Alter, and J. A. Magnuson. 1978. Saccharide Binding to Transition Metal Ion Free

539 Concanavalin A. Biochemistry **17**: 4425–4430. doi:10.1021/bi00614a011

- 540 Chrost, R., and H. Krambeck. 1986. Fluorescence correction for measurements of enzyme activity in
- 541 natural waters using methylumbelliferyl-substrates. Arch. Hydrobiol. **106**: 79–90.
- 542Chróst, R. J., and J. Overbeck. 1987. Kinetics of alkaline phosphatase activity and phosphorus543availability for phytoplankton and bacterioplankton in Lake PluBsee (North German Eutrophic
- 544 Lake). Microb. Ecol. **13**: 229–248. doi:10.1007/BF02025000
- 545 Chróst, R. J. 1990. Microbial Ectoenzymes in Aquatic Environments, p. 47–77. *In* J. Overbeck and R.J.
- 546 Chróst [eds.], Aquatic Microbial Ecology: Biochemical and molecular approaches. Springer Verlag,
  547 New York.
- 548 Chróst, R. J. 1991. Environmental Control of the Synthesis and Activity of Aquatic Microbial

549 Ectoenzymes, In Chróst R.J. [ed.] Microbial Enzymes in Aquatic Environments. Springer, New York

- Cunha, M. A., M. A. Almeida, and F. Alcantara. 2001. Short-term responses of the natural planktonic
   bacterial community to the changing water properties in an estuarine environment:
   ectoenzymatic activity, glucose incorporation, and biomass production. Microb Ecol 42: 69–79.
   doi:10.1007/s002480000098
- Davis, C. E., C. Mahaffey, G. A. Wolff, and J. Sharples. 2014. A storm in a shelf sea: Variation in
   phosphorus distribution and organic matter stoichiometry. Geophys. Res. Lett. 41: 8452–8459.
   doi:10.1002/2014GL061949
- 557 Delmas, D., C. Legrand, C. Bechemin, C. Collinot, C. Legrand, C. Bechemin, and C. Collinot Aquat. 1994.
- 558 Exoproteolytic activity determined by flow injection analysis: its potential importance for 559 bacterial growth in coastal marine ponds. Aquat. Living Resour **7**: 17-24.
- Delmas, D., and M. J. Garet. 1995. SDS-preservation for deferred measurement of exoproteolytic
  kinetics in marine samples. J. Microbiol. Methods 22: 243-248. doi:10.1016/01677012(95)00008-9
- Duhamel, S., K. M. Björkman, J. K. Doggett, and D. M. Karl. 2014. Microbial response to enhanced
  phosphorus cycling in the North Pacific Subtropical Gyre. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 504: 43–58.
  doi:10.3354/meps10757
- 566 Eccleston, J. F., J. P. Hutchinson, and D. M. Jameson. 2005. Fluorescence-Based Assays. Prog. in Med.
   567 454 Chem. 43: 19–48. doi: 10.1016/S0079-6468(05)43002-7
- Fernley, H. N., and P. G. Walker. 1967. Studies on Alkaline Phosphatase Inhibition by phosphate
  derivatives and the substrate specificity. Biochem. J. 104: 1011–1018.
  doi:10.11405/nisshoshi1964.71.784
- 571 Fonin, A. V., A. I. Sulatskaya, I. M. Kuznetsova, and K. K. Turoverov. 2014. Fluorescence of dyes in 572 solutions with high absorbance. Inner filter effect correction. PLoS One.

- 573 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0103878
- 574 Fukuda, R., Y. Sohrin, N. Saotome, H. Fukuda, T. Nagata, and I. Koike. 2000. East-west gradient in 575 ectoenzyme activities in the subarctic Pacific: Possible regulation by zinc. Limnol. Oceanogr. **45**:
- 576 930–939. doi:10.4319/lo.2000.45.4.0930
- 577 Gonnelli, M., S. Vestri, and C. Santinelli. 2013. Chromophoric dissolved organic matter and microbial 578 enzymatic activity. A biophysical approach to understand the marine carbon cycle. Biophys.
- 579 Chem. **182**: 79–85. doi:10.1016/j.bpc.2013.06.016
- 580 Guillard, R. R. L., and J. H. Ryther. 1962. Studies of marine planktonic diatoms. Can. J. Microbiol. 8: 229–
  581 239.
- Hoppe, H.-G. 1983. Significance of exoenzymatic activities in the ecology of brackish water:
   measurements by means of methylumbelliferyl-substrates. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 11: 299–308.
   doi:10.3354/meps011299
- 585 Hoppe, H.-G. 2003. Phosphatase activity in the sea. Hydrobiologia 187–200.
   586 doi:10.1023/a:1025453918247
- Kao, S., A. N. Asanov, and P. B. Oldham. 1998. A comparison of fluorescence inner-filter effects for
  different cell configurations. Instrum. Sci. Technol. 26: 375–387.
  doi:10.1080/10739149808001906
- Karl, D. M., and K. M. Björkman. 2015. Dynamics of Dissolved Organic Phosphorus, p 233-334. In D. A.
  Handsell and C. A. Carlson [eds.], Biogeochemistry of marine dissolved organic matter: Second
  Edition. Academic Press, Amsterdam.
- Karner, M., D. Fuks, and G. J. Herndl. 1992. Bacterial activity along a trophic gradient. Microb. Ecol. 24:
  243–257. doi:10.1007/BF00167784
- 595 Keil, R. G., and D. L. Kirchman. 1991. Dissolved combined amino acids in marine waters as determined

- 596 by a vapor-phase hydrolysis method. Mar. Chem. **33**: 243–259. doi:10.1016/0304-597 4203(91)90070-D
- Kirchman, D. L. 2008. Microbial Ecology of the Oceans: Second Edition. Wiley-Blackwell, Hoboken. 477
  593 593p.
- 600 Koch, M. S., D. C. Kletou, and R. Tursi. 2009. Alkaline phosphatase activity of water column fractions
- and seagrass in a tropical carbonate estuary, Florida Bay. Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci. 83: 403–413.
  doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2009.04.007
- 603 Kothawala, D. N., K. R. Murphy, C. A. Stedmon, G. A. Weyhenmeyer, and L. J. Tranvik. 2013. Inner filter
- 604 correction of dissolved organic matter fluorescence. Limnol. Oceanogr. Methods **11**: 616–630.
- 605 doi:10.4319/lom.2013.11.616
- Labry, C., D. Delmas, and A. Herbland. 2005. Phytoplankton and bacterial alkaline phosphatase
  activities in relation to phosphate and DOP availability within the Gironde plume waters (Bay of
  Biscay). J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol. **318**: 213–225. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2004.12.017
- Labry, C., D. Delmas, A. Youenou, J. Quere, A. Leynaert, S. Fraisse, M. Raimonet, and O. Ragueneau.
- 610 2016. High alkaline phosphatase activity in phosphate replete waters: The case of two macrotidal
- 611 estuaries. Limnol. Oceanogr. **61**: 1513–1529. doi:10.1002/lno.10315
- Liu, Y., W. Kati, C. M. Chen, R. Tripathi, A. Molla, and W. Kohlbrenner. 1999. Use of a fluorescence plate
- for measuring kinetic parameters with inner filter effect correction. Anal. Biochem. **267**:
- 614 331–335. doi:10.1006/abio.1998.3014
- 615 Marathe, B. M., V. Lévêque, K. Klumpp, R. G. Webster, and E. A. Govorkova. 2013. Determination of
- 616 Neuraminidase Kinetic Constants Using Whole Influenza Virus Preparations and Correction for
- 617 Spectroscopic Interference by a Fluorogenic Substrate. PLoS One **8**: e71401.
- 618 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071401
- 619 Misic, C., P. Povero, and M. Fabiano. 2002. Ectoenzymatic ratios in relation to particulate organic

- 620 matter distribution (Ross sea, Antarctica). Microb. Ecol. 44: 224–234. doi:10.1007/s00248-002621 2017-9
- Nausch, M., G. Nausch, and N. Wasmund. 2004. Phosphorus dynamics during the transition from
  nitrogen to phosphate limitation in the central Baltic Sea. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 266: 15–25.
  doi:10.3354/meps266015
- Niell, F. X., B. a Whitton, and I. Hernández. 2003. Phosphatase activity of benthic marine algae. An
  overview. J. Appl. Phycol. 3: 475–487.
- Ory, P., S. Palesse, D. Delmas, and H. Montanié. 2011. In situ structuring of virioplankton through
  bacterial exoenzymatic activity: interaction with phytoplankton. Aquat. Microb. Ecol. 64: 233–
  252. doi:10.3354/ame01524
- Palmier, M. O., and S. R. Van Doren. 2007. Rapid determination of enzyme kinetics from fluorescence:
  Overcoming the inner filter effect. Anal. Biochem. **371**: 43–51. doi:10.1016/j.ab.2007.07.008
- 632 Patel, A. B., K. Fukami, and T. Nishijima. 2000. Regulation of seasonal variability of aminopeptidase
- 633 activities in surface and bottom waters of Uranouchi Inlet, Japan. Aquat. Microb. Ecol. 21: 139–
- 634 149. doi:10.3354/ame021139
- Payne, J. W., ed. 1980. Microorganisms and nitrogen sources : transport and utilization of amino acids,
  peptides, proteins, and related substrates. John Wiley, New York. 870p.
- Pinto, M. F., B. N. Estevinho, R. Crespo, F. A. Rocha, A. M. Damas, and P. M. Martins. 2015. Enzyme
  kinetics: The whole picture reveals hidden meanings. FEBS J. 282: 2309–2316.
  doi:10.1111/febs.13275
- Puchalski, M. M., M. J. Morra, and R. von Wandruszka. 1991. Assessment of inner filter effect
  corrections in fluorimetry. Fresenius. J. Anal. Chem. **340**: 341–344. doi:10.1007/BF00321578
- 642 Rath, J., C. Schiller, and G. J. Herndl. 1993. Ectoenzymatic activity and bacterial dynamics along a

643	trophic gradient in the Caribbean Sea. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. <b>102</b> : 89–96. doi:10.3354/meps102089
644	Rees, A. P., S. B. Hope, C. E. Widdicombe, J. L. Dixon, E. M. S. Woodward, and M. F. Fitzsimons. 2009.
645	Alkaline phosphatase activity in the western English Channel: Elevations induced by high
646	summertime rainfall. Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci. 81: 569–574. doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2008.12.005
647	Ridal, J. J., and R. M. Moore. 1992. Dissolved organic phosphorus concentrations in the northeast
648	subarctic Pacific Ocean. Limnol. Oceanogr. <b>37</b> : 1067–1075. doi:10.4319/lo.1992.37.5.1067
649	Rinker, K. R., and R. T. Powell. 2006. Dissolved organic phosphorus in the Mississippi River plume during
650	spring and fall 2002. Mar. Chem. <b>102</b> : 170–179. doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2005.09.013
651	Saifuku, K., T. Sekine, T. Namihisa, T. Takahashi, and Y. Kanaoka. 1978. A novel fluorometric ultramicro
652	determination of serum leucine aminopeptidase using a coumarine derivative. Clin. Chim. Acta
653	<b>84</b> : 85–91. doi:10.1016/0009-8981(78)90479-5
654	Sala, M. M., M. Karner, L. Arin, and C. Marrasé. 2001. Measurement of ectoenzyme activities as an
655	indication of inorganic nutrient imbalance in microbial communities. Aquat. Microb. Ecol. 23:
656	301–311. doi:10.3354/ame023301

- Sebastián, M., and F. X. Niell. 2004. Alkaline phosphatase activity in marine oligotrophic environments:
   Implications of single-substrate addition assays for potential activity estimations. Mar. Ecol. Prog.
- 659 Ser. **277**: 285–290. doi:10.3354/meps277285
- Shi, Z., J. Xu, X. Li, R. Li, and Q. Li. 2019. Links of Extracellular Enzyme Activities, Microbial Metabolism,
   and Community Composition in the River-Impacted Coastal Waters. J. Geophys. Res.
   Biogeosciences 124: 3507–3520. doi:10.1029/2019JG005095
- Sinsabaugh, R. L., S. Findlay, P. Franchini, and D. Fischer. 1997. Enzymatic analysis of riverine
  bacterioplankton production. Limnol. Oceanogr. 42: 29–38. doi:10.4319/lo.1997.42.1.0029
- 665 Sisma-Ventura, G., and E. Rahav. 2019. DOP Stimulates Heterotrophic Bacterial Production in the

- 666 Oligotrophic Southeastern Mediterranean Coastal Waters. Front. Microbiol. 10: 1–10.
  667 doi:10.3389/fmicb.2019.01913
- Sohm, J. A., and D. G. Capone. 2006. Phosphorus dynamics of the tropical and subtropical north
  Atlantic: Trichodesmium spp. versus bulk plankton. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. **317**: 21–28.
  doi:10.3354/meps317021
- 671 Somville, M. 1984. Measurement and study of substrate specificity of Exoglucosidase activity in
  672 eutrophic water. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 48: 1181–1185.
- 673 Somville, M., and G. Billen. 1983. A method for determining exoproteolytic activity in natural waters.
- 674 Limnol. Oceanogr. **28**: 190–193. doi:10.4319/lo.1983.28.1.0190
- Song, C., X. Cao, Y. Zhou, and others. 2019. Nutrient regeneration mediated by extracellular enzymes
  in water column and interstitial water through a microcosm experiment. Sci. Total Environ. 670:
  982–992. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.03.297
- 578 Steen, A. D., J. P. Vazin, S. M. Hagen, K. H. Mulligan, and S. W. Wilhelm. 2015. Substrate specificity of
- 679 aquatic extracellular peptidases assessed by competitive inhibition assays using synthetic
- 680 substrates. Aquat. Microb. Ecol. **75**: 271–281. doi:10.3354/ame01755
- Štrojsová, A., J. Nedoma, M. Štrojsová, X. Cao, and J. Vrba. 2008. The role of cell-surface-bound
  phosphatases in species competition within natural phytoplankton assemblage: An in situ
  experiment. J. Limnol. 67: 128–138. doi:10.4081/jlimnol.2008.128
- Talbot, V., L. Giuliano, V. Bruni, and M. Bianchi. 1997. Bacterial abundance, production and
  ectoproteolytic activity in the Strait of Magellan. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 154: 293–302.
  doi:10.3354/meps154293
- Thingstad, T. F., U. L. Zweifel, and F. Rassoulzadegan. 1998. P limitation of heterotrophic bacteria and
  phytoplankton. Limnol. Oceanogr. 4: 88–94.

689	Valeur, B. 2001. Molecular fluorescence, principles and application. Wiley, Weinheim. 381p.
690	Van Wambeke, F., U. Christaki, A. Giannakourou, T. Moutin, and K. Souvemerzoglou. 2002.
691	Longitudinal and vertical trends of bacterial limitation by phosphorus and carbon in the
692	Mediterranean Sea. Microb. Ecol. <b>43</b> : 119–133. doi:10.1007/s00248-001-0038-4
693	Van Wambeke, F., JF. Ghiglione, J. Nedoma, G. Mével, and P. Raimbault. 2009. Bottom up effects on
694	bacterioplankton growth and composition during summer-autumn transition in the open NW
695	Mediterranean Sea. Biogeosciences <b>6</b> : 705–720. doi:10.5194/bg-6-705-2009
696	Yamaguchi, T., M. Sato, F. Hashihama, M. Ehama, T. Shiozaki, K. Takahashi, and K. Furuya. 2019. Basin-
697	Scale Variations in Labile Dissolved Phosphoric Monoesters and Diesters in the Central North
698	Pacific Ocean. J. Geophys. Res. Ocean. <b>124</b> : 3058–3072. doi:10.1029/2018JC014763

## 700 Figure captions

701 Fig. 1. Fig. 1. (A) Normalized fluorescence spectra of MUF-P (alkaline phosphatase substrate, dashed 702 lines) and MUF (product, solid lines) over emission (gray lines) or excitation wavelength (black lines). 703 Excitation spectra of MUF and MUF-P were obtained using a constant emission wavelength (460 nm) 704 while excitation wavelength varied. Emission spectra were obtained using a constant excitation 705 wavelength (364 nm) with variable emission wavelength. (B) Normalized fluorescence spectra of 706 LLMCA (protease substrate, dashed lines) and MCA (product, solid lines) over emission (gray lines) or 707 excitation wavelength (black lines). To obtain excitation spectra of MCA and LLMCA, emitted light 708 was respectively collected at a wavelength of 440 and 410 nm while excitation wavelength varied. To 709 obtain emission spectra, emitted light was collected over a range of wavelength while excitation 710 wavelength was set to 350 and 325 nm for MCA and LLMCA, respectively. em: emission, ex: excitation. 711 Vertical lines represent excitation and emission wavelengths used during enzymatic assays.

Fig. 2. Conceptual illustration of excitation IFE (also termed primary IFE) and emission IFE (also
termed secondary IFE) using a right angle geometry, one of the most common for cuvette system.

Table 1. Literature examples showing phosphatase activity assay conditions used in different
environments. All measurements were carried out using 4-Methylumbelliferyl phosphate (MUF-P)
substrate.

Table 2. Literature examples showing exoproteolytic activity assay conditions used in different
environments. All measurements were carried out using L-Leucine-7-amido-4-methylcoumarin
(LLMCA) substrate.

**Fig. 3.** Detection of IFE using calibration curves of MUF (a, c, e) and MCA (b, d, f), with cuvette operated LS50 spectrofluorometer. Calibration curves (a, b) were determined from solutions prepared in varying concentration of non-hydrolysed substrate (MUF-P, LLMCA). On panel a and b, only four calibration curves are shown to facilitate readability although 12 and 9 curves were respectively measured for APA and EPA. All calibrations are displayed on other panels. Calibration of MUF shows no IFE as the slope of each calibration is not dependent on MUF-P concentration (c) and intercept varies linearly with MUF-P concentration (e). Calibration of MCA exhibits an IFE as the slope of each
calibration varies significantly with LLMCA concentration (d) and intercept does not vary linearly
above 60 µM of LLMCA (f). *r*: correlation coefficient.

Fig. 4. (a) Kinetics of natural bacterial communities EPA measured using FIA-SFM25 (black line) or
with LS50 (using cuvette, grey line). (b) Correlation between EPA measured with LS50 (using cuvette)
and using FIA-SFM25. Dashed line highlights the substrate concentration threshold.

**Fig. 5.** Evolution of kinetic parameters ( $V^n_{max}$ ,  $K^n_m$ ) of purified E. coli alkaline phosphatase over the maximum substrate concentration ( $S_{max}$ ) used. Several fittings were done on the same assay data, iteratively removing the highest substrate concentration. Correlation coefficient indicated significant results for n > 4 (at 0.1%).

**Fig. 6.** Normalized  $V_{max}$  ( $V^n_{max}$  /  $V^t_{max}$ ) over normalized maximum substrate concentration ( $S_{max}$  /  $K^t_m$ ) of APA assays conducted on various samples (purified enzymes from shrimp and E. coli, cultures of T. weissflogii and A. minutum and natural bacterial communities). Each dot represent a non-linear fitting done on the same kinetic experiment data, but iteratively reducing  $S_{max}$ , which is represented normalized on the X-axis. Velocities are normalized by the "true"  $V^t_{max}$  obtained at  $S_{max} = 500 \mu$ M and substrate concentrations are normalized by the "true"  $K^t_m$  obtained at  $S_{max} = 500 \mu$ M.

Fig. 7. APA measured using trace MUF-P concentrations with various concentrations of G6P, a natural
non-fluorescent competitor. Results are given in mV min<sup>-1</sup> and normalized by the maximum activity
obtained for each MUF-P concentration (without competitor).

Fig. 8. EPA measured using 0.125 μM LLMCA (a) or 2 μM LLMCA (b), with various concentrations
of Leu-Gly-Gly, Leu-Gly or Hexagly, acting as competitors (C). Results are measured in mV min<sup>-1</sup> and
normalized by the maximum activity obtained without competitor.

## 749 Acknowledgments

- 750 This work was supported by the French National Program for Coastal Environment (EC2CO) and by
- the ISblue project, Interdisciplinary graduate school for the blue planet (ANR-17-EURE-0015), co-
- funded by a grant from the French government under the program "Investissements d'Avenir". We wish
- to thank M. Latimier for the preparation of phytoplankton cultures.