

The phyto-bacterioplankton couple in a shallow freshwater ecosystem: Who leads the dance?

Imen Louati, Naoise Nunan, Kevin Tambosco, Cécile Bernard, Jean-François

Humbert, Julie Leloup

▶ To cite this version:

Imen Louati, Naoise Nunan, Kevin Tambosco, Cécile Bernard, Jean-François Humbert, et al.. The phyto-bacterioplankton couple in a shallow freshwater ecosystem: Who leads the dance?. Harmful Algae, 2023, 126, pp.102436. 10.1016/j.hal.2023.102436 . hal-04256441

HAL Id: hal-04256441 https://hal.science/hal-04256441

Submitted on 24 Oct 2023

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.

Highlights

• High frequency monitoring of phytoplankton and bacterioplankton dynamics in an eutrophic shallow lake

• Phytoplankton and associated bacterioplankton communities can be seen as a couple in interaction but with flexible species variations

• Free-living bacterioplankton is under less direct influence of the phytoplankton communities and environmental variables dynamics

1	The phyto-bacterioplankton couple in a shallow freshwater ecosystem: who leads the dance?
2	
3	Authors : Imen Louati ¹ , Naoise Nunan ^{1,3} , Kevin Tambosco ¹ , Cécile Bernard ² , Jean-François
4	Humbert ¹ , and Julie Leloup ¹ .
5	Affiliations :
6	1) UMR 7618 iEES-Paris Sorbonne Université - 4 place Jussieu - 75252 Paris Cedex 05 - France
7	2) UMR 7245 MCAM Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle - CNRS, CP 39, 12 rue Buffon,75231
8	Paris Cedex 05, France
9	3) Department of Soil and Environment, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, P.O. Box
10	7014, 75007 Uppsala, Sweden
11	Corresponding author : Julie Leloup
12	UMR 7618 iEES-Paris Sorbonne Université - 4 place Jussieu - 75252 Paris Cedex 05 - France
13	Phone : 0033 144 273 826
14	E-mail : jleloup@sorbonne-universite.fr
15	
16	Keywords / Highlights
17	• High frequency monitoring of phytoplankton and bacterioplankton dynamics in an
18	eutrophic shallow lake
19	• Phytoplankton and associated bacterioplankton communities can be seen as a couple in
20	interaction but with flexible species variations
21	• Free-living bacterioplankton is under less direct influence of the phytoplankton communi-
22	ties and environmental variables dynamics
23	

24 Abstract

25 Bloom-forming phytoplankton dynamics are still unpredictable, even though it is known that several abiotic factors, such as nutrient availability and temperature, are key factors for bloom 26 27 development. We investigated whether biotic factors, i.e. the bacterioplankton composition (via 28 16SrDNA metabarcoding), were correlated with phytoplankton dynamics, through a weekly monitoring of a shallow lake known to host recurrent cyanobacterial blooms. We detected 29 concomitant changes in both bacterial and phytoplankton community biomass and diversity. 30 31 During the bloom event, a significant decrease in phytoplankton diversity, was detected, with a first co-dominance of *Ceratium*, *Microcystis* and *Aphanizomenon*, followed by a co-dominance of 32 the two cyanobacterial genera. In the same time, we observed a decrease of the particle-associated 33 34 (PA) bacterial richness and the emergence of a specific bacterial consortium that was potentially better adapted to the new nutritional niche. Unexpectedly, changes in PA bacterial communities 35 36 occurred just before the development the emergence of the phytoplanktonic bloom and the 37 associated modification of the phytoplanktonic community composition, suggesting that changes in environmental conditions leading to the bloom, were first sensed by the bacterial PA community. 38 39 This last was quite stable throughout the bloom event, even though there were changes in the blooming species, suggesting that the association between cyanobacterial species and bacterial 40 communities may not be as tight as previously described for monospecific blooming communities. 41 42 Finally, the dynamics of the free-living (FL) bacterial communities displayed a different trajectory 43 from those of the PA and phytoplankton communities. This FL communities can be viewed as a reservoir for bacterial recruitment for the PA fraction. Altogether, these data also highlight s that 44 the spatial organization within these different microenvironments in the water column is a relevant 45 factor in the structuring of these communities. 46

2

47

48 Keywords: cyanobacterial bloom, eutrophic lake, phototrophic-heterotrophic interactions,
49 temporal dynamic

50

51 1. Introduction

52 Due to the health risks for human populations associated with cyanobacterial blooms, numerous studies have been published during the past 20 years on the determinism of these cell 53 proliferations, their potential toxicity, as well as the diversity of metabolites they produce (e.g. 54 55 Demay et al., 2019). Overall these studies have shown that cyanobacterial blooms are strongly 56 associated with the eutrophication of lentic ecosystems (e.g. Smith, 2003; Heisler et al., 2008; Conley et al., 2009) and, more recently, that climatic change (temperature and light mainly) tends 57 58 to amplify these proliferations, as reviewed by Chorus et al. (2021). Despite the numerous studies on the genetics, ecophysiology and toxicity of bloom-forming cyanobacteria, cyanobacterial 59 60 dynamics (appearance, intensity and duration) remain poorly understood (Harke et al., 2016, Wilhelm et al., 2020). This is particularly important because cyanobacterial blooms are frequently 61 62 characterized by chaotic population dynamics, with rapid population rises and declines (Pobel et 63 al., 2011), but we do not have a clear understanding of the processes or interactions that underlie these dynamics. 64

A number of studies have shed a light on the role of biotic interactions as potential structuring factors in combination with environmental conditions. The competition between cyanobacteria and microalgae (e.g. Huisman et al., 1999; Ji et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2017) or the grazing of cyanobacteria by zooplankton (e.g. Dmitrieva and Semenova, 2011; Ka et al., 2012; Ger et al., 2016) are examples of such biotic interactions. It is only recently that the interactions occurring between cyanobacteria and the other bacteria have been investigated in freshwater ecosystems. These interactions are crucial as the recycling of organic matter (OM) produced by cyanobacteria

and other phytoplankton is performed by heterotrophic bacteria in the microbial loop (Cole et al., 72 73 1988). These bacteria are either planktonic in the water column (free-living - FL fraction) or 74 associated with the immediate environment of phytoplanktonic cells (Particle-associated -PA 75 fraction), thus forming the phycosphere where specialized interactions are expected to occur (Song 76 et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2021). The composition and diversity of these PA and FL communities are known to be significantly different (e.g. Parveen et al., 2013; Seymour et al., 2017). These 77 differences are explained by the continuous input of autochthonous OM resulting from 78 79 phytoplanktonic extracellular OM and cell lysis, which is more readily available to bacterial communities within the phycosphere, and which preferentially affects the metabolic capacities of 80 PA communities relative to FL communities (Louati et al., 2015; Woodhouse et al., 2018; Hu et 81 82 al., 2020). Moreover, the chemical composition of photosynthates varies both with the taxonomic composition of the phytoplankton and their physiological status. Labile low-molecular-weight 83 84 molecules (such as amino acids and fatty acids) are produced during the growth phase and high-85 molecular-weight molecules (polysaccharides, proteins) during the senescence phase (Leloup et al., 2013; Buchan et al., 2014; Seymour et al., 2017; Camarena-Gómez et al., 2018, Lemoigne et 86 87 al, 2021). Thus, the taxonomic composition of the phytoplankton, their growth state, as well as their physiological status can modulate the structure of the PA and FL bacterial communities, (e.g. 88 Grossart et al., 2006; Zhu et al., 2016; Berg et al., 2018; Pascault et al., 2021). It has been suggested 89 90 that the composition of bacterial communities could also modulate the metabolic interactions between heterotrophic bacteria and phytoplankton (Pinhassi et al., 2004; Grossart et al., 2006; 91 92 Klindworth et al., 2014), and could lead to modifications of some phytoplanktonic traits, such as growth rate or aggregation capacity, and ultimately their fitness. For example, Jackrel et al. (2021) 93 demonstrated that the presence of established associated bacterial species can facilitate the growth 94 95 rates, environmental stress responses and fitness of green algae. Moreover, Jankowiac and Gobler 96 (2020) suggested that the metabolic activities, the growth rates and the diversity of both the
97 phytoplanktonic and the bacterial communities, affected the acclimation rates of the phycosphere
98 to changes in environmental conditions.

99 Based on these data, we hypothesized that the bacterial and phytoplanktonic communities 100 could have synchronized seasonal dynamics, and that different phytoplankton-bacterioplankton 101 couples would emerge depending on the environmental conditions. As recently emphasized, 102 studies have been carried out over a limited range of spatial and temporal scales, and high frequency 103 monitoring approaches in natural conditions are needed (Lindh et al., 2015; Jankowiac and Gobler, 2020). High frequency monitoring can provide a fine understanding of the dynamics of the 104 associations between phytoplankton and bacterial communities. This is particularly true in small 105 106 sized ecosystems where the phytoplankton communities display rapid and chaotic changes (Pobel et al., 2011). Such an approach could provide novel insights into processes occurring between 107 108 bacteria and phytoplankton during different stages of a bloom event, or under different 109 environmental conditions and their potential roles in bloom dynamics.

To explore these hypotheses, we monitored a shallow lake known to host recurrent 110 cyanobacterial blooms on a weekly basis in order to determine (i) whether the dynamics of 111 associated (PA) and free-living (FL) bacterial communities were synchronized with that of 112 phytoplankton community (eukaryotic algae and cyanobacteria) dynamics or whether there was a 113 lag between the two, (ii) whether the reduced phytoplankton diversity that is commonly observed 114 during cyanobacterial blooms results in a concomitant reduction of either the PA or FL bacterial 115 diversity and (iii) whether changes in bacterial communities composition was accompanied with 116 117 the emergence of some specific potential functions during the bloom season, thus contributing to a better understanding of this process. 118

119 2. Experimental procedures

120 <u>2.1. Study sites, sampling and fraction separation</u>

The sampling site is a recreational lake located near the city of Champs-sur-Marne (Seine-et-121 122 Marne, Ile-de-France, France, 48° 51'47.0 N, 02°35'53.9 E). This aquatic ecosystem has a surface area of 0.1 km² with an average depth of 2.70 m, and, since 2006, it has experienced several 123 124 cyanobacterial bloom episodes (Ledreux et al., 2010). In 2013, a time-series sampling campaign was performed in which weekly samples were collected from surface water (between 0.5 to 1m 125 depth) starting June 26th to October 28th (14 dates, July 1st and July 15th were not sampled), as 126 127 recommended for small lakes (Pobel et al., 2011). Triplicate raw water samples (50 to 100 mL depending on the Chl-a content) were filtered through a 1.2 µm polycarbonate filter (Isopore 128 129 Membrane Millipore) to concentrate the particle-associated fraction (PA), followed by a 0.2 μ m polycarbonate filter (Nuclepore Polycarbonate - Whatman) in order to concentrate the free-living 130 fraction (FL). Filters were immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C until DNA 131 132 extraction. In parallel, raw water samples (2 L for Chl-a content and 150 mL for nutrient analysis) were filtered in triplicate through a 0.7µm glass fiber filter (GFF - Whatman) pre-combusted at 133 450°C overnight. The filters and half of the eluates (collected in sterile polyethylene flasks) were 134 135 stored at -20°C. The remaining half of the eluates were preserved with 36 μ l 85% phosphoric acid (H_3PO_4) and stored at ambient temperature and in the dark, until physico-chemical measurements 136 137 were carried out.

138 <u>2.2. Chlorophyll-*a* and phytoplankton analyses</u>

Chlorophyll-a (Chl-*a*) content, which provides an estimation of the phytoplankton biomass, was extracted and measured, in triplicate, by spectrophotometry after cell lysis (Demay et al., 2019). Taxonomic identification (at the genus level) and total counts were performed on at least 400 phytoplankton units (cells, trichomes, and colonies), under a Nikon Eclipse TS-100 inverted microscope (400X) (Table S1). The phytoplankton were characterized (at the genus level, Table S2) in samples fixed in buffered formaldehyde (5% v/v), using taxonomic guides and keys based
on morphological characteristics, as described in Talling (1986) and Cronberg and Annadotter
(2006). The volume of each genus was either estimated using geometric shapes, as described by
Sun and Liu (2003), taken from the Ile de France phytoplankton check list (Escalas et al., 2019) or,
for rare genera, from the HELCOM phytoplankton check list (Olenina et al., 2006).

149 <u>2.3. Physico-chemical analysis</u>

Dissolved organic and inorganic N and P were determined in duplicate using an automated colorimetric procedure as described by Holmes et al. (1999), at the MIO-PACEM analytical platform (https://www.mio.osupytheas.fr/fr/plateformes-de-recherche/ptf-analytique-de-chimiedes-environnements-marins-pacem). Dissolved organic carbon (DOC) concentration was measured on a Shimadzu TOC VCSH analyzer, as in Rochelle et al. (2014). Meteorological data (temperature, rainfall and global radiation) were obtained from the Météo-France database (Meteo-France, Vincennes, France). All abiotic data are summarized in Table S3.

157 <u>2.4. DNA extraction</u>

DNA was extracted from a total of 84 filters (triplicate filters per date and per filter pore size, Table 158 S4) following Louati et al. (2015). Briefly, each filter was flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen, and then 159 transferred to Lysing Matrix E tubes (MP Biomedicals, Illkirch, France) with 1.1 mL of lysis buffer 160 (40mM EDTA, 50mM Tris-HCl, 0.75 M sucrose). Bead-beating was applied for 3x30 sec at a 161 speed of 6.5 m. s⁻¹ (FastPrep1-24, MP Biomedicals, France). Lysozyme (0.6 mg. mL⁻¹) was then 162 added to the filters and incubated at 37°C for 45 min with gentle stirring. Subsequently, sodium 163 164 dodecyl sulfate (1% final concentration) and proteinase K (Thermo Scientific, France) were added, 165 and incubated at 55°C for at least 90 min. Filter-debris were pelletized by centrifugation at 14 000 g for 5 min and supernatants were collected and purified twice with phenol-chloroform-isoamyl 166 167 alcohol. After precipitation with sodium acetate (0.1 vol) and cold isopropanol (0.6 vol), the nucleic acids were washed with 70% ethanol, and then re-suspended in 100 μ L milliQ water. The DNA was stored at -20°C until analysis.

170 <u>2.5. Quantification of total bacterial abundances</u>

Total bacterial abundances were quantified by qPCR using primers targeting the 16S rDNA, N₂-171 172 fixing bacteria with primers targeting *nif*H gene, and denitrifying bacteria with primers targeting 173 *nir*K and *nir*S genes, as described previously (Leloup et al., 2018). Reactions were carried out in a CFX96 Real Time PCR detection system (Bio-Rad, Marnes la Coquette, France) with a 20 µL 174 175 reaction volume containing SsoAdvanced[™] Universal SYBR® Green Supermix (Bio-Rad, Marne la Coquette, France), 1 mM of each primer, 2 µM bovine serum albumin and 0.4 ng and 4 ng of 176 DNA (in order to detect amplification inhibition). Two quantitative PCR assays were performed 177 and gene abundances were determined in duplicate. Standard curves were obtained using serial 178 dilutions of linearized plasmids containing the studied genes respectively amplified from 179 180 Pseudomonas fluorescens (16SrDNA sequences), Azotobacter vinelandii (nifH sequence), Sinorhizobium meliloti (nirK sequence), and Pseudomonas stutzeri (nirS sequence). 181

182 <u>2. 6. High-throughput sequencing</u>

In order to exclude chloroplast and cyanobacterial sequences of the 16S rRNA fragment, the primer 183 set 895F and 1492R, designed by Hodkinson and Lutzoni (2009), was used to amplify the V6-V8 184 region, as previously described in Louati et al. (2015). In silico analyses showed that most of 185 cyanobacterial 16S rDNA sequences were excluded when using these primers (Louati et al., 2015). 186 PCR amplification was performed in triplicate and pooled, as described in Louati et al. (2015). 187 188 Briefly, DNA was amplified using the Phire Hot Start II DNA Polymerase (ThermoScientific, France) with a touchdown round (without TAG): 98°C for 3 min; 24 cycles of 98°C for 30 s, 65 to 189 55°C for 30 s with -0.4°C/cycle, 72°C for 60 s; followed by 12 cycles at 55°C and a final extension 190 of 10 min at 72°C. A second PCR round was used to insert the TAG-primers within the sequences 191

at an annealing temperature of 55°C. The triplicate PCR products were pooled and purified using
MinElute Gel Extraction Kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA). Pyrosequencing, using a Roche 454 GS-FLX
system (Titanium Chemistry), was performed by Eurofins - GATC (Konstanz, Germany). A total
of 84 PCR samples (14 dates, 2 fractions and 3 replicates) were sequenced.

196 <u>2.7. Bioinformatic analysis</u>

Nine of the 84 samples (FL 2207R2, FL 0209R2, FL 1609R3, FL 2810R1, FL 0508R1, 197 PA 2406R1, PA CSM0807R1, PA CSM0508R1, PA CSM1208R1) were removed from the 198 199 dataset due to low (<1000) read content. Data were processed through the FROGS pipeline (Find Rapidly OTU with Galaxy Solution) implemented on a galaxy instance (2.3.0) 200 (https://galaxy.migale.inra.fr/) (Escudié et al., 2018). First, raw data were cleaned according to size 201 criteria (500 to 600 bp) and homopolymer detection: all sequences with at least one homopolymer 202 203 of more than seven nucleotides and with a distance of less than or equal to 10 nucleotides between 204 two poor quality positions, i.e. with a Phred quality score below 10 (here 454 data), were removed. After the prep-process, a total of 519 943 high quality reads were analyzed (Table S4). Reads were 205 clustered using the SWARM algorithm (2.1.5) that uses a local clustering threshold, by clustering 206 nearly identical amplicons iteratively with an aggregation distance of 1, as recently recommended 207 (Mahé et al., 2014). Within an OTU, the "consensus" sequence that will be used for assignment, is 208 the sequence that is the most abundant in the OTU (see Escudié et al., 2018). Chimera were then 209 removed using VSEARCH (Rognes et al., 2016). The low abundance OTUs (< 5 reads) were 210 removed from the dataset (Filtering step). At the sample level, datasets were rarefied to the lowest 211 212 number of reads. The taxonomic assignation of each cluster was carried out using the blast+ tool 213 (Camacho et al., 2009) against the SILVA 138-16S pintail 100 database (Pruesse et al., 2007), which finds an alignment between each OTU seed (the most abundant sequence within the OTU) 214 215 and the database. Only the best hits with the same score are reported, and if several blast results returned identical scores for an OTU, the taxonomy was determined for each hit at each taxonomic level. The blast scores (% identity, % coverage, length alignment, and e-value) for the first 100 OTUs in the dataset are provided in Table S5. For the rest of the OTUs (representing less than 0.01% of the abundance of the dataset), the weaker values detected were 78,837% of identity, 81,69% of query coverage and an e-value of 3.93.10⁻¹⁹. If these taxonomies differ across hits, the first level of conflict and all lower ones were set to 'Multi-affiliation'. After a multiple alignment using Mafft, a rooted phylogenetic tree was created with the FastTree and Phangorn R packages

223

2.8. Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using R (4.1.2, and 3.3.6) (R Development Core Team, 224 http://www.R-project.org), and are listed in the supplemental file 2. The Phyloseg (1.36.0, 225 226 McMurdie and Holmes, 2013) and Microbiome (1.14.0) packages were used to describe community composition and diversity. Cyanobacterial reads that remained in the dataset, were 227 228 removed using the phyloseq function 'subset taxa" (Table S1). Plots were drawn using the 229 packages ggplot2 (3.3.5, Wickham, 2016) and Phyloseq. In order to identify significant groupings (P-value of 0.05 and 1000 permutations) in both the phytoplanktonic and bacterioplanktonic 230 231 communities, SIMPROF analyses (similarity profiling with no *a priori*, Clustsig package 1.1, 232 Clarke et al., 2008) were performed, based on the Bray-Curtis distance matrix (after a square-root transformation for the phytoplankton data). Three temporal stages were thus detected for the 233 phytoplanktonic as well as for the bacterioplanktonic PA communities (see figure S1). 234

Richness (number of OTU), evenness (Pielou) and diversity (Simpson) indices were calculated. The relationships between these indices and environmental variables were identified using multivariate generalized additive models (GAM). Prior to model fitting, all candidate variables were tested for collinearity using Spearman's correlation analysis. Model were calculated using the gam() function of the mgcv package (Wood, 2011). Model selection was carried out using the "select = TRUE" argument in the gam() function. Non-normal variates were log-transformedprior to analysis in or order to avoid attributing excessive weight to outliers.

242 A metrical dimensional scaling (MDS), based on the Bray Curtis distance matrix, was used for the ordination of the bacterioplankton communities. Differences according to the temporal 243 244 stages (described above), as well as according to the fractions (PA and FL), were statistically tested using permutational PERMANOVA (9999 permutations), with ADONIS (vegan 2.6.2, Oksanen et 245 al., 2022). Relationships between bacterial community structure and environmental variables were 246 247 explored by a constrained correspondence analysis (yegan 2.6.2, Oksanen et al., 2022). Variance partitioning was measured based on the OTU table, a biotic table (Phytoplankton biomass and 248 composition, bacterial and functional abundances), and an abiotic table (see Tables S1 and S3), 249 using the varpart function (vegan 2.6.2, Oksanen et al., 2022). As the quantitative data have 250 251 different units, data were transformed prior to analysis.

We then sought to identify the OTUs that contributed the most to the dissimilarity among communities using the SIMPER function (vegan 2.6.2, Oksanen et al., 2022) with the criterion of up to 70% of the cumulative explained dissimilarity (with an adjusted p-value < 0.1).

255 Two separated analyses were performed and illustrated as heatmaps:

i) the OTUs responsible for the dissimilarities between PA and FL communities, whatever
the temporal stages, were identified. After a differential expression analysis (padj < 0.01, Table
S7), three expression patterns were detected: up in the PA fraction, up in the FL fraction, or equally
abundant in both (termed "cosmopolitan").

ii) the OTUs responsible for the dissimilarities between each three temporal stages, were
identified within: a) the PA fraction and b) the FL fraction. A differential expression analysis of
these OTUs was performed using DESeq2 (1.32.0, Love et al., 2014, padj < 0.01, Tables S8). Three
expression patterns were identified: up in the Stage I, up in the stage II and up in the stage III.

264 <u>2.9. Nucleotide read accession numbers</u>

The nucleotide reads determined in this study have been deposited to the SRA database under the

266 Project accession number: PRJNA579262 (<u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/</u>).

267

268 **3. Results**

Strong temporal variations were observed in the composition and biomass of the phytoplankton
community during the monitoring period (Figure 1). Based on a SIMPROF analysis, three temporal
stages were distinguished:

(i) Stage I (06/24 and 07/08 - Phyto_Cluster_1 - Figure S1) was characterized by low
biomass values and a large co-dominance of the phytoplankton community by Chlorophyta and
Diatomophyta (Tables S1 and S2).

(ii) **Stage II** (07/22 to 08/26 - Phyto_Cluster_2 - Figure S1) was characterized by an increase of the biomass (with a max of 115 µg Chl-*a*. L⁻¹ in mid-August) and by changes in the composition of the phytoplankton community, with a diversified mix of Dinophyta, Bacillariophyta, Euglenophyta, Chlorophyta, and Cyanobacteria (Tables S1 and S2) and a shift from a dominance by cyanobacteria (mainly belonging to *Dolichospermum* genus) at the beginning of this stage toward a dominance by Chlorophyta at the middle of the stage and finally a codominance by Chlorophyta and Dinophyta (mainly *Ceratium* genus) at the end of the stage II.

(iii) Stage III (09/02 to 10/28 - Phyto_Cluster_3a, b and c - Figure S1) was characterized
by higher biomasses (with a max of 332 Chl-*a*. L⁻¹ reached at beginning of September) and by a codominance of the phytoplankton community by *Ceratium* spp (Dinophyta) and Cyanobacteria until
middle September, followed by a dominance by two cyanobacterial genera, *Microcystis* and *Aphanizomenon* (Tables S1 and S2).

As for the phytoplankton communities, a clustering in three stages was detected for the 287 288 bacterial communities of the PA fraction (SIMPROF, p < 0.05, Figure S2). During the stage III, 289 the same clustering in three subgroups found for the phytoplanktonic communities (Figure S1) was 290 also observed for the PA-bacterial community (Figure S2). Interestingly, one discrepancy was 291 detected for the sampling date of 26/08 (transition between the phytoplanktonic stages II and III, Figure 1), the PA-bacterial communities was clustering with the ones of the stage III (Figure S2, 292 Bac Cluster 3d), while the phytoplanktonic community was clustering with the ones of the stage 293 294 II (Figure S1, Phyto Cluster 2). No clustering was found for the FL communities.

Both the phytoplankton biomass (estimated by Chl-a values) and the PA bacterial 295 296 abundances increased during the stages II and III with higher values during the bloom event (Figure 297 1 and S3). These increases were concomitant with a decrease in phosphate and dissolved organic P (DOP) and an increase of particulate organic P (POP) (Table S6). During the stage II, a peak of 298 299 the N₂-fixing abundances was detected in the PA fraction, in correlation with temperature and 300 nitrate (linear curve) and ammonium (exponential-shaped curve) (Table S3), followed by a peak of denitrifying bacteria at the beginning of the stage III in the PA and the FL fractions (Figure S3). 301 302 The bacterial community structure was explored through richness and diversity indexes (Figure 2). 303 In the PA fraction, all three indexes were lower during the stage III, while only a decrease of richness was observed in the FL fraction, during the stage II (Figure 2), and were correlated with 304 phosphate, DOP, POP and temperature (Table S6). In the FL fraction, Richness was positively 305 correlated to phosphate, and the Simpson and Evenness were both positively related to DOP and 306 POP (Table S6). 307

The relationship between bacterial community structure and the biotic and abiotic variables was further explored with a redundancy analysis (Figure 3). First, the bacterial communities were clustered according to their lifestyle (PA vs FL, axis 1 and 2; 20.50 and 8.15%, p-value <0.001). 311 Second, the temporal dynamic was clearly highlighted for the PA fraction with the three stages 312 being strongly separated (also detected in Figure S6). The PA-bacterial communities from the 313 transition date (between stage II and III, 26/08) were the exception as previously highlighted in the Figure S2. This differentiation between stages was mainly due to higher cyanobacterial abundance. 314 315 chl-a and DOC, DOP and POP concentrations during stage III, while the stage II was related to the presence of the Chlorophyta. In the FL fraction, the temporal dynamic was also detected but was 316 less marked, and driven mainly by the temperature, and the phosphate and ammonium 317 concentrations. A variance partitioning analysis showed that 16 to 18% of the total variance was 318 explained by the abiotic data, and 39 to 44% by the biotic data (Figures S4). 319

Gammaproteobacteria always dominated the PA communities (78 to 97%) while 320 Gammaproteobacteria and Actinobacteria were both dominant in the FL communities (from 20 to 321 80%, Figure S5A). We explored the dissimilarity between the PA and the FL communities with a 322 323 selected dataset of 14 OTUs (SIMPER analysis, Figure 4 and Table S7). These OTUs displayed clear statistically significant (p-value<0.01) between each fraction: a set of seven OTUs (upper 324 part) belonging to Micrococcales, Xanthomonadales and Burkholderiales, were higher in the FL 325 326 fraction, while a set of seven OTUs (below part), belonging to the Burkholderiales and Rhodobacterales, were higher in the PA fraction (Figure 4). Thus, the differences between the 327 communities within each fraction was mainly explained by a few OTUs that belonged to a few 328 329 specific taxonomic families.

Within each fraction, the relative abundances of bacterial families differed between phytoplankton bloom stages (Figure S5B). In the PA community, the Burkholderiaceae were abundant during stages I and II, and the Nitrosomonadaceae during the stage III (Gammaproteobacteria). In the FL fraction, the Burkholderiaceae and Methylophilaceae were the major families, and the Nitrosomonadaceae also appeared during the stage III (Figure S5B). In order to better understand the fine dynamics of these bacterial families, the trajectories of the OTUs
explaining most of the dissimilarity between the temporal stages, for each fraction separately, was
explored and presented in Figures 5.

Thirty-one and twenty-one OTUs (in the PA and FL fractions, respectively) displayed clear 338 339 statistically significant (P < 0.01) dynamics according to the three stages (Table S8). In the PA fraction, thirteen and twelve OTUs were respectively over-represented during stages I and II. These 340 341 OTUs were affiliated mostly to the Burkholderiales, followed by Aeromonadales, 342 Methylococcales, Enterobacterales, Rhodobacterales and Halothiobacillales. Only six OTUs belonging to Burkholderiales, principally Nitrosomanadaceae were over-represented during stage 343 III. It is worth noting that these six OTUs were already present and abundant at the transition date 344 (August 26, dashed square, Figure 5A) where the phytoplankton was co-dominated by *Ceratium* 345 346 spp and Chlorophyta.

In the FL fraction, the picture was different, a smaller number of OTUs (4 to 7) were overrepresented, but were assigned to a higher number of bacterial families and orders than the PA fraction (Table S8), also in the stage III (Figure 5B). Interestingly, some OTUs were both highlighted in the PA and FL fractions but not during the same stage. The OTU 1 was overrepresented in both PA and FL fractions during the stage III. The OTUs 6 and 9, were found to be cosmopolitan in the FL fraction, but over-represented in the PA fraction during the stage I and almost inexistent in the stage III.

354

355 4. Discussion

Although numerous studies of phytoplanktonic blooms have been carried out throughout the world, especially focused on cyanobacterial blooms, the interactions that underlie bloom dynamics (appearance, intensity and duration) remain poorly understood (e.g. Wilhelm et al.,

2020). In particular, it has been argued that a better description of the relationships between 359 360 phytoplankton and their associated bacteria within the phycosphere is necessary. Therefore, we carried out a weekly-monitoring of a small French shallow lake throughout a bloom season in order 361 to better understand the fine dynamics of phytoplankton and bacterioplankton communities. As 362 363 previously observed in this lake (Ledreux et al., 2010, Louati et al., 2015), the phytoplankton 364 biomass increased during the summer and was accompanied by a decrease in phytoplankton taxa richness during the cyanobacterial bloom. Concomitantly, a decrease of phosphate concentration 365 was observed, most likely related to the high cellular growth that is typical of bloom events and 366 the associated high P demand for ribosome and protein production (Elser et al, 2020, Pascault et 367 al., 2021). This could indicate a shift in the available P forms towards particulate organic P (Nalven 368 369 et al. 2020). The N concentrations remained high throughout the period of the survey. This can be explained by the presence of two N₂-fixing cyanobacterial genera, *Dolichospermum* associated with 370 Chlorophyta in July during the first peak of phytoplankton biomass (stage II, Chl-a level of 110 371 µg. L¹), and Aphanizomenon associated with Microcystis during the second intense bloom (Stage 372 III, Chl-a level up to 332 µg, L^{-1}). These dynamics, showing temporal succession of N₂-fixing and 373 374 non N_2 -fixing cyanobacteria as well as co-dominance, are frequently observed in eutrophic ecosystems during the summer period (Beversdorf et al., 2013; Louati et al., 2015). Within such 375 cyanobacterial co-dominance, the bacterial interactions promote nutrient exchanges and recycling 376 in order to face the high nutrient demand, as observed by Pascault et al. (2021), where mineral N 377 (newly fixed and/or allochthonous) was preferentially transformed into amino acids for the growth 378 of cyanobacteria and their associated microbiome. It thus suggests that the input of newly formed 379 380 N by the N_2 -fixing cyanobacteria promotes the growth and emergence of *Microcystis* cells by supplementing the N stock (Jackrel et al., 2021; Pascault et al., 2021). 381

All the changes in the phytoplankton community were accompanied by substantial changes 382 383 in the PA communities. In particular, the bacterial communities of the stage III were clearly 384 different from those of the stages I and II. These changes were underscored by an increase of the bacterial abundances as well as a strong decrease in the richness and diversity indexes during the 385 386 bloom event. Within the phycosphere, most of the interactions are believed to be driven by the recycling of dissolved organic matter (DOM), and can be modulated by DOM quantity and quality 387 (Amin et al., 2015 Zhang et al., 2019), by the composition of the daily extracellular phytoplankton 388 389 production (EPP, Landa et al., 2014, Park et al., 2022) and by microbial senescence/predation (Simek et al., 2008; Seymour et al., 2017). The strong increase in phytoplanktonic OM during the 390 bloom event, likely led to the reduction of the microbial diversity and changes in composition, with 391 392 species that are well adapted to the new nutritional niche coming to dominate and to a competitive exclusion of other species (Teeling et al., 2012, Luria et al., 2016; Nelson et al., 2021). In this 393 394 context, we observed the emergence of Nitrosomonadaceae and Comamonadaceae known to be 395 potential nitrifying and denitrifying microorganisms, during the bloom in the PA fraction. They have been previously detected in several cyanobacteria and dinoflagellates blooms (Louati et al., 396 397 2015; Nelson et al., 2021; Pascault et al., 2021, Fortin et al., 2022), and might ensure a tight recycling of N during bloom events, as they occur concomitantly with N₂-fixing cyanobacteria. 398 Nevertheless, their relative contribution to the N cycle has not yet been quantified (Kolmonen et 399 400 al., 2004).

Here, the weekly monitoring has also highlighted that the PA bacterial communities in the
stage III were very close to the communities observed at the transition date (stage II - August 26).
At this time there was an increase in the biomass of *Ceratium spp* in the phytoplankton community.
Moreover, the structure of PA communities was stable during all the stage III, even after the
replacement of *Ceratium* by the cyanobacteria. These data show that the bacterial communities

406 associated with *Ceratium* and the co-dominant cyanobacteria, *Microcystis* and *Aphanizomenon*, 407 had similar compositions. *Ceratium*, a mixotrophic dinoflagellate, is able to reach high biomasses in eutrophic ecosystems and has shown seasonal dynamics that are similar to those of cyanobacteria 408 in these ecosystems (Gligora *et al.*, 2003; Grigorszky et al., 2019). All these findings suggest that 409 410 environmental conditions leading to the genesis of a phytoplankton bloom during stage III have 411 resulted in the selection of a stable PA-bacterial community during all the bloom process (from its early development to its end), even if there were changes in the blooming species. These results 412 413 bring new insight into phytoplankton-bacteria interactions, with previous studies detecting specific bacterial consortium within monospecific phycosphere (Louati et al. 2015, Cook et al., 2020, 414 Gobler and Jankowiak, 2022). The couple formed by phytoplanktonic species and their associated 415 416 bacteria are often viewed as an interactome which is selected by the abiotic conditions. Here, the 417 weekly sampling during the summer phytoplankton succession has uncovered the possibility that 418 the association between cyanobacterial species and bacterial communities may not be as tight as observed for monospecific blooming communities, and that environmental conditions are likely to 419 play a very important role in the interactions between phytoplankton and bacteria. The bloom event 420 421 was constituted of several eukaryotic and bacterial photosynthetic species, most certainly leading 422 to a composite of extracellular phytoplanktonic OM resources, that might have selected and ensured that a more stable bacterial community, present for several weeks during the bloom event, 423 424 occurred. Finally, we can hypothesize that the bacterial signature in the PA may be indicative of an early bacterial community response to environmental changes, that are sensed later by the 425 phytoplanktonic species. Changes in the associated bacterial communities would thus be beneficial 426 427 for the development and the severity of the phytoplanktonic bloom. Within the phytobacterioplankton couple, the latter are often underestimated as well as their role in the emergence 428 of bloom. However, these theories need to be tested experimentally in the lab. 429

430 The highly dynamic changes in the phytoplanktonic community can be seen as short-term 431 pulses of disturbances (via the releases of specific DOM), provoking resilience phenomena (rapid 432 recovery) of the associated microbiomes (Baert et al., 2016, Gobler and Jankowiak, 2022). This is particularly true for the PA fraction where the bacteria are more tightly spatially related to the 433 nutrient and energy sources, as is found in the rhizosphere in soil (Seymour et al., 2017). The spatial 434 localization within these microenvironments in the water column may therefore be a relevant factor 435 in the structuring of the microbiomes. The bacteria in the FL fraction displayed different trends, 436 437 with a decrease of the richness and diversity during the stage II, suggesting that there were 438 differently influenced by the phytoplankton dynamics. Even though the differences between PA and FL communities are frequently reported (Liu et al. 2019; Parveen et al. 2013; Cai et al. 2014), 439 the underlying bacterial assembly mechanisms are not yet well known. They could be based both 440 on host selection and/or stochastic effects (Kimbrel et al. 2019, Zhou et al. 2019). Our data show 441 442 that a set of OTUs, that discriminate the temporal dynamic within the PA fraction, were also present 443 in the FL fraction throughout the monitoring period. These OTUs were positively or negatively associated with the phytoplankton dynamics. Thus, the FL communities could be viewed as a 444 reservoir for bacterial recruitment for the PA fraction evolving under phytoplankton stage, and 445 446 could act as a buffering compartment for the fluctuating phytoplanktonic dynamics.

To conclude, we detected that both the phyto- and bacterioplankton compositions changed concomitantly during the survey, suggesting that they could be viewed as a microbial couple interacting fluctuating together throughout the seasons. We also detected a modification of the PA bacterial community just before the emergence of the bloom. This signature may be indicative of an early bacterial community response to physico-chemical or biological, as yet unidentified, signals that were sensed later by the phytoplanktonic species, and should to be further explored.

As between-species interactions impact their ability to coexist, our findings show that bacterial 453 454 communities could have the potential to modulate phytoplanktonic species diversity and 455 community composition. Until now, only the fitness of photosynthetic microorganisms in the face of environmental changes has been considered (Pound et al., 2021). The data presented here 456 457 suggest that abiotic and biotic factors are acting on the concomitant selection of phyto- and bacterioplankton couples in interaction, also termed interactome, and known to provide functional 458 capacities for bloom sustainability (Cook et al., 2020; Wilhelm et al., 2020). Thus, studying the 459 impact of anthropogenic pressure on aquatic ecosystems should focus as much on the 460 phytoplankton perturbations as the bacterioplankton and their interactions within the phycosphere. 461

462

463 <u>Acknowledgements:</u>

464 This study was funded by the PHYCOCYANO project in the Jeunes Chercheurs-Jeunes 465 Chercheuses program of the French ANR (Agence Nationale de la Recherche; ANR-11-JSV7-014-466 01). L. Albaric and A. Roullot are thanked for access to the Champ-sur-Marne recreational area. 467 We are grateful to the INRA MIGALE bioinformatics facility (MIGALE, INRA, 2018. Migale 468 bioinformatics Facility, doi: 10.15454/1.5572390655343293E12) for providing help and support. 469 Chemical analyses were performed at the iEES-Paris analytical platform (Y. Marcangeli) and at 470 the MIO-PACEM analytical platform (P. Raimbault).

471

472 Data accessibility

473 Raw sequences were deposited to the SRA database and can be accessed under the Project
474 accession number PRJNA579262. Supplementary information accompanies the manuscript.

475

476 Author contributions

- 477 J.L. designed the study. J.L., I.L. and K.T. collected the data. J.L., N.N., J.F.H. and C.B. analyzed
- 478 the data. J.L., N.N., J.F.H. and C.B. wrote the manuscript.

479 **ORCID**

- 480 Julie Leloup: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2777-284X
- 481 Naoise Nunan: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3448-7171
- 482 Jean-François Humbert: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1519-5651
- 483 Cécile Bernard : https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7032-3989
- 484 **Conflict of interest**
- 485 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

486 **References**

- Amin, S.A., Hmelo, L.R., van Tol, H.M., Durham, B.P., Carlson, L.T., Heal, K.R., ... Armbrust,
- E.V., 2015. Interaction and signaling between a cosmopolitan phytoplankton and associated
 bacteria. Nature 522(7554), 98-101. doi: 10.1038/nature14488
- Baert, J.M., De Laender, F., Sabbe, K., Janssen, C.R., 2016. Biodiversity increases functional and compositional resistance, but decreases resilience in phytoplankton communities. Ecology 97(12), 3433-3440. doi: 10.1002/ecy.1601
- Berg, C., Dupont, C.L., Asplund-Samuelsson, J., Celepli, N.A., Eiler, A., Allen, A E., ...
 Ininbergs, K., 2018. Dissection of microbial community functions during a cyanobacterial
 bloom in the Baltic sea via metatranscriptomics. Front. Mar. Sci. 5, 55. doi:
 10.3389/fmars.2018.00055
- Beversdorf, L.J., Miller, T.R., McMahon, K.D., 2013. The role of nitrogen fixation in cyanobacterial bloom toxicity in a temperate, eutrophic lake. PLoS ONE 8(2), e56103. doi:
- 499 10.1371/journal.pone.0056103

500	•	Buchan, A., LeCleir, G.R., Gulvik, C.A., González, J.M., 2014. Master recyclers: features and
501		functions of bacteria associated with phytoplankton blooms. Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 12(10), 686-
502		698. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro3326

- Cai, H., Jiang, H., Krumholz, L.R., Yang, Z., 2014. Bacterial community composition of size fractioned aggregates within the phycosphere of cyanobacterial blooms in a eutrophic
 freshwater lake. PLoS ONE 9: e102879. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2019.02202
- Camacho, C., Coulouris, G., Avagyan, V., Ma, N., Papadopoulos, J., Bealer, K., Madden, T.L.,
 2009. BLAST+: architecture and applications. BMC Bioinformatics 10(1), 421. doi:
 10.1186/1471-2105-10-421
- Camarena-Gómez, M., Lipsewers, T., Piiparinen, J., Eronen-Rasimus, E., Perez-Quemaliños,
 D., Hoikkala, L., ... Spilling, K., 2018. Shifts in phytoplankton community structure modify
 bacterial production, abundance and community composition. Aquat Micro. Ecol. 81(2), 149170. doi: 10.3354/ame01868
- Chorus, I., Fastner, J., Welker, M., 2021. Cyanobacteria and cyanotoxins in a changing
 environment: concepts, controversies, challenges. Waters 13, 2463. doi:
 https://doi.org/10.3390/w13182463
- Clarke, K.R., Somerfield, P.J., Gorley R.N., 2008. Testing of null hypothesis in exploratory
 community analyses: similarity profiles and biota-environment linkage. J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.
 366, 56-69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2008.07.009
- Cole, J., Findlay, S., Pace, M., 1988. Bacterial production in fresh and saltwater ecosystems: a
 cross-system overview. Mar Ecol Progr Series 43, 1-10. doi: 10.3354/meps043001

- Conley, D.J., Paerl, H.W., Howarth, R.W., Boesch, D.F., Seitzinger, S.P., Havens, K.E., ...
 Likens, G. E., 2009. Controlling eutrophication : nitrogen and phosphorus. Science 320, 10141015. doi: 10.1126/science.1167755
- Cook, K.V., Li, C., Cai, H., Krumholz, L.R., Hambright, K.D., Paerl, H.W., ... Zhu, G., 2020.
- 525 The global *Microcystis* interactome. Limnol. Ocean. 65(S1). doi: 10.1002/lno.11361
- Cronberg, G., Annadotter, H., 2006. Manual on aquatic cyanobacteria: a photo guide and a
 synopsis of their toxicology. ISSHA Eds, ISBN: 9788799082704.
- Demay, J., Bernard, C., Reinhardt, A., Marie, B., 2019. Natural Products from Cyanobacteria:
 Focus on Beneficial Activities. Mar. Drugs 17(6), 320. doi: 10.3390/md17060320
- Dmitrieva, O. A., Semenova, A.S., 2011. Seasonal dynamics of phyto- and zooplankton and
 their interactions in the hypereutrophic reservoir. Inland Wat. Biol. 4, 308-315.
 https://doi.org/10.1134/S1995082911030059
- Elser, J.J., Sterner, R.W., Gorokhova, E., Fagan W.F., Markow, T.A, ...Weider, L.J., 2000.
 Biological stoichiometry from genes to ecosystems. Ecol. Lett. 3, 540-555.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2000.00185.x
- Escalas, A., Catherine, A., Maloufi, S., Cellamare, M., Hamlaoui, S., ... Bernard, C., 2019.
 Drivers and ecological consequences of dominance in periurban phytoplankton communities
 using networks approaches. Wat. Res. 163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2019.114893
- Escudié, F., Auer, L., Bernard, M., Mariadassou, M., Cauquil, L., Vidal, K., ... Pascal, G., 2018.
 FROGS: Find, Rapidly, OTUs with Galaxy Solution. Bioinformatics 34(8), 1287-1294. doi:
 10.1093/bioinformatics/btx791

Fortin, S.G., Song, B., Anderson, I.C., and Reece, K.S., 2022. Blooms of the harmful algae
 Margalefidinium polykrikoides and *Alexandrium monilatum* alter the York River Estuary
 microbiome. Harmful Algae 114, 102216. doi: 10.1016/j.hal.2022.102216

Ger, K.A., Urrutia-Cordero, P., Frost, P.C., Hansson, L.A., Sarnelle, O., ...Lürling, M., 2016.
The interaction between cyanobacteria and zooplankton in a more eutrophic world. Harmful
Algae 54, 128-144. doi: 10.1016/j.hal.2015.12.005

- Gligora, M., Plenković-Moraj, A., Ternjej, I., 2003. Seasonal distribution and morphological
 changes of *Ceratium hirundinella* in two mediterranean shallow lakes. Hydrobiol. 509, 213 220.
- Gobler, C. J., Jankowiak, J. G., 2022. Dynamic responses of endosymbiotic microbial
 communities within Microcystis colonies in north american lakes to altered nitrogen,
 phosphorus, and temperature levels. Front. Microbiol. 3890.
- Grigorszky, I., Gligora-Udovič, M., Gábor, B., 2019. Drivers of the *Ceratium hirundinella* and
 Microcystis aeruginosa coexistence in a drinking water reservoir. Limnetica 38, 41-53.
- Grossart, H.-P., Czub, G., Simon, M., 2006. Algae-bacteria interactions and their effects on aggregation and organic matter flux in the sea. Env. Microbiol. 8(6), 1074-1084. doi: 10.1111/j.1462-2920.2006.00999.x.
- Harke, M.J., Steffen, M.M., Gobler, C.J., Otten, T.G., Wilhelm, S.W., ... Paerl, H.W., 2016. A review of the global ecology, genomics, and biogeography of the toxic cyanobacterium, *Microcystis* spp. Harmful Algae 54, 4-20. doi: 10.1016/j.hal.2015.12.007.
- Heisler, J., Glibert, P.M., Brukholder, J.M., Anderson, D.M., Cochlan, W., Dennison, W.C., ...
- 563 Suddleson, M., 2008. Eutrophication and harmful algal blooms: a scientific consensus. Harmful
- Algae 8, 3-13. doi: 10.1016/j.hal.2008.08.006

565	•	Hodkinson, B.P., Lutzoni, F., 2010. A microbiotic survey of lichen-associated bacteria reveals
566		a new lineage from the Rhizobiales. Symbiosis 49, 163-180. doi: 10.1007/s13199-009-0049-3

- Holmes, R.M., Aminot, A., Kérouel, R., Hooker, B.A., Peterson, B.J., 1999. A simple and precise method for measuring ammonium in marine and freshwater ecosystems. Can. J. Fish.
 Aqua. Sci. 56, 8. doi:10.1139/f99-128.
- Hu, Y., Xie, G., Jiang, X., Shao, K., Tang, X., Gao, G., 2020. The relationships between the
 free-living and particle-attached bacterial communities in response to elevated eutrophication.
 Front. Microbiol. 11, 423. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2020.00423
- Huisman, J., Jonker, R.R., Zonneveld, C., Weissing, F.J., 1999. Competition for light between
 phytoplankton species: experimental tests of mechanistic theory. Ecology, 80, 211-222. doi:
 10.1038/s41579-018-0040-1
- Jackrel, S.L., Yang, J.W., Schmidt, K.C., Denef, V.J., 2021. Host specificity of microbiome assembly and its fitness effects in phytoplankton. ISME J. 15(3), 774-788. doi: 10.1038/s41396-020-00812-x
- Jankowiak, J.G., Gobler, C., 2020. The composition and function of microbiomes within
 Microcystis colonies are significantly different than native bacterial assemblages in two north
 american lakes. Front. Microbiol. 11, 1016. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2020.01016
- Ji, X., Verspagen, J.M.H., Stomp, M., Huisman, J., 2017. Competition between cyanobacteria
 and green algae at low versus elevated CO₂: who will win, and why? J. Exp. Bot. 68, 38153828. doi: 10.1093/jxb/erx226
- Ka, S., Mendoza-Vera, J.M., Bouvy, M., Champalbert, G., N'Gom-Ka, R., Pagano, M., 2012.
- 586 Can tropical freshwater zooplankton graze efficiently on cyanobacteria? Hydrobiol. 679, 119-
- 587 138. doi:10.1007/s10750-011-0860-8

- Kimbrel, J.A., Samo, T.J., Ward, C., Nilson, D., Thelen, M.P., Siccardi, A., ..., Mayali, X. 2019.
 Host selection and stochastic effects influence bacterial community assembly on the microalgal
 phycosphere. Algal Research 40, 101489.
- Klindworth, A., Mann, A.J., Huang, S., Wichels, A., Quast, C., Waldmann, J., ... Glöckner,
 F.O., 2014. Diversity and activity of marine bacterioplankton during a diatom bloom in the
 North Sea assessed by total RNA and pyrotag sequencing. Mar. Genomics 18, 185-192. doi:
 10.1016/j.margen.2014.08.007
- Kolmonen, E., Sivonen, K., Rapala, J., Haukka, K., 2004. Diversity of cyanobacteria and heterotrophic bacteria in cyanobacterial blooms in Lake Joutikas, Finland. Aqu. Microb. Ecol. 36, 201-211. doi: 10.3354/ame036201
- Landa, M., Cottrell, M.T., Kirchman, D.L., Kaiser, K., Medeiros, P.M., Tremblay, L., ...,
 Obernosterer, I., 2014. Phylogenetic and structural response of heterotrophic bacteria to
 dissolved organic matter of different chemical composition in a continuous culture study:
 bacterial diversity and dissolved organic matter. Environ. Microbiol. 16: 1668-1681.
 doi :10.1111/1462-2920.12242.
- Ledreux, A., Thomazeau, S., Catherine, A., Duval, C., Yéprémian, C., Marie, A., Bernard, C.,
 2010. Evidence for saxitoxins production by the cyanobacterium *Aphanizomenon gracile* in a
 french recreational water body. Harmful Algae 10(1), 88-97. doi: 10.1016/j.hal.2010.07.004
- Leloup, M., Nicolau, R., Pallier, V., Yéprémian, C., Feuillade-Cathalifaud, G., 2013. Organic
 matter produced by algae and cyanobacteria: quantitative and qualitative characterization. J.
- 608 Env. Sciences 25(6), 1089-1097. doi: 10.1016/S1001-0742(12)60208-3

609	• Leloup, J., Baude, M., Nunan, N., Mériguet, J., Dajoz, I., Le Roux, X., Raynaud, X., 2018.
610	Unravelling the effects of plant species diversity and aboveground litter input on soil bacterial
611	communities. Geoderma 317:1-7. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2017.12.018

- Lemoigne, D., Demay, J., Reinhardt, A., Bernard, C., Kim Tiam, S., Marie, B., 2021 Dynamics
 of the metabolome of *Aliinostoc* sp. PMC 882.14 in response to light and temperature variations.
 Metabolites 11(11), 745. doi: 10.3390/metabo11110745
- Lindh, M. V., Sjöstedt, J., Andersson, A. F., Baltar, F., Hugerth, L. W., Lundin, D., ... Pinhassi,
- 516 J., 2015. Disentangling seasonal bacterioplankton population dynamics by high-frequency
- 617 sampling: high-resolution temporal dynamics of marine bacteria. Env. Microbiol. 17(7), 2459-
- 618 2476. doi: 10.1111/1462-2920.12720
- Liu, M., Liu, L., Chen, H., Yu, Z., Yang, J.R., Xue, Y., ... Yang, J., 2019. Community dynamics
 of free-living and particle-attached bacteria following a reservoir *Microcystis* bloom. Science
 Total Environ. 660, 501-511.
- Louati, I., Pascault, N., Debroas, D., Bernard, C., Humbert, J.-F., Leloup, J. (2015). Structural diversity of bacterial communities associated with bloom-forming freshwater cyanobacteria differs according to the cyanobacterial genus. PLoS ONE 10(11), e0140614. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0140614
- Love, M.I., Huber, W., Anders, S., 2014. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion
 for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. Gen. Biol. 15(12): 550.
- Luria, C.M., Amaral-Zettler, L.A., Ducklow, H.W., Rich, J.J., 2016. Seasonal succession of
 free-living bacterial communities in coastal waters of the western Antarctic peninsula. Front.
- 630 Microbiol. 7. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2016.01731

631	٠	Mahé, F., Rognes, T., Quince, C., de Vargas, C., Dunthorn, M., 2014. Swarm: Robust and fast
632		clustering method for amplicon-based studies. PeerJ, 2, e593. doi: 10.7717/peerj.593

- McMurdie, P.J., Holmes, S., 2013. Phyloseg: an R package for reproducible interactive analysis 633 ٠ of microbiome 634 and graphics census data. PLoS ONE 8(4), e61217. doi: 635 10.1371/journal.pone.0061217
- Nalven, S.G., Ward, C.P., Payet, J.P., Cory, R.M., Kling, G.W., Sharpton, T.J., ..., Crump, B.C.,
 2020. Experimental metatranscriptomics reveals the costs and benefits of dissolved organic
 matter photo-alteration for freshwater microbes. Environ. Microbiol. 22, 3505-3521.
 doi:10.1111/1462-2920.15121
- Nelson, C., Giraldo-Silva, A., Garcia-Pichel, F., 2021. A symbiotic nutrient exchange within
 the cyanosphere microbiome of the biocrust cyanobacterium, *Microcoleus vaginatus*. ISME J.
 15(1), 282-292. doi: 10.1038/s41396-020-00781-1
- Oksanen, J., Simpson, G., Blanchet, F., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., Minchin, P., ... Weedon, J.,
 2022. Vegan: community ecology package. R package version 2.6-2, https://cran.rproject.org/web/packages/vegan/index.html.
- Olenina, I., Hajdu, S., Edler, L., Wasmund, N., Busch, S., Göbel, J., ... Niemkiewicz, E., 2006.
 Biovolumes and size-classes of phytoplankton in the Baltic Sea. Balt. Sea Environ. Proc. 106,
 144pp. https://doi.org/HELCOM
- Park, J., Kim, G., Kwon, H.K., Han, H., Park, T.G., Son, M., 2022. Origins and characteristics
 of dissolved organic matter fueling harmful dinoflagellate blooms revealed by δ13C and d/l Amino acid compositions. Sci Rep. 12, 15052.
- Parveen, B., Mary, I., Vellet, A., Ravet, V., Debroas, D., 2013. Temporal dynamics and
 phylogenetic diversity of free-living and particle-associated Verrucomicrobia communities in

- relation to environmental variables in a mesotrophic lake. FEMS Microbiol. Ecol. 83(1), 189201. doi: 10.1111/j.1574-6941.2012.01469.x
- Pascault, N., Rué, O., Loux, V., Pédron, J., Martin, V., Tambosco, J., ... Leloup, J., 2021.
 Insights into the cyanosphere: capturing the respective metabolisms of cyanobacteria and
 chemotrophic bacteria in natural conditions? Env. Microbiol. Rep 13(3), 364-374. doi:
 10.1111/1758-2229.12944
- Pinhassi, J., Sala, M.M., Havskum, H., Peters, F., Guadayol, Ò., Malits, A., Marrasé, C., 2004.
 Changes in bacterioplankton composition under different phytoplankton regimens. Appl. Env.
 Microbiol. 70(11), 6753-6766. doi: 10.1128/AEM.70.11.6753-6766.2004
- Pobel, D., Robin, J., Humbert, J.-F., 2011. Influence of sampling strategies on the monitoring
 of cyanobacteria in shallow lakes: lessons from a case study in France. Wat. Res. 45(3), 1005–
 1014. doi: 10.1016/j.watres.2010.10.011
- Pound, H.L., Martin, R.M., Sheik, C.S., Steffen, M.M., Newell, S.E., Dick, G.J., ... Wilhelm,
 S.W., 2021. Environmental studies of cyanobacterial harmful algal blooms should include
 interactions with the dynamic microbiome. Envi. Sci. Tech. acs.est.1c04207. doi:
 10.1021/acs.est.1c04207
- Pruesse, E., Quast, C., Knittel, K., Fuchs, B.M., Ludwig, W., Peplies, J., Glockner, F.O., 2007.
 SILVA: a comprehensive online resource for quality checked and aligned ribosomal RNA
 sequence data compatible with ARB. Nucl. Acids Res. 35(21), 7188-7196. doi:
 10.1093/nar/gkm864
- Rochelle-Newall, E., Hulot, F.D., Janeau, J.L., Merroune, A., 2014. CDOM fluorescence as a
 proxy of DOC concentration in natural waters: a comparison of four contrasting tropical
 systems. Environ Monit Assess 186, 589-596.

- Rognes, T., Flouri, T., Nichols, B., Quince, C., Mahé, F., 2016) VSEARCH: a versatile open
 source tool for metagenomics. PeerJ 4, e2584. doi: 10.7717/peerj.2584
- Seymour, J.R., Amin, S.A., Raina, J.-B., Stocker, R., 2017. Zooming in on the phycosphere:
 The ecological interface for phytoplankton-bacteria relationships. Nature Microbiol. 2(7),
 17065. doi: 10.1038/nmicrobiol.2017.65
- Simek, K., Hornák, K., Jezbera, J., Nedoma, J., Znachor, P., Hejzlar, J., Sed'a, J., 2008. Spatio temporal patterns of bacterioplankton production and community composition related to
 phytoplankton composition and protistan bacterivory in a dam reservoir. Aqu. Microb. Ecol. 51,
 249-262. doi: 10.3354/ame01193
- Smith, V. H., 2003. Eutrophication of freshwater and coastal marine ecosystems A global
 problem. Env. Sci. Poll. Res. 10, 126-139. https://doi.org/10.1065/espr2002.12.142
- Song, H., Xu, J., Lavoie, M., Fan, X., Liu, G., Sun, L., ... Qian, H., 2017. Biological and chemical factors driving the temporal distribution of cyanobacteria and heterotrophic bacteria in a eutrophic lake (West Lake, China). Appl. Microbiol. Biotech. 101(4), 1685-1696. doi: 10.1007/s00253-016-7968-8
- Sun, J., Liu, D., 2003. Geometric models for calculating cell biovolume and surface area for
 phytoplankton. J. Plankton Res. 25, 1331e1346. doi : 10.1093/plankt/fbg096.
- Talling, J., 1986. The seasonality of phytoplankton in african lakes. Hydrobiol. 138, 139-160.
 doi:10.1007/BF00027237.
- Teeling, H., Fuchs, B.M., Becher, D., Klockow, C., Gardebrecht, A., Bennke, C.M., ... Amann,
- 697 R., 2012. Substrate-controlled succession of marine bacterioplankton populations induced by a
- 698 phytoplankton bloom. Science 336(6081), 608-611. doi: 10.1126/science.1218344.

- Wang, L.C., Zi, J.M., Xu; R.B., Hilt, S., Hou, X.L., Chang, X.X., 2017. Allelopathic effects of *Microcystis aeruginosa* on green algae and a diatom: evidence from exudates addition and co-culturing. Harmful Algae 61, 56-62. doi: 10.1051/limn/2019006
- Wickham, H., 2016. ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis. Springer-Verlag New York.
 ISBN 978-3-319-24277-4.
- Wilhelm, S.W., Bullerjahn, G.S., McKay, R.M.L., 2020. The complicated and confusing
 ecology of *Microcystis* blooms. MBio 11(3). doi: 10.1128/mBio.00529-20.
- Wood, S.N., 2011. Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood estimation of semiparametric generalized linear models. J. Royal Stat. Soc. (B) 73(1), 3-36.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2010.00749.x
- Woodhouse, J.N., Ziegler, J., Grossart, H.-P., Neilan, B.A., 2018. Cyanobacterial community
 composition and bacteria–bacteria interactions promote the stable occurrence of particle associated bacteria. Front. Microbio. 9, 777. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2018.00777.
- Zhang, W., Zhou, Y., Jeppesen, E., Wang, L., Tan, H., Zhang, J., 2019. Linking heterotrophic
 bacterioplankton community composition to the optical dynamics of dissolved organic matter
 in a large eutrophic Chinese lake. Sci Total Environ 679, 136-147.
- Zhang, Z., Fan, X., Peijnenburg, W.J.G.M., Zhang, M., Sun, L., Zhai, Y., ... Qian, H., 2021.
 Alteration of dominant cyanobacteria in different bloom periods caused by abiotic factors and
 species interactions. J. Env. Sci. 99, 1-9. doi: 10.1016/j.jes.2020.06.001.
- Zhou, J., Chen, G.-F., Ying, K.-Z., Jin, H., Song, J.-T., Cai, Z.-H., 2019. Phycosphere microbial
- succession patterns and assembly mechanisms in a marine dinoflagellate bloom. Appl. Environ.
- 720 Microbiol. 85, e00349-19.

Zhu, L., Zancarini, A., Louati, I., De Cesare, S., Duval, C., Tambosco, K., ... Humbert, J.-F.,
 2016. Bacterial communities associated with four cyanobacterial genera display structural and
 functional differences: evidence from an experimental approach. Front. Microbiol. 7. doi:
 10.3389/fmicb.2016.01662

- 725
- 726 Legends

727 Figure 1:

Temporal dynamic of Chl-*a* concentration, as well as the composition of phytoplankton community
expressed as biovolume proportions (see Table S1 and S2 for more details). The three temporal
phytoplanktonic stages (defined by the SIMPROF analyis, see Figure S1) are highlighted by the
colored panels (stage I, green; stage II, red and stage III, blue).

Figures 2: Temporal dynamic of the microbial diversity indexes (boxplot representation of
Richness, Inverse Simpson and Evenness indices), according to the three stages identified in the
phytoplankton community (see Figures 1 and S1 for more details), within the Particle-associated
(A) and the Free-living (B) fractions.

Figure 3: Redundancy analysis of the bacterial communities, based on a Bray-Curtis distance matrix for the PA (triangle) and FL (circle) communities. Colors indicate the three stages identified in the phytoplankton community (see Fig. 1). The values in brackets correspond to the percentages of the total variance information represented by each axis.

Figure 4: Temporal dynamic of the discriminating OTUs, that contributed to up to 70% of the dissimilarity between PA and FL communities (p-value <0.01) and for which a differential abundance was observed (Table S7). The abundances are expressed as relative abundance of the total reads, and presented in a heatmap. An overview of the phytoplankton dynamic (Figure 1) with the defined three stages is placed above the graphs. 745 Figures 5: Temporal dynamic of the discriminating OTUs, that contributed to up to 70% of the dissimilarity within PA and FL communities separately (p-value <0.01) and for which a differential 746 abundance was observed among the 3 phytoplanktonic stages (Table S8). Three and four temporal 747 patterns were observed in the PA and FL fractions, respectively. The temporal patterns are 748 749 illustrated with the black frames. The abundances are expressed as relative abundance of the total reads, and presented in a heatmap for (A) the particle-associated fraction and (B) the Free-living 750 fraction. The OTUs that contributed the most to the dissimilarity are highlighted by * symbols 751 752 (Table S8). An overview of the phytoplankton dynamic (Figure 1) with the defined three stages is placed above the graphs. 753

754







Figures 5A and B

* Consummalaces • OTL 5 * Arramamalaces • OTL 5 * Consummalaces • OTL 5 * Moreobactisses • OTL 5 * M	А		I												-1
* Arronnandezes: 001.9: * Methylonessics: 001.9: * Methylonessics: 001.9: Yerkinkes: 001.9: Yerkinkes: 001.9: Yerkinkes: 001.9: Yerkinkes: 001.9: Methylonessics: 001.9: Commondates: 001.9: Commondates: 001.9: Commondates: 001.9: Commondates: 001.9: Commondates: 001.9: Commondates: 001.9: Methylonessics: 001.9: Commondates: 001.9: Methylonessics: 001.9: Commondates: 001.9: Methylonessics: 001.9: Commondates: 001.9: Methylonessics: 001.9: Commondates: 001.9: Commondates: 001.9: Methylonessics: 001.9: Commondates: 001.9: Commondates: 001.9: Methylonessics: 001.9: Methylonessi	 Comamonadaceae - OTU_6 Comamonadaceae - OTU_9 														
* Michylawandarca: 011.9. Michylawandarca: 011.9. Michylawandarca: 011.9. Michylawandarca: 011.9. Commondarca: 011.9. Nitrosomandarca: 011.9. <td>* Aeromonadaceae - OTU_13. Rhodobacteraceae - OTU_17.</td> <td></td>	* Aeromonadaceae - OTU_13. Rhodobacteraceae - OTU_17.														
Alteringmacker: 010,25 Alteringmacker: 010,25 Alteri	* Methylomonadaceae - OTU_18.														
$B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 &$	Alcaligenaceae - OTU_25 - Alteromonadaceae - OTU 37 -								_						
Michyloneddices - 010, 14 Chromosdarces - 010, 15 Madigaacse - 010, 15 Chammodarces - 010, 16 Chromosdarces - 010, 16	Yersiniaceae - OTU_92					_									
Klaidobacterace: 011.45 Acatagoace: 011.45 Commonadace: 011.45 Commonadace: 011.44 Riodobacterace: 011.44 Riodobacterace: 011.34 Riodobacterace: 011.34 Riodo	Methylomonadaceae - OTU_131 Chromobacteriaceae - OTU 136														
Arangenerge 001,94 Commonadace: 001,94 Commonadace: 001,94 Commonadace: 001,94 Commonadace: 001,24 * Commonadace: 001,24 * Rodobacterace: 001,25 * Rodo	Comamonadaceae - OTU_157														
B * Rodobacter corrus B * R	Alcaligenaceae - OTU_36 - Comamonadaceae - OTU_53 -														
Britholderizace: 01U_31- Britholderizace: 01U_32- Britholderizace: 01U_32- Britholderizace: 01U_32- Britholderizace: 01U_34- Comamonadace: 01U_34- Comamonadace: 01U_34- Romanomadace: 01U_34- Comamonadace: 01U_34- Romanomadace: 01U_34- Romanom	Oxalobacteraceae - OTU_10-														
Kendobactrazes: OTU_21: Rendobactrazes: OTU_23: Comamonadaces: OTU_33: Comamonadaces: OTU_34: Comamonadaces: OTU_34: Rendobactrazes: OTU_35: Habtibactilaces: OTU_35: Habtibactrazes: OTU_35: Habti	Burkholderiaceae - OTU_11-														
Commonadacea: OTU_3: Commonadacea: OTU_3: Commonadacea: OTU_3: Commonadacea: OTU_3: Commonadacea: OTU_3: Habithiobacillocea: OTU_3: Commonadacea: OTU_4: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_1: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_1: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_1: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_1: * Commonadacea: OTU_1: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_1: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_1: * Commonadacea: OTU_1: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_2: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_2: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_2: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_3: Microbacteriacea: OTU_3: * Acenumadacea: OTU_3: * Acenumadacea: OTU_3: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_3: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_3: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_3: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_3: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_3: * Acenumadacea: OTU_3: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_4: * Acenumadacea: OTU_3: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_4: * Acenumadacea: OTU_4: * Nitrosomnadacea: OTU_4: * Acenumadacea: OTU_4: * Nitrosomnadacea: O	Comamonadaceae - OTU_21 - Rhodobacteraceae - OTU_26 -														
* Comamonadaces - 011, 29. Comamonadaces - 011, 39. Comamonadaces - 011, 39. Comamonadaces - 011, 49. * Nitrosomandaces - 011, 1 - * * Comamonadaces - 011, 1 - * * Comamonadaces - 011, 1 - * * Comamonadaces - 011, 1 - * * Rodobacteraces - 011, 1 - * * Comamonadaces - 011, 1 - * * Rodobacteraces - 011, 2 - * Microbacteriaces - 011, 2 - * * Rodobacteraces - 011, 3 - * Rodobacteraces - 011, 3 - * Rodobacteraces - 011, 4 - * * Rodobacteraces - 011, 5 - * * Rodobacteraces - 011, 5 - * * Rodobacteraces - 011, 4 - * * Rodobacteraces - 011, 5	Comamonadaceae - OTU_28 -										_				
Burkholderiacea: OTU_33: Comamonadacea: OTU_41: * Nitrosomonadacea: OTU_42: Nitrosomonadacea: OTU_42: * Nitrosomonadacea: OTU_42: * Nitrosomonadacea: OTU_42: * Rholdebacteriacea: OTU_41: * Rholdebacteriacea: OTU_42: * Rholdebacteriacea: OTU_43: Comamonadacea: OTU_43: Comamonadacea: OTU_44: * Aremonadacea: OTU_44: * Microbacteriacea: OT	* Comamonadaceae - OTU_29 - Comamonadaceae - OTU 32 -														
Comamonadacese OTU_14 * Nitrosomonadacese OTU_14 * Nitrosomonadacese OTU_14 Nitrosomonadacese OTU_14 Nitrosomonadacese OTU_12 Nitrosomonadacese OTU_14 Nitrosomonadacese OTU_14 Nitrosomonadacese OTU_14 Nitrosomonadacese OTU_14 Nitrosomonadacese OTU_14 * Rhodobacteracese OTU_17 * Rhodobacteracese OTU_17 * Comamonadacese OTU_17 * Comamonadacese OTU_17 * Comamonadacese OTU_14 Microbacteriacese OTU_14 Omamonadacese OTU_14 * Aremonadacese OTU_14 * Aremonadacese OTU_14 * Aremonadacese OTU_14 * Microbacteriacese OTU_14 Comamonadacese OTU_14 * Aremonadacese OTU_14 * Microbacteriacese OTU_14 Comamonadacese OTU_14 * Microbacteriacese OTU_14 Comamonadacese OTU_14 * Microbacteriacese OTU_14 Comamonadacese OTU_15 * Microbacteriacese OTU_15 * Microbacteriacese OTU_16 * Microbacteriacese OTU_25 * Comamonadacese OTU_55 * Comamonadacese OTU_5	Burkholderiaceae - OTU_33 -														
Comamonadaceae 0 oTU _11 - * Nitrosomonadaceae 0 oTU _2 - Nitrosomonadaceae 0 oTU _2 - $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$	Comamonadaceae - OTU_35 - Halothiobacillaceae - OTU_38 -														
* Nitrosomonadacea: OTU_5: Methylophilacea: OTU_5: Methylophilacea: OTU_12: Nitrosomonadacea: OTU_14: Nitrosomonadacea: OTU_14: Nitrosomonadacea: OTU_14: Nitrosomonadacea: OTU_14: Microbactriacea: OTU_15: Methylophilacea: OTU_47: * Comamonadacea: OTU_56: Microbactriacea: OTU_56: Microbactriacea: OTU_56: Microbactriacea: OTU_56: Microbactriacea: OTU_14: Comamonadacea: OTU_14: Comamonadacea: OTU_14: Microbactriacea: OTU_14: Comamonadacea: OTU_14: Comamonadacea: OTU_14: Comamonadacea: OTU_24: Microbactriacea: OTU_25: * Microbactriacea: OTU_24: Comamonadacea: OTU_24: Comamonadacea: OTU_24: Comamonadacea: OTU_24: Comamonadacea: OTU_24: Comamonadacea: OTU_24: Comamonadacea: OTU_14: Comamonadacea: OTU_24: Microbactriacea: OTU_25: * Microbactriacea: OTU_25: * Microbactriacea: OTU_25: * Microbactriacea: OTU_25: * Microbactriacea: OTU_24: Microbactriacea: OTU_24: Microbactriacea: OTU_25: * Microbactriacea: OTU_25: * Comamonadacea: OTU_15: * Microbactriacea: OTU_25: * Comamonadacea: OTU_16: Microbactriacea: OTU_16: Microbactriacea: OTU_25: * Comamonadacea: OTU_25	Comamonadaceae - OTU_41 -						_		_						
Methylophilacea · OTU_12· Nitrosomonadacea · OTU_12· Nitrosomonadacea · OTU_12· 	 Nitrosomonadaceae - OTU_1 - Comamonadaceae - OTU_5 - 														
Nitrosomonadacea: 010_121- Nitrosomonadacea: 010_22-	Methylophilaceae - OTU_8 -														
Nitrosomonadaceae · OTU_22-	Nitrosomonadaceae - OTU_12 -								_						
B I I I Khodobacteriacea: OTU_17 Microbacteriacea: OTU_14 Comamonadacea: OTU_11 * Aceromonadacea: OTU_14 Comamonadacea: OTU_15 * Microbacteriacea: OTU_2- * Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_2- * Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_25 * Comamonadacea: OTU_26 * Microbacteriacea: OTU_26 Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_26 * Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_26 * Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbacteriacea: OTU_16 Microbact	introsomonadaceae - 010_14-														
B * Rhodobacteriaceae: OTU_17 * Comamonadaceae: OTU_47 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_11 * Acromonadaceae: OTU_14 Comamonadaceae: OTU_13 Comamonadaceae: OTU_14 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_21 * Microbacteriaceae: OTU_24 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_15 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_16 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_16 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_16 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_16 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_16 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_16 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_16 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_24 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_24 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_24 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_25 * Comamonadaceae: OTU_52 * Comamonadaceae: OTU_52	Nitrosomonadaceae - OTU_14-														
B I II II * Rhodobacteraceae OTU_17 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_47 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_47 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_11 - * Arenomonadaceae OTU_11 - * Microbacteriaceae OTU_21 - Comamonadaceae OTU_21 - Comamonadaceae OTU_21 - * Microbacteriaceae OTU_23 - * Microbacteriaceae OTU_24 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_25 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_55 - * Comam	Nitrosomonadaceae - OTU_14-	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19	- 08/26	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
* * * * * Rhodobacteraceae: OTU_17 * * Microbacteriacea: OTU_47 Microbacteriacea: OTU_77 Methylophilaceae: OTU_11 * Acromonadaceae: OTU_13 Comamonadaceae: OTU_13 Comamonadaceae: OTU_14 Comamonadaceae: OTU_13 Comamonadaceae: OTU_14 Comamonadaceae: OTU_15 Xanthomonadaceae: OTU_16 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_16 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_44 Comamonadaceae: OTU_25 * Acaigenaceae: OTU_26 * * Microbacteriaceae: OTU_26 * Microbacteriaceae: OTU_27 Microbacteriaceae: OTU_26 * Acaigenaceae: OTU_27 * Microbacteriaceae: OTU_26 * * Microbacteriaceae: OTU_26 * * Microbacteriaceae: OTU_27 * Microbacteriaceae: OTU_26 * * * Comamonadaceae: OTU_27 * Microbacteriaceae: OTU_56 * * * * * <th>Nitrosomonadaceae - OTU_14-</th> <th>- 06/24</th> <th>- 07/08</th> <th>- 07/22</th> <th>- 07/29</th> <th>- 08/05</th> <th>- 08/12</th> <th>- 08/19</th> <th>- 08/26 ate</th> <th>- 09/02</th> <th>- 09/09</th> <th>- 09/16</th> <th>- 09/30</th> <th>- 10/14</th> <th>- 10/28</th>	Nitrosomonadaceae - OTU_14-	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19	- 08/26 ate	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
 Comamonadaceae OTU_47 Microbacteriaceae OTU_56 Microbacteriaceae OTU_11 * Aeromonadaceae OTU_11 * Aeromonadaceae OTU_13 Comamonadaceae OTU_29 * Microbacteriaceae OTU_15 Xanthomonadaceae OTU_15 Xanthomonadaceae OTU_16 Microbacteriaceae OTU_46 Comamonadaceae OTU_52 * Alcaligenaceae OTU_52 * Comamonadaceae OTU_52 	Nitrosomonadaceae · OTU_14· Nitrosomonadaceae · OTU_22·	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19	- 08/26	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
Microbacteriaceae · OTU_56 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_77 · Methylophilaceae · OTU_14 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_11 · * Aeromanonadaceae · OTU_21 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_29 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_2 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_15 · Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_15 · Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_14 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_16 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_27 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_15 · Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_16 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_28 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_29 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_29 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_29 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_29 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_26 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_26 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_27 · * Alcaligenaceae · OTU_25 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_25 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_25 ·	Nitrosomonadaceae - OTU_14- Nitrosomonadaceae - OTU_22- B	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19 Di	- 08/26 ate	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
Microbacteriaceae OTU_14 Comamonadaceae OTU_11 * Acromonadaceae OTU_21 Comamonadaceae OTU_21 Comamonadaceae OTU_22 * Microbacteriaceae OTU_13 Microbacteriaceae OTU_10 Microbacteriaceae OTU_124 Microbacteriaceae OTU_31 Pseudomonadaceae OTU_25 * Comamonadaceae OTU_25 * Comamonadaceae OTU_25 * Comamonadaceae OTU_25 * Comamonadaceae OTU_25	Nitrosomonadaceae · OTU_14 · Nitrosomonadaceae · OTU_22 · B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_17 - * Comamonadaceae · OTU_47 -	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19 Di	- 08/26 ate	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
Comamonadaceae OTU_11 - * Aeromonadaceae OTU_13 - Comamonadaceae OTU_21 - Comamonadaceae OTU_29 - * Microbacteriaceae OTU_1 - Methylophilaceae OTU_16 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_24 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_24 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_24 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_6 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_6 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_9 - * Alcaligenaceae OTU_9 - * Alcaligenaceae OTU_9 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_9 - * Comamo	Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_17 - * Comamonadaceae · OTU_17 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_17 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_56 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_56 -	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19 Di	- 08/26 ate	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
* Aeromonadaceae OTU_13 - Comamonadaceae OTU_21 - Comamonadaceae OTU_22 - * Microbacteriaceae OTU_3 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_15 - Xanthomonadaceae OTU_16 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_16 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_44 - Comamonadaceae OTU_6 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_9 - * Alcaligenaceae OTU_9 - * Alcaligenaceae OTU_52 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_52 -	Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_17- * Comamonadaceae · OTU_17- * Comamonadaceae · OTU_17- Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47- Microbacteriaceae · OTU_56- Microbacteriaceae · OTU_77- Methylophilaceae · OTU - 0TU_71-	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19 Di	- 08/26 ate	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
Comamonadaceae OTU_29 * Microbacteriaceae OTU_2 * Nitrosomonadaceae OTU_1 Methylophilaceae OTU_15 Xanthomonadaceae OTU_16 Microbacteriaceae OTU_131 Pseudomonadaceae OTU_9 * Alcaligenaceae OTU_9 * Comamonadaceae OTU_9 * Comamonadaceae OTU_9 * Comamonadaceae OTU_9 * Comamonadaceae OTU_52	Altrosomonadaceae · OTU_14- Nitrosomonadaceae · OTU_22 · B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_17 - * Comamonadaceae · OTU_17 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 - OTU_4 - Comamonadaceae · OTU_41 - Comamonadaceae · OTU_11 -	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19	- 08/26 ate	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
* Microbacteriaceae · OTU_2 - * Nitrosomonadaceae · OTU_1 - Methylophilaceae · OTU_3 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_15 - Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_15 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_46 - Comamonadaceae · OTU_6 - * Comamonadaceae · OTU_9 - * Alcaligenaceae · OTU_25 - * Comamonadaceae · OTU_52 - * Comamonadaceae · OTU_52 -	B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_17 - * Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_17 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_56 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_17 - Methylophilaceae · OTU_11 - * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_11 - * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_13 - Comamonadaceae · OTU_13 - Comamonadaceae · OTU_13 -	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19 Di	- 08/26 ate	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
* Introductance of the first second s	B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_17 - * Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 - Methylophilaceae · OTU_47 - Comamonadaceae · OTU_11 - * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_11 - Comamonadaceae · OTU_12 - Comamonadaceae · OTU_24 - COTU_24 - COTU_24 - COTU_24 -	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19	- 08/26 ate	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
Microbacteriaceae OTU_15 - Xanthomonadaceae OTU_16 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_24 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_31 - Pseudomonadaceae OTU_66 - Comamonadaceae OTU_9 - * Alcaligenaceae OTU_9 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_52 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_5	B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_12 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_17 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_17 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_17 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_17 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_11 · * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_11 · * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_11 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_21 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_22 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_22 ·	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19 D	- 08/26 ate	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
Xanthomonadaceae OTU_16 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_24 - Microbacteriaceae OTU_46 - Comamonadaceae OTU_66 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_9 - * Alcaligenaceae OTU_52 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_52 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_52 -	B * Rhodobacteraceae - OTU_12- * Comamonadaceae - OTU_12- * Comamonadaceae - OTU_17- Microbacteriaceae - OTU_17- Microbacteriaceae - OTU_17- Methylophilaceae - OTU_4- Comamonadaceae - OTU_11- * Aeromonadaceae - OTU_11- * Aeromonadaceae - OTU_21- Comamonadaceae - OTU_21- Comamonadaceae - OTU_22- * Microbacteriaceae - OTU_22- * Microbacteriaceae - OTU_2- * Microbacteriaceae - OTU_2- * Microbacteriaceae - OTU_2- * Microbacteriaceae - OTU_2-	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	-08/12	- 08/19 Di	- 08/26 ate	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
Microbacteriaceae OTU_31 - Pseudomonadaceae OTU_46 - Comamonadaceae OTU_9 - * Alcaligenaceae OTU_52 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_52 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_52 - * Comamonadaceae OTU_52 -	B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_12 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_17 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_17 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 · Methylophilaceae · OTU_4 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_11 · * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_13 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_13 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_12 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_2 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_1 · Methylophilaceae · OTU_1 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_1 · Methylophilaceae · OTU_1 · Methylophilaceae · OTU_1 ·	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	-08/12	- 08/19 D	- 08/26	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
Pseudomonadaceae · OTU_46 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_6 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_9 · * Alcaligenaceae · OTU_25 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_52 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_52 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_52 · • OTU_52 ·	B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_12 · Mitrosomonadaceae · OTU_22 · B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_17 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_47 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_56 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_14 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_11 · * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_11 · * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_11 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_21 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_2 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_2 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_1 · Methylophilaceae · OTU_1 · Methylophilaceae · OTU_1 · Methylophilaceae · OTU_1 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_1 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_1 ·	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/79 D	- 08/26	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
Comamonadaceae OTU_0 * Comamonadaceae OTU_9 * Alcaligenaceae OTU_25 * Comamonadaceae OTU_52 * Comamonadaceae OTU_52 • OTU_52 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_17 * Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_17 * Comamonadaceae · OTU_47 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_14 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_11 * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_11 Comamonadaceae · OTU_11 Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_22 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_23 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_15 · Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_15 · Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_15 · Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_24 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 ·	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19 D:	- 08/26	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
* Alcaligenaceae · OTU_52 - - <td>B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_17 * Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 Comamonadaceae · OTU_17 * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_11 * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_11 Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_22 * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_23 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_15 Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_15 Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_15 Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_24 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_31 Pseudomonadaceae · OTU_16 Commonadaceae · OTU_31 Pseudomonadaceae · OTU_36 Commonadaceae · OTU_31 ·</td> <td>- 06/24</td> <td>- 07/08</td> <td>- 07/22</td> <td>- 07/29</td> <td>- 08/05</td> <td>- 08/12</td> <td>- 08/19 D:</td> <td>- 08/26</td> <td>- 09/02</td> <td>- 09/09</td> <td>- 09/16</td> <td>- 09/30</td> <td>- 10/14</td> <td>- 10/28</td>	B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_17 * Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 Comamonadaceae · OTU_17 * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_11 * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_11 Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_22 * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_23 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_15 Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_15 Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_15 Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_24 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 Microbacteriaceae · OTU_31 Pseudomonadaceae · OTU_16 Commonadaceae · OTU_31 Pseudomonadaceae · OTU_36 Commonadaceae · OTU_31 ·	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19 D:	- 08/26	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
* Comamonadaceae · OTU_52	B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_17- * Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47- Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47- Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47- Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47- Comamonadaceae · OTU_47- Comamonadaceae · OTU_47- Comamonadaceae · OTU_47- Comamonadaceae · OTU_4- Comamonadaceae · OTU_11- * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_22- * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_23- Microbacteriaceae · OTU_15- Microbacteriaceae · OTU_15- Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_16- Microbacteriaceae · OTU_46- Comamonadaceae · OTU_6- * Comamonadaceae · OTU_6- * Comamonadaceae · OTU_6-	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	- 08/12	- 08/19 D:	- 08/26	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
10/2 10/1 09/0 09/0 09/0 08/2 08/2 08/2 08/2 08/2 08/2 08/2 0 7/2 0 7/2 0 7/2 0 7/2 0 7/2	B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_17 - * Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_17 - * Comamonadaceae · OTU_17 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_17 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_17 - Methylophilaceae · OTU_14 - Comamonadaceae · OTU_11 - * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_11 - * Aeromonadaceae · OTU_12 - Comamonadaceae · OTU_21 - Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 - * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_2 - * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_15 - Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_15 - Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_15 - Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_16 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_21 - Seudomonadaceae · OTU_24 - Microbacteriaceae · OTU_25 - * Alcaligenaceae · OTU_9 - * Alcaligenaceae · OTU_25 -	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	-08/12	- 08/19 Da	- 08/26	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16	- 09/30	- 10/14	- 10/28
8 4 0 6 0 4 6 0 4 N Q 4 8 4	B * Rhodobacteraceae · OTU_12 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_17 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_17 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_47 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_14 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_14 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_11 · * Acromonadaceae · OTU_11 · * Acromonadaceae · OTU_12 · Comamonadaceae · OTU_22 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_2 · * Microbacteriaceae · OTU_12 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_15 · Xanthomonadaceae · OTU_16 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_16 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_16 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_24 · Microbacteriaceae · OTU_25 · * Comamonadaceae · OTU_52 ·	- 06/24	- 07/08	- 07/22	- 07/29	- 08/05	-08/12	- 08/19 Di	08/26	- 09/02	- 09/09	- 09/16		- 10/14	- 10/28

Supplementary file_1

Click here to access/download Supplementary Material R2_Leloup_Supplemental_Information_1.docx Supplementary file_2

Click here to access/download Supplementary Material R2_Leloup_Supplemental_Information_2.docx

HARMFUL ALGAE

AUTHOR DECLARATION

Submission of an article implies that the work described has not been published previously (except in the form of an abstract or as part of a published lecture or academic thesis), that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere, that its publication is approved by all authors and tacitly or explicitly by the responsible authorities where the work was carried out, and that, if accepted, it will not be published elsewhere in the same form, in English or in any other language, without the written consent of the copyright-holder.

By attaching this Declaration to the submission, the corresponding author certifies that:

- The manuscript represents original and valid work and that neither this manuscript nor one with substantially similar content under the same authorship has been published or is being considered for publication elsewhere.
- Every author has agreed to allow the corresponding author to serve as the primary correspondent with the editorial office, and to review the edited typescript and proof.
- Each author has given final approval of the submitted manuscript and order of authors. Any subsequent change to authorship will be approved by all authors.
- Each author has participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for all the content.

Declaration of interests

 \boxtimes The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

□The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests: