- 1 Life in suspension and its impact on phytoplankton morphology. An homage to Colin S. Reynolds
- 2

3 Luigi Naselli-Flores¹, Tamar Zohary² and Judit Padisák³

4

¹ University of Palermo, Department of Biological, Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences and
 Technologies (STEBICEF), Via Archirafi, 28, 90123 Palermo, Italy. E-mail: luigi.naselli@unipa.it

² Kinneret Limnological Laboratory, Israel Oceanographic and Limnological Research, Migdal,
 Israel. E-mail: tamarz@ocean.org.il

³ Department of Limnology, University of Pannonia, Egyetem u. 10, Veszprém 8200, Hungary. E mail: padisak@almos.uni-pannon.hu

11

12 Abstract

The amazing morphological diversity of phytoplankton has to be considered an evolutionarily-13 driven compendium of strategies to cope with the strong variability and unpredictability of the 14 15 pelagic environment. Phytoplankton collects unicellular and colonial photosynthetic organisms 16 adapted to live in apparent suspension in turbulent water masses. Turbulence represents a key 17 driver of phytoplankton dynamics in all aquatic ecosystems and phytoplankton morphological 18 variability is the evolutionary response of this group of photosynthetic organisms to the temporal 19 and spatial scales of variability of turbulence. This paper reviews the existing literature on the 20 effects exerted by turbulence on phytoplankton populations and is aimed at showing how deeply turbulence contributes to the shape and size structure of phytoplankton assemblages. Our aim is 21 22 to explore how turbulence governs phytoplankton access to resources and, at the same time, how 23 the shape and size structure of phytoplankton represents the evolutionary way in which this group 24 of organisms has optimized its survival in the highly dynamic aquatic environment. The paper is 25 intended to serve as an homage to the (phytoplankton) ecologist Colin S. Reynolds. His life-long 26 work highlighted how profoundly the ecology of phytoplankton depends on the physical 27 constraints governing the movements of the water masses in which phytoplankton evolved and 28 lives.

29 Keywords: planktic life, phenotypic plasticity, morphological variability, physical constraints, shape

- 30 structure, size, biotic interactions
- 31

32 Introduction

Contributing about half of the global primary production, phytoplankton represents the real 33 34 "green lung" of the Planet (e.g. Smayda, 1970; Falkowski 1994; Litchman et al., 2015) although its 35 standing stock accounts for only a negligible fraction (< 1%) of the global photosynthetic biomass 36 (Field et al., 1998; Sigman & Hain, 2012). To better understand the links existing between phytoplankton biomass and its productivity, a main focus of scientific papers over the last ~60 37 38 years has been the roles of resource availability (nutrients and light) and the effect of grazers on phytoplankton structure. If indeed nutrients, light and predators represent primary constraints to 39 40 phytoplankton growth in an isotropic environment, it would be legitimate to ask: why evolution/competition has not driven phytoplankton toward being composed by a few species all 41 42 showing similar sizes and shapes (possibly small and spherical)? As pointed out by Sommer et al. 43 (2017), it is too simplistic to equate small size with metabolic advantages.

44 The evidence that this ecological group of photosynthetic organisms often shows a high number of coexisting species, along with the high variability in their size and shape, led to the so 45 46 called "Paradox of the Plankton" (Hutchinson, 1961), which has been representing one of the 47 conceptual frameworks that moved ahead phytoplankton ecology (Dodds & Whiles, 2020). Among 48 the explanations proposed to solve the paradox, a large effort has been put in demonstrating that 49 the aquatic environment is far from being isotropic (Durham & Stocker, 2012). Anisotropy in aquatic environments determines a lack of equilibrium (Margalef, 1978), largely due to the 50 51 intrinsic turbulent motion of water masses that represent the selective environments for phytoplankton on Earth's surface. Phytoplankton evolution responds to instability by providing a 52 53 large array of adaptive strategies addressed at facing variable environmental conditions mainly 54 driven by water movements (Glibert, 2016). Planet rotation, the gravitational effect of the Moon, 55 the wind blowing on the water surface, the establishment of temperature gradients both among adjacent water layers and at a global scale (Hutter et al., 2011a), and convectional currents 56 57 generated by density differences (Lewis, 1973; Granin et al., 2000) all contribute to the motion of 58 water masses where phytoplankton is transported and has evolved (Finkel, 2007; Kozawa et al., 2019). 59

The way in which water masses move within inland lentic ecosystems strongly depends on their exposure to wind, on their morphology (e.g. shoreline development, bathymetry, surface area, volume, extension of the tributaries, etc.), on the effects of local climate as expressed by

63 their geographic location (Imberger, 1998) and land use (Katsiapi et al., 2012). In lotic ecosystems, 64 the velocity of the unidirectional flow can change at various points along the river course and it is generally related to a variety of meteorologically-driven and morphological factors such as water 65 66 discharge, the gradient of the slope that the river moves along, the width and depth of the 67 channel and the amount of friction caused by rough edges within the river bed (e.g. Julien, 2002; Bukaveckas, 2010). The complex physical processes governing water motion in an aquatic 68 69 ecosystem are therefore subjected to the intrinsic and local features of water bodies: these further contribute to increase the variability of the physical scenario (e.g. Elliott et al., 2001; 70 71 Padisák et al., 2010b). Phytoplankton is evolutionarily equipped to cope with this variability and much of the features it developed is expressed in the extent of morphological plasticity within 72 populations, formed by highly-variable, unicellular organisms eventually grouped in aggregates 73 74 with various number of cells.

75 To explain vertical and horizontal patchiness of phytoplankton in the oceans (i.e. its 76 accumulation, blooming mechanisms, susceptibility to grazing, and geographic distribution), 77 several papers analysed the spatial distribution of phytoplankton in relation to the complex 78 patterns of vertical and lateral mixing at different space and time scales (e.g. Martin, 2003 and 79 literature therein; Behrenfeld & Boss, 2014 and literature therein; Mahadevan, 2016; Taylor, 2016; Brereton et al., 2018; Spatharis et al., 2019). Moreover, the main evolutionary feature of 80 81 phytoplankton, i.e. being adapted to live in a three-dimensional moving fluid, has a central role in 82 giving phytoplankton access to the resources it needs for growth while moving (and being 83 transported) in the highly dynamic aquatic ecosystems (e.g. Reynolds, 1973; Reynolds, 1976a, 84 1976b; MacIntyre, 1998; Rodrigo et al., 1998; Naselli-Flores & Barone, 2000; Huisman et al., 2004; 85 Winder et al., 2009). However, today we are still far from a complete understanding of the processes that govern planktic life in turbulent motion, even though our knowledge on the 86 87 evolutive role exerted by environmental variability on phytoplankton morphological traits has increased in the last years (e.g. Reynolds et al., 2002; Kruk et al., 2010). According to Reynolds 88 89 (1998): "among phytoplankton ecologists, the concern focussed upon the importance of water 90 chemistry and upon the competition for nutrients has often outweighed the attention afforded to 91 the physical quality of the environment".

Colin S. Reynolds (London, 1942 – Kendal, 2018) dedicated a substantial part of his
 professional career to investigate the adaptations of phytoplankton species and assemblages with
 regard to the acquisition of resources while suspended in water and subjected to its motions. He

95 showed that much of the ecological success of phytoplankton depended on their morphology, 96 evolutionarily forged to optimize their access to resources in a turbulent world (Reynolds, 1984a; 1997; 2006). The spectrum of shapes and sizes of phytoplankton is therefore the result of adaptive 97 98 selection addressed at maximising the chances to survive under variable environmental conditions 99 (Naselli-Flores & Barone, 2011 and literature therein). These morphological features determine the degree of entrainment of phytoplankton organisms in the water motion. Furthermore, these 100 101 features impact their ability to exploit resources, constitute an efficient shield against grazing, and ultimately drive their ecology by allowing populations to grow (Reynolds, 1984b). 102

103 The scientific contributions of Colin S. Reynolds have influenced profoundly not only modern phytoplankton ecology but also ecosystem theory. As an homage to CS Reynolds, this paper 104 105 attempts to review the literature on the role of phytoplankton morphological variability and its 106 adaptive value addressed to i) fit the spectrum of turbulent conditions generated by water 107 motions, ii) maximise resource exploitation while being entrained and transported in a moving 108 fluid, iii) reduce the impact exerted by herbivores. Papers dealing with both marine and 109 freshwater phytoplankton were considered since, as stated by Reynolds (2012a) "there is little physical difference between seawater and fresh water, certainly not in the motions to which 110 111 either is subjected, nor, the clear taxonomic distinctions apart, in the evident adaptations of species to exploit them". 112

Here we will try to clarify how water motions modulate the ecology of phytoplankton and how much its morphological variability is the result of adaptations evolutionarily addressed at maximizing the chances to survive in a highly variable environment. An exhaustive treatment of the physical laws governing water motions is beyond the scope of this paper.

117

118 Why are there so many different phytoplankton morphologies?

Phytoplankton, according to a widely accepted definition, is an ecological group of unicellular and
colonial photosynthetic microorganisms (not a taxonomic group, due to the distant phylogenetic
origins of its members) adapted to live in apparent suspension in turbulent water masses
(Reynolds, 2006). This definition implies that through trying to exert a control on their position and
rate of movement in the water column (i.e. its entrainment in the turbulent motion),
phytoplanktic populations are able to acquire the resources they need to persist in a turbulent
environment. Since water on Earth is in continuous motion, and the extent of this motion is

variable, phytoplankton has to be evolutionarily adapted to life in a wide range of hydrodynamic
 conditions. Moreover, the polyphyletic origin of phytoplankton may reflect the existence of
 convergent forces in evolution that moulded these organisms into planktic existence (Reynolds,
 2006).

130 The word "suspension" in the definition of phytoplankton echoes some rigorously defined physical properties of water masses such as density, viscosity and flow. Moreover, since 131 132 phytoplankton rarely has exactly the same density as that of the medium in which it lives (isopicnyc), it will tend to sink or to float. The rate of these vertical movements depends also on 133 the size of the organisms and the "apparent suspension" (i.e. the state of being neutrally buoyant, 134 neither sinking nor floating) is therefore consistently achieved by "microscopic" organisms. To find 135 136 a shared consensus on what can be defined as being "truly microscopic" is therefore not trivial: 137 only those organisms which are small enough to be negligibly subjected to inertial forces (i.e. to the gravity) should be considered microscopic. However, even among "microscopic" organisms a 138 wide dimensional spectrum exists, spanning over 4 orders of magnitude in maximum linear 139 140 dimension (from sub-microns to millimetres) and 7 orders of magnitude in volume (from about 10⁻ ¹ to 10⁶ µm³). These differences in dimensions necessarily have an influence on the ecology of 141 142 these organisms.

143 A first attempt to define a boundary between "small" and "big" organisms was made, about a century ago, by Thompson (1917). Trying to explain how physical forces govern the 144 145 growth and shape of organisms, he separated organisms into two types: "small" organisms in which physical forces acted mainly on their surface, and "big" organisms in which the forces acted 146 147 proportionally on their body mass. Since all the living organisms move in a fluid (air or water), the 148 boundary between these two groups of organisms can be assessed by computing their Reynolds 149 Number (*Re*), i.e. the ratio between the inertial (gravity) and the viscous (drag or fluid resistance) forces that act on a body moving in a fluid, a unitless number (for more details see Naselli-Flores & 150 151 Barone, 2011). In particular:

$$Re = (\rho u l) \eta^{-1} = (u l) v^{-1}$$

where *u* is velocity of the fluid [m s⁻¹], *l* [m] is the length dimension available for the dissipation of energy (usually the depth of the flow or the linear dimension of an object), and *v* [m² s⁻¹] is the kinematic viscosity of the fluid, i.e. the absolute viscosity of the fluid (η) [kg m⁻¹s⁻¹] with its density (ρ) [kg m⁻³] divided out. Any combination of velocity, viscosity and length scale that results in the same *Re* will result in a geometrically similar flow regime, as characterized by the ratio of inertial
to viscous forces. Thus, doubling the length scale will result in a flow regime that can also be
realized by doubling velocity or by halving kinematic viscosity (Humphries, 2007).

160 A relatively higher importance of viscous forces is typically recorded in those organisms 161 with a very small mass (i.e. inertial forces are negligible compared to viscous forces) and $Re \ll 1$, 162 as commonly showed by unicellular and colonial phytoplankters ($10^{-6} < Re < 10^{-2}$). These organisms 163 are all subjected to Stokesian dynamics, i.e. their sinking velocity, as early recognized by McNown 164 & Malaika (1950), can be computed using the Stokes' equation:

 $w_s = 2/9gr^2(\rho' - \rho) \eta^{-1}$ [ms⁻¹]

166 where $w_s \text{ [ms}^{-1]}$ is the sedimentation velocity of the sphere, g [ms⁻²] is the acceleration of gravity, 167 r [m] is the radius of the sphere, ρ' [kgm⁻³] is the density of the sinking sphere, ρ [kgm⁻³] is the 168 density of the fluid where sinking occurs, and [kgm⁻¹s⁻¹] is the viscosity of the fluid. The difference 169 $(\rho'-\rho)$ is also defined as "excess of density".

170 The reliability of velocity estimated with the Stokes' equation is high, even for actively swimming dinoflagellates (Sommer, 1988; Kamykowski et al., 1992), as confirmed by sophisticated 171 measurements performed by Walsby & Holland (2006). However, early observations exist 172 173 highlighting that phytoplankton settling rates often diverge from what is predicted by the Stokes' 174 equation, which was established to calculate sinking velocity of spherical particles (e.g. Smayda & Boleyn, 1965; Eppley et al, 1967). The deviation from predictions, since long ago (Ostwald, 1902 in 175 Margalef, 1958), has been attributed to the "bizarre" morphologies often shown by different 176 phytoplankton species, characterised by expansions and protuberances, and to their effectiveness 177 178 in increasing the role of viscous forces on cell surface and ultimately in modulating the sinking 179 velocity of phytoplankton (e.g. Padisák et al., 2003; Chindia & Figueredo, 2018). This deviation can be computed by including in the Stokes' equation a dimensionless species-specific variable called 180 181 coefficient of form resistance (Φ_r). Φ_r represents the factor by which the directly measured sinking velocity of the particle (w_s measured) differs from that of a sphere (w_s sphere) of equivalent 182 183 volume and density, in the same fluid:

184

 $\Phi_r = w_s$ measured/ w_s sphere

185

186 Therefore, the relationship governing sinking velocity of phytoplankters will be:

 $w_s = 2/9gr^2(\rho' - \rho) \Phi_r^{-1}\eta^{-1}$ [ms⁻¹]

187

Padisák et al. (2003), studied the systematic variability of the coefficient of form resistance 188 189 in selected phytoplankters and contributed to better understanding the effects of phytoplankton 190 morphology on sinking. These authors showed that for the majority of phytoplankters (both 191 unicellular and colonial), the value of Φ_r is > 1, and the associated shape will tend to sink more slowly than the equivalent sphere (e.g. a spherical particle of identical volume and density). 192 193 Moreover, colony formation and its morphology, although increasing the size of the phytoplankton unit, can effectively contribute to increase the form resistance (see also Bienfang, 194 195 1982; Jaworski et al., 1988). Conversely, tear-drop shapes, often associated with small 196 phytoflagellates, were shown to have $\phi_r < 1$, thus sinking faster than the equivalent sphere.

Of the six variables appearing in the Stokes' equation, one (g) can be considered a 197 198 constant; two (ρ and η) depend on water temperature and salinity, and the other three (cell or 199 colony size, cell density and coefficient of form resistance) are species-specific biological 200 characteristics and thus subjected to adaptation and to evolutionary modification through natural 201 selection. In particular, the fact that some organisms may sink faster than the equivalent sphere 202 allow to think that they are adapted to exploiting resources under turbulent conditions quite 203 differently from those organisms sinking more slowly than the equivalent sphere, which have 204 therefore to be able to show different adaptive strategies. Therefore, minimizing sinking velocity is 205 actually not the main goal of phytoplankton. Instead, maximising the opportunities for suspension 206 under variable turbulent conditions should be considered the primary evolutionary target of this group of organisms. 207

208 In summary, the adaptations required to decrease sinking velocity include small size, 209 and/or excess of density close to that of water $[(\rho' - \rho) = 0$ or slightly positive], and/or mechanisms for increasing frictional resistance with the water (i.e. expansions and protuberances), 210 independently from size and density. All these features are addressed at enhancing the 211 212 entrainability of phytoplankton by turbulent eddies. Conversely, other phytoplankters invested in enhancing their ability to escape entrainment by turbulent eddies. This goal is achieved through a 213 214 negative excess of density $[(\rho' - \rho) < 0]$, and/or relatively larger size (including formation of colonies), and/or streamlining (i.e. tear-drop shapes), and/or bearing "propellers" (i.e. flagella) to 215 216 move rapidly through water.

However, it has been observed that healthy and physiologically active phytoplankton
organisms sink much slower than dead or moribund ones, without perceivable alteration in their
size and morphology (for more details see Naselli-Flores & Barone, 2011 and literature therein).
These differences have been related to the breakdown of active physiological mechanisms (vital
factor) yet unidentified but likely due to a rapid change in density that accompany physiological
death (Wiseman & Reynolds, 1981).

The evidence that phytoplankton species show different physiological characteristics *per se* does not answer the question "why are there so many different morphologies in phytoplankton?". It is therefore important to point out that several trade-offs exist between morphological (i.e. size and shape of single cells and colonies) and physiological traits of phytoplankton, and that morphology, through modulating the physiological pathways of protein synthesis, photosynthesis and nutrient uptake, deeply impact growth and metabolism of the different phytoplankton populations (Litchman & Klausmeier, 2008 and literature therein).

230 The striking morphological variability, both intra- and interspecific, of unicellular and 231 colonial phytoplankton (see Naselli-Flores et al., 2007 and literature therein), has been early 232 recognised as a specific evolutionary feature allowing its living in apparent suspension in a variety 233 of hydrodynamic conditions (Hensen, 1887 in Smayda, 1970). The deep ecological implications of 234 phytoplankton morphological features in determining their competitive success led Lund (1959) to state "It would therefore be useful if one could study their rate of sinking before embarking on 235 biochemistry" when talking about the role of buoyancy in the ecology of freshwater 236 phytoplankton. 237

238

239 Is there an upper constraint to the maximum size of planktic algae?

The microscopic dimensions of phytoplankton have been often explained by the need to uptake nutrients from the surrounding medium over the cell surface. Furthermore, once inside the organisms, nutrients have to be translocated to the site of use. These two constraints have a role in determining the small size of cells and in pushing toward a relatively high surface-to-volume ratio (Reynolds, 1984). However, this reason alone does not fully consider the wide range of variability of phytoplankton size and shape, and the relatively low surface-to volume ratio, which characterises the largest and spherical phytoplanktic organisms.

An additional explanation lies in the way in which water masses move. When a fluid is 247 248 moved by a force acting on it, small portions of that fluid will tend to stick to themselves and to the particles eventually suspended in that fluid. Viscosity represents the magnitude of this 249 tendency and will depend on the physicochemical nature of the fluid itself (Vogel, 1994). Following 250 251 Reynolds (2006), if a mild force (τ) is applied to the surface of a fluid (e.g. wind blowing on the surface of a water body), the interaction between these two fluids (air and water) will result in the 252 linear dragging of the water molecules at the air-water interface in the same direction of the wind. 253 The movement will be progressively transmitted to the layer below and propagated downward, 254 255 albeit at a lower velocity because part of the energy will be dissipated by the shear stress (due to viscosity) generated between these layers. The smooth sliding of each layer of water molecules 256 over the one below is known as laminar flow. In this case the mechanical energy introduced in the 257 258 fluid is accommodated in an ordered structure of parallel layers moving in the same direction and showing a vertical gradient of horizontal velocities (u) [ms⁻¹]whose steepness is defined by the 259 differential notation du/dz (i.e. the decrement of horizontal velocity for a small increment in the 260 vertical direction z [m]). Persisting the condition of laminar flow, the ratio between the applied 261 262 force τ [kgms⁻²] per unit area and the velocity gradient corresponds to the absolute viscosity of the 263 water, η . That is,

264

$$\eta = \tau (du/dz)^{-1}$$
 [kgm⁻¹s⁻¹]

Absolute viscosity of water inversely varies with temperature and directly with salinity.

266 Biological factors, as the secretion of exopolymers from both phytoplankton and bacteria 267 can contribute to increase viscosity on a small scale (Decho, 1990; Jenkinson & Sun, 2010), 268 whereas morphological features of phytoplankton such ornamentations of the cell wall (e.g. papillate surface), spines, bristles and protuberances (and their distribution on the surface of cells 269 270 and colonies) may contribute to increase the effects of viscosity at an individual scale (Padisák et 271 al., 2003). Moreover, temperature-dependent variations in density and viscosity of water are 272 known to control ciliary activity and swimming behaviour in several zooplankton species (e.g. Larsen et al., 2008; Larsen & Riisgård, 2009; Moison et al., 2012; Simoncelli et al., 2019). 273

Viscosity is therefore a measure of the resistance offered by the water to the motion
induced, at different spatial scales, by buoyancy, swimming, tide, wind or Coriolis effects. If
mechanical energy introduced in the aquatic system is higher than that the molecular structure of
the fluid is able to accommodate in a laminar flow, turbulence will develop.

278 Turbulence is a quite complex subject of Hydrodynamics (whose treating goes beyond the 279 scope of this review) and its impact on the behaviour of planktic algae has remained obscure for a long time. The development of instrumentation and direct sensing of turbulence began only in the 280 second half of the last century (see Imberger, 1998). The results collected by this new generation 281 282 of instruments were rapidly incorporated in physical limnology and oceanography (e.g. Imberger & Spiegel, 1987; Imboden & Wüest, 1995; Wüest & Lorke, 2003; Hutter et al., 2011a; 2011b; 2014; 283 284 Baudena et al., 2019) and strongly contributed to a better characterisation of the phytoplankton environment and of the complex physical relationships between the movement of phytoplankton 285 286 and that of the fluid in which it is contained (e.g. Guasto et al., 2012; Croze et al., 2013 and literature therein). 287

288 When turbulence develops, the energy is not dissipated through an ordered system of 289 parallel layers of water sliding one on each other but through cascades of gyratory structures, 290 called eddies, that have smaller and smaller dimensions as they proceed downward (or upward – the motion is not necessarily unidirectional) the vertical direction. The progressively smaller 291 292 dimensions of the eddies are due to the dissipation of energy as heat. Of course, viscosity is still 293 effective among the small portions of the fluid but the intensity of the energy imparted to the fluid 294 overwhelms viscosity effects and the motion of the fluid will assume complex and quite chaotic patterns; there is however an end point of the eddy spectrum where energy is dissipated enough 295 296 to allow viscous forces to overwhelm inertia. Reynolds (1998) calculated that even in the most 297 dissipative conditions the smallest eddy has a diameter of about 0.2-0.4 mm. To avoid mechanical damages caused by turbulence and to take advantage of the viscosity of mobile water masses (e.g. 298 to be constantly embedded in a laminar flow), planktic algae must be smaller than the smallest 299 300 eddy. In fact, unicellular organisms rarely exceed 200 μm, larger colonies generally growing in only very calm or stratified water layers. The smallest eddy size therefore places a physical constraint 301 302 to the upper limit of size that planktic algae may attain.

303

304 Moving in a constantly mixed environment

The word "plankton", coined in 1887 by the German physiologist Viktor Hensen from Greek $\pi\lambda\alpha\gamma\kappa\tau\delta\nu$, means "wanderer" and reflects the basic characteristic of these organisms that "go with the flow", where the water movements (i.e. the turbulent motion) drift them. However, it tells us little about the trajectories followed by individual phytoplankters when they are embedded and

309 transported in water motion. Furthermore, it does not contribute to understanding the conditions of life at the spatial scales appropriate to the different species. Actually, the time scale of 310 phytoplankton growth falls between $10^5 - 10^6$ s (Reynolds, 1990), which corresponds to the time 311 scale of sub-mesoscale turbulent processes (Mahadevan, 2016). In particular, as shown by 312 Reynolds (1994), a wind velocity of 8 m s⁻¹ on the water surface creates a turbulence that imparts 313 a speed to fully entrained phytoplankton which allows the cell to travel a 5 m deep mixed layer 314 and to regain its initial position in about 10 minutes. This time (~10² s) is three-four orders of 315 magnitude lower than the time required by phytoplankton cells to replicate $(10^5 - 10^6 \text{ s})$ or to 316 develop a stable population $(10^6 - 10^7 \text{ s})$ and clearly attest the dominance of mixed-layer 317 advection in the spatial distribution of phytoplankton organisms. In other words, the transport 318 time (the flow velocity of water masses, often indicated as flushing time or residence time) 319 320 influences algal growth and loss rates (e.g. Reynolds & Wiseman, 1982), and biomass accumulation (e.g. Lucas et al., 2009 and literature therein). 321

To assess the trajectories followed by phytoplankton species and their displacement in the 322 323 mixed layer as they are transported in the water motion is a complex issue (Clifton et al., 2018). By 324 simplifying, it can be related to the velocity fluctuations of turbulence along horizontal and vertical 325 axes in the three-dimensional water mass. The variable resulting from the combination of the different velocities is called turbulent intensity $(u^*)^2$ and its square root u^* , which has the 326 327 dimension of velocity (m s⁻¹), is known as turbulent velocity or shear velocity. Turbulent velocity 328 varies significantly in time and space. However, as discussed above, independently from the value of turbulent velocity, phytoplankton live in an immediate spatial environment that is wholly 329 330 viscous. At the same time, it is liable to be transported far and quickly in the turbulent field, with 331 varying intensities and frequency. As pointed out by Reynolds (2006), phytoplankton lives in viscous packets, rapidly moving in any of three dimensions. The extent by which phytoplankton is 332 333 efficiently embedded in these viscous packets determines its degree of entrainment in water motion. 334

The degree of entrainment of phytoplankton depends on a quotient, Ψ [unitless] which represents the boundary between a behaviour dominated by the turbulent diffusivity of water and a behaviour dominated by the speed of phytoplankton cells or colonies (as described by their sinking and floating velocity and/or by the velocity imparted by flagellar propulsion) in the medium (Humphries & Imberger, 1982). According to Reynolds (1994), it can be approximately computed according to the formula:

341

$\Psi \approx w_{\rm s}/15u^*$

where w_s [ms⁻¹] is the sinking velocity of a particle and u^* [ms⁻¹] is the turbulent velocity of water. The latter can be related to the mean windspeed 10 m above the water surface (Denman & Gargett, 1983; Moreno-Ostos et al., 2009):

345
$$u^* = (\rho_a c_l U_{10}^2 / \rho_w)^{0.5}$$
 [ms⁻¹]

346 where ρ_a is the density of the air, ρ_w is the density of the water, U_{10} is the wind speed 10m above 347 the water surface and c_l is a dimensionless coefficient for drag friction upon water (1.3x10⁻³).

348 A value of Ψ = 1 represents the boundary between entrainment (particles are embedded in the turbulent motion) and disentrainment (particle properties dominate distribution). The smallest 349 350 species of the picoplankton (cells < 2µm) are almost perfectly entrained, increasingly larger 351 species of the nanoplankton (2–20µm) and microplankton (20–200µm) are likely to have higher sinking rates and to be liable to escape from turbulent eddies (Reynolds, 2012b). However, since 352 w_s is generally 1 to 6 orders of magnitude less than u^* (Reynolds, 2006), under most of the 353 hydrodynamic conditions experienced by a water body, phytoplankters are constantly 354 redistributed in the turbulent water column and their trajectories will follow all the possible 355 356 directions in the three-dimensional pelagic environment. This is true also for actively swimming 357 dinoflagellates, whose spatial distribution is often patchier than that of non-motile species 358 (Durham et al., 2013). Dinoflagellates establish vertical heterogeneity by migration during calm weather, then transport by water motions cause their patchy distribution (Alexander & Imberger 359 360 2009). The swimming behaviour shown by self-propelling algae when embedded in water motion was analysed in several studies to explain both the hydrodynamical aspects of algal motion and 361 362 the dynamics of bloom formation (e.g. Kessler, 1985; Pedley & Kessler, 1992; Reigada et al., 2003; Goldstein, 2015; Durham et al., 2009; O'Malley & Bees, 2011). In particular, actively swimming 363 single cells are known to respond in a complex way to flow (e.g. Croze et al., 2013; Cencini et al., 364 365 2019) and their mean swimming direction largely depends on flow direction and intensity (gyrotaxis). In the absence of flow gradients, cells will tend to swim upwards on average 366 367 (gravitaxis). More in general, the thrusts of the turbulent eddies can move phytoplankters upwards faster than they gravitate downwards and allow their sinking trajectories to re-initiate at 368 a higher point in the turbulence field. However, as turbulence decays with depth, the role of 369 370 sinking, floating and self-propelling velocities will increase with depth until a point where the

entraining capacity is too weak to maintain entrainment. Some other particles will therefore belost by sedimentation.

373 Since entrainment depends on w_s , it is not surprising that phytoplankters adaptively show a 374 great variability of size, and an array of shapes that allow them to modulate their sinking velocity 375 through increasing/decreasing form resistance.

In addition, phytoplankters also developed tools to vary, more or less effectively, their cell 376 density in the attempt to reduce the excess of density and avoid sedimentation losses (e.g. 377 378 Peperzak et al., 2003). The density of phytoplanktic cells depends on their content in proteins, carbohydrates, nucleic acids (all more dense than water) and lipids (less dense than water). 379 380 Although these components were found to be positively correlated with cell volume and taxonspecific (Hitchcock, 1982), the mechanisms deployed by phytoplankton to reduce cell density are 381 382 shared by species phylogenetically distant, most likely as a result of evolutionary convergence 383 (Reynolds, 2006). These include mucilage production (e.g. Reynolds, 2007), lipid accumulation (e.g. 384 Walsby & Reynolds, 1980), ionic (e.g. Kahn & Swift, 1978) and other osmolytes regulation (e.g. 385 Boyd & Gradmann, 2002), and, in cyanobacteria, production of gas-vesicles (e.g. Reynolds et al., 386 1987; Walsby, 1994). Other "heavy" constituents as silica and carbonate impregnated into the cell 387 walls can affect sinking. However, in diatoms, the thickness of the frustule was found to be 388 negatively scaled with size. This can contribute to mitigate the effects of a larger size on sinking velocity (Miklasz & Denny, 2010). 389

390 The sinking behaviour of a single phytoplankton population can differ significantly from the 391 average sedimentation rate shown by the whole phytoplankton assemblage (Riebesell, 1989). This 392 is in large part due to the fact that assemblages are generally composed by species with 393 morphologies that respond differently to environmental stimuli, and that many of them eventually 394 live in relatively low numbers under sub-optimal conditions (Padisák, 1992). The high variability 395 intrinsically imparted by water turbulence to the pelagic environment (which also include a 396 variability in the re-distribution of the resources needed to phytoplankton growth) allows these 397 species to eventually gain advantage (and reach dominance) when the average physical conditions 398 of the water masses change (Padisák et al., 2010a).

Last but not least, phytoplankters sink, float and swim in a moving medium (e.g. Reynolds & Walsby, 1975). The reciprocal movements of phytoplankters and of the water masses in which they are embedded have been demonstrated to have a role in the spatial distribution of

phytoplankton at different scales (Font-Muñoz et al., 2017 and literature therein). In particular,
the different circulation patterns of the water masses both at small (advection: 1-10 cm) and at
larger scales (currents: 1-10 km) can be effective in shaping the spatial variability of phytoplankton
size structure in the aquatic environment (Reynolds et al., 1993).

406

407 Phytoplankton access to resources while entrained and disentrained in water motion

408 The pelagic environment is characterised by a great heterogeneity with regard to resources 409 distribution and availability, as well as with regard to the direction and intensity of water 410 movements (Reynolds, 1997). The water movements, generally much larger than the value of molecular diffusivity, largely contribute to re-distribution of heat (Jassby & Powell, 1975) and 411 412 nutrients (Robarts & Ward, 1978) within and across the upper mixed layer of a given water body. There, light is attenuated with depth and varies in relation to the hour of the day, the season, the 413 414 geographic location, the meteorological conditions, the trophic state, the inorganic seston and 415 humic material contents. Nutrients accessible for a phytoplanktic organism are often patchily 416 distributed, even at the scale of a few millimetres, and their concentrations generally increase with depth (Padisák & G-Tóth, 1991; Reynolds, 2006). The movements of water masses at 417 different spatial and temporal scales influence and modulate the availability of light and nutrients 418 419 for phytoplankton: they can transport nutrients from the deep layers to the euphotic zone and can 420 enhance the (re)suspension of phytoplankton in the illuminated layers (Mahadevan, 2016). Moreover, since physical factors can modify growth (and loss) rates of phytoplankton, they can 421 422 also modify the competitive abilities of phytoplankton and re-shape the composition of assemblages (Seip & Reynolds, 1995; Padisák et al., 2010b). 423

Temperature is largely considered a powerful driver of phytoplankton size structure in 424 425 different aquatic ecosystems (e.g. López-Urrutia & Morán, 2015; Rasconi et al., 2015; Pulina et al., 426 2018; Rugema et al., 2019; Abonyi et al., 2020) due to the multiple constraints it imposes on cell 427 growth. Water temperature exerts a direct influence on metabolic rates and biochemical 428 processes of phytoplankton (e.g. Chisholm, 1992) and, consequently, it has an important role in determining the rates of resource uptake (both nutrients and light) by phytoplankton (Borowitza 429 et al., 2016). Moreover, temperature affects the duration of stratification and the thickness of the 430 surface mixed layer, with different and independent consequences to phytoplankton growth 431 432 (Winder & Sommer, 2012). Falkowski & Oliver (2007) suggested that, at a global scale, higher

temperatures are causing a decreased turbulent mixing in the upper part of the oceans, and a
consequent reduction of nutrient availability, which is leading to an altered size structure of
phytoplankton assemblages. Last but not least, temperature also affects two variables (density
and absolute viscosity of water) directly linked to phytoplankton sinking, floating and swimming,
and ultimately to its entrainment in water motion (Zohary et al., 2017).

438 By regulating its entrainment in the external medium through species selection and/or 439 phenotypic plasticity, phytoplankton has to accommodate for two vital necessities: to gain enough 440 light and enough nutrients to sustain net production. Although a geometrical trade-off exists 441 between size and shape (Litchman & Klausmeier, 2008; Stanca et al., 2013), phytoplankton size structure is considered to be largely driven by nutrient availability (e.g. Peter & Sommer, 2013; De 442 443 Senerpont Domis et al., 2013; Marañón et al., 2015; Mousing et al., 2018), whereas light 444 availability can have a strong influence in determining the shape of phytoplankton organisms (e.g. 445 Naselli-Flores & Barone, 2007). Disentrainment (by increasing sinking velocity or by active 446 swimming) may therefore represent an advantage with regard to nutrient supply, since it 447 facilitates the movement of the organisms towards deeper layers where nutrient concentrations are higher. At the same time, it brings organisms away from the upper layers where the light 448 449 conditions are more favourable. Different species have therefore adopted different strategies to 450 manage and regulate their positioning in the water column. Each strategy represents the attempt 451 to maximise the chances to survive in the challenging pelagic environment. Moreover, 452 phytoplankton species are characterised by a relatively high degree of phenotypic plasticity 453 (Naselli-Flores & Barone, 2011). This morphological variability can be considered as a tool to cope 454 with environmental changes. Zohary et al. (2017) noted that many phytoplankton species, of 455 diverse taxonomic phyla, commonly found in Lake Kinneret, Israel, all year-round (even though with different abundances) had larger cells or colony size in winter, and smaller in summer. Similar 456 457 results were obtained by Naselli-Flores (Fig. 1, previously unpublished data) for two phytoplankton species from Sicily (Italy). Pulina et al. (2019) analysed long-term variability of single 458 459 phytoplankton species and assemblage size structure in Mediterranean reservoirs. They found 460 assemblages with smaller mean cell size in summer and larger mean size in winter. Literature surveys, allowed Sommer et al. (2017) and Zohary et al. (2020) to conclude that marine and 461 freshwater phytoplankton become smaller in size with increasing water temperatures. This 462 occurred at the species and community levels. Based on computations of Stokes' sinking velocity, 463 Zohary et al. (2017) hypothesised that the seasonal changes in intra-specific cell or colony size 464

they observed could represent an adaptation that enabled species to overcome temperaturedependent changes in water density and viscosity. These changes are summarised in Figure 2
where the theoretical relationships between phytoplankton size and sinking velocity are shown. In
the figure, the curves represent the sinking velocities attained by spherical algae of different size
(but with the same cell-density of 1.15 g cm⁻³) in the temperature range 10 – 30 °C: when
temperature increases (and the related water density and viscosity decrease), smaller
cells/colonies have to be selected to keep a given sinking velocity constant.

472 Compared to freshwater, seawater shows higher density and viscosity values at a given 473 temperature. Differences in the size distribution of marine and freshwater diatoms are known, with marine diatoms larger than freshwater species (Litchman et al., 2009). However, these 474 475 differences were explained in terms of nutrient fluctuations and differences in the depth of the 476 mixed layer rather than as a consequence of the higher density and viscosity of seawater. A 477 decrease in cell size of microphytoplanktic organisms was also registered in correspondence of 478 increased ice-melting (and decreased salinity) episodes in Antarctica (Teixeira de Lima et al., 479 2019). Unfortunately, to our knowledge, no data exist on the effects exerted by viscosity and density on the size structure of marine and freshwater phytoplankton. Nevertheless, larger or 480 481 smaller specimens are alternatively selected by environmental pressure and their size change, as suggested by Zohary et al. (2017), could be addressed at counteracting the changes in density and 482 483 viscosity of the water and at adjusting their sinking velocities in order to achieve a similar access to 484 resources in the different physical scenario set by seasonal and environmental variations in the 485 density and viscosity of water. To our knowledge, the effects of temperature on the morphology 486 of single phytoplankton species were rarely investigated (e.g. Bailey-Watts & Kirika, 1981; De Miranda et al., 2005; Jung et al., 2013) and, apart from Zohary et al. (2017), no other works exist in 487 the literature on the potential effects of temporal and spatial variation in water density and 488 489 viscosity on phytoplankton. However, it is well known that the increase in density and viscosity along the water column during thermal stratification is responsible for the spatial segregation of 490 491 morphologically different phytoplankton species, and for the eventual establishment of the so called "deep chlorophyll maximum" (e.g. Selmeczy et al., 2016) as one extreme case, as well as 492 surface scums of cyanobacteria (e.g. Zohary & Robarts, 1990; Paerl & Otten, 2013) at the other 493 extreme. 494

Indirect evidences of the effects exerted on phytoplankton by temperature-dependent
 variation of water viscosity and density are abundant in the literature. A direct influence of

497 temperature on the size structure of phytoplankton assemblages was found by Mousing et al. 498 (2014), who showed a global decrease in the relative contribution of large cells to phytoplankton 499 assemblages as temperature increases regardless of ambient nutrient availability. Analogous 500 results were shown by Winder et al. (2009) who recorded a compositional shift in the diatom 501 assemblage of Lake Tahoe, independently from nutrient concentrations and addressed at favouring smaller species, as a consequence of increased temperatures due to global warming. 502 503 Several authors found similar patterns (smaller phytoplanktic organisms in warmer periods) using 504 paleolimnological records to compare different climate periods over geological and centennial 505 time scales (e.g. Smol et al., 2005; Finkel et al., 2005; Mousing et al., 2017).

506 As regard phytoplankton assemblage composition, the role of higher temperature and 507 lower density and viscosity of water, along with an atelomictic thermal pattern, was discussed by 508 Barbosa & Padisák (2002) to explain the replacement of diatoms by desmids, frequently observed 509 in some large tropical lakes with deep epilimnia (Descy & Sarmento, 2008). According to these 510 authors, the low density and viscosity of the water in shallow epilimnia would increase the sinking 511 velocity of diatoms enough to cause an excessive loss by sedimentation, making the lighter but also shade-adapted desmids more suitable to small and warmer waters. As demonstrated by Salas 512 513 de Leon et al. (2016), tropical lakes stratify and mix more easily, and at lower depths than 514 temperate ones in response to changes in wind intensity and to reversals in the heat flux.

515 Climate-driven physical properties of water can therefore play a role in determining the 516 composition and structure of phytoplankton. Analogous results were shown by Rugema et al. 517 (2019) by studying long-term, non-seasonal dynamics of phytoplankton in Lake Kivu, confirming what was shown by Ptacnik et al. (2003): specific sedimentation loss rates can be higher in shallow 518 519 mixed layers (as those occurring in tropical lakes, especially under atelomictic conditions) than in 520 deep ones because the probability of resuspension increases with increasing mixing depth. To prevent settling out of the upper mixed layer, natural selection will therefore favour 521 522 phytoplankton organisms with lower sinking rates. However, presence of non-buoyant 523 phytoplankton like diatoms and desmids in epilimnia appears paradoxical at first sight. Diatoms sink relatively fast because of cell density reasons (specific gravity of diatom frustules is about 2 g 524 cm⁻³; Smol et al., 1984) and small desmids because of their low form resistance ($\phi_r < 1$; Padisák et 525 526 al., 2003). In this case, fast sinking within the epilimnion is beneficial since cells can reach the 527 nutrient rich density gradient (which anyhow slows sinking down) and the climate driven nocturnal mixing (atelomixis) resuspends the cells having a temporary "rest" on the density gradient (Souza 528

et al., 2008). This strategy is useful as long as growth rate can exceed or at least compensate
sinking loss and reminds us that sedimentation properties and nutrient uptake strategies are
closely linked to each other.

532

533 Nutrient uptake and entrainment in water motion

Phytoplankton size is conveniently described by the ratio between the surface and the volume (sv^{-1}) of the organism (unicell or colony). Size influences several metabolic patterns of phytoplankton, ultimately addressed at optimizing the growth of the populations. Reynolds (1989) showed that maximum growth rates at 20 °C, r_{20} , and sv^{-1} , in continuously light- and nutrient-saturated cultures, are scaled according to the formula:

539
$$r_{20} = 1.142(sv^{-1})^{0.325}$$

540 Not surprisingly, growth rates are higher in smaller species, which are also characterised by lower 541 sinking velocities (Fig. 3). Conversely, larger cells and colonies characterised by lower growth rates 542 will show higher sinking velocity. This different behaviour is strictly associated to the different life 543 strategies (C-S-R) that characterise large and small sized phytoplankton (see below and Reynolds, 544 1995).

545 Evidently, all the nutrients needed by phytoplankton to grow have to be drawn from the surrounding water. There, nutrient concentrations (typically in the range 2-50 µmols N L⁻¹ and 0.1-546 5 μmols P L⁻¹) are 5-6 orders of magnitude lower than those occurring within the cells (≈ 2.8 mol N 547 L^{-1} and ≈ 0.18 mols P L^{-1} ; see Reynolds, 2006). Therefore, phytoplankton has to overcome a steep 548 chemical gradient to perform nutrient uptake and this requires a complex system of 549 transmembrane proteins to capture, bind and transport specific molecules into and within 550 551 phytoplankton cells as well as a high amount of energy (Reynolds, 2006). This cellular mechanism can only be effective over a short distance beyond the cell but sufficient to influence the 552 concentration of nutrients within the boundary layer adjacent to the cell (Pasciak & Gavis, 1975; 553 554 Sommer, 1988; Estrada & Berdalet, 1997), up to creating, in the absence of water flow or algal movement, a depletion zone (the so called "concentration boundary layer" or "diffusive boundary 555 layer", see Kiørboe, 2008) in its immediate vicinity (Bonachela et al., 2011). Both microturbulence 556 and phytoplankton motion (either swimming or passive sinking/floating) can therefore make the 557 diffusive boundary layer thinner (Arin et al., 2002; Peters et al., 2006) and increase the fluxes of 558

559 nutrients into the cells above the fluxes that would be experienced by one cell that is not motile 560 with respect to the adjacent medium (Munk & Riley, 1952; Ploug et al., 1999; Kiørboe et al., 2001; Guasto et al., 2012). However, Riebesell & Wolf-Gladrow (2002) showed that, for particles moving 561 in the water at low Reynolds numbers, a distinction has to be made between i) very small cells 562 (e.g. Chlorella or small centric diatoms) deeply entrained in the turbulence spectrum and ii) larger 563 or actively swimming cells or colonies ($Re > 10^{-3}$). By considering the rate of solute diffusive 564 transport, the concentration gradient from the medium to the algal surface and the thickness of 565 566 the diffusive boundary layer, these authors demonstrated that in the first group of organisms the 567 benefit of increasing water fluxes (i.e. the dependence on turbulence) around the cell is quite marginal, whereas it becomes increasingly important for larger organisms. It was also shown that 568 the nutrient concentration threshold below which cells cannot sustain a given growth rate 569 increases rapidly with cell size (Chisholms, 1992). An increase in the relative movement between 570 571 the organisms and the water masses allow large organisms to overcome the biophysical constraint given by i) the thickening of the diffusion boundary layer around the cell, and by ii) the reduction 572 in nutrient diffusion per unit of cell volume (Marañón, 2014). Moreover, large elongated cells and 573 574 multi-celled trichomes can also show an increased nutrient flux per unit cell volume due to the increased surface-to-volume ratio (Pahlow et al., 1997; Karp-Boss & Boss, 2016). These results 575 576 confirmed the earlier observations made by Walsby & Reynolds (1980) who analysed the tradeoffs between sinking and uptake rates in diatoms and suggested that under chronically low 577 578 nutrient concentrations, large organisms depend much more on turbulence than smaller ones to 579 maximise nutrient acquisition.

It is therefore the trade-off between entrainment and nutrient availability that determines 580 the competitive success of a species, rather than the absolute value of nutrient concentrations. 581 This trade-off also plays an important role in the seasonal succession of freshwater phytoplankton. 582 583 As shown by Reynolds (1988; 1995; 1997), small spherical or quasi-spherical organisms (volume < 10³ µm³) are good competitors under deep mixing and high nutrient availability (as in winter, early 584 585 spring in temperate lakes) whereas a reduced nutrient availability, and lower mixing conditions (as in late spring, summer) will favour larger ($10^4 < volume < 10^6 \mu m^3$), spherical or subspherical, more 586 stress-tolerant ones. These two groups respectively well fit the features of r- and K-selected 587 organisms, as applied to plankton by Kilham & Kilham (1980). 588

589

590 Access to light when travelling in the water column

The ability to harvest and process light at low irradiance levels is enhanced by small size or by the 591 592 attenuation of larger size in one or two planes (Reynolds, 2006; Naselli-Flores & Barone, 2011). 593 These morphological traits characterise phytoplankton organisms with a high photon affinity that 594 can therefore photosynthesize with high capacity at low ambient light (Reynolds, 1997; Padisák et 595 al., 2003). Moreover, as recently shown by Durante et al. (2019), who reviewed the data on sinking 596 velocity of phytoplankton species available in the literature, cell shape changes as size increases 597 and cylindrical shapes can get much larger than spherical or subspherical cells though maintaining 598 a similar sinking rate.

599 Since morphological traits related to small spherical and large cylindrical shapes are 600 typically shown by both small r- and elongated K-selected species, they were placed by Reynolds 601 et al. (1983) in a strategic group created *ad hoc* (*w*-selected species, investing in efficient light 602 conversion; see also Reynolds, 2003).

603 The relationships existing between phytoplankton specific growth rates at sub-saturating 604 light intensities (α_r) and cell morphology were discussed by Reynolds (1997) who found that:

605

$$\alpha_r = 0.257 (msv^{-1})^{0.236}$$

where *m* is the maximal linear dimension. The product of *m* and sv^{-1} well describes the attenuation 606 607 in a solid and its departure from a spherical shape. Its value is actually minimal (6) for the spherical shape and progressively increases as it is attenuated in one or two planes, up to reaching a 608 filamentous shape (see Naselli-Flores & Barone, 2011 for further details). Elongated shapes are 609 610 generally characterised by a coefficient of form resistance up to 2.3-5.1 times higher than that of the equivalent sphere (Reynolds, 1984) and, for cylindrical shapes, their sinking velocity may 611 612 depend on initial filaments' orientation (Holland, 2010). Padisák et al. (2003), by using PVC models 613 for reproducing the shapes of different phytoplankton species and allowing them to sink in a glycerine medium, showed that sinking velocity of elongated (cylindrical) shapes is also positively 614 related to the length/width ratio of the cylinders and to their degree of coiling (tightly coiled 615 filaments sink faster than loosely coiled ones). These results confirmed earlier observations carried 616 by Booker & Walsby (1979) who noted that cyanobacterial filaments with helical shapes sank 617 faster than straight filaments of comparable length. Several morphological features, which affect 618 619 the sinking velocity and modify the entrainment of phytoplankton organisms in the turbulent 620 motion, can be expressed within the extent of phenotypic plasticity of a given population in

response to the selective pressure of environmental constraints. When these constraints
overcome the range of phenotypic plasticity of a species, the species will be replaced by another
having a shape better fitting the new environmental conditions.

The reduced sinking velocity shown by elongated shapes allows them to persist in the upper part of the mixed layers of the water column where light availability is higher. Adopting this strategy can be particularly helpful in the more productive environments, characterised by reduced light availability and by nutrient concentrations above limiting thresholds (e.g. Zapomělová et al. 2008; Naselli-Flores, 2014).

However, the environmental template sets the rules and, as shown by Reynolds et al. (1986), under stagnant conditions sinking may represent a short-term benefit to escape the damaging photo-inhibition caused by oxidative stress of excessive insolation near the water surface.

633 In well-mixed environments, a "critical light intensity" was defined as the species-specific 634 minimal light intensity needed for the species to grow under a constant light supply (Huisman & 635 Weissing, 1994). Accordingly, the species showing the lowest value of critical light intensity will constitute better competitors under light-limited conditions (Weissing & Huisman, 1994; Huisman 636 et al., 1999). A further consequence is that establishment of a highly shade adapted species [like 637 638 Raphidiopsis raciborskii (Wołoszyńska) Aguilera, Berrendero Gómez, Kastovsky, Echenique & 639 Salerno in any appropriate ecosystem] may build up much higher biomass per square meter than 640 its also N-fixing counterparts (e.g. Aphanizomenon or Dolichospermum). However, phytoplankton 641 entrained in the turbulent water motion is exposed to a fluctuating light regime while being 642 transported up and down in the water column. The frequency of such fluctuations, at a given location and season, is directly related to the amount of kinetic energy imparted to water masses 643 644 by wind intensity (Reynolds, 1987). The relationships between light attenuation and the time 645 required to fully travel (and be repositioned) along a well-mixed water column (in the order of 10^3 s during vigorous wind mixing in a water column 5 m deep), will depend on the depth of the 646 647 mixing zone and will have implications in the selection of phytoplankton species (Reynolds, 1993). The ratio between euphotic and mixing depth (z_{eu}/z_{mix}) was therefore selected as a good predictor 648 649 of phytoplankton performance under fluctuating light conditions (Huisman, 1999).

To explain how phytoplankton can manage to persist, and eventually bloom, in the illuminated water layers, Huisman et al. (2002 and literature therein) proposed a population

652 dynamic theory of sinking phytoplankton that considered balancing between light-dependent 653 growth rates, mortality rates, sinking rates, and turbulent-diffusion rates. These authors described the existence of a "turbulent window" that allows phytoplankton to grow in the euphotic zone. 654 655 The window is characterised by intermediate turbulence levels allowing phytoplankton organisms 656 to avoid both sedimentation losses and dilution beyond their growth capacity, while being passively transported within the mixed layer. The interplay between the depth of the mixing zone 657 658 (z_{mix}) and that of the euphotic layer (z_{eu}) was further analysed by Huisman & Sommeijer (2002) and by Huisman et al. (2004 and literature therein), who showed that changes in the z_{mix}/z_{eu} ratio 659 660 (primarily caused by a lower turbulent diffusivity) are key factors in determining the species structure of phytoplankton assemblage. Naselli-Flores (2000) reached similar conclusions by 661 662 studying phytoplankton dynamics in Mediterranean reservoirs. In fact, the *z_{mix}/z_{eu}* ratio indicates the proportion of time a phytoplankton organism may spend at critical light intensities once it is 663 664 entrained in the mixed water column (Naselli-Flores & Barone, 2007). As shown by Reynolds (1984), assuming a constant respiration rate of 10% of maximum photosynthetic rate, net growth 665 of entrained phytoplankton cannot occur when $z_{mix}/z_{eu} > 3$ due to the insufficient extent of the 666 667 aggregated photoperiod. A significant relationship between z_{mix}/z_{eu} and msv^{-1} is shown in Naselli-668 Flores & Barone (2007) and in Naselli-Flores (2011) attesting the selective tendency toward an 669 attenuated shape as *z_{mix}/z_{eu}* ranges between 1.5 and 3.0. In shallow, optically-deep water bodies, 670 as those characterised by a high algal turbidity, low flow conditions and values of the ratio higher 671 than 3 were found to promote the dominance of gas-vacuolated cyanobacteria that float to the 672 surface shading eukaryotic phytoplankton (e.g. Naselli-Flores, 2003; Bormans et al., 2005). In these 673 cases, buoyancy regulation represents an efficient strategy to persist in the illuminated layer and 674 to monopolise light resources, while shading and outcompeting phytoplankton species more dense than water. In water bodies subjected to low wind speeds where shallow diurnal mixed 675 676 layers form, those cyanobacteria are further advantaged by maintaining position within the diurnal mixed layer, while non-buoyant species depend on turbulent mixing to re-suspend them to 677 678 the euphotic zone (Robarts & Zohary, 1984).

679 Reynolds et al. (1983) have shown that stratification within the euphotic zone positively 680 affects large flagellates and buoyant cyanobacteria such as *Microcystis* spp., which require and 681 also tolerate a high dose of light to grow. Conversely, deep mixing favours negatively buoyant 682 diatoms and desmids (that otherwise would be lost from suspension) provided that the reduction 683 of the average light intensity is sub-critical to their net growth. Based on these findings, deep

684 mixing has proved to be effective in hampering cyanobacterial growth, especially that of 685 Microcystis spp. and Dolichospermum spp., in stratifying water bodies (Visser et al., 2016 and literature therein). Deep mixing and high flow conditions negatively affect these cyanobacteria 686 since they promote i) an increase of the z_{mix}/z_{eu} , ii) an increase of the frequency of exposure to 687 688 light levels below the critical intensity, and iii) the growth of competitors better adapted to deep mixing (Xiao et al., 2018). Similar results were shown by Naselli-Flores & Barone (2005) in a 689 690 *Microcystis*-dominated Mediterranean reservoir: in summer the reservoir experienced a strong dewatering (up to 90 % of the water volume stored in early spring) due to its use for irrigation 691 692 purposes, which transformed a quite deep lake into a shallow one (Naselli-Flores, 2003) with an immediate development of a dense Microcystis bloom. To prevent the repetition of this event, in 693 694 the following years the summer water-withdrawal was managed to establish a stable thermocline 695 at depth of 5-6 m and to maintain it throughout the summer. The resulting upper mixed layer was 696 much deeper than the intermittent microstratification caused by atelomixis in the "shallow lake" phase, with a diurnal thermocline development located within the upper 50 cm of depth. As a 697 consequence, a strong reduction of cyanobacteria was recorded in the reservoir when dewatering 698 699 was managed to maintain a stable summer thermocline. This effect was accompanied by lower values of *z_{mix}/z_{eu}*, which favoured green algae (e.g. *Pediastrum* s.l., *Hariotina*, *Coelastrum*, 700 701 Scenedesmus) sensitive to settling into the low light layers (see Reynolds et al., 2002). Hence, two 702 opposing approaches can exert similar results on the composition of phytoplankton assemblages: 703 the first is aimed at decreasing the thermal stability while the second at enhancing thermal 704 stability. Both resulted in the reduction of light resources for cyanobacteria. These observations 705 are in agreement with the results shown by Wu et al. (2019) who found that the effects of 706 turbulence on the formation of cyanobacteria scums can vary according to the extent of 707 turbulence itself, and to the way in which mixing regimes influence resource availability (both light 708 and nutrients) in the water column.

709

710 Biotic interactions and water motion

Understanding how bacterio-, phyto- and zooplankton interact when being passively transported
across the pelagic environment is not trivial. The existence and functioning of aquatic ecosystems
depend on these interactions that convey energy fluxes and promote biogeochemical cycles.
Intuitively, members of these ecological groups, due to differences in their size and modes of

propelling through the water, are differently subjected to water motion. Moreover, fluid dynamics
affects plankton growth and its spatial distribution, but at the same time plankton behaviour
influences fluid motion across a range of scales, through excretion of exopolymers (Prairie et al.,
2012), feeding (Jiang et al., 1999) and swimming (Simoncelli et al., 2018; 2019).

719 As regard bacteria, they occupy all habitats of aquatic (and non-aquatic) ecosystems 720 including the sediments (even the deep ocean thermal chimneys), the water column, and the 721 surface of all the other members of the biological compartment. Bacteria in plankton are found in 722 the mucilage of cyanobacterial species, where they establish symbiotic relationships (e.g. 723 Brunberg, 1999; recently recognized as global functional interactome, see Hooker et al., 2019), 724 and in the gut of zooplankton (Grossart et al., 2010). Stratification patterns can create abrupt 725 differences between the upper and lower layers of the water column and promote the 726 development of distinctive, specialized prokaryotic assemblages (Salcher et al., 2011) or at least 727 disperse them. Climate change may promote the incidence of such events (Kasprzak et al., 2017). 728 Although bacteria show high morphological variability (e.g. van Teeseling et al., 2017) it is unlikely 729 that this could represent an adaptive response to the pelagic environment [but see Faivre et al., (2008 and Raschdorf et al. (2013)]. Their size, and the very low Reynolds Number at which they 730 731 live, can however represent an advantage since it keeps them in suspension (Lauga, 2016) and/or, depending on the depth of a water body, it can favour re-suspension (Amalfitano et al., 2017), 732 733 promote their motion (Koch & Subramanian, 2012), and allow their dispersion in all the biotic 734 components of the aquatic ecosystem (Eckert et al., 2020).

In an attempt to explain the morphological variability of phytoplankton, Jiang et al. (2005) 735 presented a model showing that in the absence of grazers, phytoplankton should evolve towards 736 737 picoplanktic size. According to this model, the interactions between phytoplankton and 738 zooplankton over geological time scales may have contributed to the high variability in size shown by phytoplankton. The basic assumption of this model was partially contradicted by another 739 740 model recently developed by Woodward et al. (2019) showing that water flow can keep planktic predators and preys separated as they are transported in the water motion. Inertial drift can drive 741 crustacean zooplankton out of the turbulent eddies allowing phytoplankton within the eddies to 742 escape grazing control, and eventually favouring the formation of water blooms. As it was 743 744 evidenced, crustacean zooplankton is more subjected to inertia (G.-Tóth et al., 2011) than 745 phytoplankton and even small differences in inertia and/or buoyancy between predators and 746 preys can significantly affect their encounter rates. To overcome the problem, several planktic

herbivorous crustaceans use their body appendages to generate microcurrents to convey the algal
particles to their mouth (e.g. Jiang et al., 1999; Lampert, 2001). A side effect of the
microturbulence generated by zooplankton (biomixing) at millimetric scale could cause the
thinning of the diffusive boundary layer and increase nutrient uptake by phytoplankton (see
Prairie et al., 2012 and literature therein). However, the role of biomixing at larger scales (i.e.
disruption of thermal stratification) has been controversial (e.g. Dekshenieks et al., 2001; Visser,
2007; Subramanian, 2010; Prairie et al., 2010).

754 However, crustaceans are not the only players with the role of "consumer" in the planktic 755 compartment of the pelagic food webs. Since the work by Azam et al. (1983) who highlighted the importance of the microbial loop in sustaining primary production in all the aquatic environments, 756 757 a huge amount of literature has investigated the interactions among bacteria, heterotrophic 758 flagellates and phytoplankton (including mixotrophic species), and the importance of the role they 759 exert in ecosystem functioning (e.g. Fenchel, 2008; Nakano, 2014; Mitra et al., 2016; Naselli-Flores & Barone, 2019). As shown by Reigada et al. (2003), if one group of planktic organisms is "lighter" 760 than the other, some degree of separation between predators and prey can occur. Accordingly, 761 762 the comparable size of the organisms forming the microbial loop has probably a role in gathering 763 them together and in strengthening their trophic interactions by minimizing the patchy distribution of trophic resources generally occurring in a nutritionally diluted environment 764 765 (Conover, 1968).

766 It is well known that the impact of grazers has evolutionarily produced an array of phytoplankton defence tools, involving biochemical, behavioural and morphological mechanisms 767 addressed at reducing grazing losses (see Van Donk et al., 2011 for a review). As reviewed in 768 769 Naselli-Flores & Barone (2011), several defence morphological mechanisms are not constitutive 770 but are induced by the grazing activity exerted by herbivores by release of infochemicals and 771 allelopathic substances. Infochemicals were demonstrated to be effective in promoting colony 772 formation, changes in cell size and/or induction to grow spines and bristles (e.g. Lürling, 2003; 773 Tang et al., 2008). The induction of these morphological changes requires re-allocation of 774 resources and can have a cost in terms of growth rates. Changes in size (e.g. as it happens when single cells aggregate to form colonies) can cause an increase in the sedimentation rates affecting 775 the persistence in the illuminated layers and the gathering of nutrients, due to the decreased 776 777 surface-to-volume ratio (e.g. Verschoor, 2005).

778 Developing defences against grazing is part of the adaptations required by the organisms 779 living in apparent suspension. The evolutionary interactions between phytoplankton and zooplankton certainly have had a role in determining the present spectrum of sizes and shapes 780 shown by phytoplankton organisms (Jiang et al., 2005). However, it is often difficult to disentangle 781 782 the effects exerted on phytoplankton morphology while being transported in the water motion regarding three fundamental necessities: i) to access adequate amount of resources, ii) to 783 784 minimize sedimentation losses, and iii) to escape from herbivores. The amazing morphological 785 diversity of phytoplankton has therefore to be considered an evolutionarily-driven compendium of 786 strategies to cope with the strong variability and unpredictability of the pelagic environment. Escape of parasites, like chytrids, by disruption of colonies, sinking fast and being reanimated 787 during the next complete mixing may represent another strategy of population survival. 788

789

790 Perspectives: where research should be addressed

791 Global warming, among others, is causing an increase of water temperature, which has multiple 792 effects on phytoplankton growth by directly influencing its metabolism and the temperature-793 dependent physical properties of its fluid environment (Prairie et al., 2012). Temperature acts 794 directly and indirectly on phytoplankton in several ways and disentangling the single effect caused by temperature variations is not an easy task. Direct effects are those impacting phytoplankton 795 796 metabolic rates (and resulting in an alteration of biogeochemical cycles; see Toseland et al., 2013). 797 Indirect effects include, as an example, warming of the surface waters leading to shallowing of the 798 upper mixed layer (Gray et al., 2019), and temperature-dependent changes in density and viscosity 799 of water which affect fluid dynamics and the entrainment of phytoplankton into the water motion 800 (Zohary et al., 2017). Literature on whether climate change is deepening or shallowing the thermocline (therefore the depth of the upper mixed layer) is controversial: either deepens or 801 makes it shallower (see Selmeczy et al., 2016); influence seems to be highly lake-specific (and 802 803 model specific). However, existing data are consistent in that climate change has a profound effect on stratification patterns cascading throughout the whole pelagic scenario (e.g. Pareeth et al., 804 805 2016 and literature therein).

Although several interdisciplinary papers coupling biological and physical aspects of phytoplankton ecology are available in the scientific literature, we are still far from a complete understanding of the structuring impacts of (micro)turbulence on plankton. This is certainly linked

809 to the complexity of effects exerted on plankton dynamics by the physical properties of the fluid at 810 different spatial (from millimetres to kilometres) and temporal (from a few seconds to seasons) scales and by the inherent difficulties in coupling phytoplankton ecology and fluid mechanics. 811 Methodological and technological advances along with closer interactions between physicists and 812 biologists have begun to reveal the importance of flow-microorganism interactions and the 813 adaptations of microorganisms to flow (Berman & Shteinmann, 1998; Koch & Subramainan, 2011; 814 Ng et al., 2011; Prairie et al., 2012; Wheeler et al., 2019). In addition, it is important to recall that 815 phytoplankton morphology is evolutionarily shaped. However, phytoplankton shape structure, 816 817 compared to phytoplankton size structure, is only seldom considered in the literature. Morphological variability among species as well as natural intrapopulation variability, can lead to 818 variability in metabolic and functional traits, which may impair our full understanding of the 819 ecological trajectories followed by natural phytoplankton assemblages (Bestion et al., 2018). 820 821 Investigations aimed at finding the links between cell morphology (and its ornamentations: papillae, protuberances, arms, spines, bristles), sinking velocity of phytoplankton, metabolic traits 822 and flow conditions of aquatic ecosystems would therefore help in better understanding the 823 824 structure and distribution patterns of phytoplankton in aquatic ecosystems, and its role in determining the ecosystem functioning. Although time-consuming, morphological analysis of 825 826 phytoplankton, both addressed at evaluating the modifications in its size structure along time and at recording seasonal size changes of single species, represent an important tool to investigate the 827 ecological dynamics of aquatic ecosystems (Naselli-Flores, 2014). It would be therefore important 828 829 to invest more efforts in collecting and analysing morphological data on phytoplankton and 830 include such analyses in the scientific literature dealing with phytoplankton dynamics, especially 831 when long-trend data sets are presented.

832 References

- Abonyi, A., K.T. Kiss, A. Hidas, G. Borics, G. Várbíró & É. Ács, 2020. Size matters: cell size decrease and
 altered cell size structure constrain ecosystem functioning of phytoplankton in the middle Danube
 River due to long-term environmental change. Ecosystems 23 (Online first). DOI: 10.1007/s10021-019 00467-6
- Alexander, R. & J. Imberger, 2009. Spatial distribution of motile phytoplankton in a stratified reservoir: the
 physical controls on patch formation. Journal of Plankton Research 31: 101-118
- Amalfitano, S., G. Corno, E. Eckert, S. Fazi, S. Ninio, C. Callieri, H.-P. Grossart & W. Eckert, 2017. Tracing
 particulate matter and associated microorganisms in freshwaters. Hydrobiologia 800: 145–154.
- Arin, L., C. Marrasé, M. Maar, F. Peters, M.M. Sala & M. Alcara, 2002. Combined effects of nutrients and
 small-scale turbulence in a microcosm experiment. I. Dynamics and size distribution of osmotrophic
 plankton. Aquatic Microbial Ecology 29: 51–61.

- Azam, F., T. Fenchel, J.G. Field, J.S. Gray, L.A. Meyer-Reil & F. Thingstad, 1983. The role of water-column
 microbes in the sea. Marine Ecology Progress Series 10: 257-263.
- Bailey-Watts, A.E. & A. Kirika, 1981. The assessment of size variation in Loch Leven phytoplankton: a
 methodology and some of its uses in the study of factors influencing size. Journal of Plankton Research
 3: 261-282.
- Barbosa, F.A.R. & J. Padisák, 2002. The forgotten lake stratification pattern: atelomixis, and its ecological
 importance. Verhandlungen des Internationalen Verein Limnologie 28: 1385-1395.
- Baudena, A., E. Ser-Giacomi, C. López, E. Hernández-García & F. d'Ovidio, 2019. Crossroads of the
 mesoscale circulation. Journal of Marine Systems 192: 1-14.
- Behrenfeld, M.J. & E.S. Boss, 2014. Resurrecting the ecological underpinnings of ocean plankton blooms.
 Annual Review of Marine Science 6: 167-194.
- Berman, T. & B. Shteinman, 1998. Phytoplankton development and turbulent mixing in Lake Kinneret
 (1992–1996). Journal of Plankton Research 20: 709-726.
- Bestion, E., B. García-Carreras, C.-E. Schaum, S. Pawar & G. Yvon-Durocher, 2018. Metabolic traits predict
 the effects of warming on phytoplankton competition. Ecology Letters 21: 655-664.
- Bienfang, P.K., 1982. Phytoplankton sinking-rate dynamics in enclosed experimental ecosystems. In Grice
 J.D. & M.R. Reeve (eds), Marine Mesocosms. Biological and Chemical Research in Experimental
 Ecosystems. Springer, New York: 261-274.
- Bonachela, J.A., M. Raghib & S.A. Levin, 2011. Dynamic model of flexible phytoplankton uptake.
 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS) 108: 2063320638.
- Booker, M.J. & A.E. Walsby, 1979. The relative form resistance of straight and helical blue-green algal
 filaments. British Phycological Journal 14: 141-150.
- Bormans, M., P.W. Ford & L. Fabbro, 2005. Spatial and temporal variability of cyanobacterial populations
 controlled by physical processes. Journal of Plankton Research 27: 61-70.
- Borowitzka, M.A., J. Beardall & J.A. Raven, 2016. The Physiology of Microalgae. Springer, Heidelberg, 681
 pp.
- Boyd, C.M. & D. Gradmann, 2002. Impact of osmolytes on buoyancy of marine phytoplankton. Marine
 Biology 141: 605-618.
- Brereton, A., J. Siddons & D.M. Lewis, 2018. Large-eddy simulation of subsurface phytoplankton dynamics:
 an optimum condition for chlorophyll patchiness induced by Langmuir circulations. Marine Ecology
 Progress Series 593: 15-27.
- Brunberg, A.-K., 1999. Contribution of bacteria in the mucilage of *Microcystis* spp. (Cyanobacteria) to
 benthic and pelagic bacterial production in a hypereutrophic lake. FEMS Microbiology Ecology 29: 1322.
- Bukaveckas, P.A., 2010. Hydrology: Rivers. In Lickens G.E. (ed.), River Ecosystem Ecology: A Global
 Perspective. Elsevier, Amsterdam: 32-43.
- Cencini, M., G. Boffetta, M. Borgnino & F. De Lillo, 2019. Gyrotactic phytoplankton in laminar and turbulent
 flows: a dynamical system approach. The European Physical Journal E 42: 31.
- Chisholm, S.W., 1992. Phytoplankton size. In Falkowski P.G. (ed.), Primary Productivity and Biogeochemical
 Cycles in the Sea. Plenum, New York: 213–237.

- Clifton, W., R.N. Bearon & M.A. Bees, 2018. Enhanced sedimentation of elongated plankton in simple flows.
 IME Journal of Applied Mathematics 83: 743-766.
- 887 Conover, R.J., 1968. Zooplankton-life in a nutritionally dilute environment. American Zoologist 8: 107-118.
- Croze, O.A., G. Sardina, M. Ahmed, M.A. Bees & L. Brandt, 2013. Dispersion of swimming algae in laminar
 and turbulent channel flows: consequences for photobioreactors. Journal of the Royal Society
 Interface 10: 20121041.
- Becho, A. W. 1990. Microbial exopolymer secretions in ocean environments their role(s) in food webs and
 marine processes. Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review 28: 73–153.
- Dekshenieks, M.M., P.L. Donaghay, J.M. Sullivan, J.E.B. Rines, T.R. Osborn & M.S. Twardowski, 2001.
 Temporal and spatial occurrence of thin phytoplankton layers in relation to physical processes. Marine
 Ecology Progress Series 223: 61–71.
- De Miranda, M., M. Gaviano & E. Serra, 2005. Change in the cell size of the diatom *Cylindrotheca closterium* in a hyperaline pond. Chemistry and Ecology 21: 77-81.
- Denman, K.L. & A.E. Gargett, 1983. Time and space scales of vertical mixing and advection of phytoplankton
 in the upper ocean. Limnology and Oceanography 28: 801-815.
- De Senerpont Domis, L.N., J.J. Elser, A.S. Gsell, V.L.M. Huszar, B.W. Ibelings, E. Jeppesen, S. Kosten, W.M.
 Mooij, F. Roland, U. Sommer, E. Van Donk, M. Winder & M. Lürling, 2013. Plankton dynamics under
 different climatic conditions in space and time. Freshwater Biology 58:463–482.
- 903 Descy, J-P. & H. Sarmento, 2008. Microorganisms of the East African Great Lakes and their response to
 904 environmental changes. Freshwater Reviews 1: 59-74.
- Dodds, W.K. & M.R. Whiles, 2020. Chapter 17. Nutrient use and remineralization. In Dodds, W.K. & M.R.
 Whiles (eds), Freshwater Ecology. Concepts and Environmental Applications of Limnology (3rd Edition).
 Academic Press, Cambridge: 503-535.
- Durante, G., A. Basset, E. Stanca & L. Roselli, 2019. Allometric scaling and morphological variation in sinking
 rate of phytoplankton. Journal of Phycology 55: 1386-1393.
- Durham, W.M. & R. Stocker, 2012. Thin phytoplankton layers: characteristics, mechanisms and
 consequences. Annual Review of Marine Science 4: 177-207.
- Durham, W.M., J.O. Kessler & R. Stocker, 2009. Disruption of vertical motility by shear triggers formation of
 thin phytoplankton layers. Science 323: 1067-1070.
- Durham, W.M., E. Climent, M. Barry, F. De Lillo, G. Boffetta, M. Cencini & R. Stocker, 2013. Turbulence
 drives microscale patches of motile phytoplankton. Nature Communications 4: 2148.
- Eckert, E., S. Amalfitano, A. Di Cesare, C. Manzari, G. Corno & D. Fontaneto, 2020. Different substrate within
 a lake harbour connected but specialised microbial communities. Hydrobiologia (Online first). DOI:
 10.1007/s10750-019-04068-1
- Elliott, A., A.E. Irish & C.S. Reynolds, 2001. The effects of vertical mixing on a phytoplankton community: a
 modelling approach to the intermediate disturbance hypothesis. Freshwater Biology 46: 1291-1297.
- Eppley, R.W., R.W. Holmes & J.D.H. Strickland, 1967. Sinking rates of marine phytoplankton measured with
 a fluorometer. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 1: 191-208.

923 Estrada, M. & E. Berdalet, 1997. Phytoplankton in a turbulent world. Scientia Marina 61 (Supl. 1): 125-140.

Faivre, D., N. Menguy, M. Pósfai & D. Schüler, 2008. Environmental parameters affect the physical
 properties of fast-growing magnetosomes. American Mineralogist 93:463-469.

- Falkowski, P.G., 1994. The role of phytoplankton photosynthesis in global biogeochemical cycles
 Photosynthesis Research 39: 235-258.
- Falkowski, P.G. & M.J. Oliver, 2007. Mix and match: how climate selects phytoplankton. Nature Reviews
 Microbiology 5: 813-819.
- Fenchel, T., 2008. The microbial loop 25 years later. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology
 366: 99-103.
- Field, C.B., M.J. Behrenfeld, J.T. Randerson & J.P. Falkowski, 1998. Primary production of the biosphere:
 integrating terrestrial and oceanic components. Science 281: 237-240.
- Finkel, Z.V., 2007. Does phytoplankton cell size matter? The evolution of modern marine food webs. In:
 Falkowski, P.G. & A.H. Knoll (eds), Evolution of Primary Producers in the Sea. Elsevier Academic Press,
 London: 333-350.
- Finkel, Z.V., M.E. Katz, J.D. Wright, O.M.E. Schofield & P.G. Falkowski, 2005. Climatically driven
 macroevolutionary patterns in the size of marine diatoms over the Cenozoic. Proceedings of the
 National Academy of Science of the United States of America 102: 8927-8932.
- Font-Muñoz, J.S., A. Jordi, I. Tuval, J. Arrieta, S. Anglès & G. Basterretxea, 2017. Advection by ocean currents
 modifies phytoplankton size structure. Journal of the Royal Society Interface 14: 20170046.
- Glibert, P.M., 2016. Margalef revisited: A new phytoplankton mandala incorporating twelve dimensions,
 including nutritional physiology. Harmful Algae 55: 25-30.
- Goldstein, R.E., 2015. Green algae as model organisms for biological fluid dynamics. Annual Review of Fluid
 Mechanics 47: 343-375.
- Granin, N.G., D.H. Jewson, R. Y. Gnatovsky, L. A. Levin, A. A: Zhdanov, L. A: Gorbunova, V. V. Tsekhanovsky,
 L. M Doroschenko & N. Y. Mogilev, 2000. Turbulent mixing under ice and the growth of diatoms in Lake
 Baikal. Verhandlungen der Internationale Vereinigung für theoretische und angewandte Limnologie:
 27: 2812-2814.
- Gray, E., J.A. Elliott, E.B. Mackay, A.M. Folkard, P.O. Keenan & I.D. Jones, 2019. Modelling lake
 cyanobacterial blooms: Disentangling the climate-driven impacts of changing mixed depth and water
 temperature. Freshwater Biology (Early View) DOI: 10.1111/fwb.13402
- Grossart, H.-P., C. Dziallas, F. Leunert & K. W. Tang, 2010. Bacteria dispersal by hitchhiking on zooplankton.
 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA 107: 11959–11964.
- G.-Tóth, L., L. Parpala, C. Balog, I. Tàtrai & E. Baranyai, 2011. Zooplankton community response to enhanced
 turbulence generated by water-level decrease in Lake Balaton, the largest shallow lake in Central
 Europe. Limnology and Oceanography 56: 2211-2222.
- Guasto, J.S., R. Rusconi & R. Stocker, 2012. Fluid mechanics of planktonic microorganisms. Annual Review of
 Fluid Mechanics 44: 373-400.
- Hitchcock, G.L., 1982. A comparative study of the size-dependent organic composition of marine diatoms
 and dinoflagellates. Journal of Plankton Research 4: 363-377.
- Holland, D.P., 2010. Sinking rates of phytoplankton filaments orientated at different angles: theory and
 physical model. Journal of Plankton Research 32: 1327-1336.
- Hooker, K.V, C. Li, L.-R. Krumholz, K.D. Hambright, H.W. Paerl, M.M. Steffen, A.E. Wilson, M. Burford, H.-P.
 Grossart, D. Hamilton, H. Jiang, D. Latour, E. Meyer, J. Padisák, B. Qin, A. Sukenik, R.M. Zamor & G. Zhu,
 2019. The global *Microcystis* interactome. Limnology and Oceanography DOI: 10.1002/lno11362
- Huisman, J., 1999. Population dynamics of light limited phytoplankton: microcosm experiments. Ecology 80:
 202-210.

- Huisman, J. & F.J. Weissing, 1994. Light-limited growth and competition for light in well-mixed aquatic
 environments: an elementary model. Ecology 75: 507-520.
- Huisman, J. & B. Sommeijer, 2002. Maximal sustainable sinking velocity of phytoplankton. Marine Ecology
 Progress Series 244: 39-48.
- Huisman, J., R.R. Jonker, C. Zonneveld & F.J. Weissing, 1999. Competition for light between phytoplankton
 species: experimental tests of mechanistic theory. Ecology 80: 211-222.
- Huisman, J., M. Arrayás, U. Ebert & B. Sommeijer, 2002. How do sinking phytoplankton species manage to
 persist? The American Naturalist 159: 245-254.
- Huisman, J., J. Sharples, J.M. Stroom, P.M. Visser, W.E.A. Kardinaal, J.M.H. Verspagen & B. Sommeijer,
 2004. Changes in turbulent mixing shift competition for light between phytoplankton species. Ecology
 85: 2960-2970.
- Humphries, S., 2007. Body size and suspension feeding. In Hildrew, A.G., D.G. Raffaelli & R. Edmonds-Brown
 (eds), Body size. The structure and function of aquatic ecosystems. Cambridge University Press,
 Cambridge: 16-32.
- 983 Hutchinson, G.E., 1961. The paradox of the plankton. The American Naturalist 95: 137-145.
- Hutter, K., Y. Wang & I.P. Chubarenko, 2011a. Physics of Lakes. Volume 1: Foundation of the Mathematical
 and Physical Background. Springer Verlag, Berlin, 434 pp.
- Hutter, K., Y. Wang & I.P. Chubarenko, 2011b. Physics of Lakes. Volume 2: Lakes as Oscillators. Springer
 Verlag, Berlin, 646 pp.
- Hutter, K., Y. Wang & I.P. Chubarenko, 2014. Physics of Lakes. Volume 3: Methods of Understanding Lakes
 as Components of the Geophysical Environment. Springer Verlag, Berlin, 605 pp.
- Imberger, J. & R.H. Spigel, 1987. Circulation and mixing in Lake Rotongaio and Lake Okaro under conditions
 of light to moderate winds: preliminary results. New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater
 Research 21: 515-519.
- Imboden, D.M. & A. Wüest, 1995. Mixing mechanisms in lakes. In Lerman A., Imboden D.M. & Gat J.R.
 (Eds.), Lakes: Chemistry, Geology and Physics, 2nd edn, Springer-Verlag, New York: 83–138.
- Jassby, A. & T. Powell, 1975. Vertical patterns of eddy diffusion during stratification in Castle Lake,
 California. Limnology and Oceanography 20: 530-543.
- Jaworski, G.H.M., S.W. Wiseman & C.S. Reynolds, 1988. Variability in sinking rate of the freshwater diatom
 Asterionella formosa: the influence of colony morphology. British Phycological Journal 23: 167-176.
- Jenkinson, I.R. & J. Sun, 2010. Rheological properties of natural waters with regard to plankton thin layers.
 A short review. Journal of Marine Systems 83: 287–297.
- Jiang, H., C. Meneveau & T.R. Osborn, 1999. Numerical study of the feeding current around a copepod.
 Journal of Plankton Research 21: 1391-1421.
- Jiang, L., O. Schofield, J.P. Falkowski, 2005. Adaptive evolution of phytoplankton cell size. The American
 Naturalist 166: 496-505.
- 1005 Julien, P.Y., 2002. River Mechanics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 434 pp.
- Jung, S.W., S.J. Youn, H.H. Shin, S.M. Yun, J.S. Ki & J.H. Lee, 2013. Effect of temperature on changes in size
 and morphology of the marine diatom, *Ditylum brightwellii* (West) Grunow (Bacillariophyceae).
 Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Research 135: 128–136.
- Kahn, N. & E. Swift, 1978. Positive buoyancy through ionic control in the non-motile marine dinoflagellate
 Pyrocystis noctiluca Murray ex Schuett. Limnology and Oceanography 23: 649–658.

- Kamykowski, D., R.E. Reed & G.J. Kirkpatrick, 1992. Comparison of sinking velocity, swimming velocity,
 rotation and path characteristics among six dinoflagellate species. Marine Biology 113: 319-328.
- Karp-Boss, L. & E. Boss, 2016. The elongated, the squat and the spherical: selective pressure for
 phytoplankton shape. In Glibert P.M. & T.M. Kana (eds), Aquatic microbial ecology and
 biogeochemistry: A dual perspective. Springer, Heidelberg: 25-34.
- 1016 Kasprzak, P., T. Shatwell, M.O. Gessner, T. Gonsiorczyk, G. Krillin, G.B. Selmeczy, J. Padisák & C. Engelhardt,
 1017 2017. Extreme weather event triggers cascade towards extreme turbidity in a clear-water lake.
 1018 Ecosystems 20: 1407-1420.
- 1019 Katsiapi, M., A. D: Mazaris, E. Charalampous & M- Moustaka-Gouni, 2012. Watershed land use types as
 1020 drivers of freshwater phytoplankton structure. Hydrobiologia 698: 121-131.
- 1021 Kessler, J.O., 1985. Hydrodynamic focussing of motile algal cells. Nature 313: 218-220.
- Kilham, P. & S.S. Kilham, 1980. The evolutionary ecology of phytoplankton. In Morris, I. (ed.), The
 Physiological Ecology of Phytoplankton. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford: 571-597.
- Kiørboe, T. 2008. A Mechanistic Approach to Plankton Ecology. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 209
 pp.
- Kiørboe, T., H. Ploug, & U.H. Thygesen, 2001. Fluid motion and solute distribution around sinking
 aggregates. I. Small-scale fluxes and heterogeneity of nutrients in the pelagic environment. Marine
 Ecology Progress Series 211: 1–13.
- Koch, D.L. & G. Subramainan, 2011. Collective hydrodynamics of swimming microorganisms: living fluids.
 Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics 43: 637-659.
- Kozawa, T., K. Sugitani, D.Z. Oehler, C.H. House, I. Saito, T. Watanabe & T. Gotoh, 2019. Early Archean
 planktonic mode of life: Implications from fluid dynamics of lenticular microfossils. Geobiology 17:
 113-126.
- Kruk, C., V.L.M. Huszar, E.T.H.M. Peeters, S. Bonilla, L. Costa, M. Lürling, C.S. Reynolds & M. Scheffer, 2010.
 A morphological classification capturing functional variation in phytoplankton. Freshwater Biology 55:
 614–627
- Lampert, W., 2001. Survival in a varying environment: phenotypic and genotypic responses in Daphnia
 populations. Limnetica 20: 3-14.
- Larsen, P. S. & H. U. Riisgård, 2009. Viscosity and not biological mechanisms often controls the effects of
 temperature on ciliary activity and swimming velocity of small aquatic organisms. Journal of
 Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 381: 67–73.
- Larsen, P. S., C. V. Madsen & H. U. Riisgård, 2008. Effect of temperature and viscosity on swimming velocity
 of the copepod *Acartia tonsa*, brine shrimp *Artemia salina* and rotifer *Brachionus plicatilis*. Aquatic
 Biology 4: 47–54.
- 1045 Lauga, E., 2016. Bacterial hydrodynamics. Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics 48: 105-130.
- Lewis Jr., W.M., 1973. The thermal regime of lake Lanao (Philippines) and its theoretical implications for
 tropical lakes. Limnology and Oceanography 18: 200-217.
- Litchman, E. & C.A. Klausmeier, 2008. Trait-based community ecology of phytoplankton. Annual Review of
 Ecology Evolution and Systematics 39:615–639.
- Litchman, E., C.A. Klausmeier & K. Yoshiyama, 2009. Contrasting size evolution in marine and freshwater
 diatoms. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS) 106:
 2665-2670.

1053 Litchman, E., P. de Tezanos Pinto, K.F. Edwards, C.A. Klausmeier, C.T. Kremer & M.K. Thomas, 2015. Global 1054 biogeochemical impacts of phytoplankton: a trait-base perspective. Journal of Ecology 103: 1384-1396. 1055 Lucas, L.V., J.K. Thompson & L.R. Brown, 2009. Why are diverse relationships observed between 1056 phytoplankton biomass and transport time? Limnology and Oceanography 54: 381-390. 1057 Lund, J.W.G., 1959. Buoyancy in relation to the ecology of the freshwater phytoplankton. British 1058 Phycological Bulletin 1: 1-17. 1059 Lürling, M., 2003. Phenotypic plasticity in the green algae Desmodesmus and Scenedesmus with special 1060 reference to the induction of defensive morphology. Annales de Limnologie - International Journal of 1061 Limnology 39: 85-101. 1062 MacArthur, R.H. & E.O. Wilson, 1967. The theory of island biogeography. Princeton University Press, 1063 Princeton, 203 pp. 1064 MacIntyre, S., 1998. Turbulent mixing and resource supply to phytoplankton. In Imberger, J. (ed.), Physical 1065 processes in lakes and oceans. Coastal and Estuarine Studies 54. American Geophysical Union, 1066 Washington DC: 561-590. 1067 Mahadevan, A., 2016. The impact of submesoscale physics on primary productivity of plankton. Annual 1068 Review of Marine Science 8: 161-184. 1069 Marañón, E., 2014. Cell size as a key determinant of phytoplankton metabolism and community structure. 1070 Annual Review of Marine Science 7: 241-264. 1071 Marañón, E., P. Cermeño, M. Latasa, & R.D. Tadonleke, 2015. Resource supply alone explains the variability 1072 of marine phytoplankton size structure. Limnology and Oceanography 60: 1848–1854. 1073 Margalef, R., 1957. Nuevos aspectos del problema de la suspensión en los organismos planctónicos. 1074 Investigación Pesquera 7: 105-116. 1075 Margalef, R., 1978. Life-forms of phytoplankton as survival alternatives in an unstable environment. 1076 Oceanologica Acta 1: 493-509. 1077 Martin, A.P., 2003. Phytoplankton patchiness: the role of lateral stirring and mixing. Progress in 1078 Oceanography 57: 125-174. 1079 McNown, J.S. & J. Malaika, 1950. Effects of particle shape on settling velocity at low Reynolds Numbers. 1080 Transactions of the American Geophysical Union 31: 74-82. 1081 Miklasz, K.A. & M.W. Denny, 2010. Diatom sinking speeds: improved predictions and insight from a 1082 modified Stokes' law. Limnology and Oceanography 55: 2513-2525. 1083 Mitra, A., K. J. Flynn, U. Tillmann, J. A. Raven, D. Caron, D. K. Stoecker, F. Not, P. J. Hansen, G. Hallegraeff, R. 1084 Sanders, S. Wilken, G. McManus, M. Johnson, P. Pitta, S. Våge, T. Berge, A. Calbet, F. Thingstad, H. J. 1085 Jeong, J.-A. Burkholder, P. M. Glibert, E. Granéli & V. Lundgren, 2016. Defining planktonic protist 1086 functional groups on mechanisms for energy and nutrient acquisition: incorporation of diverse 1087 mixotrophic strategies. Protists 167: 106–120. 1088 Moison, M., F.G. Schmitt & S. Souissi, 2012. Effect of temperature on Temora longicornis swimming 1089 behaviour: illustration of seasonal effects in a temperate ecosystem. Aquatic Biology 16: 149–161. 1090 Moreno-Ostos, E., L. Cruz-Pizarro, A. Basanta & D.G. George, 2009. The influence of wind induced mixing on 1091 the vertical distribution of buoyant and sinking phytoplankton species. Aquatic Ecology 43: 271-284. 1092 Mousing, E.A., M. Ellegaard & K. Richardson, 2014. Global patterns in phytoplankton community size 1093 structure – evidence for a direct temperature effect. Marine Ecology Progress Series 497: 25-38.

- Mousing, E.A., S. Ribeiro, C. Chisholm, A. Kuijpers, M. Moros & M. Ellegaard, 2017. Size differences of Arctic
 marine protists between two climate periods—using the paleoecological record to assess the
 importance of within-species trait variation. Ecology and Evolution 7: 3-13.
- Mousing, E.A., K. Richardson & M. Ellegaard, 2018. Global patterns in phytoplankton biomass and
 community size structure in relation to macronutrients in the open ocean. Limnology and
 Oceanography 63: 1298-1312.
- Munk, W.H. & J.A. Riley, 1952. Absorption of nutrients by aquatic plants. Journal of Marine Research 11:
 215–240.
- 1102 Nakano, S.-i., 2014. Biodiversity researches on microbial loop in Aquatic Systems. In Okuda N., K.
 1103 Watanabe, K. Fukumori, S.-i. Nakano & T. Nakazawa (eds), Biodiversity in Aquatic Systems and
 1104 Environments. Lake Biwa. Springer, Tokyo: 51-67.
- Naselli-Flores, L., 2000. Phytoplankton assemblage in twenty-one Sicilian reservoirs: relationships between
 species composition and environmental factors. Hydrobiologia 424: 1–11.
- 1107 Naselli-Flores, L., 2003. Man-made lakes in Mediterranean semi-arid climate: the strange case of Dr Deep
 1108 Lake and Mr Shallow Lake. Hydrobiologia 506-509: 13-21.
- Naselli-Flores, L., 2011. Mediterranean climate and eutrophication of reservoirs: limnological skills to
 improve management. In Ansari A.A., S.S. Gill, G.R. Lanza & W. Rast (eds), Eutrophication: causes,
 consequences and control. Springer, Dordrecht: 131–142.
- Naselli-Flores, L., 2014. Morphological analysis of phytoplankton as a tool to assess ecological state of
 aquatic ecosystems: the case of Lake Arancio, Sicily, Italy. Inland Waters 4: 15-26.
- Naselli-Flores, L. & R. Barone, 2000. Phytoplankton dynamics and structure: a comparative analysis in
 natural and man-made water bodies of different trophic state. Hydrobiologia 438: 65-74.
- 1116 Naselli-Flores, L. & R. Barone, 2005. Water-level fluctuations in Mediterranean reservoirs: setting a
 1117 dewatering threshold as a management tool to improve water quality. Hydrobiologia 548: 85-99.
- Naselli-Flores, L. & R. Barone, 2007. Pluriannual morphological variability of phytoplankton in a highly
 productive Mediterranean reservoir (Lake Arancio, Southwestern Sicily). Hydrobiologia 578: 87-95.
- Naselli-Flores, L. & R. Barone, 2011. Fight on plankton! Or, phytoplankton shape and size as adaptive tools
 to get ahead in the struggle for life. Cryptogamie Algologie 32: 157-204.
- Naselli-Flores, L. & R. Barone, 2019. Mixotrophic phytoplankton dynamics in a shallow Mediterranean
 water body: how to make a virtue out of necessity. Hydrobiologia 831: 33-41.
- 1124 Naselli-Flores, L., J. Padisák & M. Albay, 2007. Shape and size in phytoplankton ecology: do they matter?
 1µ25 Hydrobiologia 578: 157-161.
- Ng, S.M.Y., J.P. Antenucci, M.R. Hipsey, G. Tibor & T. Zohary, 2011. Physical controls on the spatial evolution
 of a dinoflagellate bloom in a large lake. Limnology and Oceanography 56: 2265-2281.
- O'Malley, S. & M.A. Bees, 2011. The orientation of swimming biflagellates in shear flows. Bulletin of
 Mathematical Biology 74: 232-255.
- Padisák, J., 1992. Seasonal succession of phytoplankton in a large shallow lake (Balaton, Hungary) a
 dynamic approach to ecological memory, its possible role and mechanisms. Journal of Ecology 80:
 217–230.
- Padisák, J. & L. G.-Tóth, 1991. Some aspects of the ecology of the subdominant green algae in a large
 nutrient limited shallow lake (Balaton, Hungary). Archiv für Protistenkunde 139: 225-242.

- Padisák, J., É. Soróczki-Pintér & Z. Rezner, 2003. Sinking properties of some phytoplankton shapes and the
 relation of form resistance to morphological diversity of phytoplankton an experimental study.
 Hydrobiologia 500: 243-257.
- Padisák, J., É. Hajnal, L. Krienitz, J. Lakner & V Üveges, 2010a. Rarity, ecological memory, rate of floral
 change in phytoplankton and the mistery of the Red Cock. Hydrobiologia 653: 45-64.
- Padisák, J., É. Hajnal, L. Naselli-Flores, M.T. Dokulil, P. Nõges & T. Zohary, 2010b. Convergence and
 divergence in organization of phytoplankton communities under various regimes of physical and
 biological control. Hydrobiologia 639: 205-220.
- Pahlow, M., U. Riebesell & D.A. Wolf-Gladrow, 1997. Impact of cell shape and chain formation on nutrient
 acquisition by marine diatoms. Limnology and Oceanography 42: 1660-1672.
- Pareeth, S., M. Bresciani, F. Buzzi, B. Leoni, F. Lepori, A. Ludovisi, G. Morabito, R. Adrian, M. Neteler & N.
 Salmaso, 2016. Warming trends of perialpine lakes from homogenised time series of historical satellite
 and *in-situ* data. Science of the Total Environment 578: 417-426.
- 1148Pasciak, W.J. & J. Gavis, 1974. Transport limitation of nutrient uptake in phytoplankton. Limnology and1149Oceanography 19: 881-889.
- Paerl, H.W. & T.G. Otten, 2013. Harmful cyanobacterial blooms: causes, consequences, and controls.
 Microbial Ecology 65: 995-1010.
- Pedley, T.J. & J.O. Kessler, 1992. Hydrodynamic phenomena in suspensions of swimming microorganisms.
 Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics 24: 313-358.
- Peperzak, L., F. Colijn, R. Koeman, W.W.C. Gieskes & J.C.A. Joordens, 2003. Phytoplankton sinking rates in
 the Rhine region of freshwater influence. Journal of Plankton Research 25: 365-383.
- Peter, K.H., U. Sommer, 2013. Phytoplankton cell size reduction in response to warming mediated bynutrient limitation. PLoS ONE 8: e71528.
- Peters, F., L. Arin, C. Marrasé, E. Berdalet, & M.M. Sala, 2006. Effects of small-scale turbulence on the
 growth of two diatoms of different size in a phosphorous-limited medium. Journal of Marine Systems
 61: 134–148.
- Ploug, H., W. Stolte & B.B. Jørgensen, 1999. Diffusive boundary layers of the colony-forming plankton alga
 Pheocystis sp. implications for nutrient uptake and cellular growth. Limnology and Oceanography 44:
 1959-1967.
- Prairie, J.C., P.J.S. Franks & J.S. Jaffe, 2010. Cryptic peaks: Invisible vertical structure in fluorescent particles
 revealed using a planar laser imaging fluorometer. Limnology and Oceanography 55: 1943–1958.
- Prairie, J.C., K.R. Sutherland, K.J. Nickols & A.M. Kaltenberg, 2012. Biophysical interactions in the plankton:
 A cross-scale review. Limnology and Oceanography: Fluids and Environments 2: 121-145.
- Ptacnik, R., S. Diehl & S. Berger, 2003. Performance of sinking and nonsinking phytoplankton taxa in a
 gradient of mixing depths. Limnology and Oceanography 48: 1903-1912.
- Pulina, S., C.T. Satta, B.M. Padedda, N. Sechi & A. Lugliè, 2018. Seasonal variations of phytoplankton size
 structure in relation to environmental variables in three Mediterranean shallow coastal lagoons.
 Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 212: 95-104.
- Pulina, S., A. Lugliè, M.A. Mariani, M. Sarria, N. Sechi & B.M. Padedda, 2019. Multiannual decrement of
 nutrient concentration and phytoplankton cell size in a Mediterranean reservoir. Nature Conservation
 34: 163-191.

- 1176 Raschdorf, O., F.D. Müller, M. Pósfai, J.M. Plitzko, & D. Schüler, 2013. The magnetosome proteins MamX,
 1177 MamZ and MamH are involved in redox control of magnetite biomineralization in *Magnetospirillum* 1178 *gryphiswaldense*. Molecular microbiology 89:872-886.
- 1179 Rasconi, S., A. Gall, K. Winter & M.J. Kainz, 2015. Increasing water temperature triggers dominance of small
 1180 freshwater plankton. PLOS ONE. 10: e0140449
- 1181 Reigada, R., R.M. Hillary, M.A. Bees, J.M. Sancho & F. Sagués, 2003. Plankton blooms induced by turbulent
 1182 flows. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 270: 875-880.
- 1183 Reynolds, C.S., 1973. The seasonal periodicity of planktonic diatoms in a shallow eutrophic lake. Freshwater
 1184 Biology 3: 89-110.
- 1185 Reynolds, C.S., 1976a. Sinking movements of phytoplankton indicated by a simple trapping method. I. A
 Fragilaria population. British phycological Journal 11: 279-291.
- 1187 Reynolds, C.S., 1976b. Sinking movements of phytoplankton indicated by a simple trapping method. II.
 1188 Vertical activity ranges in a stratified lake. British phycological Journal 11: 293-303.
- 1189 Reynolds, C.S., 1984a. The ecology of freshwater phytoplankton. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
 1190 384 pp.
- 1191 Reynolds, C.S., 1984b. Phytoplankton periodicity: the interactions of form, function and environmental
 1192 variability. Freshwater Biology 14: 111-142.
- 1193 Reynolds, C.S., 1988. Functional morphology and the adaptive strategies of freshwater phytoplankton. In
 1194 C.D. Sandgren (ed.), Growth and Reproductive Strategies of Freshwater Phytoplankton. Cambridge
 1195 University Press, Cambridge: 338–433.
- 1196 Reynolds, C.S., 1989. Physical determinants of phytoplankton succession. In U. Sommer (ed.), Plankton
 1197 Ecology. Succession in Plankton Communities. Springer, Berlin: 9-56.
- 1198 Reynolds, C.S., 1990. Temporal scales of variability in pelagic environments and the response of
 phytoplankton. Freshwater Biology 23: 25-53.
- 1200 Reynolds, C.S., 1993. Scales of disturbance and their role in plankton ecology. Hydrobiologia 249: 157-171.
- Reynolds, C.S., 1994. The role of fluid motion in the dynamics of phytoplankton in lakes and rivers. In P.S.
 Giller, A.G. Hildrew & D.G. Raffaelli (eds), Aquatic Ecology: Scale, Pattern and Process. Blackwell
 Scientific Publications, Oxford: 141–87.
- Reynolds, C.S., 1995. Successional change in the planktonic vegetation: species, structures, scales. In I. Joint
 (ed.), Molecular Ecology of Aquatic Microbes. Springer, Berlin: 115–132.
- Reynolds, C.S., 1997. Vegetation processes in the pelagic: a model for ecosystem theory. Ecology Institute,
 Oldendorf/Luhe: 371 pp.
- Reynolds, C.S., 1998. Plants in motion: physical biological interactions in the plankton. In Imberger, J.
 (ed.), Physical processes in lakes and oceans. Coastal and Estuarine Studies 54. American Geophysical
 Union, Washington DC: 535-560.
- 1211 Reynolds, C.S., 2003. Pelagic community assembly and the habitat template. Bocconea 16: 323-339.
- 1212 Reynolds, C.S., 2006. The Ecology of Phytoplankton. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 535 pp.
- Reynolds, C.S., 2007. Variability in the provision and function of mucilage in phytoplankton: facultative
 responses to the environment. Hydrobiologia 578: 37-45.
- Reynolds, C.S., 2012a. Environmental requirements and habitat preferences of phytoplankton: chance and
 certainty in species selection. Botanica Marina 55: 1-17.

- Reynolds, C.S., 2012b. Pelagic Ecology. In A.H. El-Shaarawi & W.W. Piegorsch (eds), Encyclopedia of
 Environmetrics, 2nd Edition. John Wiley & Sons, New York: 1812-1818.
- 1219 Reynolds, C.S. & A.E. Walsby, 1975. Water blooms. Biological Reviews 50: 437-481.
- Reynolds, C.S. & S.W. Wiseman, 1982. Sinking losses of phytoplankton in closed limnetic systems. Journal of
 Plankton Research 4: 489-522.
- Reynolds, C.S., S.W. Wiseman, B.M. Godfrey & C. Butterwick, 1983. Some effects of artificial mixing on the
 dynamics of phytoplankton populations in large limnetic enclosures. Journal of Plankton Research 5:
 203–234.
- Reynolds, C.S., V. Montecino, M.E. Graf & S. Cabrera, 1986. Short-term dynamics of a *Melosira* population
 in the plankton of an impoundment in central Chile. Journal of Plankton Research 8: 715-740.
- Reynolds, C.S., R.L. Oliver & A.E. Walsby, 1987. Cyanobacterial dominance: the role of buoyancy regulation
 in dynamic lake environments. New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 21: 379–399.
- Reynolds, C. S., J. Padisák & I. Kóbor, 1993. A localized bloom of *Dinobryon sociale* in Lake Balaton: Some
 implications for the perception of patchiness and the maintenance of species richness. Abstracta
 Botanica 17: 251-260.
- 1232 Reynolds, C.S., V. Huszar, C. Kruk, L. Naselli-Flores & S. Melo, 2002. Towards a functional classification of
 1233 the freshwater phytoplankton. Journal of Plankton Research 24: 417-428.
- Riebesell, U., 1989. Comparison of sinking and sedimentation rate measurements in a diatom winter/spring
 bloom. Marine Ecology Progress Series 54: 109-119.
- Riebesell, U. & D.A. Wolf-Gladrow, 2002. Supply and uptake of inorganic nutrients. In Williams, P.J. le B.,
 D.N. Thomas & C.S. Reynolds (eds), Phytoplankton Productivity. Carbon Assimilation in Marine and
 Freshwater Ecosystems. Blackwell Science, Oxford: 109–140.
- Robarts, R.D. & P.R.B. Ward, 1978. Vertical diffusion and nutrient transport in a tropical lake (Lake
 McIlwaine, Rhodesia). Hydrobiologia 59: 213-221.
- Robarts, R.D. & T. Zohary, 1984. *Microcystis aeruginosa* and underwater light attenuation in a hypertrophic
 lake (Hartbeespoort Dam, South Africa). Journal of Ecology 72: 1001-1017
- Rodrigo, M.A., D.C. Pierson, K. Petterson, E. Kaup & J. Padisák, 1998. Sinking and floating rates of natural
 phytoplankton assemblages in Lake Erken. Archiv für Hydrobiologie, Special Issues, Advances in
 Limnology 51: 143-156.
- Rugema, E., F. Darchambeau, H. Sarmento, M. Stoyneva-Gärtner, M. Leitao, W. Thiery, A. Latli & J.-P. Descy,
 2019. Long-term change of phytoplankton in Lake Kivu: The rise of the greens. Freshwater Biology 64:
 1940-1955.
- Salas de Leon, D.A., J. Alcocer, V. Ardiles Gloria & B. Quiroz-Martínez, 2016. Estimation of the eddy diffusity
 coefficient in a warm monomictic tropical lake. Journal of Limnology 75(s1): 161-168.
- Salcher, M.M., J. Pernthaler, N. Frater & T. Posch, 2011. Vertical and longitudinal distribution patterns of
 different bacterioplankton populations in a canyon-shaped, deep prealpine lake. Limnology and
 Oceanography 56: 2027–2039.
- Seip, K.L. & C.S. Reynolds, 1995. Phytoplankton functional attributes along trophic gradient and season.
 Limnology and Oceanography 40: 589-597.
- Selmeczy, G.B., K. Tapolczai, P. Casper, L. Krienitz & J. Padisák, 2016. Spatial and niche segregation of DCM forming cyanobacteria in Lake Stechlin (Germany). Hydrobiologia 764: 229-240.
- 1258 Sigman, D.M. & M.P. Hain, 2012. The biological productivity of the ocean. Nature Education 3: 1-16.

- Simoncelli, S., S.J. Thackeray & D.J. Wain, 2018. On biogenic turbulence production and mixing from
 vertically migrating zooplankton in lakes. Aquatic Sciences 80: 35.
- Simoncelli, S., S.J. Thackeray & D.J. Wain, 2019. Effect of temperature on zooplankton vertical migration
 velocity. Hydrobiologia 829: 143-166.
- Smayda, T.J., 1970. The suspension and sinking of phytoplankton in the sea. Oceanography and Marine
 Biology, An Annual Review 8: 353-414.
- Smayda, T.J. & B.J. Boleyn, 1965. Experimental observations on the flotation of marine diatoms. I.
 Thalassiosira cf. *nana*, *Thalassiosira rotula* and *Nitzschia seriata*. Limnology and Oceanography 10:
 499-509.
- Smol, J.P., S.R. Brown & H.J. McIntosh, 1984. A hypothetical relationship between differential algal
 sedimentation and diatom succession. Verhandlungern der Internationale Vereinigung für
 theoretische und angewandte Limnologie 22:1361-1365.
- Smol, J.P., A.P. Wolfe, H.J.B. Birks, M.S.V. Douglas, V.J. Jones, A. Korhola, R. Pienitz, K. Rühland, S. Sorvari, D.
 Antoniades, S.J. Brooks, M.-A. Fallu, M. Hughes, B.E. Keatley, T.E. Laing, N. Michelutti, L. Nazarova, M.
 Nyman, A.M. Paterson, B. Perren, R. Quinlan, M. Rautio, É. Saulnier-Talbot, S. Siitonen, N. Solovieva, &
 J. Weckström, 2005. Climate-driven regime shifts in the biological communities of Arctic lakes.
 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS) 102: 43974402.
- 1277 Sommer, U., 1988. Some size relationships in phytoflagellate motility. Hydrobiologia 161: 125-131.
- Sommer, U., K.H. Peter, S. Genitsaris & M. Moustaka-Gouni, 2017. Do marine phytoplankton follow
 Bergmann's rule *sensu lato*? Biological Reviews 92: 1011-1026.
- Sommer, U., E. Charalampous, S. Genitsaris & M. Moustaka-Gouni, 2017. Benefits, costs and taxonomic
 distribution of marine phytoplankton body size. Journal of Plankton Research 39: 494-508.
- Souza, M.B.G., C.F.A. Barros, F.A.R. Barbosa. É. Hajnal & J. Padisák, 2008. Role of atelomixis in replacement
 of phytoplankton assemblages in Dom Helvécio Lake, South-East Brazil. Hydrobiologa 607: 211-224.
- Spatharis, S., V. Lamprinou, A. Meziti, K.A. Kormas, D.D. Danielidis, E. Smeti, D.L. Roelke, R. Mancy & G.
 Tsirtsis, 2019. Everything is not everywhere: can marine compartments shape phytoplankton
 assemblages? Proceedings of the Royal Society B 286: 20191890.
- Stanca, E., M. Cellamare & A. Basset, 2013. Geometric shape as a trait to study phytoplankton distribution
 in aquatic ecosystems. Hydrobiologia 701: 99-116.
- 1289 Subramanian, G., 2010. Viscosity-enhanced bio-mixing of the oceans. Current Science 98: 1103-1108.
- Tang, K.W., W.O. Smith Jr., D.T. Elliott & A.R. Shields, 2008. Colony size of *Phaeocystis antarctica* (Prymnesiophyceae) as influenced by zooplankton grazers. Journal of Phycology 44: 1372-1378.
- Taylor, J.R., 2016. Turbulent mixing, restratification, and phytoplankton growth at a submesoscale eddy.
 Geophysical Research Letters 43: 5784-5792.
- Teixeira de Lima, D., G.A. Oliveira Moser, F. Reinhardt Piedras, L. Cotrim da Cunha, D. Rivera Tenenbaum,
 M.M. Barboza Tenório, M.V. Pereira Borges de Campos, T. de Oliveira Cornejo & J.J. Barrera-Alba,
 2019. Abiotic changes driving microphytoplankton functional diversity in Admiralty Bay, King George
 Island (Antarctica). Frontiers in Marine Science 6:638.
- 1298 Thompson, D.W., 1917. On growth and form. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 793 pp.
- Toseland, A., S.J. Daines, J.R. Clark, A. Kirkham, J. Strauss, C. Uhlig, T.M. Lenton, K. Valentin, G.A. Pearson, V.
 Moulton & T. Mock, 2013. The impact of temperature on marine phytoplankton resource allocation
 and metabolism. Nature Climate 3: 979-984.

- 1302 Van Donk, E., A. Ianora & M. Vos, 2011. Induced defences in marine and freshwater phytoplankton: A
 1303 review. Hydrobiologia 668: 3-19.
- 1304 Van Teeseling, M.C.F., M.A. de Pedro & F. Cava, 2017. Determinants of bacterial morphology: from
 1305 fundamentals to possibilities for antimicrobial targeting. Frontiers in Microbiology 8: 1264.
- 1306 Verschoor, A.M., 2005. Hard to handle. Inducible defences in plankton. PhD dissertation, Radboud
 1307 University Nijmegen, Nijmegen, pp. 200 (<u>http://hdl.handle.net/2066/19587</u> last accessed on October
 1308 14th, 2019).
- 1309 Visser, A.W., 2007. Biomixing of the oceans? Science 316: 838-839.
- Visser, P.M., B.W. Ibelings, M. Bormans & J. Huisman, 2016. Artificial mixing to control cyanobacteria
 blooms: a review. Aquatic Ecology 50: 423-441.
- 1312 Vogel, S., 1994. Life in moving fluids. The physical biology of flow. 2nd Ed. Princeton University Press,
 1313 Princeton, 467 pp.
- 1314 Walsby, A.E., 1994. Gas vesicles. Microbiological Reviews 58: 94-144.
- Walsby, A.E. & C.S. Reynolds, 1980. Sinking and floating. In Morris, I. (ed.), The Physiological Ecology of
 Phytoplankton. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford: 371–412.
- Walsby, A.E. & D.P. Holland, 2006. Sinking velocities of phytoplankton measured on a stable density
 gradient by laser scanning. Journal of the Royal Society Interface 3: 429-439.
- Weissing, F.J. & J. Huisman, 1994. Growth and competition in a light gradient. Journal of Theoretical Biology
 168: 323-336.
- Wheeler, J.D., E. Secchi, R. Rusconi & R. Stocker, 2019. Not just going with the flow: the effects of fluid flow
 on bacteria and plankton. Annual Review of Cell and Developmental Biology 35: 213-237.
- Wiseman, S.W. & C.S. Reynolds, 1981. Sinking rate and electrophoretic mobility of the freshwater diatom
 Asterionella formosa: an experimental investigation. British Phycological Journal 16: 357-361.
- 1325 Winder, M. & U. Sommer, 2012. Phytoplankton response to a changing climate. Hydrobiologia 698: 5-16.
- Winder, M., J.E. Reuter & S.G. Schladow, 2009. Lake warming favours small-sized planktonic diatom
 species. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 276: 427-435.
- Woodward, J.R., J.W. Pitchford & M.A. Bees, 2019. Physical flow effects can dictate plankton population
 dynamics. Journal of the Royal Society Interface 16: 20190247.
- Wu, X., C. Noss, L. Liu & A. Lorke, 2019. Effects of small-scale turbulence at the air-water interface on
 Microcystis surface scum formation. Water Research 167: 115091.
- 1332 Wüest, A. & A. Lorke, 2003. Small-scale hydrodynamics in lakes. Annual Reviews in Fluid Mechanics 35:
 1333 273–412.
- Xiao, M., M. Li & C.S. Reynolds, 2018. Colony formation in the cyanobacterium *Microcystis*. Biological
 Reviews 93: 1399-1420.
- Zapomělová, E., P. Hrouzek, K. Rěháková, M. Sabacká, M. Stibal, L. Caisová, J. Komárková & A. Lukešová,
 2008. Morphological variability in selected heterocystous cyanobacterial strains as a response to
 varied temperature, light intensity and medium composition. Folia Microbiologica 53: 333-341.
- Zohary, T. & R.D. Robarts, 1990. Hyperscums and the population dynamics of *Microcystis aeruginosa*.
 Journal of Plankton Research 12: 423-432.

- Zohary, T., T. Fishbein, M. Shlichter & L. Naselli-Flores, 2017. Larger cell or colony size in winter, smaller in
 summer a pattern shared by many species of Lake Kinneret phytoplankton. Inland Waters 7: 200 209.
- 1344 Zohary, T., G. Flaim & U. Sommer, 2020. Temperature and the size of freshwater phytoplankton.
- 1345 Hydrobiologia (in review)
- 1346

1347

Figure captions

1348 Figure 1. Temporal trends of water temperature and phytoplankton size, expressed as volume per

1349 colony, of two phytoplankton species (Aulacoseira granulata (Ehrenberg) Simonsen and Hariotina

1β50 *reticulata* P._A. Dangeard) recorded in Lake Arancio (Sicily, Italy) over an eight-year period.

1351 Temperature was measured with a YSI 556 MPS multiprobe; methods for phytoplankton colony

1352 volume calculations are those in Zohary et al. (2017).

1353 Figure 2. Relationships between phytoplankton size and sinking velocity (*w_s*) computed according

to Stokes' equation in the temperature range 10 - 30 °C for spherical shapes with a cell-density of

1355 1.15 g cm⁻³. When temperature changes (and the related water density and viscosity), smaller

1356 cells/colonies have to be selected to keep a given sinking velocity constant.

1357 Figure 3. Variability of sinking velocity of phytoplankton (w_s) and its maximum growth rates at 20

1358 °C (r_{20}), as a function of size, expressed here as the surface to volume ratio (sv^{-1}).



1361 Fig. 1





1369 Fig. 3