
Recovery trajectories following the reduction of urban nutrient inputs along the eutrophication gradient in French Mediterranean lagoons

Derolez Valérie ^{1,*}, Bec Béatrice ², Munaron Dominique ¹, Fiandrino Annie ¹, Pete Romain ², Simier Monique ⁵, Souchu Philippe ³, Laugier Thierry ¹, Aliaume Catherine ², Malet Nathalie ⁴

¹ MARBEC (Univ. Montpellier, CNRS, Ifremer, IRD), Sète, France

² MARBEC (Univ. Montpellier, CNRS, Ifremer, IRD), Montpellier, France

³ Ifremer, LER-MPL, Nantes, France

⁴ Ifremer, LER-PAC-Corse, Bastia, France

* Corresponding author : Valérie Derolez, email address : valerie.derolez@ifremer.fr

Highlights

► Significant reductions in water nutrient concentrations due to decreasing urban nutrient loading. ► Evidence for rapid recovery (1–3 y) of hypertrophic & eutrophic lagoons found in the water column. ► Almost complete recovery observed for the eutrophic lagoon, highlighting no hysteresis. ► The recovery patterns depend on the eutrophication status before remediation. ► Feedback responses suggest ecosystem regimes can become unstable.

1

2 **1. Introduction**

3 Mediterranean coastal lagoons are often surrounded by densely populated areas and
4 are consequently subject to strong anthropogenic pressure, and particularly high levels
5 of inputs of domestic sewage (Viaroli et al. 2008; Zaldívar, Cardoso, et al. 2008; Souchu
6 et al. 2010). In addition to this urban pressure, the transitional status of these waters
7 makes these ecosystems particularly vulnerable to eutrophication (de Jonge & Elliott
8 2001; Newton et al. 2014). Eutrophication of coastal ecosystems is a worldwide issue
9 which has been described for decades (Nixon 1995; Cloern 2001). The increase in
10 nutrient inputs, enhanced by urbanisation, agriculture or industry, leads to a complex
11 cascade of both direct and indirect responses by ecosystems (Schramm 1999; Viaroli et
12 al. 2008). Anthropogenic eutrophication causes ecological damage including anoxic
13 crises, toxic algal blooms, even loss of species, and more widely, deterioration of
14 ecosystem functions and the services they provide (Cloern 2001; Zaldívar et al. 2008).

15 In recent decades, several legal and managerial frameworks have been designed to
16 reduce human pressure on aquatic ecosystems and to establish ambitious ecological
17 quality targets, e.g., EC Nitrate Directive and Water Framework Directive (WFD) (EC
18 1991; EC 2000) or the US Clean Water Act (USEPA 2002). In particular, mitigation
19 actions have targeted sewerage networks in estuarine watersheds, and have resulted in
20 their recovery at varying speeds and with various patterns (Lie et al. 2011; Saeck et al.
21 2013; Staehr et al. 2017). While the degradation trajectories of coastal ecosystems
22 subjected to eutrophication have been extensively described (Schramm 1999; Cloern
23 2001; de Jonge et al. 2002; Viaroli et al. 2008), recovery trajectories have only recently
24 been studied (Duarte et al. 2009; Borja et al. 2010; McCrackin et al. 2017). Moreover,
25 the rate of improvement after mitigation works on coastal ecosystems is not well known,
26 even though this information is indispensable to assess recovery effectiveness and to

1 guide future management actions (McCrackin et al. 2017). Only a few studies have been
2 conducted on the recovery process of French coastal lagoons, and they focused on
3 selected water bodies (Collos et al. 2009; Leruste et al. 2016; Pasqualini et al. 2017).
4 These studies emphasised shifts in communities of primary producers after mitigation
5 actions. The originality of our study is that we used a large set of data collected from
6 2001 to 2014 from 16 French Mediterranean coastal lagoons, thereby covering the whole
7 eutrophication gradient from oligotrophic to hypertrophic. Some of these lagoons have
8 been receiving large quantities of urban nutrient inputs for decades, leading to extremely
9 high levels of phytoplankton biomass, associated with high pico- and nano-
10 phytoplankton abundances in the most degraded lagoons (annual median values >100
11 $\mu\text{g Chl } a.L^{-1}$, $>10^9$ and $>10^{10}$ $\text{cell}.L^{-1}$, respectively, Souchu et al. 2010; Bec et al. 2011).
12 Large-scale management actions were recently undertaken on waste water treatment
13 systems to restore the quality and the functioning of the ecosystems (De Wit et al. 2015;
14 Leruste et al. 2016). The unprecedented range of anthropogenic eutrophication and the
15 remediation works carried out during the 14-year study period allowed us to analyse
16 recovery trajectories. First we analysed changes in the eutrophication gradient over the
17 study period and identified key parameters. We then focused on three contrasted
18 ecosystems to test the following hypotheses: (i) reducing inputs of urban nutrients has a
19 rapid effect on the nutrient levels and phytoplankton biomass in Mediterranean lagoons;
20 and (ii) the pattern of the recovery trajectories depends on the degree of anthropogenic
21 eutrophication before the remediation actions were undertaken. Analysis of available
22 historical data provided useful information to improve our understanding of the patterns
23 of change in the ecological functioning of coastal lagoons after remediation.

24 **2. Materials and methods**

25 **2.1. Study sites and sampling strategy**

1 Data from 16 French Mediterranean coastal lagoons collected between 2001 and 2014,
2 were analysed. Fourteen of the lagoons are located in the Gulf of Lions, from north of
3 Perpignan to Montpellier, and two in Corsica (Fig. 1). The database includes polyhaline
4 and euhaline microtidal lagoons (annual median salinity > 18) (see Supplementary
5 Material), with surface areas ranging from 1.4 to 75 km², depths ranging from 0.7 to 9 m
6 and volumes ranging from 0.7 to 260 x 10⁶ m³ (Souchu et al. 2010). Details on the
7 morphometric and hydrologic characteristics of the study sites are available in Souchu
8 et al. 2010 and Bec et al. 2011. The lagoons are all connected to the Mediterranean Sea,
9 through direct inlets, or through indirect connections via a canal or another lagoon. The
10 database covers the anthropogenic eutrophication gradient from oligotrophic to
11 hypertrophic lagoons (Bec et al. 2011). In each of the 16 lagoons, water was sampled at
12 one or two stations depending on the size of the lagoon, giving a total of 22 stations:
13 Leucate (LES, LEN), La Palme (LAP), Bages-Sigean (BGS and BGN), Ayrolle (AYR),
14 Gruissan (GRU), Thau (TES, TWS), Ingril (INN and INS), Vic (VIC), Pierre-Blanche
15 (PBE), Arnel (ARN), Prévost (PRE), Méjean (MEW, MEE), Grec (GRC), Or (ORE and
16 ORW), Diana (DIA) and Urbino (URB). We first analysed changes in the anthropogenic
17 eutrophication gradient at the 22 stations over the 14-year study period.

18 Next, three stations were selected for specific statistical analyses based on their degree
19 of anthropogenic eutrophication according to the descriptions provided by Souchu et al.
20 (2010): Ayrolle (AYR station): oligotrophic, Bages-Sigean (BGN station): eutrophic,
21 Palavasian complex (MEW station): hypertrophic (represented by asterisks in Fig. 1). At
22 the beginning of monitoring in 2001, AYR station was characterised by transparent
23 waters with dominance of marine phanerogams and associated macroalgae, whereas
24 BGN station was characterised by phanerogams and proliferating macroalgae (stations
25 AY and BN in Souchu et al. 2010). MEW station was almost entirely dominated by
26 phytoplankton (station MW in Bec et al. 2011). Details on the main hydro-morphologic

1 characteristics of these stations and the reductions in nutrient inputs are listed in Table
2 1. The three stations are located in shallow lagoons (mean depth < 1.5 m) (Bec et al.
3 2011) with comparable ranges of salinities (median values: AYR=31.1, BGN=25.9,
4 MEW=28.1; see Supplementary Material) and climatic conditions. MEW station is
5 located on Méjean lagoon, which is part of the Palavasian complex, south of Montpellier
6 (Fig. 1). Méjean lagoon has no direct connection to the sea and the water renewal is
7 driven by the inputs of brackish waters coming from the « Rhône to Sète Canal » (Leruste
8 et al. 2016). The Palavasian complex watershed is highly urbanised due to the presence
9 of the city of Montpellier (250,000 inhabitants). The construction of an upgraded
10 wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) in 2005, followed by the diversion of its effluents via
11 an outfall in the Mediterranean Sea located 11 km off-shore led to a sudden dramatic
12 reduction in anthropogenic inputs of nitrogen and phosphorus into the lagoons. This
13 included an estimated 83% reduction in total N and a 73% reduction in total P from the
14 watershed (Meinesz et al. 2013). Before remediation works, the contribution of WWTPs
15 to total inputs to the Palavasian complex was lower for P than for N (respectively 78%
16 and 89% of the total inputs), thanks to the physicochemical treatment of Montpellier's
17 WWTP allowing better phosphorus abatement. As a consequence, the diversion of
18 discharges from this WWTP in 2005 resulted in a larger decrease in N than in P total
19 inputs. This difference in reduction rates between N and P is also explained by the
20 increase in urban run-offs from the watershed, leading to an increase in P total inputs.
21 Bages-Sigean lagoon is located south of the city of Narbonne (53,000 inhabitants). At
22 BGN station, the water is mainly renewed by brackish waters coming from the southern
23 part of the lagoon, which is directly connected to the sea (Fiandrino et al. 2017). The
24 construction of an upgraded WWTP in Narbonne in 2003 enabled a 55% reduction in
25 total N and a 64% reduction in total P inputs from the watershed. Before remediation,
26 the contribution of WWTPs to total inputs to Bages-Sigean lagoon was higher for P than
27 for N (respectively 82% and 76% of the total inputs), this being explained by the lack of

1 physicochemical treatment on Narbonne's WWTP before its refurbishment. The
2 improvement of this WWTP in 2003, including additional treatment to ameliorate
3 phosphorus binding, resulted in a larger decrease of P total inputs than in N total inputs.
4 Oligotrophic Ayrolle lagoon has a permanent connection to the Mediterranean Sea and
5 its watershed is not directly concerned by urban inputs (Bec et al. 2011).

6 **2.2. Laboratory analyses and data collection**

7 Between 2001 and 2014, water was sampled each year at monthly intervals (June, July
8 and August) in summer, when primary production is at maximum in Mediterranean
9 lagoons (Souchu et al. 2010; Bec et al. 2011). We avoided collecting samples during
10 periods of sediment resuspension by not sampling for three days after any period in
11 which wind speed exceeded 12.5 m s^{-1} . Temperature (Temp., °C), salinity (Sal.) and
12 dissolved oxygen (O_2 , mg L^{-1}) were recorded *in-situ* with field sensors. At each station,
13 on each sampling occasion, one water sample was collected in a 1 L polypropylene bottle
14 at the subsurface (in the middle of the water column for depths below 2 m and at -1 m
15 from the surface at deeper stations) for laboratory analysis. The following parameters
16 were analysed in the laboratory: dissolved inorganic nitrogen ($\text{DIN} = \text{NH}_4^+ + \text{NO}_3^- + \text{NO}_2^-$,
17 μM), dissolved phosphorus (DIP, μM), dissolved silicate (Si, μM), total nitrogen and
18 phosphorus (TN and TP, μM) and turbidity. Nutrients were analysed using standard
19 protocols (Aminot and K erouel, 2007), as described in Souchu et al. (2010). Turbidity
20 (Turb., NTU) was measured with a HACH 2100N IS sensor following ISO 7027 protocols.
21 Chlorophyll *a* concentrations ($\mu\text{g Chl } a \text{ L}^{-1}$) were measured by spectrofluorimetry
22 (Neveux and Lantoin e 1993) with a Perkin-Elmer L650. Based on cytometric analyses,
23 different size classes of phytoplankton were identified and counted with a FACSCalibur
24 flow cytometer: autotrophic picoeukaryotes ($\leq 3 \mu\text{m}$) and nanophytoplankton ($> 3 \mu\text{m}$)
25 abundances (PICO and NANO, $10^6 \text{ cells L}^{-1}$) (see Bec et al., 2011 for phytoplankton
26 analyses).

1 **2.3. Statistical analyses**

2 Before statistical analyses, Chl *a* data were \log_{10} transformed to homogenise the
3 variances. We used non-parametric Spearman's rank correlation (ρ) analyses to identify
4 potential relationships between the 12 environmental variables: Temp., Sal., O₂, DIN,
5 DIP, Si, TN, TP, Turb., Chl *a*, PICO and NANO.

6 Five environmental variables were selected for further analyses because of their key role
7 in anthropogenic eutrophication processes in coastal lagoon waters (Souchu et al. 2010):
8 DIN and DIP both cause eutrophication; Chl *a* represents phytoplankton biomass
9 resulting from eutrophication; TP and TN correspond to causes and consequences and
10 are used as integrated parameters for phytoplankton biomass and for organic matter.
11 The five selected variables were standardised before between- and within-group
12 principal component analyses (PCA), using time and space as instrumental variables to
13 control multivariate analysis (Blanc et al. 2001). The within-group PCA of the dataset
14 was centred by group (same dimensions as the original dataset: 5 columns
15 (environmental variables), 924 lines). The within-group analysis searched for information
16 shared by the groups, while the between-group analysis searched for differences
17 between groups. For example, in our study, between-station analysis was a PCA of the
18 dataset containing of station means: 5 columns (environmental variables) and 22 lines
19 (stations). In order to highlight the annual variability of each station with respect to its
20 average position on the inertia axes, the initial data were used as supplementary
21 individuals in the between-station PCA. Between-group and within-group PCAs were
22 performed to study station, year and month effects, using a reduced dataset with five
23 selected parameters (Chl *a*, TN, TP, DIN and DIP). These PCAs made it possible to split
24 the total inertia (i.e. the total information contained in the dataset) into between- and
25 within-group inertia. Monte Carlo permutation tests were conducted on stations,
26 sampling years and sampling months to identify the statistical significance of between-

1 group analyses (Manly 2007). The distances of the trajectories recorded year to year (d_i ,
2 with i : period from year i to $i+1$) were calculated at MEW, BGN and AYR stations using
3 the first two dimensions of the between-station PCA. The cumulative year-to-year
4 distance on the first two dimensions was calculated ($\Delta_{total} = \sum |d_i|$, from $i=2001$ to 2013). At
5 MEW and BGN, annual average distances were also compared for the periods before
6 (Δ_{before}) and after (Δ_{after}) the works on the sewerage systems were completed.
7 A Mann-Kendall test was performed to assess monotonic temporal trends in
8 environmental variables at MEW, BGN and AYR stations. Non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis
9 one-way analysis of variance was also performed at these stations to identify significant
10 differences between sampling years. At MEW and BGN stations, Wilcoxon rank sum
11 tests enabled comparison of concentrations before (respectively, 2001-2005 and 2001-
12 2003) and after (respectively, 2006-2014 and 2004-2014) works on the sewage systems.
13 Tests were considered significant at $p < 0.05$. All statistical analyses were performed
14 with R software (R CoreTeam 2017).

15 **3. Results**

16 3.1. Key parameters highlighted a eutrophication gradient

17 The dataset revealed several significant correlations (Table 2) (see Supplementary
18 Material for the ranges of the environmental parameters). Temperature, salinity, O_2 , Si,
19 DIN and NANO were weakly correlated with other parameters ($\rho < 0.5$). Chl *a*
20 concentrations were highly correlated with TP ($\rho = 0.82$, $n = 900$), TN ($\rho = 0.70$, $n = 899$),
21 autotrophic picoeukaryote abundances ($\rho = 0.67$, $n = 886$) and turbidity ($\rho = 0.66$, $n =$
22 903). These five variables were significantly correlated with each other, demonstrating
23 their link with the primary production process. Total phosphorus was significantly and
24 much more strongly correlated with its inorganic forms DIP ($\rho = 0.61$, $n = 902$) than total
25 nitrogen with DIN ($\rho = 0.23$, $n = 901$). The contribution of DIP to TP had a median value
26 of 11.4%, while the contribution of DIN to TN was only 1.7%, highlighting the dominance

1 of organic forms, especially of nitrogen. Ammonium (NH_4^+) was the main form of
2 dissolved inorganic nitrogen (median 69.2%, $n = 908$). Percentages of other inorganic
3 forms of nitrogen were 18.2% for nitrates and 8.4% for nitrites. The weakest correlations
4 with other environmental parameters were found for dissolved oxygen concentrations.
5 Permutation tests of between-group PCAs performed on the five selected parameters
6 (Chl *a*, TN, TP, DIN and DIP) were all significant (Monte-Carlo's $p < 0.001$), but between-
7 month inertia only accounted for a very low percentage of total inertia (0.7%), much lower
8 than the percentages represented by the between-year and between-station inertias
9 (respectively 8.5% and 41.5%). This led us to average the dataset per year and per
10 station for the five water quality parameters. Then, as the spatial pattern was stronger
11 than the temporal pattern (percentages of total inertia of 52.3% and 10.2%, respectively,
12 Table 3), between-station PCA was selected to identify an anthropogenic eutrophication
13 gradient among the 22 sampling stations and to reveal trajectories of change over the
14 study period.

15 The first factorial axis of the between-station PCA (PC1, 81% of the between-station
16 inertia) was highly correlated with Chl *a*, TN, TP, and to a lesser extent with DIP (Fig.
17 2a). This axis ordinated stations according to a clear anthropogenic eutrophication
18 gradient (Fig. 2b). The second axis (PC2) accounted for only 11.5% of the between-
19 station inertia and was correlated with DIN (Fig. 2).

20 3.2. Recovery trajectories after remediation actions

21 The following statistical analyses focused on three stations distributed along the
22 anthropogenic eutrophication gradient identified by the between-station PCA: MEW -
23 hypertrophic station, BGN - eutrophic station - and AYR - oligotrophic station - (stations
24 in colour in Fig. 2b). Figure 3 illustrates the trajectories of the three stations between
25 2001 and 2014 on the plane defined by the first two axes of the between-station PCA.
26 During the study period, the variability of AYR station trajectory was low along the first

1 axis and the first plane of the between-station PCA. The cumulative year-to-year distance
2 on the first plane for AYR was the lowest ($\Delta_{\text{total}}=2.9$). Conversely, BGN station shifted
3 significantly along the first axis (PC1) towards oligotrophy after mitigation works were
4 completed. The cumulative distance on the first plane was more than two times greater
5 than that of AYR ($\Delta_{\text{total}} = 6.4$) and the average annual distance decreased after mitigation
6 works, indicating a reduction in ecosystem variability ($\Delta_{\text{before}} = 1.2$ and $\Delta_{\text{after}} = 0.4$). From
7 2001 to 2014, the MEW trajectory also shifted significantly along PC1 towards
8 oligotrophy. The cumulative year-to-year distance on the first plane for MEW was nearly
9 eight times greater than that of AYR ($\Delta_{\text{total}}=21.5$). The average annual distance of MEW
10 station also decreased after mitigation works ($\Delta_{\text{before}}=2$ and $\Delta_{\text{after}}=1.5$). However, from
11 2011 to 2014, the trajectory oscillated back and forth (Fig. 3), revealing instability of the
12 ecosystem, especially from 2013 to 2014, when the trajectory displayed notable
13 backtracking.

14

15 Figure 4 shows the time series of DIP, DIN, TP, TN, Chl *a*, PICO and NANO for the three
16 stations (AYR, BGN and MEW) used for a detailed examination of changes in
17 trajectories. Between 2001 and 2004, i.e. before the remediation actions in the
18 watershed containing the Palavasian complex, MEW station remained in its initial
19 hypertrophic state, with average Chl *a* concentrations of $134 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$. The recovery
20 process started in 2005 with no lag time, immediately after the construction of the
21 upgraded WWTP, when the Chl *a* biomass fell sharply (Fig. 4c). TP and TN decreased
22 synchronously with chlorophyll *a*. This was followed by a decrease in DIP and PICO
23 concentrations in 2006 and 2007 (Fig. 4a and 4d). From 2007 to 2010, the Chl *a* and
24 PICO concentrations continued to decline, whereas DIP concentrations increased
25 significantly. The 2011-2014 period was characterised by sporadic increases in
26 phytoplankton biomass and abundances, and in DIP levels (Fig. 4) of the same order of

1 magnitude or even higher than those measured before 2005 (years 2009 to 2012 and
2 2014, $p = 0.013$). However, chlorophyll *a* biomass declined significantly ($p = 0.012$)
3 throughout the study period and average Chl *a* concentrations measured before and
4 after remediation works were divided by 15.7 (134 before and $8.6 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ after, $p < 0.0001$)
5 (Fig. 4c). TP and TN followed the same trend, with a significant decrease ($p = 0.009$ and
6 0.002) and average concentrations divided respectively by 2.5 and 3.1 (20 before and
7 $8.1 \mu\text{M}$ of TP after, $p < 0.0001$; 339 before and $109 \mu\text{M}$ of TP after, $p < 0.0001$) (Fig. 4b).
8 As PICO abundances were highly correlated with Chl *a* ($\rho = 0.65$, $p < 0.0001$, $n = 42$),
9 they also decreased significantly over the study period ($p = 0.037$), and their
10 concentrations decreased by a factor of 2.4 after WWTP refurbishment (4.01×10^9 before
11 and $1.65 \times 10^9 \text{ cell L}^{-1}$ after, $p = 0.005$). Abundances of nanophytoplankton underwent
12 significant variations depending on the year, with a peak in 2006 (average $7.63 \times 10^9 \text{ cell}$
13 L^{-1}). The decrease in phytoplankton biomass was accompanied by a decrease in turbidity
14 and oxygen levels ($p=0.0014$ and 0.0017). Changes in DIN concentrations revealed no
15 particular pattern over time.

16 The pattern of change at BGN station differed from that at MEW. From 2001 to 2003, i.e.
17 before the upgraded WWTP began operating, the BGN station was eutrophic, according
18 to Souchu et al. (2010). From 2003 to 2005, BGN started recovering, but less abruptly
19 than MEW (Fig. 3). DIP concentrations dropped the year after the remediation works
20 were completed (Fig. 4a) and a significant decrease was observed over the study period
21 ($p = 0.007$), with levels divided by 5.2 (from 1.6 to $0.3 \mu\text{M}$, $p = 0.004$) after completion of
22 the works. Changes in TP followed the same trend as DIP, with mean levels divided by
23 2.4 (from 3.3 to $1.4 \mu\text{M}$, $p = 0.01$), but chlorophyll *a* concentrations only started
24 decreasing after a lag time of two years. DIN increased after completion of the WWTP
25 works and reached a maximum in 2005 (Fig. 4a).

1 After the delay in ecosystem response, the pattern of change suggested a gradual
2 continuation of the recovery process from 2006 until 2014, with a decrease in Chl *a* and
3 DIP. Chlorophyll *a* concentrations decreased significantly throughout the study period
4 ($p=0.001$) and were divided by 1.6 after remediation works (from 4.5 to 2.8 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$,
5 $p=0.03$). Chl *a* concentrations decreased after remediation works, with average levels
6 divided by 1.2 (from 47.8 to 38.5 μM , $p = 0.004$). TN concentrations decreased rapidly
7 from 2002 to 2006, but then increased again and stabilised below the level observed
8 before remediation works. However, picoeukaryotes, nanophytoplankton and dissolved
9 and organic forms of N did not decrease significantly and no significant between-year
10 differences were observed.

11 At AYR station, despite a decrease in Chl *a*, DIN and DIP over the course of the study
12 period (from 1.6 to 0.5 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, $p = 0.016$; from 1.2 to 0.32 μM , $p = 0.02$; from 0.04 to 0.03
13 μM , $p = 0.03$, respectively), the orders of magnitude of the concentrations were much
14 lower than those at BGN and MEW stations (mean levels respectively from 1.6 and 4.6
15 times lower (DIN) to 3.8 and 28.2 times lower (Chl *a*)) (Fig. 4). Phytoplankton
16 abundances showed no significant trends over time.

17 The average TN:TP and DIN:DIP ratios at MEW station were already the lowest and
18 decreased significantly after remediation works (from respectively 17.4 to 14.6, $p=0.02$;
19 and from 4.2 to 2.2, $p = 0.02$). TN:TP ratios were below 20, suggesting N limitation
20 according to the total nutrient based approach (Guilford & Hecky 2000 in Souchu et al.
21 2010). The average TN:TP ratio at BGN station (31.1) was farther from the Redfield ratio
22 and did not change significantly after remediation works. The TN:TP ratio at BGN station
23 highlighted a limitation by both P and N. Moreover, the average DIN:DIP ratio (9.5)
24 characterised a limitation by N according to the dissolved nutrient based criteria (Justic
25 et al. 1995 in Souchu et al. 2010). The average TN:TP and DIN:DIP ratios were the
26 highest at AYR station (respectively 46.8 and 17.6) and highlighted a P limitation.

1

2 **4. Discussion**

3 4.1. Integrative parameters revealed a eutrophication gradient

4 The rare dataset we used to monitor coastal lagoons whose status ranged from
5 oligotrophic to hypertrophic (Souchu et al. 2010; Bec et al. 2011), allowed us to analyse
6 eutrophication and oligotrophication phenomena in these ecosystems. Some of these
7 lagoons received large inputs of urban nutrients for several decades, but major
8 management actions have recently been implemented on the waste water treatment
9 systems in most of their watersheds (Meinesz et al. 2013; Gowen et al. 2015; Leruste et
10 al. 2016). Fourteen years after the monitoring of French Mediterranean lagoons began
11 (Souchu et al. 2010), an anthropogenic eutrophication gradient is still highlighted by the
12 water quality parameters. The five parameters selected in our study to identify the
13 anthropogenic eutrophication gradient are representative of nutrient cycling in the water
14 column of coastal lagoons as they incorporate either the causes (DIN and DIP), or the
15 consequences of the eutrophication process (Chl *a*), or both (TP and TN, which were
16 closely correlated with each other and with Chl *a*). DIN and DIP represented very low
17 percentages of total nutrients in summer (median 1.68% and 11.4%, respectively).
18 Dissolved nutrient concentrations were very low because of continuous uptake by
19 massive phytoplankton blooms, which occur mainly in summer (Bec et al. 2011). These
20 results are in agreement with observations made in shallow lakes (Ibelings et al. 2007;
21 Jeppesen et al. 2007), where the integrative parameters TN, TP and Chl *a* appear to be
22 good complements to the dissolved nutrients usually measured in transitional and
23 coastal ecosystems (Claussen et al. 2009; Ferreira et al. 2011; McLaughlin et al. 2013;
24 Lemley et al. 2015). These parameters appear to be suitable for monitoring programmes,
25 such as WFD assessment programmes, whose aim is to evaluate the effectiveness of
26 management measures.

1 4.2. Remediation works triggered a rapid and significant response by lagoon
2 ecosystems

3 In our study, the hypothesis that the reduction in urban nutrient inputs would have a rapid
4 effect on the water total nutrient levels and phytoplankton biomass was confirmed in
5 hypertrophic and eutrophic lagoons. After a reduction of more than 50% in TP and of
6 80% in TN loadings from the watershed of these ecosystems, a recovery trajectory was
7 rapidly identified using the integrative parameters Chl *a*, TN and TP. The concentrations
8 of these parameters in the water column decreased significantly within one to three
9 years. The response lag times and ranges observed after remediation actions in the
10 eutrophic lagoon are in agreement with those reported in other coastal lagoons by
11 Pasqualini et al. (2017) and in estuaries by Lie et al. (2011), Boynton et al. (2013) or Ní
12 Longphuirt et al. (2016). Our results demonstrate that even hypertrophic coastal lagoons
13 can recover following substantial reduction in nutrient loads and confirm the rare
14 observations available on such degraded ecosystems, whose main nutrient sources are
15 WWTPs (Leruste et al. 2016), or on temperate lakes (Jeppesen et al. 2005; Ibelings et
16 al. 2007; Jeppesen et al. 2007). What is remarkable about our results is the speed (one
17 to two years) and the extent of the recovery of the hypertrophic lagoon, the decreases in
18 the concentrations of Chl *a* and TP being 10 fold greater than in the eutrophic lagoon.
19 This difference may be due to the more drastic reduction in nutrient loading, which
20 reached 83% for total N and a 73% for total P in the hypertrophic lagoon versus 55%
21 and 64% in the eutrophic lagoon. We observed shorter recovery lag times than those
22 observed by many authors in transitional water ecosystems, who reported 10 to 18 years
23 (García et al. 2010; Gee et al. 2010; Saeck et al. 2013). We also observed stronger
24 effects than those reported by other authors on water column quality after remediation
25 works of comparable magnitude (Kronvang et al. 2005; Williams et al. 2009).

1 The TN:TP ratios were the lowest for the hypertrophic lagoon and the closest to the
2 Redfield ratio, intermediate for the eutrophic lagoon and the highest for the oligotrophic
3 lagoon. Such increases in the TN:TP ratios from the most to the least eutrophic
4 ecosystem may also reflect a reduction in the dominance of primary production by
5 phytoplankton and also a limitation of phytoplankton growth by phosphorus, which is
6 more frequently observed in undisturbed ecosystems (Souchu et al. 2010; Paerl et al.
7 2014). The increase in the DIN:DIP ratio from the hypertrophic to the oligotrophic lagoon
8 confirms this shift from DIN limitation to DIP limitation. This result is in agreement with
9 observations of coastal lagoons (Zirino et al. 2016) and also of freshwater ecosystems
10 (Jeppesen et al. 2005; Jeppesen et al. 2007; Yan et al. 2016). In the hypertrophic lagoon,
11 the decrease in the TN:TP and DIN:DIP ratios corresponds to a decrease in urban
12 nutrient inputs, which was greater for nitrogen (-83%) than for phosphorus (-73%). The
13 decrease is also due to the higher DIP concentrations observed four years after
14 remediation actions were completed. The increase in DIP concentrations could be
15 caused by phosphorus released into the water column from highly enriched bottom
16 sediments (Gikas et al. 2006), which is facilitated by the strong benthic-pelagic nutrient
17 coupling in shallow coastal lagoons (Kennish & de Jonge, 2011). But this increase in DIP
18 could also be the result of non-consumption by phytoplankton as a consequence of
19 strong nitrogen limitation in summer (Souchu et al. 2010).

20 4.3. Recovery trajectories in coastal lagoons

21 The pathways of change in the three coastal lagoons in our study covered a wide range
22 of anthropogenic eutrophication, from oligotrophic to hypertrophic ecosystems.
23 Environmental monitoring of hypertrophic and eutrophic lagoons for respectively nine
24 and 11 years after significant reductions in urban nutrient loading made it possible to
25 identify different recovery patterns. The conceptual models of changes to the status of
26 an ecosystem with pressure proposed by Elliott et al. 2007 and Tett et al. 2007, were

1 used to represent the trajectories of the oligotrophic, eutrophic and hypertrophic lagoons,
2 at different phases of anthropogenic eutrophication and recovery processes (Fig. 5). The
3 concentration of Chl *a* in the water in summer was chosen as the ecosystem status metric
4 (for shared periods: before (years 2001 to 2003) and after remediation works (years 2012
5 to 2014), as this integrative parameter has been shown to be a relevant indicator of
6 eutrophication status (Cloern et al. 2001; Bec et al. 2011; Ferreira et al. 2011). Moreover,
7 our results are in agreement with those of Bec et al. (2011), showing that Chl *a* is closely
8 correlated with autotrophic picoeukaryotes, which comprise the majority of the
9 phytoplankton community in French Mediterranean lagoons. TN total inputs from the
10 watersheds (before and after remediation works, Table 1) were chosen as the pressure
11 metrics, as N is typically the limiting factor in eutrophic lagoons in summer (Souchu et
12 al. 2010).

13 Like in many studies of the recovery of coastal ecosystems (except e.g. Kemp et al.,
14 2005 or Ibelings et al. 2017), the states of the eutrophic and hypertrophic lagoons before
15 degradation were not fully described. The observations on the oligotrophic lagoon
16 revealed a high ecological status, with low Chl *a* concentrations in accordance with the
17 reference conditions laid down by European WFD (MEDDE, 2015), and revealed slight
18 inter-annual variations (Fig. 5-1). This pattern reflects the inherent variability of
19 undisturbed coastal lagoons (Elliott and Quintino 2007), dominated by perennial benthic
20 macrophytes (Schramm et al. 1999; Viaroli et al. 2007).

21 The eutrophic lagoon, in which the presence of macrophytes had been demonstrated
22 before remediation (Fig. 5-2), recovered to a mesotrophic state, with primary production
23 less dominated by phytoplankton and more by phanerogams (Ifremer 2014). If we
24 hypothesise that the reference conditions attainable for the eutrophic lagoon were similar
25 to those of the oligotrophic lagoon, the recovery was almost complete, indicating
26 complete resilience, because the ecosystem status after remediation was close to the

1 reference state (Elliott et al. 2007). Such shifts from pelagic-dominated to more benthic-
2 dominated communities based on macroalgae and seagrasses during the
3 oligotrophication process have already been reported in coastal and estuarine eutrophic
4 ecosystems after remediation actions (Lie et al. 2011; Cebrian et al. 2013; Saeck et al.
5 2013).

6 The hypertrophic lagoon, which was dominated by phytoplankton and where the bottom
7 was bare sediments before remediation (Fig. 5-4), shifted to a eutrophic state (Fig. 5-3),
8 with the appearance of fast-growing macroalgae after mitigation actions (Ifremer 2010).

9 In contrast to the eutrophic lagoon, the recovery trajectory of the hypertrophic lagoon
10 appears to be not yet complete, suggesting that all compartments of the ecosystem have
11 not yet recovered, particularly the benthic compartments (Elliott et al. 2007; Tett et al.
12 2007). Moreover, the trajectory of the hypertrophic lagoon displayed high variability and
13 feedback responses, suggesting that the ecosystem regime had become unstable
14 (Scheffer and Carpenter 2003; Ibelings et al. 2007; Kennish and de Jonge 2011). Shortly
15 after remediation actions, the hypertrophic lagoon displayed a renewed increase in DIP
16 concentrations, mimicking the immediate decrease in Chl *a*, and later the appearance of
17 macroalgae (observed between 2006 and 2009 (Ifremer 2010)). The increase in DIP
18 could correspond to the release of phosphate accumulated in the sediments, which is
19 favoured by summer conditions (Kemp et al. 2005), and also to their incomplete
20 consumption by phytoplankton in the water column. Another possible explanation is
21 recycling of the organic matter originating from macroalgae degradation and leading to
22 an increase in dissolved inorganic nutrients in the water column. In lakes, internal loading
23 of phosphates from sediments has frequently been reported to delay recovery from
24 anthropogenic eutrophication (Gulati and Van Donk 2002; Jeppesen et al. 2005;
25 Jeppesen et al. 2007), more rarely in coastal or estuarine ecosystems (Lillebø et al.
26 2007; Ní Longphuirt et al. 2016; Riemann et al. 2016). The recent renewed increases in

1 Chl *a* and DIP persisting in 2015 and 2016, confirmed the incomplete recovery of the
2 hypertrophic ecosystem, which alternates blooms of macroalgae and phytoplankton
3 depending on the monitoring year (Schramm 1999; Viaroli et al. 2008). Although a
4 significant decrease was observed, Chl *a* concentrations after remediation still
5 correspond to a bad status according to the European WFD (MEDDE, 2015).

6 Figure 5 suggests that there is a common restoration scheme in the studied lagoons
7 following an equivalent decrease in anthropogenic pressure (nitrogen inputs). To what
8 extent factors such as depth or salinity could modify this pattern remains to be
9 determined. Following a significant reduction in nutrient inputs, hypertrophic or eutrophic
10 coastal lagoons showed an almost immediate positive response in their environmental
11 conditions. However, the oligotrophication trajectory and the likelihood of recovery, even
12 partial, remain statistically difficult to predict (Duarte et al. 2009; McCrackin et al. 2017).

13 Given the costs and difficulties in implementing management plans for nutrient reduction,
14 managers and policy-makers should consider uncertainty and ecosystem specificity as
15 their main guides when designing any remediation actions targeting oligotrophication of
16 coastal lagoons. Indeed, as exemplified in this study, the level of recovery and the
17 trajectory could be affected by: (i) external drivers, such as completeness of nutrient
18 reduction, other stressors, connectivity, or climate change; (ii) internal factors such as
19 physical traits (i.e. water renewal time; de Jonge et al. 2002; Fiandrino et al. 2017),
20 lagoon history, sediment nutrient stocks (Duarte et al. 2009; Borja et al. 2010) or the
21 presence of residual seagrass patches or seed stocks (Ibelings et al. 2007; Le Fur et al.
22 2017); and interactions between the two drivers. All of these may cause time lags, regime
23 shifts and non-linearities (Ibelings et al. 2007; Duarte et al. 2009; Riemann et al. 2016)
24 in ecosystem responses following remediation efforts. Specifically in the case of
25 hypertrophic coastal lagoons, we showed that even 10 years after major reduction in
26 nutrient loads, the environmental conditions necessary to restore the ecological functions

1 and structure of the ecosystem, and the objectives laid down by the European WFD have
2 not fully been achieved. It was not possible to estimate the recovery times needed to
3 reach a good ecological status by all the lagoons studied. Further analyses of a larger
4 number of lagoons will be necessary and should be completed by modelling to determine
5 the effects of each factor and feedback interactions (positive or negative) with an impact
6 on recovery trajectory and recovery time. At the time of writing, three strategies are
7 feasible:

- 8 • “Wait and see”: one could hypothesise that eutrophication pressure is now
9 sufficiently low to allow the ecosystem to recover its ecological functions and
10 structure of the reference conditions, after a period of hysteresis;
- 11 • “Go further” in reducing nutrient inputs: this is economically and technically hard
12 to implement, and the likelihood of ecological recovery, even partial, is not
13 guaranteed for the same reasons as discussed previously;
- 14 • “Give a helping hand”: implementing active restoration programmes to enhance
15 internal factors could facilitate ecological recovery (Verdonschot et al. 2013).
16 Examples of possible active restoration actions are: restoration of seagrass
17 meadows (Orth et al. 2012; de Wit et al. 2017) to reduce nutrient sediment fluxes
18 or limit turbidity; development of passive aquaculture for top-down phytoplankton
19 control and/or nutrient export (Ferreira and Bricker 2016; Ahmed et al. 2017;
20 Reitsma et al. 2017).

21 Two common results in studies of oligotrophication trajectories are the unpredictability of
22 the degree of ecological recovery and its duration (at best 10 years) in the case of
23 success (Duarte et al., 2009; Verdonschot et al. 2013; McCrackin et al. 2017). Both call
24 for continued long-term monitoring and research programmes (see list of priorities in
25 Verdonschot et al. 2013) as well as adaptive recovery management plans, which
26 emphasize institutional experimentation and learning by doing (Jentoft 2007).

1 **Author contributions**

2 All authors contributed to the conception and design of the study, to the selection,
3 analyses and interpretation of the data and relevant literature. VD led the writing of the
4 manuscript. BB, DM, AF, RP, MS, PS, TL, CA and NM critically revised the manuscript.
5 All authors approve the manuscript in its current form and agree to be accountable for
6 all aspects of the works.

7 **Acknowledgements**

8 This study was based on data collected during the projects “*Réseau de Suivi Lagunaire*”
9 and Water Framework Directive, which received financial support from Ifremer, *Agence*
10 *de l’Eau Rhône Méditerranée Corse*, *Région Languedoc-Roussillon/Occitanie* and
11 Cépralmar. The authors are extremely grateful to Martine Fortuné and Grégory Messiaen
12 for the analyses of nutrients and to Elise Hatey for the analyses of chlorophyll *a* during
13 all the years of the monitoring program; this article would not exist without their rigorous
14 work in the laboratory. We thank our colleagues from Ifremer LERLR, LERPAC and
15 LERPAC-Corse, Laurent Benau (Narbonne Regional Park), lagoon management
16 structures for their help during field investigations. The authors would like to thank Maela
17 Kloareg and Claire Bissery/Kuzulia for their help with data analyses. Thanks to Grégory
18 Messiaen, Cédric Duvail and Pierre Lopez for the design and layout of the figures.

19 **References**

- 20 Ahmed, N., Bunting, S.W., Glaser, M., Flaherty, M.S., Diana, J.S., 2017. Can greening
21 of aquaculture sequester blue carbon? *Ambio* 46: 468–477,
22 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-016-0849-7>.
- 23 Aminot, A., Kérouel R, 2007. Dosage automatique des nutriments dans les eaux
24 marines. Quae. Versailles.
- 25 Anderson, M.J., Legendre P., 1999. An empirical comparison of permutation methods

- 1 for tests of partial regression coefficients in a linear model. *Journal of Statistical*
2 *Computation and Simulation* 62: 271–303,
3 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00949659908811936>.
- 4 Bec, B., Collos, Y., Souchu, P., Vaquer, A., Lautier, J., Fiandrino, A., Benau, L., Orsoni,
5 V., Laugier, T., 2011. Distribution of picophytoplankton and nanophytoplankton
6 along an anthropogenic eutrophication gradient in French Mediterranean coastal
7 lagoons. *Aquatic Microbial Ecology* 63: 29–45, <https://doi.org/10.3354/ame01480>.
- 8 Blanc, L., Aliaume, C., Zerbi, A., Lasserre, G., 2001. Spatial and temporal co-structure
9 analyses between ichthyofauna and environment: An example in the tropics.
10 *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences - Série III* 324: 635–646,
11 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0764-4469\(01\)01338-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0764-4469(01)01338-5).
- 12 Borja, A., Dauer, D.M., Elliott, M., Simenstad, C.A., 2010. Medium-and long-term
13 recovery of estuarine and coastal ecosystems: patterns, rates and restoration
14 effectiveness. *Estuaries and Coasts* 33: 1249–1260,
15 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-010-9347-5>.
- 16 Boynton, W. R., Hodgkins, C.L.S., O'Leary, C.A., Bailey, E.M., Bayard, A. R., Wainger,
17 L.A., 2013. Multi-decade responses of a tidal creek system to nutrient load
18 reductions: Mattawoman Creek, Maryland USA. *Estuaries and Coasts* 37: 111–127,
19 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-013-9690-4>.
- 20 Cebrian, J., Corcoran, D., Lartigue, J., 2013. Eutrophication-driven shifts in primary
21 producers in shallow coastal systems: implications for system functional change.
22 *Estuaries and Coasts* 37: 180–197, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-013-9689-x>.
- 23 Claussen, U., Zevenboom, W., Brockmann, U., Topcu, D., Bot, P., 2009. Assessment of
24 the eutrophication status of transitional, coastal and marine waters within OSPAR.
25 *Hydrobiologia* 1: 49-58, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-009-9763-3>.

- 1 Cloern, J.E., 2001. Our evolving conceptual model of the coastal eutrophication problem.
2 Marine Ecology Progress Series 210: 223–253,
3 <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps210223>.
- 4 Collos, Y., Bec, B., Jauzein, C., Abadie, E., Laugier T., 2009. Oligotrophication and
5 emergence of picocyanobacteria and a toxic dinoflagellate in Thau lagoon, southern
6 France. *Journal of Sea Research* 61: 68–75.
- 7 de Jonge, V.N., Elliott, M., 2001. Causes, historical development, effects and future
8 challenges of a common environmental problem: eutrophication. *Encyclopedia of*
9 *Ocean Sciences* 2: 852-870.
- 10 de Jonge, V.N., Elliott, M., Orive, E., 2002. Causes, historical development, effects and
11 future challenges of a common environmental problem: eutrophication.
12 *Hydrobiologia* 475-476: 1-19, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020366418295>.
- 13 de Wit, R., Rey-Valette, H., Balavoine, J., Ouisse, V., Lifran, R., 2015. Restoration
14 ecology of coastal lagoons: new methods for the prediction of ecological trajectories
15 and economic valuation. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater*
16 *Ecosystems* 27: 137–157, <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2601>.
- 17 Duarte, C.M., Conley, D.J., Carstensen, J., Sánchez-Camacho, M., 2009. Return to
18 Neverland: Shifting baselines affect eutrophication restoration targets. *Estuaries*
19 *and Coasts* 32: 29–36, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-008-9111-2>.
- 20 European Community (EC). 2000, Directive 2000/60/EC of the European parliament and
21 of the council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for community action in
22 the field of water policy.
- 23 European Community (EC). 1991, Council Directive 91/676/EEC of 12 December 1991
24 concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from
25 agricultural sources.

- 1 Elliott, M., Burdon, D., Hemingway, K.L., Apitz, S.E., 2007. Estuarine, coastal and marine
2 ecosystem restoration: Confusing management and science - A revision of
3 concepts. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 74: 349–366,
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2007.05.034>.
- 5 Elliott, M., Quintino, V., 2007. The estuarine quality paradox, environmental homeostasis
6 and the difficulty of detecting anthropogenic stress in naturally stressed areas.
7 *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 54: 640–645,
8 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2007.02.003>.
- 9 Ferreira, J.G., Andersen, J.H., Borja, A., Bricker, S.B., Camp, J., da Silva, M.C., Garcés,
10 E. et al., 2011. Overview of eutrophication indicators to assess environmental status
11 within the European Marine Strategy Framework Directive. *Estuarine, Coastal and*
12 *Shelf Science* 93: 117–131, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2011.03.014>.
- 13 Fiandrino, A., Giraud, A., Robin, S., Pinatel, C., 2012. Validation d'une méthode
14 d'estimation des volumes d'eau échangés entre la mer et les lagunes et définition
15 d'indicateurs hydrodynamiques associés (report in French).
16 <http://archimer.ifremer.fr/doc/00274/38544/> (accessed 16 October 2018).
- 17 Fiandrino, A., Ouisse, V., Dumas, F., Lagarde, F., Pete, R., Malet, N., Le Noc, S., de Wit,
18 R., 2017. Spatial patterns in coastal lagoons related to the hydrodynamics of
19 seawater intrusion. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 119: 132-144,
20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.03.006>
- 21 García, P., Santín, C., Colubi, A., Gutiérrez, L.M., 2010. Nutrient and oxygenation
22 conditions in transitional and coastal waters: Proposing metrics for status
23 assessment. *Ecological Indicators* 10: 1184–1192,
24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2010.04.004>.
- 25 Gee, A.K., Wasson, K., Shaw S.L., Haskins, J., 2010. Signatures of restoration and

- 1 management changes in the water quality of a central California estuary. *Estuaries*
2 and Coasts 33: 1004–1024, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-010-9276-3>.
- 3 Gikas, G.D., Yiannakopoulou, T., Tsihrintzis, V.A., 2006. Water quality trends in a coastal
4 lagoon impacted by non-point source pollution after implementation of protective
5 measures. *Hydrobiologia* 563: 385–406, [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-006-0034-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-006-0034-2)
6 2.
- 7 Gowen, R.J., Collos, Y., Tett, P., Scherer, C., Bec, B., Abadie, E., Allen, M., O'Brien, T.,
8 2015. Response of diatom and dinoflagellate lifeforms to reduced phosphorus
9 loading: A case study in the Thau lagoon, France. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf*
10 *Science* 162: 45–52, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2015.03.033>.
- 11 Gulati, R.D., Van Donk, E., 2002. Lakes in the Netherlands, their origin, eutrophication
12 and restoration: State-of-the-art review. *Hydrobiologia* 478: 73–106.
- 13 Ibelings, B.W., Portielje, R., Lammens, E.H.R.R., Noordhuis, R., Van Den Berg, M.S.,
14 Joesse, W., Meijer M.Louise., 2007. Resilience of alternative stable states during
15 the recovery of shallow lakes from eutrophication: Lake Veluwe as a case study.
16 *Ecosystems* 10: 4–16, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-006-9009-4>.
- 17 Ifremer, 2010. Réseau de Suivi Lagunaire du Languedoc-Roussillon. Bilan des résultats
18 2009 (report in French). <http://archimer.ifremer.fr/doc/00118/22919/> (accessed 14
19 May 2018).
- 20 Ifremer, 2014. Réseau de Suivi Lagunaire du Languedoc-Roussillon. Bilan des résultats
21 2013 (report in French). <http://archimer.ifremer.fr/doc/00210/32154/> (accessed 14
22 May 2018).
- 23 Jentoft, S., 2007. Limits of governability: institutional implications for fisheries and coastal
24 governance. *Marine Policy* 31: 360–370,
25 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2006.11.003>.

- 1 Jeppesen, E., Søndergaard, M., Jensen, J.P., Havens, K.E., Anneville, O., Carvalho, L.,
2 Coveney, M.F. et al., 2005. Lake responses to reduced nutrient loading - An
3 analysis of contemporary long-term data from 35 case studies. *Freshwater Biology*
4 50: 1747–1771, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2005.01415.x>.
- 5 Jeppesen, E., Søndergaard, M., Meerhoff, M., Lauridsen, T.L., Jensen, J.P., 2007.
6 Shallow lake restoration by nutrient loading reduction - Some recent findings and
7 challenges ahead. *Hydrobiologia* 584: 239–252, [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-007-0596-7)
8 007-0596-7.
- 9 Kemp, W.M., Boynton, W.R., Adolf, J.E., Boesch, D.F., Boicourt, W.C., Brush, G., 2005.
10 Eutrophication of Chesapeake Bay: historical trends and ecological interactions.
11 *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 303: 1–29.
- 12 Kennish, M. J., de Jonge, V. N., 2011. Chemical Introductions to the Systems: Diffuse
13 and Nonpoint Source Pollution from Chemicals (Nutrients: Eutrophication). *Treatise*
14 *on Estuarine and Coastal Science* 8: 113-148, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-374711-2.00806-8)
15 374711-2.00806-8.
- 16 Kronvang, B., Jeppesen, E., Conley, D.J., Søndergaard, M., Larsen, S.E., Ovesen, N.B.,
17 Carstensen, J., 2005. Nutrient pressures and ecological responses to nutrient
18 loading reductions in Danish streams, lakes and coastal waters. *Journal of*
19 *Hydrology* 304: 274–288, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2004.07.035>.
- 20 Le Fur, I., de Wit, R., Plus, M., Oheix, J., Simier, M., Ouisse, V., 2017. Submerged
21 benthic macrophytes in Mediterranean lagoons: distribution patterns in relation to
22 water chemistry and depth. *Hydrobiologia* 808: 175-200,
23 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-017-3421-y>.
- 24 Legendre, P., Anderson, M.J., 1999. Distance-based redundancy analysis: Testing
25 multispecies responses in multifactorial ecological experiments. *Ecological*

- 1 Monographs 69: 1–24, [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9615(1999)069[0001:DBRATM]2.0.CO;2)
2 9615(1999)069[0001:DBRATM]2.0.CO;2.
- 3 Lemley, D.A., Adams, J.B., Taljaard, S., Strydom, N.A., 2015. Towards the classification
4 of eutrophic condition in estuaries. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 164: 221–
5 232, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2015.07.033>.
- 6 Leruste, A., Malet, N., Munaron, D., Derolez, V., Hatey, E., Collos, Y., de Wit, R., Bec
7 B., 2016. First steps of ecological restoration in Mediterranean lagoons: shifts in
8 phytoplankton communities. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 180: 190–203,
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2016.06.029>.
- 10 Lie, A.A.Y., Wong, C.K., Lam, J.Y.C., Liu, J.H., Yung, Y.K., 2011. Changes in the nutrient
11 ratios and phytoplankton community after declines in nutrient concentrations in a
12 semi-enclosed bay in Hong Kong. *Marine Environmental Research* 71: 178–188,
13 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2011.01.001>.
- 14 Lillebø, A.I., Teixeira, H., Pardal, M.A., Marques, J.C., 2007. Applying quality status
15 criteria to a temperate estuary before and after the mitigation measures to reduce
16 eutrophication symptoms. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 72: 177–187,
17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2006.10.012>.
- 18 Manly, B.F.J., 2007. *Randomization, bootstrap and Monte Carlo methods in biology*.
19 Third edition. Edited by Chapman and Hall/CRC. New-York.
- 20 McCrackin, M.L., Holly, P.J., Jones, P.C., Moreno-Mateos, D., 2017. Recovery of lakes
21 and coastal marine ecosystems from eutrophication: A global meta-analysis.
22 *Limnology and Oceanography* 62: 507–518, <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.10441>.
- 23 McLaughlin, K., Sutula, M., Busse, L., Anderson, S., Crooks, J., Dagit, R., Gibson, D.,
24 Johnston, K., Stratton, L., 2013. A regional survey of the extent and magnitude of
25 eutrophication in Mediterranean estuaries of southern California, USA. *Estuaries*

- 1 and Coasts 37: 259–278, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-013-9670-8>.
- 2 Meinesz, C., Derolez, V., Bouchoucha, M., 2013. Base de données “pressions sur les
3 lagunes méditerranéennes” - Analyse des liens état - pression. Report in French.
4 <http://archimer.ifremer.fr/doc/00154/26496/> (accessed 14 May 2018).
- 5 Ministère de l'Ecologie, du Développement Durable et de l'Energie (MEDDE), 2015.
6 Arrêté du 27 juillet 2015 modifiant l'arrêté du 25 janvier 2010 relatif aux méthodes
7 et critères d'évaluation de l'état écologique, de l'état chimique et du potentiel
8 écologique des eaux de surface pris en application des articles R. 212-10, R. 212-
9 11 et R. 212-18 du Code de l'Environnement. JORF n°0198, p. 15032.
10 <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/eli/arrete/2015/7/27/DEVL1513989A/jo/texte>
11 (accessed 14 May 2018).
- 12 Neveux, J., Lantoiné, F., 1993. Spectrofluorometric assay of chlorophylls and
13 phaeopigments using the least squares approximation technique. Deep-Sea
14 Research Part I - Oceanographic Research papers 40: 1747–1765.
- 15 Newton, A., Icely, J., Cristina, S., Brito, A., Cardoso, A.C., Colijn, F., Dalla Riva, S. et al.,
16 2014. An overview of ecological status, vulnerability and future perspectives of
17 European large shallow, semi-enclosed coastal systems, lagoons and transitional
18 waters. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 140: 95–122,
19 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2013.05.023>.
- 20 Ní Longphuirt, S., Mockler, E.M., O'Boyle, S., Wynne, C., Stengel D.B., 2016. Linking
21 changes in nutrient source load to estuarine responses: an Irish perspective.
22 Biology and Environment: Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy 116B: 295,
23 <https://doi.org/10.3318/bioe.2016.21>.
- 24 Nixon, S.W., 1995. Coastal marine eutrophication: A definition, social causes, and future
25 concerns. Ophelia: 199–2019, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00785236.1995.10422044>.

- 1 Orth, R.J., McGlathery, K.J., Heck Jr, K.L. (Eds), 2012. Eelgrass recovery induces state
2 changes in a coastal bay system. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 434: 171–301,
3 <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps09596>.
- 4 Paerl, H.W., Hall, N.S., Peierls, B.L., Rossignol K.L., 2014. Evolving paradigms and
5 challenges in estuarine and coastal eutrophication dynamics in a culturally and
6 climatically stressed world. *Estuaries and Coasts* 37: 243-258,
7 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-014-9773-x>.
- 8 Pasqualini, V., Derolez, V., Garrido, M., Orsoni, V., Baldi, Y., Etourneau, S., Leoni, V. et
9 al., 2017. Spatiotemporal dynamics of submerged macrophyte status and
10 watershed exploitation in a Mediterranean coastal lagoon: understanding critical
11 factors in ecosystem degradation and restoration. *Ecological Engineering* 102: 1-
12 14.
- 13 RCoreTeam, 2017. A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
14 for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria.
- 15 Reitsma, J., Murphy, D.C., Archer, A.F., York, R.H., 2017. Nitrogen extraction potential
16 of wild and cultured bivalves harvested from nearshore waters of Cape Cod, USA.
17 *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 116(1-2): 175-181,
18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.12.072>.
- 19 Riemann, B., Carstensen, J., Dahl, K., Fossing, H., Hansen, J.W., Jakobsen, H.H.,
20 Josefson, A.B. et al., 2016. Recovery of Danish coastal ecosystems after reductions
21 in nutrient loading: a holistic ecosystem approach. *Estuaries and Coasts* 39: 82–97,
22 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-015-9980-0>.
- 23 Saeck, E.A., O'Brien, K.R., Weber, T.R., Burford M., 2013. Changes to chronic nitrogen
24 loading from sewage discharges modify standing stocks of coastal phytoplankton.
25 *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 71: 159–167,

- 1 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.03.020>.
- 2 Scheffer, M., Carpenter S.R., 2003. Catastrophic regime shifts in ecosystems: linking
3 theory to observation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 18: 648–656,
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2003.09.002>.
- 5 Schramm, W., 1999. Factors influencing seaweed responses to eutrophication : some
6 results from EU-project EUMAC. *Journal of Applied Phycology* 11: 69–78.
- 7 Souchu, P., Bec, B., Smith, V.H., Laugier, T., Fiandrino, A., Benau, L., Orsoni, V., Collos,
8 Y., Vaquer A., 2010. Patterns in nutrient limitation and chlorophyll *a* along an
9 anthropogenic eutrophication gradient in French Mediterranean coastal lagoons.
10 *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 67: 743–753,
11 <https://doi.org/10.1139/F10-018>.
- 12 Staehr, P.A., Testa, J., Carstensen, J., 2017. Decadal changes in water quality and net
13 productivity of a shallow Danish estuary following significant nutrient reductions.
14 *Estuaries and Coasts* 40: 63–79.
- 15 Tett, P., Gowen, R., Dave, M., Fernandes, T., Gilpin, L., Huxham, M., Kennington, K.,
16 Read, P., Service, M., Wilkinson, M., Malcolm, S., 2007. Defining and detecting
17 undesirable disturbance in the context of marine eutrophication. *Marine Pollution*
18 *Bulletin* 55: 282-297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2006.08.028>.
- 19 United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 2002. Federal Water Pollution
20 Control Act, United States Code.
- 21 Verdonschot, P.F.M., Spears, B.M., Feld C.K., Brucet S., Keizer-Vlek, H., Borja, A.,
22 Elliott, M., Kernan, M., Johnson, R.K., 2013. A comparative review of recovery
23 processes in rivers, lakes, estuarine and coastal waters. *Hydrobiologia* 704: 453-
24 474. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-012-1294-7>.
- 25 Viaroli, P., Bartoli, M., Giordani, G., Naldi, M., 2008. Community shifts, alternative stable

- 1 states, biogeochemical controls and feedbacks in eutrophic coastal lagoons : a brief
2 overview. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 18: 105–117,
3 <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc>.
- 4 Williams, M., Longstaff, B., Buchanan, C., Llansó, R., Dennison, W., 2009. Development
5 and evaluation of a spatially-explicit index of Chesapeake Bay health. *Marine*
6 *Pollution Bulletin* 59: 14–25, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2008.11.018>.
- 7 Yan, Z., Han, W., Penuelas, J., Sardans, J., Elser, J.J., Du, E., Reich, P.B., Fang, J.,
8 2016. Phosphorus accumulates faster than nitrogen globally in freshwater
9 ecosystems under anthropogenic impacts. *Ecology Letters*: 1237–1246,
10 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12658>.
- 11 Zaldívar, J.-M., Cardoso, A.C., Viaroli, P., de Wit, R., Ibañez, C., Reizopoulou, S.,
12 Razinkovas, A., Basset, A., Holmer, M., Murray, N., 2008. Eutrophication in
13 transitional waters : an overview. *Transitional Waters Monographs* 1: 1–78,
14 <https://doi.org/10.1285/i18252273v2n1p1>.
- 15 Zaldívar, J.-M., Strozzi, F., Dueri, S., Marinov, D., Zbilut, J.P., 2008. Characterization of
16 regime shifts in environmental time series with recurrence quantification analysis.
17 *Ecological Modelling* 210: 58–70, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2007.07.012>.
- 18 Zirino, A., Elwany, H., Facca, C., Maicu'Fra, C., Neira, C., Mendoza, G., 2016. Nitrogen
19 to phosphorus ratio in the Venice (Italy) Lagoon (2001-2010) and its relation to
20 macroalgae. *Marine Chemistry* 180: 33–41.

21

1 **Table 1.** Summary characteristics of the three sampling stations studied covering the eutrophication
 2 gradient. Lagoon and watershed areas, eutrophication status in 2001 (from Souchu et al., 2010), residence
 3 time (Fiandrino et al. 2012) and year of the remediation works. Annual N and P inputs originating from
 4 WWTPs located in the watershed and annual N and P total inputs from whole watershed (including inputs
 5 from the WWTPs), before and after remediation works (Meinesz et al. 2013). N and P inputs were
 6 standardized by lagoon volume (values in $\text{t}\cdot\text{year}^{-1}\cdot 10^6\text{m}^{-3}$).

Lagoon (sampling station - eutrophication status in 2001)	Lagoon area (km ²)	Lagoon volume (10 ⁶ m ³)	Watershed area (km ²)	Residence time (d) (volume/residence time, 10 ⁶ m ³ d ⁻¹)	Year of the remediation works	N and P inputs from the WWTPs, in $\text{t}\cdot\text{year}^{-1}\cdot 10^6\text{m}^{-3}$				N and P total inputs from the watershed, in $\text{t}\cdot\text{year}^{-1}\cdot 10^6\text{m}^{-3}$			
						N before works	N after works	P before works	P after works	N before works	N after works	P before works	P after works
Ayrolle (AYR - oligotrophic)	13.4	9.9	119.8	ND	-	0	0	0	0	0.05	0.05	0.006	0.006
Bages (BGN - eutrophic)	24.4	47	468.6	210 (0.23)	2003	6.2	0.9	0.9	0.09	8.2	3.7	1.1	0.4
Palavasian complex (MEW - hypertrophic)	7.2	9.1	662	32 (0.28)	2005	157.7	3.9	13.5	0.6	177.2	30.2	17.3	4.6

7

8 **Table 2.** Spearman's rank correlations (ρ) between environmental variables measured monthly at the 22
 9 stations from 2001 to 2014 (** $p < 0.001$; * $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$; *ns*: not significant; strong correlations
 10 ($|\rho| \geq 0.5$) in bold and underlined). Temp.: temperature, Sal.: salinity, O2: dissolved oxygen, Turb.: turbidity,
 11 Si: dissolved silicate, DIN: dissolved inorganic nitrogen, TN: total nitrogen, TP: total phosphorus, DIP:
 12 dissolved inorganic phosphorus, Chl *a*: chlorophyll *a*, NANO: nanophytoplankton, PICO: autotrophic
 13 picoeukaryotes

	Temp.	Sal.	O2	Turb.	Si	DIN	TN	TP	DIP	Chl <i>a</i>	NANO
Sal.	0.07*										
O2	-0.10**	-0.24***									
Turb.	<i>ns</i>	-0.32***	<i>ns</i>								
Si	0.14**	-0.24***	-0.09	0.31***							
DIN	<i>ns</i>	-0.19***	0.14***	0.24***	<i>ns</i>						
TN	0.13***	-0.36***	<i>ns</i>	0.73***	0.46***	0.23***					
TP	0.22***	-0.27***	<i>ns</i>	0.74***	0.36***	0.20***	0.81***				
DIP	0.16***	-0.10**	<i>ns</i>	0.34***	0.34***	0.09**	0.38***	0.61***			
Chl <i>a</i>	0.29***	-0.19***	<i>ns</i>	0.66***	0.38***	0.12***	0.70***	0.82***	0.45***		
NANO	0.10**	-0.11***	<i>ns</i>	0.35***	<i>ns</i>	0.10**	0.31***	0.36***	0.13***	0.41***	
PICO	0.12***	-0.22***	<i>ns</i>	0.57***	0.28***	0.13***	0.56***	0.65***	0.28***	0.67***	0.38***

14

15 **Table 3.** Inertia and first eigenvalues (PC1) associated with global, between- and within-group Principal
 16 Component Analyses (PCA) of the environmental dataset (DIN, DIP, Chl *a*, TN, TP)

PCA	Global	Within-year	Between-year	Within-station	Between-station
Inertia	5	4.49 (89.7%)	0.51 (10.2%)	2.38 (47.7%)	2.62 (52.3%)
PC1	3.12	2.75	0.41	1.07	2.12

17

18

19

1 Figure captions:

2

3 **Fig. 1.** Location of the 16 lagoons and the 22 water sampling stations. The three stations with asterisks
4 were the subject of specific statistical analyses.

5

6 **Fig. 2.** Between-station PCA of 5 water column variables from the 22 stations and the 14 years of
7 sampling. **a)** Loadings of the 5 active variables on the plane defined by PC1 and PC2. **b)** Location of
8 stations on the PC1-PC2 plane. The colours show the degree of eutrophication of three of the stations:
9 oligotrophic (AYR, blue), eutrophic (BGN, green) and hypertrophic (MEW, red). The d-values give the
10 scale (i.e. the size of the grid is shown in grey).

11

12 **Fig. 3.** Trajectories between 2001 and 2014 of the AYR (oligotrophic, in blue), BGN (eutrophic, in green)
13 and MEW (hypertrophic, in red) stations on the plane defined by PC1 and PC2 of the between-station
14 PCA. The d-value gives the scale (i.e. the size of the grid is shown in grey).

15

16 **Fig. 4.** Monthly concentrations (diamonds) and means (curves) of summer concentrations (June-
17 August) of: **a)** DIP and DIN (μM), **b)** TP and TN (μM), **c)** Chl *a* ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, \log_{10} scale) and **d)** picoeukaryote
18 and nanoeukaryote abundances (10^6 cell L^{-1}) from 2001 to 2014 at MEW (left column), BGN (middle
19 column) and AYR (right column) stations. The shaded areas represent the period before the waste water
20 treatment systems were improved.

21

22 **Fig. 5.** Changes in chlorophyll *a* in the water at stations BGN and MEW measured before (years 2001-
23 2002-2003) and after mitigation actions (years 2012-2013-2014) versus TN total inputs from the
24 watersheds (dots: average; crosses: outliers). Boxplot of Chl *a* at AYR station represents data measured
25 in 2001-2002-2003 and in 2012-2013-2014. Data are represented in the conceptual model of changes
26 in the ecosystem status with pressure (adapted from Elliott et al. 2007 and Tett et al. 2007). Illustrations
27 of ecosystem status: oligotrophic (1) mesotrophic (2), eutrophic (3) and hypertrophic (4) (© Réseau de
28 Suivi Lagunaire).

29

30 **Supplementary material**

31 Distribution of the 12 environmental parameters (temperature (Temp.), salinity (Sal.), dissolved oxygen
32 (O₂), turbidity (Turb.), dissolved silicate (SiOH), dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN), total nitrogen (TN),
33 total phosphorus (TP), dissolved inorganic phosphorus (DIP), chlorophyll *a* (Chl *a*), nanophytoplankton
34 (NANO), autotrophic picoeukaryotes (PICO)) measured in the 22 stations. Box and whiskers plots from
35 summer data (June, July, and August) of year 2001 to year 2014 (n=42 for each station): the whiskers
36 represent the 5th and the 95th percentiles, the outer edges of the boxes represent the 25th and 75th
37 percentiles, the horizontal lines within the boxes represent the medians and the black points represent
38 the averages. The colours show the degree of eutrophication of three of the stations: oligotrophic (AYR,
39 blue), eutrophic (BGN, green) and hypertrophic (MEW, red).

40 The variability of parameters of the 22 stations are within the observed ranges of coastal Mediterranean
41 lagoons. According to the whole variability observed in these 22 stations, the 3 selected lagoons cover
42 the range of observed trophic status. AYR and MEW stations represent the observed minima & maxima
43 for most of the 12 parameters studied.

44









