

---

## Comment. What drives plankton seasonality in a stratifying shelf sea? Some competing and complementary theories

Atkinson Angus <sup>1,\*</sup>, Polimene Luca <sup>1</sup>, Fileman Elaine S. <sup>1</sup>, Widdicombe Claire E. <sup>1</sup>, McEvoy Andrea J. <sup>1</sup>, Smyth Tim J. <sup>1</sup>, Djeghri Nicolas <sup>2</sup>, Saillely Sevrine F. <sup>1</sup>, Cornwell Louise E. <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Plymouth Marine Lab, Prospect PI, Plymouth PL1 3DH, Devon, England.

<sup>2</sup> UBO, IUEM, CNRS, Lab Sci Environm Marin, UMR 6539, Plouzane, France.

\* Corresponding author : Angus Atkinson, email address : [aat@pml.ac.uk](mailto:aat@pml.ac.uk)

---

### Abstract :

The Plymouth L4 time plankton series in the Western English Channel is a textbook example of a shallow, stratifying shelf sea system. Over its 30 yr of weekly sampling, this site has provided a diverse and contrasting suite of numerical and conceptual models of plankton bloom formation, phenology, and seasonal succession. The most recent of these papers, Kenitz et al. (2017) has initiated this comment, partly because we feel that it has presented a slightly misleading picture of the plankton composition at this site, and of a robust, recurring seasonal succession. We address this by illustrating the extent of inter-annual variability in phenology that occurs at the site, and which needs to be captured better within models. However our main aim is to foster a much better integration of the variety of top-down and bottom-up processes that have all been suggested to be key in driving seasonal succession. Some of these, particularly the multiple grazing and growth controls contributing to the so-called "loophole hypothesis" may be complementary, but others, such as the role of copepod feeding traits in driving species succession (Kenitz et al. 2017) offer testable competing hypotheses. The basic assumptions and outputs of all these models need to be validated more critically, both against time series data and process studies that include the finding of unselective feeding. We suggest that the variability in plankton phenology (and not just mean timing and amplitude) could be used to diagnose the performance of alternative models of plankton succession.

45

## Introduction

46

Within marine environments, productive, stratifying shelf seas are disproportionately

47

important in nutrient cycling and providing services to humans such as fishing, aggregate

48

extraction or waste disposal (Simpson and Sharples 2012). In temperate seas the amplitude

49

of seasonal variability in temperature is maximised, and the effects of this seasonality have

50

been studied intensely for decades. A recent study of plankton seasonality in one such

51

system was published last year in Limnology and Oceanography by Kenitz et al. (2017).

52 These authors examine the plankton time series from station L4, an inshore site near  
53 Plymouth in the Western English Channel.

54 While we do comment specifically on this paper, with a focus on L4, our primary aim  
55 is to stress the need for an evaluation and integration of the suite of mechanisms proposed  
56 to explain seasonality and plankton succession based on time series. We think that this  
57 exercise is now timely, since various studies have arrived at sometimes very different  
58 conclusions over what is driving L4 seasonality (**Table 1**). With this comment we want to  
59 initiate this process by: 1) providing an overview of functional group biomass and seasonality  
60 observed at L4; 2) bringing the various explanations of L4 seasonality (including Kenitz et al.  
61 2017) under one umbrella, comparing and contrasting their suggested mechanisms; and 3)  
62 suggesting fruitful ways in which sometimes competing hypotheses can be evaluated, tested  
63 critically and, where appropriate, amalgamated to provide a better framework for  
64 understanding plankton succession.

65

#### 66 **Plankton biomass and seasonality at L4.**

67 The L4 site is a shallow (~54 m water depth) site 13 km SSW of Plymouth, a  
68 textbook stratifying shelf sea system that has been sampled at weekly resolution since 1988  
69 (Southward et al. 2005; Harris 2010). This provides a rich, taxon-resolved time series of  
70 plankton coupled to profiling of physics and nutrients; a valuable resource for modellers and  
71 empiricists alike (Southward et al. 2005; Harris 2010; Smyth et al. 2015;  
72 [www.westernchannelobservatory.org.uk/](http://www.westernchannelobservatory.org.uk/)). L4 stratifies typically between May and  
73 September with a thermocline at ~10-20 m. Surface temperatures typically range from ~8-  
74 9°C in winter to ~16-17°C in summer, when surface layer macronutrients are depleted to  
75 limiting levels (Smyth et al. 2010; 2015). Average surface chlorophyll *a* (chl *a*) values range  
76 typically from ~0.5 mg chl *a* m<sup>-3</sup> in winter to ~2-3 mg chl *a* m<sup>-3</sup> during blooms that can occur  
77 throughout the spring to autumn period (Widdicombe et al. 2010; Atkinson et al. 2015).

78 Plankton from the site are identified under a microscope to species, genus or broader  
79 groupings. The protists are enumerated from Lugol's- and formaldehyde-preserved water  
80 samples taken at 10 m depth (~280 taxa) and mesozooplankton are from paired 0-50 m

81 WP2 net hauls (~180 taxa). Based mainly on measurements on individual taxa sampled  
82 from L4 and literature conversion factors (e.g. Menden-Deuer and Lessard 2000 for protists)  
83 we have estimated biomass of major functional groups (**Fig. 1**). While diatoms comprise the  
84 non-motile component, overall the protistan assemblage is dominated strongly by motile  
85 cells, chiefly autotrophic dinoflagellates and nanoflagellates, with colourless (presumed  
86 mainly heterotrophic) dinoflagellates and ciliates also contributing strongly in some years.  
87 Biomass of the metazoan component at L4 is dominated roughly equally by copepods that  
88 can employ feeding currents such as *Calanus helgolandicus* and *Pseudocalanus elongatus*  
89 (Green et al. 1993; Eloire et al. 2010; Maud et al. 2015) and by non-copepod taxa including a  
90 diverse meroplankton assemblage (Highfield et al. 2010; Lindeque et al. 2013). By  
91 comparison strict ambush feeders such as *Oithona similis* comprise a small portion of the  
92 estimated mesozooplankton biomass (**Fig. 1**). It is important to note here that many of the  
93 early life stages of small copepods (including *Oithona similis*) are not retained by the meshes  
94 of the 200  $\mu\text{m}$  nets and therefore are strictly defined as microzooplankton rather than  
95 mesozooplankton.

96 The phenology at L4 is intriguing as the increases in both copepod and meroplankton  
97 often precede those of their prey (**Fig. 2**; see also Smyth et al. 2014; Atkinson et al. 2015).  
98 Based on overall average values across all years, diatoms and *Phaeocystis* bloom in spring,  
99 with nanoflagellates and dinoflagellates dominating in summer or autumn (Widdicombe et al.  
100 2010). Coccolithophores are important in some years, blooming in summer or autumn.  
101 However, **Fig. 2** emphasises the great year-to-year variability around this average picture.  
102 For instance, in some years the motile taxa peak first and in other years diatoms bloom in  
103 autumn. Indeed, interannual timings of each of these groups typically vary from year to year  
104 by about two months and independently of each other (Atkinson et al. 2015).

105

#### 106 **A suite of explanations for plankton seasonality at L4**

107 What are the processes causing the seasonal timing and succession that we observe  
108 at L4? **Table 1** presents the Kenitz et al. (2017) study in the context of a series of other  
109 seasonality process studies from the same site. The first four processes in **Table 1** could

110 loosely be described as variations within the so-called “loophole hypothesis” (Irigoien et al.  
111 2005; Kiørboe 2008). This provides an appealing framework, whereby physical perturbations  
112 (for example causing improvement in the light environment) allow specific taxa that are  
113 better defended against attack to escape from grazing control and thus bloom. Importantly,  
114 this model invokes microzooplankton rather than mesozooplankton as the main grazers,  
115 given their frequent dominance in this role (Calbet and Landry 2004). This would seem a fair  
116 assumption at L4 given the measured high grazing impact of microzooplankton (Fileman et  
117 al. 2002), minor impact from mesozooplankton (Bautista and Harris 1992; Bautista et al.  
118 1992), and the substantial biomass of motile protists that can participate in heterotrophy  
119 **(Fig. 1)**.

120 Irigoien et al. (2005) only speculate on what causes the hiatus in tight grazing  
121 pressure and on the subsequent feedbacks that allow blooms to develop. Later publications  
122 invoked the inversion of the net heat flux (Smyth et al. 2014) and the variations in  
123 phytoplankton nutritional status (Polimene et al. 2015) as alternative (but not necessarily  
124 incompatible) explanations for when and why some taxa can escape grazing control during  
125 the spring bloom. Beside traits of predation deterrence, other works also suggested that  
126 different photophysiological properties (light acclimation and adaptation), affinity for nutrients  
127 and growth rates within the phytoplankton community contribute to bloom dynamics and  
128 species succession at L4 (Polimene et al., 2014; Edwards et al 2013).

129 A different angle on seasonal succession is provided by empirical studies of  
130 phenological timing in relation to water temperature. Differential sensitivities to temperature  
131 could explain observed patterns which are not consistent with the classic prey-predator  
132 dynamics. For example, copepods often increase at L4 even earlier than their prey **(Fig. 2)**.  
133 Differential phenological temperature sensitivities between taxa has attracted much interest,  
134 because it could lead to changes in the relative match or mismatch between trophic levels in  
135 a warming climate (Edwards and Richardson 2004; Aberle et al. 2012; Thackeray et al.  
136 2013). The taxonomic richness and weekly resolution of L4 is good for determining  
137 phenology (Mackas et al. 2012), and indeed some major heterotrophs showed strong  
138 temperature sensitivity in their timings (earlier when warmer), for example the heterotrophic

139 dinoflagellate *Gyrodinium spp*, and the copepod genera *Pseudocalanus* and *Acartia*  
140 (Atkinson et al. 2015). By contrast diatom timing remained overall unrelated to temperature  
141 as found elsewhere (Wiltshire et al. 2008), being possibly cued also by light (Ji et al. 2010).  
142 However, Atkinson et al. (2015) found much individual variability around the textbook  
143 generality under warming of “spring species increasing earlier and autumn species later”.  
144 This trend was perhaps obscured by other factors dictating seasonal timings.

145         Predation control is one such confounding factor that can shape the observed  
146 seasonality. Since the concentrations that we see reflect the dynamic balance between gain  
147 and loss processes, the seasonality of concentrations observed may follow trajectories (such  
148 as predators increasing before their prey) that are counterintuitive if viewed solely from a  
149 bottom-up perspective. Thus, for example the seasonal timing of increase of *Calanus*  
150 *helgolandicus* copepodites is poorly related to that of their egg production rate but more  
151 closely to the timing of stratification (Irigoien and Harris 2003; Maud et al. 2015). These  
152 authors speculate that summer stratification is required to prevent eggs settling to the  
153 seabed and subsequently being predated. For the ambush feeding copepod *Oithona similis*  
154 at L4, similar decoupling between the timings of maximum egg production rate (in late  
155 summer) and copepodite abundance (in spring) has been observed (Cornwell et al. 2018).  
156 Thus overall there is no congruence between timings of ambush or active-feeding copepods  
157 and their suggested motile and non-motile food sources (Djeghri et al. 2018).

158         The importance of zooplankton feeding behaviour in shaping seasonal succession is  
159 also a feature of the last two studies listed in **Table 1**. Sailley et al. (2015) emphasise the  
160 importance of unselective and selective zooplankton feeding (the latter triggered by prey C:N  
161 and C:P ratios) in determining the duration of the spring bloom and the amount of  
162 zooplankton biomass in summer. While the model proposed by Sailley et al (2015) describes  
163 a generic zooplankton (defined as any heterotroph larger than 20  $\mu\text{m}$ ), the authors propose  
164 a correspondence between modelled unselective grazers and copepods that can generate  
165 feeding currents and modelled selective grazers and ambush or cruise feeder copepods.  
166 The model of Sailley et al. (2015) does not consider phytoplankton type succession and  
167 does not imply any coupling between feeding behaviour and prey seasonality.

168 In contrast, the Kenitz et al. (2017) study is based on the controls exerted by  
169 ambushing and active feeding mesozooplanktonic copepods on the seasonality of their  
170 respective motile and non-motile food sources. Kenitz et al. (2017) conclude by proposing  
171 the existence of two-way coupling of functional traits, namely motility among the prey and  
172 feeding mode among the grazers. Based on their model and the time series, they suggest a  
173 regular and robust seasonal succession of non-motile cells in late spring/summer, followed  
174 by motile cells in summer-autumn. These in turn are linked to respective increases in active  
175 (i.e. feeding current and cruise-feeding) copepods best suited to capturing non-motile prey  
176 followed by ambush feeders that target motile cells. They state that “*Our model highlights*  
177 *the importance of mesozooplankton in shaping the seasonal succession of protists, and*  
178 *reveals how the seasonal trait succession can be explained as a trophic trait cascade*”.

179 Thus, unlike most of the other studies listed in **Table 1**, the Kenitz et al. (2017) study  
180 explicitly invokes mesozooplankton as the main grazing agents shaping the seasonality of  
181 their prey by selective feeding in their trait-based model (ambushers eating motile prey only,  
182 more active feeders eating non-motile prey only). We believe that these conclusions may  
183 have been driven by some misunderstandings about the L4 dataset. More specifically, we  
184 think that Kenitz et al. (2017) have substantially underestimated biomass of protists at the 10  
185 m sampling depth by not including several key prey groups at this site, namely  
186 phytoflagellates and *Phaeocystis* spp. We also estimate biomass of ambush feeding  
187 mesozooplanktonic copepods of  $0.43 \text{ mg C m}^{-3}$  that are only one-third of their values; in any  
188 case ambushing copepods likely have minor grazing impact at L4 compared to other taxa  
189 (**Fig. 1**). We therefore suggest to subsequent authors not to use the L4 observational data  
190 presented in Table 1, Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 of Kenitz et al. 2017), but instead to obtain the  
191 original source data ([www.westernchannelobservatory.org.uk/](http://www.westernchannelobservatory.org.uk/)). Notwithstanding this caveat  
192 over data, the Kenitz et al paper provides a testable alternative mechanism to the loophole  
193 hypothesis.

194

195 **So, what controls plankton seasonality in a stratifying shelf sea?**

196 Over the years a variety of authors have approached the question of what controls  
197 seasonality in stratifying shelf seas. Based on the L4 time series, they have arrived at a suite  
198 of different mechanisms. Several of these are not mutually exclusive and could fruitfully be  
199 combined. As one example, variations around the general theme of the “loophole  
200 hypothesis” have been invoked to explain the development of phytoplankton blooms (Irigoien  
201 et al. 2005; Smyth et al. 2014; Polimene et al. 2015). For copepod seasonality, the  
202 mechanisms of temperature-related phenology and the match-mismatch hypothesis  
203 (Atkinson et al. 2015) could be combined with the concept of strong top-down control  
204 (Irigoien and Harris 2003; Maud et al. 2015; Durant et al. 2013).

205 However, all of the studies in **Table 1** are hampered by a fundamental uncertainty:  
206 we still do not know exactly how zooplankton feed in the open sea. Feeding traits of  
207 zooplankton have been categorised elegantly (Kiørboe 2011), and we know that copepods  
208 can select certain prey types from mixtures in bottles. Trait-based approaches have  
209 emphasised the link between feeding mode and diet, with the notion that feeding currents  
210 are more effective for catching non-motile cells and that ambush feeders target motile cells  
211 (Litchman et al. 2013; Kenitz et al. 2017). But what actually happens in the sea, with its  
212 plethora of sizes, types and qualities of available particles? Even among the copepods there  
213 is a diversity of opinions on their feeding selectivity in natural food assemblages; a variety of  
214 methodological approaches find much less specialised feeding than that which underpins the  
215 trait-based models (Huntley 1981; Hopkins 1987; Atkinson 1995; Fileman et al. 2010; Pond  
216 and Ward 2011; Isari et al. 2013, Djeghri et al. 2018). Likewise, for protists the variable role  
217 of mixotrophy blurs distinctions of traditionally-defined functional groups (Flynn et al. 2013),  
218 requiring improved functional definitions (Mitra et al. 2016). These issues are matched by the  
219 diversity of ways of dealing with top down control in **Table 1**. In some studies, for example,  
220 models are based or validated around selective feeding traits based on prey motility whereas  
221 in others prey stoichiometry is invoked as a modulator of predation.

222 In attempting to deal with the thorny issue of feeding (Mitra et al. 2014), the models in  
223 **Table 1** reflect an upsurge in “trait-based” approaches to modelling plankton (Litchman et al.  
224 2013; Benedetti et al. 2016). This provides an appealing conceptual approach, because it is



225 built from a mechanistic basis, getting to the heart of predator-prey interactions. In this sense  
226 we believe that Kenitz et al. (2017) provide an appealing and exciting approach to examine  
227 the traits and trade-offs involved with feeding mode and how they interact between predators  
228 and prey (Kjørboe 2011).

229         Notwithstanding the attractions of trait-based models, we suggest that it is time to  
230 critically re-evaluate the models for seasonality presented in **Table 1**. It may then become  
231 possible to synthesise the plausible and complementary components of each into a single  
232 conceptual framework. Equally important, models need to be validated more rigorously  
233 against observed seasonal patterns. Since models built very differently can all recreate a  
234 bloom of diatoms in spring, it is clear that average bloom timing is not enough to evaluate  
235 the reality of model assumptions. Other, more counterintuitive properties of the system need  
236 to be considered, for example the occurrences of mesozooplankton increasing before their  
237 prey, or the patterns of phenological succession of motile and non-motile protists that can  
238 vary greatly between years. Many of the time series around the NW European shelf are  
239 lengthening and have sampling resolution sufficient to resolve bloom development (O'Brien  
240 et al. 2017). The L4 time series has now reached its 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary, and this and other  
241 time series provide ideal testbeds for models of phenology, seasonal succession, bloom  
242 formation and decay. With these resources at hand, we hope that this comment will help  
243 towards integration of the multiple factors driving the seasonality of stratifying shelf seas.

244

245

### References

246 Aberle, N., B. Bauer, A. Lewandowska, U Gaedke, and U Sommer. 2012. Warming induces  
247 shifts in microzooplankton phenology and reduces time-lags between phytoplankton and  
248 protozoan production. *Mar. Biol.* **159**: 2441-2453.

249

250 Atkinson, A., 1995. Omnivory and feeding selectivity in five copepod species during spring in  
251 Bellingshausen Sea, Antarctica. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **52**: 385-396.

252 Atkinson, A., R. A. Harmer, C. E. Widdicombe, A. J. McEvoy, T. J. Smyth, D. G. Cummings,  
253 P. J. Somerfield, J. L. Maud, and K. McConville. 2015. Questioning the role of phenology  
254 shifts and trophic mismatching in a planktonic food web. *Progr. Oceanogr.* **137**: 498-512.

255 Bautista, B. and R. P. Harris. 1992. Copepod gut contents, ingestion rates and grazing  
256 impact on phytoplankton in relation to size structure of zooplankton and phytoplankton  
257 during a spring bloom. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **82**:41-50.


- 258 Bautista, B., R. P. Harris RP, P. R. G. Tranter and D. Harbour. 1992. In situ copepod feeding  
259 and grazing rates during a spring bloom dominated by *Phaeocystis* sp. in the English  
260 Channel. *J. Plankton Res.* **14**: 691-703. doi10.1093/plankt/14.5.691.
- 261 Benedetti, F., S. Gasparini, and S. -D. Avata. 2016. Identifying copepod functional groups  
262 from species functional traits. *J. Plankton Res.* **38**:159-166.
- 263 Calbet, A. and M. R. Landry 2004 Phytoplankton growth, microzooplankton grazing, and  
264 carbon cycling in marine systems. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **49**: 51-57. doi  
265 10.4319/lo.2004.49.1.0051
- 266 Cornwell, L. E., H. S. Findlay, C. Lewis, E. S. Fileman, T. J. Smyth, A. G. Hirst, J. T. Bruun,  
267 A. J. McEvoy, C. E. Widdicombe, C. Castellani. 2018. Seasonality of *Oithona similis* and  
268 *Calanus helgolandicus* reproduction and abundance: contrasting responses to  
269 environmental variation at a shelf site. *J. Plankton Res.* **40**: 295-310  
270 doi:10.1093/plankt/fby007
- 271 Durant, J., D. Ø. Hjermannet, T. Falkenhaus, D. J. Gifford, L. -J. Naustvoll, B. K. Sullivan, G.  
272 Beaugrand, and N.C. Stenseth. 2013. Extension of the match-mismatch hypothesis to  
273 predator-controlled systems. *Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser.* **473**: 43-52.
- 274 Djeghri, N., A. Atkinson, E. S. Fileman, R. A. Harmer, C. E. Widdicombe, A. J. McEvoy, L.  
275 Cornwell, and D. J. Mayor. 2018. High prey-predator size ratios and unselective feeding in  
276 copepods: a seasonal comparison of five species with contrasting feeding modes. *Progr*  
277 *Oceanogr.* **165**: 63-74.
- 278 Edwards, K. F., E. Litchman, and C. A. Klausmeier. 2013. Functional traits explain  
279 phytoplankton community structure and seasonal dynamics in a marine ecosystem. *Ecol.*  
280 *Letts.* **16**:56-63. doi:10.1111/ele.12012
- 281 Edwards, M. E. and A. J. Richardson. 2004. Impact of climate change on marine pelagic  
282 phenology and trophic mismatch. *Nature* **430**: 881-884.
- 283 Eloire, D., P. J. Somerfield, D. V. P. Conway, C Halsband-Lenk, R. P. Harris, and D. Bonnet.  
284 2010. Temporal variability and community composition of zooplankton at station L4 in the  
285 Western Channel: 20 years of sampling. *J. Plankton Res.* **32**: 657-679.
- 286 Fileman, E. S., D. G. Cummings, and C. A. Llewellyn. 2002. Microplankton community  
287 structure and impact of microzooplankton grazing during an *Emiliana huxleyi* bloom, off the  
288 Devon coast. *J. Mar. Biol. Ass. U.K.* **82**: 359-368.
- 289 Fileman, E., A. Petropavlovsky, and R. P. Harris. 2010. Grazing by the copepods *Calanus*  
290 *helgolandicus* and *Acartia clausi* on the protozooplankton community at station L4 in the  
291 western English Channel. *J. Plankton Res.* **32**: 709-724.
- 292 Flynn, K. J., D. K. Stoecker, A. Mitra, J.A. Raven, P. M. Glibert, P. J. Hansen, E. Granéli,  
293 and J. M. Burkholder. 2013. Misuse of the phytoplankton–zooplankton dichotomy: the need  
294 to assign organisms as mixotrophs within plankton functional types. *J. Plankton Res.* **35**: 3-  
295 11.
- 296 Green, E. P., R. P Harris, and A. Duncan. 1993. The seasonal abundance of the copepodite  
297 stages of *Calanus helgolandicus* and *Pseudocalanus elongatus* off Plymouth *J. Mar. Biol.*  
298 *Ass. UK.* **73**: 109-122.
- 299 Harris, R. 2010. The L4 time-series: the first 20 years. *J. Plankton Res.* **32**: 577-583
- 300 Highfield, J. M., D. Eloire, D.V. Conway, P. K. Lindeque, M. J. Attrill, and P.J. Somerfield.  
301 2010. Seasonal dynamics of meroplankton assemblages at L4. *J. Plankton Res.* **32**: 681-  
302 691.

- 303 Hopkins, T. L. 1987. Midwater food web in McMurdo Sound, Ross Sea, Antarctica. *Mar. Biol.*  
304 **96**, 93-106.
- 305 Huntley, M. 1981. Nonselective, nonsaturated feeding by three calanoid copepod species in  
306 the Labrador Sea. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **26**: 831-842.
- 307 Irigoien, X. and R. P. Harris. 2003. Interannual variability of *Calanus helgolandicus* in the  
308 English Channel. *Fish. Oceanogr.* **12**: 317-326.
- 309 Irigoien, X., K. J. Flynn, and R. P. Harris. 2005. Phytoplankton blooms: a 'loophole' in  
310 microzooplankton grazing impact? *J. Plankton Res.* **27**: 313-321.
- 311 Isari, S., M. Anto, and E. Saiz. 2013. Copepod foraging on the basis of food nutritional  
312 quality: can copepods really chose? *PLoS ONE***8**(12), e84742.
- 313 Ji R, M. Edwards, D. L. Mackas, J. A. Runge, and A. C. Thomas. 2010. Marine plankton  
314 phenology and life history in a changing climate: current research and future directions. *J*  
315 *Plankton Res.* **32**: 1355-1368.
- 316 Kenitz, K. M., A. W. Visser, P. Mariani, and K. H. Andreson. 2017. Seasonal succession in  
317 zooplankton feeding traits reveals trophic trait coupling. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **62**: 1184-1197.
- 318 Kiørboe, T. 2008. A mechanistic approach to plankton ecology. Princeton University Press,  
319 Woodstock, Oxfordshire, UK, 209 pp.
- 320 Kiørboe, T., 2011. How zooplankton feed: mechanisms, traits and trade-offs. *Biol. Revs.* **86**:  
321 311-339.
- 322 Lindeque, P. K., H. E. Parry, R. A Harmer, P. J. Somerfield, and A. Atkinson 2013. Next  
323 generation sequencing reveals the hidden diversity of zooplankton assemblages. *PLoS One*  
324 e81327.
- 325 Litchman, E., M. D. Ohman, and T. Kiørboe. 2013. Trait-based approaches to zooplankton  
326 communities. *J. Plankton Res.* **35**: 473-484.
- 327 Maud, J. L., A. Atkinson, A. G. Hirst, P. K. Lindeque, C. E. Widdicombe, R. A. Harmer, A.J.  
328 McEvoy and D. G. Cummings. 2015. How does *Calanus helgolandicus* maintain its  
329 population in a variable environment? Analysis of a 25-year time series from the English  
330 Channel. *Progr. Oceanogr.* **137**: 513-523
- 331 Mackas, D. L., W. Greve, M. Edwards, S. Chiba, K. Tadokoro, D Eloire, M.G. Mazzocchi, S.  
332 Batten, A. J. Richardson, C. Johnson, E. Head, A. Conversi, and T Peluso. 2012. Changing  
333 zooplankton seasonality in a changing ocean: comparing time series of zooplankton  
334 phenology. *Progr. Oceanogr.* **97-100**: 31-62.
- 335 Menden-Deuer, S., and E. J. Lessard. 2000. Carbon to volume relationships for  
336 dinoflagellates, diatoms, and other protist plankton. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **45**: 569-579.
- 337 Mitra, A., C. Castellani, W. C. Gentleman, S. H. Jónasdóttir, K. J. Flynn, A. Bode, C.  
338 Halsband, P. Kuhn, P. Licandro, M. D. Agersted, A. Calbet, P. K. Lindeque, R. Koppelman,  
339 E. F. Møller, A. Gislason, T. G. Nielsen, and M St.John, M. 2014. Bridging the gap between  
340 marine biogeochemical and fisheries sciences; configuring the zooplankton link. *Progr.*  
341 *Oceanogr.* **129**: 176-199.
- 342 Mitra, A. and 22 others. 2016. Defining planktonic protist functional groups on mechanisms  
343 for energy and nutrient acquisition: incorporation of diverse mixotrophic strategies. *Protist*  
344 **167**: 106-120.

- 345 O'Brien, T. D., L. Lorenzoni, K. Isensee, K. and L. Valdés (Eds). 2017. What are Marine  
346 Ecological Time Series telling us about the ocean? A status report. IOC-UNESCO, IOC  
347 Technical Series, No. 129: 297 pp <http://igmets.netA./report>  
348
- 349 Polimene L., C. Brunet, M. Butenschön, V. Martinez-Vicente, C. E. Widdicombe, R. Torres  
350 and J. I. Allen. 2014. Modelling a light-driven phytoplankton succession. J. Plankton Res. **36**:  
351 214-229 doi:10.1093/plankt/fbt086.
- 352 Polimene, L., A. Mitra, S. F. Sailley, S. Ciavatta, C. E. Widdicombe CE, A. Atkinson and J. I.  
353 Allen. 2015. Decrease in diatom palatability contributes to bloom formation in the Western  
354 English Channel. Progr. Oceanogr. **137**: 484-497.
- 355 Pond, D.W. and P. Ward. 2011. Importance of diatoms for *Oithona* in Antarctic waters. J.  
356 Plankton Res. **33**:105-118.
- 357 Sailley, S. F., L. Polimene, A. Mitra, A. Atkinson and, J. I. Allen. 2015. Impact of zooplankton  
358 food selectivity on plankton dynamics and nutrient cycling. J. Plankton Res. **37**: 519-529
- 359 Simpson, J.H. and J. Sharples. 2012. An Introduction to the Physical and Biological  
360 Oceanography of Shelf Seas. Cambridge University Press.
- 361 Southward, A. J., O. Langmead, N. J. Hardman-Mountford, J. Aiken, G. T. Boalch, P. R.  
362 Dando, M. J. Genner, I. Joint, M. Kendall, N. C. Halliday, R. P. Harris, R. Leaper, N.  
363 Mieszkowska, R. D. Pingree, A. J. Richardson, D. W. Sims, T. Smith, A. W. Walne, and S. J.  
364 Hawkins. 2005. Long-term oceanographic and ecological research in the western English  
365 Channel. Adv. Mar. Biol **47**, 1-105.
- 366 Smyth, T., A. Atkinson, S. Widdicombe, M. Frost, I. Allen, J. Fishwick, A. Queiros, D. Sims  
367 and M. Barange. 2015. The Western Channel Observatory. Prog. Oceanogr. **137**: 335-341
- 368 Smyth, T. J., I. Allen, A. Atkinson, J. T. Bruun, R. A. Harmer, and R. D. Pingree, C. E.  
369 Widdicombe, and P. J. Somerfield. 2014. Ocean net heat flux influences seasonal to inter-  
370 annual patterns of plankton abundance. PLoS One **9**: e98709.
- 371 Thackeray, S. J., P. A. Henrys, H. Feuchtmayr, I. D. Jones, S. C. Marberlu, and I. J.  
372 Winfield. 2013. Food web de-synchronisation in England's largest lake: an assessment  
373 based on multiple phenological metrics. Global Change Biology **19**: 3569-3580.
- 374 Widdicombe, C. E., D. Eloire, D. Harbour, R. P. Harris, and P. J. Somerfield. 2010. Long-  
375 term phytoplankton community dynamics in the Western English Channel. J. Plankton Res.  
376 **32**: 643-655.
- 377 Wiltshire, K. H., A. M. Malzahn, K. Wirtz, W. Greve, S. Janish, P. Mangelsdorf, B.F.J. Manly,  
378 and M. Boersma. 2008. Resilience of North Sea phytoplankton dynamics: an analysis of  
379 long-term data at Helgoland Roads. Limnol. Oceanogr. **53**: 1294-1302.

## 380 **Acknowledgements**


381 The L4 time series is funded through the Natural Environment Research Council's (NERC's)  
382 National Capability (Long term monitoring and Observations) and we are indebted to the  
383 crews and scientists who have maintained this time series since 1988. Our analysis was  
384 funded jointly through the NERC and Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs,  
385 Shelf Seas Biogeochemistry Programme and the Marine Ecosystems Research Programme  
386 (Grant nos. NE/K001833/1, NE/L003279/1).



387

388 **Fig. 1.** Estimated carbon biomass (with values above the bars) in the nano-micro and  
 389 mesozooplankton pools at L4, based on seasonal, L4-specific measurements of dimensions.  
 390 **A** biomass of heterotrophic taxa, based on the mean of monthly values as calculated in Fig  
 391 2d and 2e of Kenitz et al. (2007). Protistan "heterotrophs" comprise colourless  
 392 dinoflagellates and ciliates, thus designated to be semi-or wholly heterotrophic. "Feeding  
 393 current copepods" and "ambushing copepods" comprise the 12 most abundant copepods  
 394 modelled by Kenitz et al. (2007). Remaining zooplankton comprise mero-and holoplankton.  
 395 Note that micrometazoa (i.e. metazoans passing through a 200 um net) are not included  
 396 here. **B** Total biomass of non-motile protists (diatoms, coccolithophores and non-motile  
 397 *Phaeocystis* forms) and motile protists (nanoflagellates, ciliates, plus all dinoflagellates).  
 398 Note that some of the latter are included in panel **A**. Bars are colour coded and aligned to  
 399 represent grazer and preferred prey combination based on Kenitz et al. (2017).

400



401

402 **Fig. 2.** Illustration of the degree of variation in seasonality observed at the L4 site. Monthly  
 403 mean values of the weekly measurements are presented, for a 6 year period spanning 2009-  
 404 2014 **a.** biomass of motile protists (see Fig 1B), diatoms and all copepod species, illustrating  
 405 the great year-to-year variability observed in relative timings, duration and concentrations of  
 406 functional group biomass. **b** temperature at 10m and 50m, illustrating the seasonal  
 407 development and erosion of the thermocline

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415 **Table 1.** The diversity of conceptual models of factors shaping protist and mesozooplankton  
 416 seasonality, based on L4 time series data. The L4-specific publications listed here are not  
 417 necessarily the first descriptions of these mechanisms. Also an array of other bloom drivers  
 418 (e.g. dilution hypothesis) have been proposed for other systems but have not yet been  
 419 applied to L4.

Process	Application to L4	Suggested mechanisms
Loophole hypothesis	From empirical data analysis (Irigoien et al. 2003)	Physical/chemical perturbations disrupt tight grazing control by microzooplankton, allowing certain taxa that are better defended (e.g. in terms of larger size, colonies, spines or toxins) to form blooms. Subsequent bloom development and decline are shaped by algal unpalatability (e.g. stoichiometric ratios), mesozooplankton controls on microzooplankton and ultimately by nutrients.
Change in sign of Net Heat Flux	From empirical data analysis (Smyth et al. 2014)	The physical perturbation (see above) is via the switch from negative to positive net flux of heat into the ocean, promoting initial stabilisation of the upper water column. Timing of spring bloom thus follows the timing of the change in heat flux. Autumn bloom timings are likewise cued to the transition to negative heat flux.
Phytoplankton Photophysiology	Models with data validation Edwards et al. (2013) Polimene et al. (2014)	Seasonal succession of phytoplankton taxa is strongly related to the phytoplankton functional traits, namely nitrate affinity, maximum growth rate and/or light-harvesting physiology.
Stoichiometric modulation of predation	Model with data validation Polimene et al. (2015)	Similar to “loophole hypothesis” above but it is the increasingly poor nutritional status of phytoplankton (high C:N and C:P) under increasing spring light that renders them unpalatable to microzooplankton and able to bloom.
Variable temperature-dependence of plankton phenology	From empirical data analysis Mackas et al. (2012) Atkinson et al. (2015)	In warm seasons there is a weak tendency for spring grazers to increase earlier in the year and autumn grazers to appear later, with timing of diatom blooms unrelated to temperature. However, at species and functional group level, grazer and food phenologies vary greatly between years and bear little relationship to each other.
Mortality- controlled copepod phenology	From empirical data analysis Irigoien & Harris (2002) Maud et al. (2015) Cornwell et al. (in review)	Phenology of major copepods bears little relationship to that of their food or even their egg production, being instead most likely dictated by variation in mortality.
Seasonal dynamics driven by zooplankton feeding trait	Model and data Sailley et al. (2015)	Zooplankton feeding behaviour according to prey quality can have a dominant role in structuring the plankton. Selection according to favourable prey stoichiometry could lead to reduced bottom-up control compared to that from more unselective feeding behaviour.
Trophic trait coupling	Model with data validation Kenitz et al. (2017)	Like Sailley et al. (2015) this invokes the importance of feeding trait in the phytoplankton succession. However, this study focusses on the seasonal succession of feeding current- and ambush feeding copepods as a driver of a repeating and robust seasonal succession of non-motile and motile preys.