Growth anomalies in *Pecten maximus* from coastal waters (Bay of Brest, France): relationship with diatom blooms
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The aim of this study was to characterize the daily shell growth of *Pecten maximus* from early 1998 to late spring 1999 in the Bay of Brest with a careful qualitative and quantitative description of the pelagic primary production. Our results, in accordance with previous studies, demonstrate that there are episodic declines in the growth rate. Concurrent events of low growth rate and large bottom-concentrations of algae following diatom blooms (*Ceratulina pelagica* or *Rhizosolenia delicatula*), suggests that this high concentration of phytoplankton on the bottom layer may affect food intake or respiratory activity of the scallops by gill clogging or oxygen depletion. In this study, silicic acid or phosphorus are inferred to be limiting factors responsible for the collapse of the spring bloom. Further, we suggest that, in an N-enriched ecosystem, Si or P-limitation and the changing sinking velocities of phytoplankton, could affect the biology of benthic suspension-feeders.

INTRODUCTION

External growth lines provide criteria for studying environmental parameters recorded in the bivalve shell (for a review see Lutz & Rhoads, 1980). In *Pecten maximus* juveniles daily growth lines are visible and reflect the growth history of the animal at a daily-scale. Their shell contains information that allows us to reconstruct past and present-day environments. Immature juveniles are especially appropriate for such studies because of their rapid growth rate and because energy is not allocated from somatic growth to reproduction.

The environmental factors generally considered most important for bivalve growth are food availability, temperature and current speed (Claereboudt et al., 1994; MacDonald & Thomson, 1985). However, growth in *P. maximus* of the Bay of Brest does not completely follow this paradigm (Chauvaud et al., 1998). Indeed food availability measured in the Bay of Brest is not limiting to scallop growth. The studies of Chauvaud et al. (1998) have related growth cessation to the massive sedimentation of diatom blooms or to toxic dinoflagellate blooms. These authors suggested that in 1995 the large aggregates of one species of diatom, *Rhizosolenia delicatula*, could have led to a reduction in feeding due to gill clogging, which in turn led to a cessation in growth.

The present study focused on both phytoplankton dynamics and on the daily growth rate of *P. maximus* juveniles to investigate further the assumption that this trophic source can affect the biology of this suspension-feeder in a coastal ecosystem: the Bay of Brest. Particular attention is paid to the control by the chemical factors (nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), silicon (Si)) on the dynamics of primary production and, as a result, on the daily growth rate of *Pecten maximus*.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

**Study site**

The Bay of Brest (France) is a semi-enclosed area and constitutes one of many coastal macrotidal ecosystems that are receiving increasing inputs of nutrients (Le Pape et al., 1996). Over the last twenty years, N concentrations in rivers have doubled concomitantly with a decrease in the Si-to-N ratio from 2 to 0.33 in coastal seawaters (Le Pape et al., 1996).

Scallop were sampled by dredging in the Roscanvel site (Figure 1). This site (30 m deep) is characterized by heterogeneous sediments and shows one of the most dense scallop populations in the Bay (Grall et al., 1996). Furthermore, it has been used as a reference station for hydrologic parameters since 1977.

**Environmental parameters**

Environmental parameters monitored in 1999, the most intensively surveyed year, included temperature, salinity, pigment concentrations, suspended matter, nutrients and phytoplankton species composition. Measurements were performed daily during the algal bloom period vs weekly during other periods. Temperature, salinity and fluorescence were recorded using a Sea-bird SBE 19 CTD profiler. Water samples were collected near the bottom and at the surface using 5-l Niskin bottles. For pigment analyses, 1 l of water was filtered through a GF/F filter and stored at −20°C until further analysis. Chlorophyll-*a* and phaeophytin *a* concentrations were estimated using a calibrated Turner 111 fluorometer, according to Lorenzen (1967). For phytoplankton species determination, 100 ml of the sample was preserved with Lugol’s solution and kept in darkness. Silicate, nitrogen (ammonium, nitrate, nitrite)
and phosphate concentrations were monitored as potential limiting factors for diatom growth. Ammonium measurements were made according to Koroleff (1969). Phosphate concentrations were measured using the Murphy & Riley (1962) method. Silicic acid and nitrate + nitrite determination were performed using a Technicon autoanalyser II (Treguer & Le Corre, 1975).

In 1998, the environmental monitoring schedule was the same as in 1999, except for suspended solid which was not performed and measurements of phaeophytin a and nutrients which were provided by SOMLIT (Observation station of the littoral; IUEM) at the Sainte-Anne site (Figure 1). For phytoplankton, data from the Lanvéoc site (Figure 1) showed the same trends in relative abundance and species composition as in the bottom sample at Roscanvel. This allowed us to use Lanvéoc data (from the REPHY, IFREMER DEL Concarneau) when they were unavailable at Roscanvel.

RESULTS

Daily shell growth and environmental parameters in 1998

Daily shell growth of 1-yr-old juveniles in 1998 presents a classic pattern for the Bay of Brest (see Chauvaud, 1998). After growth began in late March (28), there was a progressive increase in growth rate over the spring, a plateau in May and a slow decrease during autumn. Within this cycle, a strong growth rate decrease was observed for all individuals near 20 May (Figure 2A). This event lasted approximately ten days, with daily growth rate dropping from 180 to a low of 80 µm d⁻¹ on 2 June. A rapid resumption to a normal maximum growth rate of 220 µm d⁻¹ was then observed.

Throughout the study period, temperature, salinity and total suspended solids were not abnormally variable, so those parameters have been ruled out as explanatory factors for the spring growth anomaly. Bottom temperature increased from 8.5°C in January to 15.8°C in August, and then dropped to 10.5°C by the end of December. No major fluctuations of salinity were recorded; the lowest values reached 33.8 psu. On the other hand, the specific composition of phytoplankton, chlorophyll-a and phaeophytin a concentrations might have contributed to growth variability. Several chlorophyll-a peaks were observed during the year (Figure 2B). Cryptophyceae dominated the first bloom, in early May. The second, and largest bloom (8.9 µg l⁻¹), was composed primarily of a diatom, Cerataulina pelagica (750,000 cells l⁻¹). Chaetoceros curvisetus and C. dehiscens were the dominant species during the remaining blooms. A maximum algal biomass occurred on 27 May (Figure 2B).

Figure 1. Map of the Bay of Brest (France) showing the main sampling sites: Roscanvel (RO), Sainte-Anne (SA) and Lanvéoc (LA).
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Following peak river flow in mid-April, silicic acid (="silicates") concentration reached a maximum value of 5μM (Figure 2C). Silicates then dropped from late April to late May with a marked acceleration of this trend at the beginning of the Ceratulina pelagica bloom. The collapse of this diatom bloom was concomitant with lowest silicic acid values.

A grazing index, corresponding to the ratio of phaeophytin to total pigments (phaeophytin + chlorophyll-a), showed a decline that clearly appeared 22 May (Figure 2D) during the C. pelagica efflorescence. The phaeophytin a levels followed the same pattern over time as chlorophyll-a, except during this bloom.

The maximum near-bottom chlorophyll-a concentration during the second spring bloom (C. pelagica) and the drop in the grazing index were concomitant with the decrease in scallop growth rate. If we superimpose the chlorophyll-a profile and Pecten maximus growth curve, the decreased growth seemed to be initiated when the chlorophyll-a concentration reached 5μg L⁻¹, and the recovery occurred then when concentrations were below this value (Figure 2E).

Daily shell growth and environmental parameters in 1999

A somewhat similar growth rate pattern was observed in 1999 (Figure 3A); with a rapid increase in early April (daily growth rate increased by a factor of 4 between 2–15 April), a maximum in June, and a progressive decrease in the autumn. Growth inhibition was observed, beginning about 24 April. The daily growth increment dropped from 210 to 150μm over a 10-d-period before it rebounded; however, the severe growth inhibition measured in 1998 was not observed during the spring of 1999.

Three chlorophyll-a peaks were observed from the start of measurements until 9 June (Figure 3B). All were dominated by diatoms. The first one was composed of Thalassiosira sp. (56% of total microflora on 2 April), the second peak was dominated by Rhizosolenia delicatula (91% of total microflora on 30 April) and the third one by Chaetoceros curvisetus and C. dehile (86% of total microflora, 1,458,000 cells l⁻¹ on 9 June). The concentration of phaeophytin showed the same pattern as the preceding year: the maximum biomass of R. delicatula cells corresponded to the minimum grazing index, suggesting the sinking of undigested cells that become concentrated in near bottom water (Figure 3D).

River flows clearly influenced the chemical environment during the study period. Nitrogen and silicic acid followed similar patterns, with maximum concentrations in late April during the R. delicatula bloom (Figure 3C). High phosphate concentrations were detectable before high freshwater discharges. Those concentrations remained below 0.25μM from early April to late May. The lowest concentrations (<0.05μM) were observed on 24 and 27 April.

Like 1998, the spring growth anomaly corresponded with a diatom bloom. Rhizosolenia delicatula was the dominant species in 1999, but the same chlorophyll-a threshold was noted (Figure 3E). The end of the event, characterized by the resurgence of a strong daily growth rate, coincided with the decline of chlorophyll-a concentrations below 5μg L⁻¹.

Figure 2. Temporal variations between March and September 1998. (A) Mean daily shell growth rate of juvenile Pecten maximus at Roscanvel (μm day⁻¹; vertical bars=95% CL); (B) bottom water chlorophyll-a concentrations (g l⁻¹, Roscanvel) and phytoplankton species composition (Lanvéoc); (C) averaged daily flow rate (m³ s⁻¹/20) and silicic acid concentrations (Sainte-Anne, μM); (D) grazing index (Sainte-Anne, phaeophytin (phaeophytin + chlorophyll-a); (E) daily growth rate compared to bottom chlorophyll-a concentrations.
Figure 3. Temporal variations between March and September 1999 in the Roscanvel site. (A) Mean daily shell growth rate of juvenile *Pecten maximus* at Roscanvel (μm day⁻¹; vertical bars=95% CL); (B) bottom water chlorophyll-a concentrations (μg L⁻¹) and phytoplankton species composition; (C) averaged daily flow rate (m³ s⁻¹/20) and silicic acid, nitrogen (nitrate+nitrite+ammonium) and phosphate concentrations (M); (D) grazing index (phaeophytin (phaeophytin+chlorophyll-a); (E) daily growth rate compared to bottom chlorophyll-a concentrations.

Figure 4. Comparison of mean daily shell growth rates of *Pecten maximus* juveniles (Class I) in 1998 and 1999.

Figure 5. Temporal variation of bottom water temperatures from March to September in 1998 and 1999.

Comparison of growth rate patterns over both years

When comparing the two years, striking similarities and differences appeared (Figure 4) which may be related to inter-annual variations or constancy in environmental factors. The first period observed (April to early May) was characterized by a higher daily growth rate in 1999 than in 1998. The same difference was observed between 1994 and 1995 (Chauvaud et al., 1998). The difference in bottom water temperature was undoubtedly responsible for the growth rate differences in both studies. In 1999, bottom water temperatures were higher than 1998 values from early April until mid-May (Figure 5). The most striking difference between the two years concerned the spring growth slow down, occurring later and more drastically in 1998. For the third period, the progressive autumnal growth decrease occurred approximately at the same time (mid-July). Temperature alone, which continued to increase until August and differed about 1°C between the two years, did not appear as a convincing causal factor of this trend.
it was present in 1995 without any simultaneous growth. Two species were involved in growth perturbations: (i) Cerataulina pelagica, predominated during the 1998 bloom, was suspected of inhibiting growth of *Pecten maximus* juveniles in 1995 (Chauvaud et al., 1998). These two diatom species are in a similar size range (diameter of 20—50 μm), of elongated shape without spines, and exist in chains or as separate cells. Their morphological characteristics do not allow us to determine whether growth perturbations are species specific. Another likely correlate is total phytoplankton biomass, although species composition cannot be ruled out.

In 1998 and 1999, a decrease in the growth rate, observed as an extra major ring on juvenile shells, was initiated when bottom-water algal concentration exceeded 5 μg l⁻¹. The growth resumption appeared when the concentration was below this threshold. However, depending on the year, the impact on growth was not of the same amplitude. Although species characteristics do not allow us to establish their contribution to the different levels of growth perturbation, several hypotheses can be offered to explain these observations.

Theoretically, normal shell deposition can take place only when the valves are open and the mantle well extended along the margins (Pannela & MacClintock, 1968). A growth slow-down might result from the inability of a bivalve to keep its valves open because of the high algal biomass. Indeed, Malouf & Bricelj (1989) have previously shown an alteration in filtration rates of the hard clam, *Mercenaria mercenaria*, by a high algal density. Further, Chauvaud et al. (1998) pointed out that clogged gills stopped scallops from ingesting food properly, which had a negative impact on growth. Events of 1998 and 1999 appear to confirm this hypothesis. Thus growth would be limited by ingestion capacity of *P. maximus*. However, Lewis & Cerrato (1997) showed that shell growth of the soft shell clam, *Mya arenaria*, is not a direct response to nutritive activity, but could be positively correlated with oxygen consumption. According to their findings, the growth slow-down observed in juvenile scallops could correspond to a perturbation of respiratory activity more than food intake. Respiration might be altered by gill clogging or by oxygen depletion at the water-sediment interface. Indeed, the intensification of bacterial activity and degradation of organic matter, that follows the sinking of a plankton bloom, could produce hypoxia at the water—sediment interface. Oxygen measurement is not available for the micro-layer where scallops live. It would be interesting to obtain oxygen measurements in this layer, but it would be surprising if oxygen depletion could occur in the well mixed Roscanvel site (Salomon & Breton, 1996). Nevertheless, at a *P. maximus* scale, a micro-depletion could have serious repercussions on growth. Although the exact mechanism remains unknown, this study permits the generalization that *P. maximus* daily growth perturbation were strongly associated with high algal biomass of two different diatom species.

If we try to understand why such food is so abundant in the bottom layer, two explanations are of interest. First, the high concentrations might be the result of tidal current dynamics in the Bay. But present knowledge of instantaneous and residual currents do not allow us to determine particles trajectories at temporal scales as small as several days (Le Pape, 1996; Salomon & Breton, 1996). Such an hypothesis can not be accepted or rejected.

**DISCUSSION**

Environmental parameters measured during 1998 and 1999 are close to those generally observed in the Bay of Brest (Del Amo, 1996). However, normal growth (regular bell shaped curve, as in 1994, see Chauvaud et al., 1998) was interrupted in spring in each year, albeit to different degrees. The only parameters, showing strong fluctuations during these periods were the species composition of phytoplankton and the chlorophyll-a concentration. The hypothesis advanced here is that growth anomalies could be related to phytoplankton blooms. High diatom densities are the most likely reason for the growth decline as no toxic species were detected during the study period. Two species were involved in growth perturbations: (i) *Cerataulina pelagica* predominated during the 1998 bloom, but is not considered toxic for invertebrates; furthermore, it was present in 1995 without any simultaneous growth slow down; (ii) *Rhizosolenia delicatula*, the dominant

**Figure 6.** (A) Molar ratios of Si:N between March and September 1998. (B) Molar ratios of Si:N from March to June 1999. (C) Molar ratios of Si:P from March to June 1999. The Si:N=1, Si:P=16 lines correspond to Redfield theoretical values and determine the potential limiting nutrients.
although it is improbable that the high concentrations come from outside the Bay (J.C. Salomon, personal communication).

Chauvaud et al. (1998) hypothesized that massive sedimentation of diatom blooms leads to high chlorophyll-\(a\) concentrations in bottom water, affecting the metabolism and consequently the shell growth of *P. maximus*. And according to Raguenneau et al. (1996), if dissolved silicic acid [\(\text{Si(OH)}_4\)] became limiting at the surface, cells could form aggregates surrounded by a gelatinous matrix. Numerous previous studies have documented the capacity of diatoms to acquire new proprieties: e.g. flocculation of diatom blooms, formation of diatom aggregates (Riebesell, 1999).

Further, Bienfang et al. (1982) demonstrated, using *in vitro* studies, that sinking of nutrient-depleted diatom populations was related to the kind of nutrient available and that it varied among species. In particular, Si-depletion accelerates most diatoms sinking, as diatoms have an absolute Si requirement for growth (Smetacek, 1985). The depletion of [\(\text{Si(OH)}_4\)] has been shown to cause spring bloom collapses in coastal waters (Conley et al., 1993). Although mucus secretion increases in nutrient-depleted diatom populations (Degens & Itokei, 1984), the dynamics of aggregation is poorly understood (Allerdge, et al., 1995). Observations of nutrient concentrations in parallel with diatom bloom dynamics in this study strongly suggest that diatoms sink due to nutrient limitation. This limitation can be observed first with Redfield ratios (Del Amo et al., 1997), which give estimates of relative nutrient requirements by diatoms (\(\text{Si:N:P}=16:16:1\)). In 1998, only silicic acid and dissolved inorganic nitrogen measurements (nitrate+nitrite+ammonium) are available. The low Si:N ratios (<1, Figure 6A) from late March to late July suggests that Si was potentially the most limiting nutrient during this period, but we cannot rule out the possibility of a phosphate limitation, as no data on this element are available.

Real limitation depends then on the algal species composition and on specific kinetic curves. *In situ* concentrations must be compared to half-saturation constants for nutrient uptake (\(K_m\)). If concentrations are below the \(K_m\), uptake is reduced and algal growth is potentially limited. According to Del Amo et al. (1997), \(K_m\) values of 0.2, 2.0 and 2.0 \(\mu M\) for phosphate, silicic acid and nitrogen, respectively, are considered reasonable for the Bay of Brest. During the spring bloom, silicate concentration remained below the \(K_m\) (2 \(\mu M\)) and stayed low until July (0.6—0.8 \(\mu M\) during the bloom). So even if Si is not the only limiting nutrient (as \(P\) concentrations are not available), Si limitation does occur. Furthermore, Del Amo et al. (1997) also suggested that Si limitation of silicous-phytoplankton-dominated spring blooms represented the response of the Bay of Brest ecosystem to high-nitrate-loaded fresh-water inputs.

With respect to the Si:N ratio, the 1999 bloom periods would be potentially Si limited (Si:N<1) as in 1998 (Figure 6B). However, ambient Si concentrations remained above 2 \(\mu M\) during all the blooms and high Si:P ratios (largely >16, Figure 6C) suggesting that P limitation was more important than Si limitation. Comparison of mean \(K_m\) values for phosphate uptake confirm that the major bloom was effectively P limited (ambient values of 0.05 ±0.02 \(\mu M\) were less than the 0.2 \(\mu M\) \(K_m\) value) in 1999. On the other hand, in 1998, silicic acid, rather than phosphate, is inferred to have been a limiting factor responsible for the collapse of the spring bloom.

According to Bienfang et al. (1982), sinking velocity is minor when phosphate is limiting in culture. This may explain why the phenomenon appeared to be more pronounced in 1998, as phosphate depletion in 1999 may not have been sufficient enough to cause a sinking episode. This is consistent, too, with the hypothesis of an aggregation of particles due to Si depletion. Clogging of gills and consequent growth perturbation would be greater with aggregated cells. Thus, the difference in sinking dynamics could explain why the incident was observed in 1999 but with lower amplitude. Phytoplankton concentrations inhibited growth in 1999, but not as much as overall events in 1998.

Further support for the collapse of the phytoplankton blooms due to nutrient limitation is seen in the grazing index. Relatively intact diatoms that reach the deep sea floor without being ingested by zooplankton (Smetacek, 1985) often dominate this rapidly sinking phytoplankton mass. Data on phaeopigment \(a\) and the grazing index for the two years confirm this hypothesis. Indeed, it seems that a large amount of chlorophyll-\(a\) arrived at the sea-floor without being damaged, as evidenced by low values of the grazing index. This could reinforce the hypothesis of sedimentation. In any case, the low grazing index confirms that diatom blooms give rise to perturbations, at a large scale, of phytoplankton grazers in the Bay of Brest.

This study, conducted in the Bay of Brest on the effects of environmental factors on the daily growth rate of *P. maximus* juveniles has confirmed several hypotheses.

High levels of chlorophyll-\(a\), as in 1995 (Chauvaud et al., 1998), are not necessarily correlated with high growth rates. In 1998 and 1999, peaks were even associated with a slowing of growth. Large bottom concentrations of chlorophyll-\(a\), following diatom blooms, could have a negative effect on the ingestion or respiration of *P. maximus* juveniles, either by gill clogging or by oxygen depletion at the water-sediment interface associated with the degradation of organic matter. Sedimentation mechanisms in relation to the dynamics of the nutrients seem of interest for a better understanding of diatom mass sinking. A clear resolution of this question will require experiments designed to address Si or \(P\)-limited growth directly in natural diatom assemblages. Furthermore, an experimental protocol of monitoring scallop respiration when algal concentration is high, coupled with *in situ* measurement of oxygen and food intake during a bloom, would be necessary to confirm or reject these hypotheses.
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