

Influence of Nutrient Gradient on Phytoplankton Size Structure, Primary Production and Carbon Transfer Pathway in a Highly Productive Area (SE Mediterranean)

Oumayma Chkili, Marouan Meddeb, Kaouther Mejri Kousri, Sondes Melliti Ben Garali, Nouha Makhlouf Belkhahia, Marc Tedetti, Marc Pagano, Amel Belaaj Zouari, Malika Belhassen, Nathalie Niquil, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

Oumayma Chkili, Marouan Meddeb, Kaouther Mejri Kousri, Sondes Melliti Ben Garali, Nouha Makhlouf Belkhahia, et al.. Influence of Nutrient Gradient on Phytoplankton Size Structure, Primary Production and Carbon Transfer Pathway in a Highly Productive Area (SE Mediterranean). Ocean Science Journal, 2023, 58 (1), pp.6. 10.1007/s12601-023-00101-6. hal-03937994

HAL Id: hal-03937994 https://normandie-univ.hal.science/hal-03937994v1

Submitted on 30 Mar 2023 $\,$

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1	Influence of nutrient gradient on phytoplankton size						
2	structure, primary production and carbon transfer pathway						
3	in a highly productive area (SE Mediterranean)						
4							
5	Oumayma Chkili ^{1,2,5} · Marouan Meddeb ^{1,2} · Kaouther Mejri Kousri ^{1,4} · Sondes						
6	Melliti Ben Garali ^{1,2} · Nouha Makhlouf Belkhahia ² · Marc Tedetti ³ · Marc Pagano ³						
7	[·] Amel Belaaj Zouari ^{4 ·} Malika Belhassen ^{4 ·} Nathalie Niquil ^{5 ·} Asma Sakka						
8	Hlaili ^{1,2*}						
9							
10 11	Asma Sakka Hlaili <u>asma.sakkahlaili@gmail.com</u>						
12							
13 14	¹ Université de Carthage, Faculté des Sciences de Bizerte, Laboratoire de Biologie Végétale et Phytoplanctonologie, Bizerte, Tunisie						
15 16	² Université de Tunis El Manar, Faculté des Sciences de Tunis, Laboratoire des Sciences de l'Environnement, Biologie et Physiologie des Organismes Aquatiques LR18ES41, Tunis, Tunisie						
17 18	³ Aix Marseille Univ., Université de Toulon, CNRS, IRD, MIO UM 110, 13288 Marseille, France						
19 20	⁴ Institut National des Sciences et Technologies de la Mer (INSTM); 28, rue 2 mars 1934, Salammbô 2025, Tunisia						
21 22 23	⁵ CNRS, Normandie Université, UNICAEN, UMR BOREA (MNHN, CNRS-8067, Sorbonne Universités, Université Caen Normandie, IRD-207, Université des Antilles), CS 14032, Caen, France						
24							
25							
26							
27							
28	Received: 16 July 2022 / Revised: 30 November 2022 / Accepted: 5 December 2022						
29	© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Korea Institute of Ocean Science & Technology						
30 31	(KIUSI) and the Korean Society of Oceanography (KSO) and Springer Nature B V 2023						
71	Springer Mature D. v. 2025						
32							

33 ABSTRACT

We assessed the spatial variability in the size structure of phytoplankton, community 34 composition, primary production and carbon fluxes through the planktonic food web of the Gulf 35 of Gabès (GG; Southeastern Mediterranean Sea) in the fall of 2017 during the MERMEX-36 MERITE cruise. High concentrations in nutrients, chlorophyll a (~2-6 μ g L⁻¹) and primary 37 production (1816-3674 mg C $m^{-2} d^{-1}$) revealed an eutrophic status of the studied stations in the 38 39 GG. In accordance with hydrodynamic features, inorganic nutrients showed increases in concentrations from North to South and from coast to offshore, these nutrient gradients 40 impacting the spatial distribution of phytoplankton community. Size-fractioned phytoplankton 41 42 biomass and production were the lowest in the northernmost zone where they were mainly 43 sustained by pico-sized fraction. Concomitantly, in this area, small aloricate ciliates were dominant leading to a high microbivory. Conversely, higher biomass and production were 44 45 measured towards the South and offshore with prevalence of larger phytoplankton (nano- and/or micro-sized fractions) supported by diatoms. The herbivorous protozooplankton and 46 metazooplankton were more abundant in these zones, resulting in an increase of the herbivory. 47 The vertical particulate organic carbon flux followed also a north-south and coast-offshore 48 increasing gradient, with a higher contribution of phytoplankton, and zooplankton fecal pellets 49 50 to the sinking organic matter in the southernmost area. Our results suggest that even in nutrientrich and highly productive waters, a continuum of trophic pathways, ranging from microbial to 51 multivorous and herbivorous food webs, may exist, which implies different efficiencies in 52 53 carbon export and carrying capacity within the ecosystem.

54 Keywords Phytoplankton size-structure ' Primary production ' Zooplankton grazing ' Planktonic
55 food web ' Mediterranean Gulf

57 **1 Introduction**

The phytoplankton, through its biomass, diversity and productivity, has a key role in the 58 59 functioning of marine ecosystems. The size structure of phytoplankton is an important planktonic trait that affects the magnitude of primary production, controls the size of grazers 60 and hence regulates the carbon transfer through the marine food web (Decembrini et al. 2009; 61 62 Ward et al. 2012; Sakka Hlaili et al. 2014; Negrete-García et al. 2022). Any shift in the size of phytoplankton may largely influence the planktonic food web dynamics and the overall 63 efficiency of the marine system to export primary production (Legendre and Le Fèvre 1989; 64 65 Legendre and Rassoulzadegan 1996).

In general, large phytoplankton (mainly micro-sized cells) is consumed by herbivorous 66 67 zooplankton (mainly copepods), and primary production is efficiently transferred to higher consumers through the herbivorous food web. At the opposite, small phytoplankton (mainly 68 pico-sized cells) and microbivorous protozooplankton (heterotrophic nanoflagellates and 69 70 aloricate ciliates) are involved in the microbial food web that channels less carbon to higher consumers, as most of primary production is remineralized in the euphotic zone (Legendre and 71 Le Fèvre 1989; Meddeb et al. 2018). More complex carbon pathways may be present in marine 72 ecosystems. The multivorous food web, in which large and small phytoplankton, as well as 73 herbivorous and microbivorous zooplankton play all together significant roles, can be efficient 74 75 in carbon transfer (Legendre and Rassoulzadegan 1995). The bacterial-multivorous food web, in which phytoplankton and bacterioplankton contribute together to carbon production, was 76 77 recently identified and reported to be less efficient in carbon transfer because of the recycling 78 of the latter (Meddeb et al. 2019). Legendre and Rassoulzadegan (1995) reported that the dynamics of planktonic food web was related to that of nutrients and thus described a continuum 79 of trophic pathways between eutrophic and oligotrophic systems, going from herbivorous to 80 81 multivorous and microbial food webs.

The nutrient conditions are controlled by physical processes that ultimately influence the 82 size structure of phytoplankton and the primary production (Estrada et al. 1999; Cermeño et al. 83 2006; Ferland et al. 2011). Previous studies in the Mediterranean Sea have shown that trophic 84 85 status driven by hydrodynamic forcing can impact the structure of food webs and promote the ecosystem's ability to export biogenic carbon. In highly stratified oligotrophic open waters, 86 where primary production is low, pico- and nano-sized cells dominate the phytoplankton 87 community (Decembrini et al. 2009). Most carbon is then channeled to higher consumers 88 through microbial food web, with a high recycling activity (Giannakourou et al. 2014; Livanou 89 et al. 2019). Changes in the food web structure can occur when vertical deep mixing or 90 upwelling supply nutrients to the euphotic zone that promote large-sized phytoplankton (i.e., 91 diatoms) and substantially increase primary production (Allen et al. 2002). In that case, the food 92 web shifts to an herbivorous pathway that efficiently transfers carbon to upper trophic levels 93 (Stibor et al. 2019). 94

In the Mediterranean coastal systems, hydrodynamic features (mesoscale structures, 95 tides...) may influence the hydrological and biogeochemical parameters (salinity, temperature, 96 97 nutrients...) that finally impact the size structure and composition of phytoplankton (Caroppo et al. 2006, 2018; Geyer et al. 2018; Trombetta et al. 2021). Decembrini et al. (2020) have 98 recently shown that the lateral advection of nutrient-rich water in the Gulf of Augusta (Eastern 99 Sicilian coast, Ionian Sea) triggered a change in the size structure of phytoplankton and primary 100 production with a significant ecological effect on the planktonic food web. Besides physical 101 forcing, continental nutrient inputs from anthropogenic activities can influence the 102 phytoplankton structure and alter the relationship between the latter and grazers, with possible 103 changes in trophic pathways (Smith et al. 2006; Decembrini et al. 2021). The coastal 104 Mediterranean environments are typically mesotrophic or eutrophic systems, with relatively 105 high nutrient concentrations and dominance of large-sized phytoplankton (MedECC 2020). 106 107 Yet, the herbivorous food web is not usually observed and other trophic pathways (such as

108 microbial or multivorous food webs) can occur at spatial and seasonal scales (Grami et al. 2008;

Meddeb et al. 2018; Decembrini et al. 2021; Trombetta et al. 2022), probably due to the influence of the hydrological properties of the system. Therefore, the interactions between hydrodynamics and nutrient inputs must be taken into account to describe the structure of marine food web in eutrophic coastal ecosystems (Liu et al. 2018; Decembrini et al. 2021).

Although much interest has been given to primary production and its trophic transfer in 113 the Mediterranean Sea (Moran and Estrada 2001; Casotti et al. 2003; Psarra et al. 2005; 114 Decembrini et al. 2009; Kovač et al. 2018; Mayot et al. 2020), data acquired in its Southern 115 116 basin are scarce (Sakka Hlaili et al. 2008; Grami et al. 2008; Meddeb et al. 2018). Furthermore, little effort has been dedicated to describe how nutrient inputs and physical features affect the 117 phytoplankton community structure and food web dynamics. In the Southeastern Mediterranean 118 Sea, the Gulf of Gabès (hereafter refers to as GG) is a highly dynamical coastal ecosystem, 119 characterized by a large continental shelf with relatively shallow well-mixed and rich-nutrient 120 waters (Bel Hassen et al. 2009; Zayen et al. 2020), which is in contrast to the oligotrophic status 121 of the Eastern Mediterranean basin. The nutrient enrichment results mainly from the 122 123 anthropogenic inputs (mostly by phosphoric acid industries) (Khedhri et al. 2014; El Kateb et 124 al. 2018) and the atmospheric deposition through Saharan dust (Khammeri et al. 2018). The GG is also characterized by a complex water circulation, which results from the combination 125 of the general thermohaline circulation (Bel Hassen et al. 2009), the anticyclonic winds and the 126 strong tides (Sammari et al., 2006, Hattour et al. 2010; Othmani et al. 2017) (see details below). 127 This circulation induces North-South and coast-offshore transports, which induce a gradient of 128 particles and dissolved elements (such as nutrients) with accumulation in the Southern part of 129 the GG (Ciglenečki et al. 2020; Mansouri et al. 2020). Previous studies have actually shown 130 that phytoplankton dynamics within the GG was related to the nutrient conditions and water 131 physical properties (Bel Hassen et al. 2008, 2009; Drira et al. 2009, 2014). Spatial distributions 132 were also documented for protozooplankton and copepod communities and were shown to be 133

linked to the combination of hydrodynamic conditions and anthropogenic loads (Hannachi et
al. 2008; Drira et al. 2009, 2017; Makhlouf Belkahia et al. 2021). Although nutrient inputs and
water circulation are recognized as major drivers in influencing the dynamics of phytoplankton
and zooplankton in the GG (Béjaoui et al. 2019), the link between these communities and their
functional roles are not well known.

The aim of this study is to analyze the size structure of phytoplankton and the sizefractionated primary production, as well as trophic interactions between planktonic components in order to define the main characteristics of carbon transfer pathway. In particular, our work aims to demonstrate how food web structure changes along a nutrients spatial gradient in a highly dynamical environment like the GG. The study will also allow verifying whether the "continuum of trophic pathways" reported by Legendre and Rassoulzadegan (1995) could be found in highly productive waters characterized by a gradient of eutrophic conditions.

146 **2 Materials and Methods**

147 **2.1 Hydrodynamic features of the study area**

The GG is a relatively shallow ecosystem which is strongly influenced by hydrodynamic 148 forcing, mainly driven by the general Mediterranean circulation, the anticyclonic winds and the 149 high tide effects (Hattour et al. 2010; Othmani et al. 2017). The Atlantic Tunisian Current 150 (ATC) is a surface current originating from the Atlantic Ocean. It crosses the Sicilian-Tunisian 151 152 Channel, flows along the Tunisian continental shelf southward, and splits into two branches (Fig. 1). One coastal branch of the ATC enters the GG and creates an anticyclonic circulation 153 in its Southern part (Ben Ismail et al. 2012; Boukthir et al. 2019). The other branch flows on 154 155 southeastward along the Libyan shelf, giving rise to the Atlantic Libyan Current (ALC) (Ben Ismail et al. 2015). Furthermore, the hydrodynamics of the GG is deeply influenced by 156 barometric tides (Sammari et al. 2006), which have the highest range of the Mediterranean Sea 157 with a maximal amplitude (~ 2 m) in the Southern region (Abdennadher and Boukthir 2006; 158

159 Othmani et al. 2017). Concomitantly with our work, Zayen et al. (2020) investigated the

- 160 hydrodynamic circulation in the GG, and reported an average littoral current flowing North to
- 161 South and two eddies in the middle of the GG that induce a counter current on the littoral in its
- 162 Southern part (Fig. 1).
- 163



164

Fig. 1 Gulf of Gabès: localization of the sampling stations and hydrodynamic circulation
 (Atlantic Tunisian Current: ATC and Atlantic Lybian Current: ALC). Modified from Zayen et
 al. (2020)

169 **2.2** Choice of study stations and sampling

The study was carried out within the framework of the MERMEX-MERITE project 170 (Marine Ecosystems Responses In The Mediterranean Experiment) campaign from 31 Oct. to 171 172 3 Nov. 2017. We investigated the overall function of plankton communities based on sampling and field experiments carried out simultaneously, which was not easy to achieve in several 173 stations. Therefore, to meet our objective, we chose to explore several key processes in plankton 174 communities in four relevant stations within the GG (S1, S2, S3 and S4; Fig. 1). The choice of 175 the stations was based on a preliminary work emphasizing a heterogeneous distribution of 176 nutrients in the study region, with increased concentrations from North to South and from the 177 coast to offshore (Fig. S1 in Supplementary Material). 178

179 Station S2 was located in front of the phosphoric acid plant of the Ghannouch-Gabès 180 industrial complex and was chosen as to represent coastal waters impacted by phosphogypsum 181 loading; Stations S1 and S4 were located on either side of station S2 (North and South, 182 respectively), while S3 was an offshore station in front of S1 (Fig. 1). The characteristics of the 183 stations and sampling are reported in Table 1.

In each station, seawater was collected using 2.5 L plastic water sampler (Hydro-Bios), 184 and water temperature, salinity, pH and dissolved oxygen (O₂) were measured in situ with a 185 multi-probe sensor (Multi 1970i, WTW) at three depths (between 0.5 and 14 m) depending on 186 the maximal water depth of the stations (Table 1). The collected water was filtered through a 187 200 µm mesh screen to remove large zooplankton, and three subsamples from each depth were 188 taken for nutrients, chlorophyll a (Chl a), phytoplankton and protozooplankton analyses. At 189 each station, metazooplankton (> 200 µm organisms) was collected with a 28 cm diameter 190 191 WP2 200 µm net by vertical hauls from the bottom to the surface. A flow meter was used to determine the water volume filtered during the net tow. 192

193

195 Table 1 Main characteristics, environmental parameters and phytoplankton biomasses of the

sampling stations within the Gulf of Gabès during the fall 2017. Physico-chemical variables andChl *a* concentrations are depth-averaged values; carbon biomasses are depth-integrated values

(Mean value \pm SD, N = 9). p-value (ns: not significant; *: 0.01 < p < 0.05; ** 0.001 < p < 0.01, ***:

p < 0.001 indicates the significant level for the ANOVA used to test spatial variation

		S1		S2		S3		S4	p-value
Coordinates	Latitude (N) Longitude (E)	34° 01.767' 10° 06.295'	33° 56.54 10° 08.93	5' 9'	34° 10°	01.491' 19.940'	33° 52 10° 11	2.346' 1.803'	
Sampling date		30/10		01/11		01/11		03/11	
Tide condition / height (m)		High / 1.6		High / 1.9		Low / 0.7		Low / 0.8	
Maximum water depth (m)		13.5		12.1		18.8		13.6	
Sampled depths (m)		0.5; 2.5; 5		2.5; 4; 7		2; 8; 14		2; 6; 10	
Water temperature (°C)		22.55 ± 0.64		22.90 ± 0.37		22.89 ± 0.21		24.18 ± 0.52	ns
Salinity		$39.43{\pm}0.85$		$39.56{\pm}0.37$		$39.48{\pm}~0.25$		$39.42{\pm}0.54$	ns
рН		8.31 ± 0.005		8.24 ± 0.028		8.27 ± 0.01		8.25 ± 0.017	ns
Dissolved O ₂ (mg L ⁻¹)		8.20 ± 0.05		8.25 ± 0.02		8.23 ± 0.04		8.15 ± 0.11	ns
$N_{inorg}(\mu M)$		4.27 ± 0.36		7.63 ± 0.43		5.12 ± 0.31		8.93 ± 2.11	*
$N_{org}(\mu M)$		12.29 ±2.42		9.20 ± 0.27		6.50 ± 0.11		5.03 ± 0.49	**
$P_{inorg}(\mu M)$		0.91 ± 0.27		1.77 ± 0.44		1.52 ± 0.08		2.20 ± 0.05	*
$P_{org}(\mu M)$		8.23 ± 1.93		16.95 ± 2.42		11.45 ± 0.18		18.32 ± 0.02	***
Si(OH)4 (µM)		4.90 ± 0.22		5.34 ± 0.40		6.40 ± 0.30		8.98 ± 0.76	***
Chl <i>a</i> (µg L ⁻¹)		1.65 ± 0.06		3.68 ± 1.63		5.90 ± 1.12		6.06 ± 0.24	**
% of total Chl a									
Microphyt. Nanophyt. Picophyt.		35 ± 3 28 ± 5 37 ± 6		30 ± 2 43 ± 6 27 ± 5		49 ± 5 30 ± 4 21 ± 4		$\begin{array}{c} 74 \pm 5 \\ 15 \pm 5 \\ 11 \pm 1 \end{array}$	*** * NS
Carbon biomass (mg C m ⁻²)		780.22 ± 65.60		854.50 ± 90.19		1300.3 ± 44.28		1624.57 ± 134.80	**
Microphyt. Nanophyt. Picophyt.		$\begin{array}{l} 418 \pm 51 \; (54\%) \\ 265 \pm 14 \; (9\%) \\ 152 \pm 0.1 \; (38\%) \end{array}$		$\begin{array}{l} 608 \pm 91 \; (71\%) \\ 72 \pm 0.4 \; (8\%) \\ 175 \pm 0.1 \; (21\%) \end{array}$		$\begin{array}{l} 951\pm 30\ (74\%)\\ 86\pm 13\ (7\%)\\ 263\pm 0.1\ (20\%) \end{array}$		$\begin{array}{l} 1207 \pm 30 \; (75\%) \\ 265 \pm 13 \; (16\%) \\ 152 \pm 0.1 \; (9\%) \end{array}$	*** *** **

200

201 **2.3** Nutrient, Chl *a* and plankton analyses

Inorganic nitrogen (N_{inorg}: NO₂⁻ + NO₃⁻ + NH₄⁺), inorganic phosphorus (P_{inorg}: PO₄³⁻) and silicates (Si(OH)₄), as well as total nitrogen (N_{total}) and phosphorus (P_{total}) were analyzed with a BRAN and LUEBBE type 3 autoanalyzer (Bran + Luebbe Co, Germany). The precision for all nutrient analyses was \leq 1%. Organic nutrients (N_{org} and P_{org}) were estimated as the difference between total and inorganic elements. For Chl *a* analysis, water samples (1 L) were successively filtered through 10, 2 and 0.2 μ m polycarbonate membranes to determine size-fractionated Chl *a* (> 10, 2-10 and \leq 2 μ m). Filtrations were performed under low vacuum pressure (< 100 mm Hg) and low light intensity. Chl *a* concentrations were estimated using the spectrophotometric method after 24 h extraction in 90% acetone at 4 °C in the dark (Parsons et al. 1984). Total Chl *a* concentration was estimated as the sum of the three size-fractioned Chl *a* concentrations.

To enumerate picophytoplankton ($\leq 2 \mu m$ cells), 2 mL samples were immediately fixed 213 after sampling with 20% paraformaldehyde solution, then placed at 4 °C in the dark for 15 min, 214 and finally frozen at -80 °C in liquid nitrogen until analysis with a CyFlow® Space flow 215 cytometer (Partec). Prior to analysis, the samples were filtered on 30 µm pore size filters and 216 enriched with fluorescent beads of 1 and 2 µm in diameter (Polysciences, Inc) as internal cell 217 size standards. TrucountTM beads were also added to accurately estimate the volume of each 218 219 sample (BD-Biosciences). Picoprokaryotes and picoeukaryotes were identified and counted on the basis of their relative forward scatter (FSC) and phycoerythrin orange fluorescence (at 488 220 nm) and Chl a red fluorescence (at 638 nm), respectively. Cell volumes were determined using 221 equivalent diameters estimated from flow cytometry. The biovolumes (picoprokaryotes: 222 1.77 μ m³; picoeukaryotes: 4.19 μ m³) were converted into carbon content using the following 223 conversions: 0.357 pg C μ m⁻³ for picoprokaryotes, and 0.433 x (μ m³)^{0.863} for picoeukaryotes 224 (Verity et al. 1992). The cell carbon contents were multiplied by the abundances to estimate the 225 carbon biomass of picophytoplankton (mg C m⁻³). Depth-integrated biomass (mg C m⁻²) was 226 obtained from the carbon biomasses estimated for the three depths. 227

Phytoplankton samples (nano-: 2-10 μ m; micro-phytoplankton: > 10 μ m) were preserved in 3% acidic Lugol's solution and stored at room temperature in the dark (Parsons et al. 1984). The identification and counting of cells (at least 500 *per* sample) were determined using the Motic AE31E inverted microscope on 100 mL settled volume (Utermöhl 1931; Lund et al. 1958). Cell dimensions of phytoplankton taxa were measured using a calibrated ocular micrometer and biovolumes were determined by applying standard geometric formulae to each taxon (Hillebrand et al. 1999). Then, the biovolumes were converted into carbon content using specific conversion factors or formulae (Putt and Stoecker 1989; Menden-Deuer and Lessard 2000) for diatoms, autotrophic flagellates and ciliates, as detailed in Meddeb et al. (2018). The carbon biomass of phytoplankton (mg C m⁻³) was then determined by multiplying the carbon content of different taxa by their specific abundances. Carbon biomasses from the three sampled depths were used to calculate the depth-integrated biomass (mg C m⁻²).

Protozooplankton samples (100 mL) were fixed with 4% basic Lugol's solution (Sherr 240 and Sherr 1993), and organisms were identified and counted (at least 200 cells *per* sample) 241 according to the inverted microscopy technique of Utermöhl (1931). Protozooplankton was 242 composed of heterotrophic nanoflagellates and ciliates including loricate and aloricate species, 243 but also of dinoflagellates (most of which are phagotrophic). Within dinoflagellates, 244 mixotrophic and heterotrophic organisms were distinguished according to several works (Sakka 245 Hlaili et al. 2007; Jeong et al. 2010; Boutrup et al. 2016). The ebridian flagellate Hermesinium 246 247 sp. was also considered as a micrograzer since its mixotrophy had been confirmed (Hargraves 2002; Jafari et al. 2015). 248

Samples of metazooplankton (250 mL) were fixed with a 5% borate-buffered formalin
solution. Metazoan organisms were counted and identified in the whole sample using a Leica
M 205C stereo microscope.

252 **2.4** *In situ* dilution experiment

The dilution method (Landry and Hassett 1982) was used to estimate the growth rate of phytoplankton and its grazing rate by protozooplankton at each station and at the same sampling date. Water samples were collected over the water column (5 m for S1, 7 m for S2, 14 m for S3 and 10 m for S4) with a submersible pump and then filtered through 200 µm mesh screen (to remove meso- and macroplankton). This screened seawater was diluted with free-particle seawater to achieve four dilutions (25, 50, 75 and 100% of 200 µm screened seawater). The

diluting seawater was obtained by gravity filtration using a 0.22 µm sterile filter capsule 259 (polycap 75 AS). Triplicate 2 L polycarbonate bottles (Nalgene[®]) were used for each dilution, 260 and all bottles were incubated *in situ* for one day (t = 1 d). The GG is a nutrient-rich environment 261 262 where nutrients are considered as available throughout the year (Bel Hassen et al. 2008; Béjaoui et al. 2019). Therefore, nutrients were not added to our dilution bottles to avoid the 263 overestimation of growth rates. Furthermore, several authors have found that growth rates in 264 nutrient-enriched bottles were not significantly different from those estimated without nutrients 265 during dilution experiments conducted in nutrient-rich systems (Olson and Strom 2002; Sakka 266 Hlaili et al. 2007; Pecqueur et al. 2022). Subsamples were taken from each dilution bottle at the 267 beginning and the end of incubation to determine initial and final phytoplankton carbon 268 biomasses (C_0 and C_1 ; respectively). As protozoans have a prev size-selective feeding activity 269 (Sakka Hlaili et al. 2007; Zhang et al. 2017), size-fractioned biomass of phytoplankton was 270 determined (i.e., pico-: $\leq 2 \mu m$, nano-: 2-10 μm , and microphytoplankton: > 10 μm). The 271 272 apparent growth rate of each size fraction prey (R) was calculated from the changes in carbon biomass during the incubation period as: 273

274
$$R(d^{-1}) = \ln \left(\frac{C_t}{C_0} \right) \times t^{-1}$$

The coefficients R were plotted against the dilution factor, and a model I linear regression was used to estimate growth rates k (d⁻¹) (i.e., the y-intercept that represented growth in 100% dilution in the absence of grazers) and the grazing coefficient g (d⁻¹) (i.e., the slope of the regression line) (Landry and Hassett 1982). For each size fraction in all stations, the regression lines were tested as significant by Student's t-test (p < 0.05) and were represented in the Supplementary Material (Fig. S2).

For each phytoplankton size fraction, production rates (P_1) and consumption rates by protozooplankton (G_{p1}) were calculated according to several authors (Grattepanche et al. 2011; Meddeb et al. 2018) as:

284
$$P_1 (mg \ C \ m^{-3} \ d^{-1}) = k \times C_0 [e^{(k-g)t} - 1] / (k - g \times t)$$

285 and

286
$$G_{p1} (mg \ C \ m^{-3} \ d^{-1}) = g \times C_0 [e^{(k-g)t} - 1] / (k - g \times t)$$

The P₁ and G_{p1} data were multiplied by the sampling depth to get depth-integrated rates of production (P, mg C m² d⁻¹) and consumption (G_p, mg C m² d⁻¹), respectively. Depth-integrated production rates for the three size fractions were added to obtain production rate for total phytoplankton. The percentage of production consumed *per* day was estimated as:

291 %Pgrazed
$$d^{-1} = {\binom{G_p}{P} \times 100}$$

292 2.5 Metazooplankton gut fluorescence analysis

The grazing of metazooplankton on phytoplankton was estimated using the gut 293 fluorescence method (Slaughter et al., 2006). Zooplankton was collected as indicated above. To 294 295 account for vertical migration of zooplankton likely to affect its feeding activity, sampling was carried out around sunset, when zooplankton perform a vertical ascension. Three 500 mL 296 297 subsamples of the cod content were immediately narcotized with 10% carbonated water (final 298 concentration, v/v) to minimize stress and gut evacuation by zooplankton (Kleppel and Pieper 1984) and were kept frozen in the dark to minimize fecal pellet production by the organisms 299 (Saiz et al. 1992). The zooplankton subsamples were thawed and washed with filtered seawater 300 301 to remove adhering algae and debris, and filtered onto 47 mm diameter GF/F membranes that were extracted in 10 mL of 90% acetone solution maintained at 4 °C in the dark. After overnight 302 303 extraction, each solution was centrifuged, and the supernatant absorbance was measured using a Jenway spectrophotometer before and after acidification with 10% hydrochloric acid solution 304 (Parsons et al. 1984). 305

306 The gut pigment content (GP) was calculated according to Slaughter et al. (2006) as:

307 $GP(mg pigment m^{-3}) = (GP_{sub} \times v)/(F \times V_{net}),$

308 where GP_{sub} (mg pigment m⁻³) is the phaeopigment concentration in the subsample, v (m³) is

- the volume of the subsample, F is the fraction of subsample processed for gut pigment content,
- and V_{net} (m³) is the total volume of seawater filtered during the net tow.
- 311 Consumption of > $2-\mu m$ phytoplankton by metazooplankton was calculated as:

312
$$G_m(mg\ C\ m^{-2}\ d^{-1}) = [GP \times CR \times C:Chla] \times D,$$

- 313 where D is the depth of the net tow (m), C:Chl *a* is the depth-averaged C:Chl *a* ratio determined
- $for > 2 \ \mu m$ phytoplankton at each station, and CR is the gut clearance rate of metazooplankton
- (d^{-1}) . The CR was obtained from the gut clearance rate constant (GCRC) *vs.* temperature (T)
- relationship (GCRC = 0.0117 + 0.001794T) (Dam and Peterson 1988; Irigoien 1998; Mauchline
- **317 1998**).

The impact of metazooplankton grazing on the standing stock and production of phytoplankton were calculated as:

320 %*Chla grazed*
$$d^{-1} = (GP \times CR \times 100)/SC$$

321 %
$$P \ grazed \ d^{-1} = {G_m/P} \times 100,$$

where SC is the depth-averaged concentration of Chl *a* and P is the production rate of nanoand micro-phytoplankton, estimated by the dilution method.

324 **2.6 Vertical carbon fluxes**

Sediment traps were used to estimate the vertical flux of particles, including 325 phytoplankton, metazooplankton fecal pellets, and detritus. This technique was performed by 326 several authors (Laurenceau-Cornec et al. 2015; Xiang et al. 2022; Kojima et al. 2022) because 327 it is very useful for estimating the particle sinking and gives details in the composition of the 328 sinking fluxes. At each station, two sediment traps (63 cm high, 9 cm internal diameter) were 329 incubated vertically two meters from the bottom. Prior to deployment, the traps were filled with 330 dense seawater (0.2 μ m filtered seawater + NaCl 5 g L⁻¹) to create a density gradient and avoid 331 collecting surface particles. After 24 h incubation, the traps were closed in situ, returned to the 332 laboratory and stored at 5 °C overnight to let particles settle. The supernatant was removed from 333

each trap and the bottom contents of the two traps were mixed. Subsamples were taken from
the trapped material for further analyses of particulate organic carbon (POC), phytoplankton
and fecal pellets.

For POC, ~ 500 mL seawater samples were filtered onto precombusted glass fiber filters (450 °C, 24 h) (Whatman GF/F, 25 mm). The filters were oven dried at 50 °C for 24 h and stored in clean glass vials in a desiccator. POC was determined by the high combustion method and mass spectrometry according to Raimbault et al. (2008).

Phytoplankton (> 2 μm cells) was enumerated on 500 mL subsamples fixed with acidic
Lugol's solution (final concentration 4%), and cell abundances were converted into carbon
biomasses as described above.

Subsamples (200 mL) were preserved in buffered formaldehyde (final concentration 7%) for counting fecal pellets using an inverted microscope (× 100 magnification). Differently shaped pellets were distinguished (cylindrical, conical; ovoid and round), and their dimensions were measured using a calibrated ocular micrometer.

348 The vertical fluxes of phytoplankton (F_{phyt}) and detritus (F_{det}) were estimated following 349 Grami et al. (2008):

350
$$F_{phyt}(mg \ C \ m^{-2}d^{-1}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(C_{phyt} \times V_{tr} \right) / S_{tr} \times t$$

351
$$F_{det}(mg \ C \ m^{-2}d^{-1}) = \frac{1}{2} (C_{det} \times V_{tr}) / S_{tr} \times t,$$

where C_{phyt} is the carbon biomass of nano- and microphytoplankton (mg C m⁻³) and C_{det} is the detrital carbon estimate, calculated as the POC concentration minus the carbon biomass of all particles. V_{tr} is the volume of trapped material (m³), S_{tr} is the trap area (m²) and t is the duration of incubation (d). The vertical flux of phytoplankton was considered to be the phytoplankton export from the planktonic system towards the benthos, while the vertical flux of detritus was assigned to the sinking flux.

Link: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12601-023-00101-6

The volume of each pellet shape category (V_{pel} , mm³ m⁻³) was estimated from its dimension and abundance. Then, its vertical volume flow (S_{pel}) and vertical carbon flux (F_{pel}) were estimated following Grami et al. (2008):

361
$$S_{pel}(mm^3m^{-2}d^{-1}) = \frac{1}{2}(V_{pel} \times V_{tr})/S_{tr} \times t$$

362
$$F_{pel}(mg \ C \ m^{-2}d^{-1}) = S_{pel} \times f$$

where f is a conversion factor (0.057 mg C mm⁻³ for cylindrical/conical pellets and 0.042 mg C
mm⁻³ for ovoid/rounded pellets).

365 2.7 Statistical analyses

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the significance of the spatial variation 366 of physico-chemical factors, Chl a, plankton concentrations and vertical fluxes. ANOVA was 367 also used to compare (i) environmental factors and plankton concentrations among depths, and 368 (ii) the estimates of rates (k, g, P, G_p, G_m) between phytoplankton size fractions (> 10, 2-10 and 369 < 2 µm) or stations. The assumptions of normality of data distribution (Kolmogorov-Smirnov 370 test) and homogeneity of variance (Bartlett-Box test) were met. Spearman correlations (rs) were 371 used to test the relationships between different variables: phytoplankton (Chl a, carbon biomass, 372 growth rate, production rate) and nutrients; growth (k) and grazing (g) rates; coefficients g and 373 G_p and protozooplankotn abundances; production (P) and consumption rate by 374 375 protozooplankton (G_p) ; consumption rate by metazooplankton (G_m) and phytoplankton biomass and metazoans abundances. ANOVA and correlation analyses were performed in SPSS 376 software 18.0 for Windows. 377

Canonical correspondence analysis (CCA; Ter Braak 1986) was performed to relate the spatial distribution of plankton communities to environmental parameters (P_{org} , P_{inorg} , N_{inorg} , N_{org} , Si(OH)₄, pH, temperature and salinity). The CCA also elucidated the relationship between the biomass of size-fractioned phytoplankton and different zooplanktonic groups. Phytoplankton and zooplankton data were ln (x + 1) transformed. The comparison of the canonical inertia associated with the CCA (constrained ordination) and the inertia of the classical correspondence analysis (CA, unconstrained ordination) indicated the extent to which the environmental variables explained the spatial structure of communities. Permutation tests (n = 999) were performed to identify the significant axis and to test the significance of the correlations between environmental factors and plankton distribution.

388 **3 Results**

389 **3.1 Environmental conditions**

Sampling stations were located in the continental shelf of the GG, which is characterized 390 391 by a shallow (< 20 m) well-mixed water column. Environmental factors showed no significant variations between sampling depths (ANOVA p > 0.05), and hence data were presented as 392 depth-averaged values (Table 1). Water temperature (22.6-24.2 °C), salinity (39.42-39.56), pH 393 (8.25-8.31) and dissolved O₂ $(8.15-8.25 \text{ mg L}^{-1})$ varied little among stations, while nutrient 394 concentrations exhibited significant spatial variations (ANOVA, p < 0.05). In S1, inorganic 395 nutrients presented the lowest values (4.27 µM N, 0.91 µM P and 4.90 µM Si) and increased 396 up to 8.93 µM N, 2.2 µM P and 8.98 µM Si in S4. Inorganic nutrient concentrations recorded 397 in S3 were higher than in S1, but lower than the southernmost station (S4). The highest and 398 lowest levels of organic nitrogen (Norg: 5.03-12.29 µM) were recorded in S1 and S4, 399 respectively. An opposite trend was observed for organic phosphorus (Porg: 8.23-18.32 µM). 400

401 **3.2 Spatial distribution of planktonic communities**

402 **Phytoplankton.** The depth-averaged Chl *a* concentrations and the depth-integrated 403 carbon biomasses were different among stations (ANOVA, p < 0.05; Table 1), increasing 404 gradually from S1 (1.7 µg Chl *a* L⁻¹, 780 mg C m⁻²) to S4 (6.07 µg Chl *a* L⁻¹, 1,624 mg C m⁻²). 405 Positive correlations were found between inorganic N, P and Si and Chl *a* concentrations 406 ($r_s = 0.64-0.84$, p < 0.01) and carbon biomass ($r_s = 0.67-0.78$, p < 0.01). Microphytoplankton 407 was the main source of Chl *a* in S4 (74%) and contributed to ~50% of it in S3. The contribution of picophytoplankton to Chl *a* was higher in S1 (37%) than in the other stations (11-27%), while nanophytoplankton contributed to a large fraction of Chl *a* in S2 (43%) (Table 1). In terms of carbon biomass, micro-sized fraction (418-1207 mg C m⁻²) formed the most of phytoplankton (54-75%), while nano-sized fraction (70-265 mg C m⁻²) contributed only by 9-16%. The picosized fraction (152-292 mg C m⁻²), which formed only 9% of phytoplankton carbon in S4, showed increased contributions in S2 and S3 (20-21%) and mostly in S1 (38%).

The composition of $> 2 \mu m$ phytoplankton community changed also among stations. 414 Diatoms showed different contributions to the community according to the station, and their 415 biomass was positively correlated with inorganic N, P and Si ($r_s = 0.79-0.67$, p < 0.01). Diatoms 416 were dominant in S2, S3 and S4, showing depth-averaged contribution of 73-88% (Fig. 2a). 417 They were mainly represented by Leptocylindrus minimus (30-60% of diatoms) in the three 418 stations. Large chains of Skeletonema costatum and Rhizosolenia setigera showed increased 419 contribution to diatoms (18-28%) only in S3 and S4 (Fig. 2b). The small phytoplagellates were 420 particularly abundant in S1 (45%; Fig. 2a), and were represented by nano-sized Cryptophyceae 421 422 (Hillea fusiformis and Rhodomonas marina). Within the phytoflagellates, the micro-sized 423 Dictyochophyceae (i.e., Dictyocha fibula) were more important in S3 and S4 than in the other stations (Fig. 2c). In all stations, photosynthetic ciliates (Mesodinium rubrum) and 424 dinoflagellates (*Prorocentrum gracile*) only accounted for 2-13% of the $> 2 \mu m$ phytoplankton 425 community (Fig. 2a). 426



427



sampling stations during fall 2017. Values are the means of the three depths at each station.

Protozooplankton. The depth-averaged abundance of total protozooplankton was 431 significantly different between stations (ANOVA, p < 0.05), varying from 43×10^3 cells L⁻¹ (in 432 S3) to 123×10^3 cells L⁻¹ (in S1) (Fig. 3a). Aloricate ciliates, mainly composed of *Strombidium* 433 spp. (Fig. 3b), were dominant in S1 (~60%; 70×10^3 cells L⁻¹). Loricate ciliates displayed a 434 relatively low abundance $(1.5-6 \times 10^3 \text{ cells } \text{L}^{-1})$ and were most abundant in S4, where 435 Tintinnopsis, Helicostomella and Amphorellopsis occurred (Fig. 3b). Dinoflagellates were 436 abundant in S2, S3 and S4 ($20-55 \times 10^3$ cells L⁻¹), contributing to 48-64% of protozooplankton. 437 Mixotrophic dinoflagellates including Gymnodinium, Heterocapsa, Karenia and Neoceratium 438 (Fig. 3c) were dominant in S2 (59% of dinoflagellates), whereas large heterotrophic 439 dinoflagellates (mainly Protoperidinium) mostly occurred in S4 (60%). The heterotrophic 440 nanoflagellate *Commation cryoporinum* (0.75-5.78 \times 10³ cells L⁻¹) and the ebridian flagellate 441 *Hermesinium sp.* $(8.7-26.7 \times 10^3 \text{ cells L}^{-1})$ contributed 2-12% and 15-37% to protozooplankton, 442 respectively (Fig. 3a). 443

Metazooplankton. Metazooplankton abundance significantly varied among stations 444 (ANOVA, p < 0.05) from 11×10^2 ind. m^{-3} in S1 to 20×10^2 ind. m^{-3} in S4 (Fig. 4a). Copepods 445 $(7.5-12.5 \times 10^2 \text{ ind. m}^{-3})$ were dominant in all stations, forming 53-86% of total 446 metazooplankton (Fig. 4a). Calanoida (Centropages, Clausocalanus, Paracalanus and 447 Phaenna) and Cyclopoida (Oithona) contributed to the majority of copepods, but with different 448 percentages according to the station (Fig. 4b). The harpacticoid Euterpina was relatively 449 abundant in S3 (12%). Cladocerans (Penilia sp.) mainly occurred in S4 (forming 16% of 450 metazoans), while decapod, polychaete and crab larvae as well as, crustacean nauplii were 451 observed at moderate concentrations in S2, S3 and S4. Other metazoan groups, e.g., 452 chaetognaths, appendicularians, nematodes and siphonophores were observed in all stations, 453 but at much lower densities. 454



457 Fig. 3 Abundance and composition of protozooplankton (a), and specific structure of the main
458 protozoan groups (b-d) in the sampling stations during the fall 2017. Values are the means of
459 the three depths at each station



461 Fig. 4 Abundance and composition of metazooplankton groups (a), and copepod taxa (b) in
 462 the sampling stations during the fall 2017

463

460

464 Relationship between environmental conditions and plankton communities. The influence of physico-chemical factors on phytoplankton (the three size fractions) and 465 zooplankton distribution, as well as relationships between phytoplankton and zooplankton were 466 467 summarized by the CCA. The first two canonical components extracted 69% of the canonical variance (Fig. 5). A Monte Carlo permutation test showed that all canonical axes were highly 468 significant (p < 0.0001). The positive pole of axis 1 was correlated with salinity (0.53, p < 0.05) 469 and organic nitrogen (0.73, p < 0.01), while the negative pole was correlated with temperature 470 (-0.51, p < 0.05), inorganic phosphorus (-0.61, p < 0.05), inorganic nitrogen (-0.50, p < 0.05), 471

silicates (-0.61, p < 0.05) and organic phosphorous (-0.65, p < 0.05). Axis 2 was positively correlated with the pH (0.53, p < 0.05).

The CCA discriminated two groups. The first axis positively selected picophytoplankton 474 with abiotic variables such as salinity and organic nitrogen, while nanoand 475 microphytoplankton were related to organic and inorganic phosphorus, silicates, inorganic 476 nitrogen, and temperature. The CCA also showed that pico-sized cells were associated with 477 aloricate ciliates, as well as heterotrophic and ebridian nanoflagellates. In contrast, nano- and 478 microphytoplankton prevailed when dinoflagellates (mixo- and hetero-trophic organisms), 479 480 loricate ciliates, copepods and cladocerans largely occurred. Dinoflagellates, loricate ciliates and copepods showed a positive correlation with temperature but were negatively correlated to 481 salinity. Loricate ciliates and flagellates protozoans followed, however, the opposite trend. 482



484 Fig. 5 Canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) ordination diagram showing the relationship
485 between phytoplankton (the three size fractions), zooplankton, and physico-chemical factors

486 **3.3. Phytoplankton growth and production**

The growth rates varied significantly (ANOVA, p < 0.01) among stations and size fractions (micro-: 0.41-1.52 d⁻¹; nano-: 1.09-1.89 d⁻¹; pico-phytoplankton: 1.01-1.89 d⁻¹) (Fig. 6a). The highest rate for the pico-sized fraction was recorded in S1, whereas for nano- and micro-phytoplankton, the highest rates were observed in S4. The growth rate of microphytoplankton was positively correlated with inorganic N and P ($r_s = 0.73-0.76$, p < 0.01), while that of picophytoplankton showed negative correlations with these nutrients ($r_s = -0.62 - 0.73$, p < 0.01).

494 Production rates for size fractioned and total phytoplankton varied significantly among stations (ANOVA, p < 0.05; Fig. 6b). Picophytoplankton displayed a very high production rate 495 in S1 (1412 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹) in comparison to other stations (300-496 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹). 496 Microphytoplankton showed an opposite trend, with higher production rates in S2, S3 and S4 497 $(1160-2075 \text{ mg C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1})$ than in S1 (188 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹). The production rate for the micro-498 sized fraction was positively correlated to diatom biomass ($r_s = 0.83$, p < 0.01). Production rate 499 for nanophytoplankton was low in S1 and S3 (188-215 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹). Higher value was 500 observed in S2 (452 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹) and the highest in S4 (1301 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹). Production rate 501 for total phytoplankton showed an increasing trend from S1 (1816 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹) to S4 (3873 502 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹), and was positively correlated to all inorganic nutrients ($r_s = 0.68-0.81$, p < 0.01). 503 In S2, S3 and S4, microphytoplankton was the main carbon producer (55-78%), whereas in S1 504 picophytoplankton provided 78% of total carbon production. Nanophytoplankton contributed 505 only 7-12% of produced carbon in S1 and S3, and 21-34% in S2 and S4. 506



Picophytoplankton 🖾 Nanphytoplankton 🗆 Microphytoplankton

507

Fig. 6 Growth (a) and production (b) rates of the three phytoplankton size fractions
 (picophytoplankton: < 2 μm, nanophytoplankton: 2-10 μm, microphytoplankton: > 10 μm) in the sampling stations during the fall 2017

511 **3.4 Phytoplankton grazing**

Grazing by protozooplankton. The grazing and consumption rates by protozooplankton varied significantly among size fractions and across stations (ANOVA, p < 0.01; Table 2). Picophytoplankton was grazed at higher rates (0.82-1.30 d⁻¹) than the other size fractions (micro-: 0.18-0.54 d⁻¹; nano-phytoplankton: 0.51-1.01 d⁻¹) in stations S1, S2 and S3. However, microphytoplankton was the most grazed in S4 (0.84 d⁻¹). The highest consumption rate for picophytoplankton was recorded in S1 (762.96 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹) and the lowest in S4 (137 mg C

 $m^{-2} d^{-1}$). In the opposite, nano- and micro-phytoplankton were consumed at low rates in S1 518 (92 and 71 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹, respectively). Their consumption increased in other stations, 519 particularly in S4 (318 and 1049 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹, respectively). For each size fraction, the 520 consumption rates showed positive correlations to the production rates ($r_s = 0.73-0.95$, p < 521 0.05). The consumption rate for micro-sized fraction was positively correlated with the 522 abundances of heterotrophic dinoflagellates ($r_s = 0.85$, p < 0.01) and loricate ciliates ($r_s = 0.60$, 523 p < 0.05). Protozooplankton removed a substantial fraction of daily production for 524 picophytoplankton in most stations (~60% P grazed d⁻¹), except in S4 (40% P grazed d⁻¹). The 525 protozooplankton grazing corresponded to daily remove of 23-62% of nanophytoplankton 526 production. Protozooplankton grazing impact on microphytoplankton was higher in S4 (47%) 527 P grazed d⁻¹) than in the other stations (22-41% P grazed d⁻¹). Furthermore, microbivory (carbon 528 from picophytoplankton) contributed to carbon ingestion of protozooplankton by only 9% in 529 S4, but by 24-34% in S2 and S3, and up to 82% in S1. Conversely, herbivory played a 530 531 significant role in the feeding of protozooplankton in the other stations, as microphytoplankton alone represented 54-70% of their diet (Table 2). 532

Grazing by metazooplankton. The grazing rate and the impact of metazooplankton were significantly different among stations (ANOVA, p < 0.01; Table 3). The consumption rate of phytoplankton by metazooplankton showed the lowest value in S1 (76 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹) and the highest in S4 (794 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹). This rate was positively correlated with nano- and microphytoplankton biomass ($r_s = 0.70-0.78$, p < 0.01), and with copepod and cladoceran abundances ($r_s = 0.62-0.76$, p < 0.05). Metazooplankton removed 10-24% of phytoplankton production and 22-38% of phytoplankton standing stock (Table 3).

540

542 Table 2 Grazing rates by protozooplankton (g), consumption rates of phytoplankton (G_p),

543 grazing impact on phytoplankton and protozooplankton diet in the sampling stations within the

544 Gulf of Gabès during the fall 2017 (Mean value \pm SD, N = 3). p-value (ns: not significant; *:

545 0.01 ; ** <math>0.001 , ***: <math>p < 0.001) indicates the significant level for the

546 ANOVA used to test spatial variation.

	S1	<u>82</u>	S3	<i>S4</i>	p-value
g (d ⁻¹)					
Microphyt.	0.18 ± 0.07	0.54 ± 0	$0.38{\pm}0.09$	0.84 ± 0.03	***
Nanophyt.	0.88 ± 0.21	0.51 ± 0.15	0.71 ± 0.10	0.65 ± 0.21	*
Picophyt.	1.30 ± 0.04	0.88 ± 0.48	0.82 ± 0.80	0.68 ± 0.11	**
G _p (mg C m ⁻² d ⁻¹)					
Microphyt.	71.07 ± 17.46	463.79 ± 6.96	461.91 ± 103.73	1048.77 ± 48.25	**
Nanophyt.	91.74 ± 12.49	102.12 ± 29.80	119.45 ± 46.56	317.73 ± 16.81	*
Picophyt.	762.96 ± 6.35	293.91 ± 39.01	204.79 ± 30.00	137.50 ± 16.73	**
%P grazed d ⁻¹					
Microphyt.	35 ± 15	40 ± 5	22 ± 4	47 ± 7	***
Nanophyt.	42 ± 5	23 ± 7	62 ± 20	40 ± 15	**
Picophyt.	60 ± 1	57 ± 6	56 ± 13	40 ± 4	**
Diet (%)					
Microphyt.	8 ± 3	54 ± 8	62 ± 7	70 ± 7	**
Nanophyt.	10 ± 3	12 ± 1	14 ± 8	21 ± 6	*
Picophyt.	82 ± 7	34 ± 7	24 ± 3	9 ± 1	*

⁵⁴⁸

Table 3 Phytoplankton (nano- and micro-sized fractions) consumption rates by metazooplankton and grazing impact in the sampling stations within the Gulf of Gabès during the fall 2017. (Mean value \pm SD, N = 3). p-value (ns: not significant; *: 0.01 0.001 spatial variation

	S1	S2	S 3	S4	p-value
$G_m (mg \ C \ m^{-2} \ d^{-1})$	76.26 ± 0.65	313.36 ± 6.58	225.84 ± 2.40	794.28 ± 72.20	***
% P grazed d ⁻¹	19 ± 1	20 ± 1	10 ± 5	24 ± 6	**
% Chl <i>a</i> grazed d ⁻¹	22 ± 1	38 ± 3	32 ± 1	37 ± 4	ns
666					

555

⁵⁴⁹

557 **3.5 Vertical fluxes of particulate organic matter**

The vertical fluxes of particles varied significantly among stations, from 561 mg C m⁻² d⁻ 558 ¹ in S1 to 1891 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹ in S3 (ANOVA, p < 0.05; Fig. 7). These fluxes only accounted for 559 30% of primary production in S1, but reached 43-45% in S2 and S4, and 70% in S3. Detritus 560 was the dominant sinking flux from S1 (78%) to S3 (79%), but contributed less to the vertical 561 carbon flux of S4 (62%). The phytoplankton carbon exported towards the benthos followed an 562 increasing trend from S1 (111 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹) to S4 (611 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹). Zooplankton fecal pellets 563 were non-significant in S1, S2 and S3, and made only 2% of the vertical carbon flux in S4 (38 564 $mg C m^{-2} d^{-1}$). 565



566



569 **3.6 Planktonic interactions**

570 Based on data of size-fractionated production, prey-grazers relationships and carbon 571 vertical flux, conceptual diagrams of planktonic interactions were established for all sampling 572 stations (Fig. 8). The importance of the zooplankton microbivory and herbivory in the carbon 573 transfer (i.e., total consumption by proto- and meta-zooplankton) were considered in each 574 station.

In station S1, the primary production (1816 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹) was lower than in the other 575 stations, and mainly sustained by picophytoplankton (78%). These small producers were under 576 strong grazing pressure by protozooplankton, which was dominated by aloricate ciliates. 577 Consequently, a large amount of carbon (763 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹) entered the food web via the 578 microbivory of protozooplankton, which represented 76% of carbon transfer. However, $> 2 \mu m$ 579 phytoplankton (i.e., nano- and microphytoplankton), which was mainly composed by nano-580 sized phytoflagellates and to a lesser extent by diatoms, participated weakly to primary 581 production (22%). Moreover, protozooplankton grazing on > 2 μ m phytoplankton supplied 582 small amounts of carbon to higher consumers (163 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹). Metazooplankton had also 583 low feeding on nano- and microphytoplankton (76 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹). Consequently, herbivory of 584 proto- and metazooplankton together represented only 24% of channeled carbon. Similar to 585 primary production, the amount of carbon particles that settled down and could reach benthos 586 was low (562 mg C $m^{-2} d^{-1}$). 587

In comparison to station S1, stations S2 and S3 had an increased production of $> 2 \mu m$ 588 589 phytoplankton, particularly of microphytoplankton forming more than 70% of the total primary production, simultaneously to an increase of the diatom abundance. This was accompanied by 590 an increase in the herbivory of protozooplankton (48-60% of carbon transfer), which was 591 592 dominated by mixotrophic and heterotrophic dinoflagellates and ebridian flagellates. Thus, a high amount of > 2 μ m phytoplankton production (566-660 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹) fueled the food web. 593 Conversely, grazing impact of protozooplankton has decreased for picophytoplankton, which 594 contributed moderately to primary production (15-24%), and hence protozooplankton 595 microbivory (205-294 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹) supplied 20-25% of carbon to food web. Herbivory of 596 metazooplankton was relatively important (226-313 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹), corresponding to 20-27% of 597 carbon transfer. Similarly, vertical flux of particles increased in both stations to reach higher 598 value (924-1891 mg C $m^{-2} d^{-1}$) than in S1. 599

In station S4, the production of picophytoplankton had further decreased, compared to 600 other stations, to reach the lowest rate (8% of total PP) in detriment of an increase of the 601 production of $> 2 \mu m$ phytoplankton, which was characterized by the abundance of large 602 603 diatoms (such as *Rhizosolenia setigera* and *Skeletonema costatum*). Therefore, herbivorous protozoans, such as the diatom-consumer Protoperidinium, were abundant, leading to increased 604 herbivory for proto- (59%) and meta-zooplankton (35%), which supplied substantial quantities 605 of carbon (1367 and 794 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹, respectively) to food web. A significant carbon flux 606 towards benthos was also observed in this station (1700 mg C $m^{-2} d^{-1}$). 607



Fig. 8 Primary production (PP, mg C $m^{-2} d^{-1}$), trophic relationships and carbon transfer 609 pathways within the planktonic systems of the sampling stations in link with the nutrient 610 spatial gradient and hydrodynamic circulation in the Gulf of Gabès during the fall 2017. 611 Percentage contributions of phytoplankton size fractions to PP are indicated. Values with 612 arrows show the amount of channeled biogenic carbon (mg C m⁻² d⁻¹) and percentages 613 represent the contribution of zooplankton microbivory or herbivory to carbon transfer. 614 Width of arrow is proportional to the carbon flow. Microbivory = consumption of Pico-615 by Protozoo; Herbivory = consumption of Nano- and Micro- by Protozoo and Metazoo; 616 carbon transfer = consumption of Pico, Nano and Micro by Protozoo and Metazoo. 617

618

620 **4 Discussion**

621 **4.1 Productivity and nutrient richness**

Although the primary production levels are well documented for several Mediterranean regions 622 (Psarra et al. 2005; Kovač et al. 2018), information remains scarce for the Southern 623 624 Mediterranean (Sakka Hlaili et al. 2008; Meddeb et al. 2018) and even deficient for the GG. Here we provide primary production estimates in the GG based on dilution experiments. This 625 technique has been already used in various marine systems, and has shown production rates that 626 are similar to those measured by ¹⁴C method (Moigis and Gocke 2003; Meddeb et al. 2018; 627 Dokulil and Qian 2021). Nutrients were not added to dilution bottles, assuming high nutrient 628 concentrations in the GG during our study period. The estimated growth rates were relatively 629 high for most size fractions ($k \ge 1 d^{-1}$; Fig. 6a), indicating that nutrients were non-limiting for 630 phytoplankton growth. Furthermore, our estimates of growth rates for different size fractions 631 $(0.4-1.9 d^{-1})$ are in the range of values reported for fractioned phytoplankton from dilution 632 experiments (with or without nutrient addition) in other coastal ecosystems (Grami et al. 2008; 633 Wickham et al. 2022). Furthermore, Boudriga et al. (2022) recently reported similar growth rate 634 (0.38-1.7 d⁻¹) for phtytoplankton to our study. Therefore, the growth coefficients and 635 subsequently the calculated production rates measured in the present work are considered as 636 realistic. 637

Previous observations have suggested that the high fish production of the GG was related to a high primary production (Halouani et al. 2016; Béjaoui et al. 2019). Our study reveals indeed high total phytoplankton production rates (130-370 mg C m⁻³ d⁻¹ or 1816-3674 mg C m⁻ 2 d⁻¹), which were comparable with estimates from dilution technique in other coastal waters, including Mediterranean ecosystems (Moigis and Gocke 2003; Marquis et al. 2007; Grami et al. 2008). However, the primary production levels determined in the GG, located in the oligotrophic Eastern Mediterranean, far exceed rates currently reported for ecosystems within

the same basin, as Ionian Sea, Aegean Sea and Gulf of Trieste (Christaki et al. 2011; Šolić et 645 al. 2010; Cibic et al. 2018). This suggests the influence of anthropogenic nutrient inputs, in 646 addition to natural sources, in the GG leading to its high productivity. Our estimates of Chl a 647 concentrations (1.65-6.06 µg L⁻¹) also surpassed values reported in Mediterranean open sea 648 areas (Raveh et al. 2015; Salgado-Hernanz et al. 2019), but were in the range found in other 649 650 coastal waters (Meddeb et al. 2018; Morsy et al. 2022). Our Chl a levels were higher than those recorded by previous studies in the offshore part of GG ($< 1 \mu g L^{-1}$; Bel Hassen et al. 2009; 651 Hamdi et al. 2015), which can be due to several environmental features, such as hydrological 652 conditions, nutrient content, season, and phytoplankton community composition. Most of 653 previous works have been conducted during the summer-stratification period (July-September) 654 or during the transition period from the mixed to the stratified water (May-June), when nutrients 655 were in shortage (< 3 N μ M, < 1 P μ M) resulting in low Chl *a* concentrations. Furthermore, 656 $> 2 \mu m$ cells dominated the total Chl *a* in all stations (63-89%) and microphytoplankton alone 657 formed \geq 50% in S3 and S4 (Table 1). Moreover, large diatoms (*Leptocylindrus*, *Skeletonema* 658 659 and Rhizosolenia) were dominant during our sampling period (Fig. 2a, b). All these observations may explain the higher Chl a concentrations measured during our study compared 660 to previous works, which reported the dominance of pico- and nano-sized phototrophs and the 661 scarcity of diatoms (Bel Hassen et al. 2009; Hamdi et al. 2015; Khammeri et al. 2020). 662

The high primary production and Chl *a* concentrations in the GG were associated to high 663 nutrient concentrations (Table 1), mainly due to the large supply from anthropogenic discharges 664 and also to tide-induced sediment resuspension and atmospheric deposition (Drira et al. 2016; 665 Khammeri et al. 2018). The GG is exceptionally enriched in inorganic and organic P (Table 1) 666 since it continuously receives large amounts of phosphogypsum (1,000 to 13,000 t per day since 667 the 1970's) from the phosphoric acid plant (Béjaoui et al. 2004; Khedhri et al. 2014). The Pinorg 668 concentrations measured in all stations exceed those usually observed in Mediterranean coastal 669 670 waters, like the lagoons of Bizerte (0.15 μ M; Meddeb et al. 2018) and Thau (0.18 μ M; 671 Courboulès et al. 2021), and the Gulf of Lion (0.06-0.12 μ M; Ross et al. 2016). The continuous 672 nutrient enrichment caused by anthropogenic inputs could lead to enhanced eutrophication of 673 the GG, causing ecosystem imbalance in the future. Signs of eutrophication, such as occurrence 674 of harmful algal blooms, have indeed been often reported (Feki- Sahnoun et al. 2017; Ayata et 675 al. 2018).

In the GG, a North-South and coast-offshore gradient of nutrients (Fig. S1) and organic 676 matter with accumulation in the Southern part has been already observed (Ciglenečki et al. 677 2020; Mansouri et al. 2020). This spatial pattern can be related to the hydrodynamics of the 678 679 GG, which is characterized by the presence of a stationary southward current, two great eddies in the middle, and a counter current in the Southern part (Fig. 1; Zayen et al. 2020). During our 680 study, nutrients also showed increasing concentrations from the North (S1) to the South (S4) 681 and from the coast (S1) to offshore (S3). Phytoplankton variables (i.e., production, carbon 682 biomass and Chl a) followed the same spatial distribution patterns than nutrients, confirming 683 that spatial distribution of Chl a is closely related to nutrient concentrations in the GG (Bel 684 685 Hassen et al. 2009).

686 **4.2 Spatial dynamics of phytoplankton**

There was a clear spatial variability in the size structure of phytoplankton. The dominance 687 of fast-growing picophytoplankton in S1 (Table 1, Fig. 6a, b) confirmed its main functional role 688 in this station. In general, the picophytoplankton is dominant in oligotrophic Mediterranean 689 open sea, such as the Northern Adriatic Sea, the Levantine Basin, the Southern Tyrrhenian Sea 690 and the Southern Adriatic Sea (Totti et al. 2005; Tanaka et al. 2007; Decembrini et al. 2009; 691 692 Cerino et al. 2012). Our results reveal that picophytoplankton can be an important component within the phytoplankton community in coastal Mediterranean waters, with relatively important 693 nutrient concentrations (i.e., in S1). Unlike S1, large phytoplankton characterized the other 694 695 stations, even the offshore station (i.e., S3). The micro-sized fraction contributed most of the

primary production (55-78%) and carbon biomass (71-75%) in S2, S3 and S4, and dominated 696 the Chl a (49-74%) in S3 and S4 (Table 1, Fig. 6b). The nutrient spatial gradient induced by 697 hydrodynamic features has likely influenced the spatial distribution of phytoplankton size 698 699 fractions. This was evidenced by a positive correlation between the growth rate of micro-sized fraction and inorganic nutrients, and a negative correlation for the pico-fraction growth rate. 700 701 The CCA showed also that large phytoplankton was associated with all inorganic nutrients 702 while an opposite trend was found for the picophytoplankton (Fig. 5). Jyothibabu et al. (2015) have reported a clear impact of the hydrodynamics (summer monsoon current and associated 703 eddies) on the evolution of nutrients and phytoplankton size structure in the Bay of Bengal 704 705 (Northeastern Indian Ocean). Recently, Decembrini et al. (2020) have showed that the circulation within the Gulf of Augusta (Western Ionian Sea) allowed the advection of nutrient-706 rich waters that modified the size structure of phytoplankton and triggered an increase of the 707 micro-sized fraction. 708

The $> 2 \mu m$ phytoplankton community also displayed a spatial variation in species 709 710 composition. Generally, nano-sized phytoflagellates, mainly represented by cryptophyceae, 711 dominated in biomass in S1, typified by the least rich waters of the majority of nutrients (lowest concentrations of P_{inorg}, P_{org}, and Si(OH)₄). Conversely, the contribution of diatoms increased 712 from S1 (37%) to S4 (88%) concomitantly with the nutrient increase. Diatom biomass showed 713 a positive correlation with all inorganic nutrients ($r_s = 0.79-0.67$, p < 0.01). It is well known 714 that small phototrophs with high surface-to-volume ratio require lower nutrient concentrations 715 716 for their growth than large cells, which grow well under more nutrient enriched waters (Duarte et al. 2000; Varkitzi et al. 2020). This may explain the high contribution of nano-sized cells to 717 718 the > 2 μ m phytoplankton community and the dominance of picophytoplankton in S1. The high contribution of nano-sized cells, such as chlorophyceae, cryptophyceae and prymnesiophyceae, 719 to phytoplankton community was previously reported in the GG during a period characterized 720 721 by reduced nutrient supply (Bel Hassen et al. 2009; Ben Ltaief et al. 2015; Rekik et al. 2015).

Nano-sized phytoflagellates are typical of waters with low nutrient concentrations, such as 722 Mediterranean open sea areas (Vidussi et al. 2000; Decembrini et al. 2009). In contrast, blooms 723 of diatoms are commonly observed in coastal Mediterranean environments, particularly during 724 725 late winter-spring (d'Alcalà et al. 2004; Mayot et al. 2017; Leblanc et al. 2018), when the stratification of the water column follows the vertical mixing, thus favoring the growth of small 726 727 species (such as *Chaetoceros*) (Peters et al. 2006; Trombetta et al. 2021). Other authors have rather reported the presence of diatoms in Mediterranean waters during the period of turbulence 728 (i.e., autumn), with high proliferation of large species (Margalef 1978; Decembrini et al. 2009; 729 Vascotto et al. 2021). This agrees with our finding showing that micro-sized diatoms 730 (Leptocylindrus, Skeletonema and Rhizosolenia) were dominant during our study period. 731

The decrease of picophytoplankton contribution to total primary production and Chl *a* content from S1 to S4, and the increase of micro-sized contribution and diatom proliferation would greatly influence the size and the type of grazers, as well as their feeding activity, suggesting a significant change in carbon transfer pathways between stations. These effects are detailed in the following sections.

737 **4.3 Spatial variation of top-down control by metazooplankton**

Copepods were dominant in the GG (Fig. 4a), as previously observed in this area (Drira 738 et al. 2017; Makhlouf Belkahia et al. 2021) and in other Mediterranean ecosystems (Sakka 739 Hlaili et al. 2008; Ben Lamine et al. 2015; Gueroun et al. 2020). The abundance of copepods 740 found here $(0.939-1240 \times 10^3 \text{ ind m}^{-3})$ compared also well with previous reports in the GG (Ben 741 Ltaief et al. 2017; Drira et al. 2017) and in other Mediterranean systems, i.e., Lagoons of 742 743 Bizerte, Venice and Berre (Riccardi 2010; Siokou-Frangou et al. 2010; Marques et al. 2015; Gueroun et al. 2020). Our study assessed the feeding impact of metazooplankton on 744 phytoplankton using the gut fluorescence method. This simple technique has been widely used 745 746 for more than several decades because it is useful for revealing the functional role of

metazooplankton in various marine environments (Tseng et al. 2008; Meddeb et al. 2018; He 747 et al. 2021). The results show that metazooplankton had an important control on phytoplankton, 748 by consuming 10-24% of the primary production. This feeding effect exceeded that reported in 749 750 other world oceanic regions (12%, Calbet et al. 2000), but compared with estimates from the gut fluorescence method in other Mediterranean ecosystems (8-30% P grazed d⁻¹ in the Lagoon 751 of Bizerte and 9-20% P grazed d⁻¹ in the Alboran Sea) (Gaudy et al. 2003; Meddeb et al. 2018). 752 The impact of metazooplankton on phytoplankton biomass (22-38% Chl $a d^{-1}$) was also in the 753 range of percentages found by other authors (using the gut content technique) in coastal 754 ecosystems, such as Gironde estuary, and Gulf of Mexico (Sautour et al. 2000; Landry and 755 756 Swalethorp 2021). The significant percentages of phytoplankton biomass and production daily consumed by metazooplankton suggested the importance of the metazoan grazers in channeling 757 carbon to higher trophic level in the GG. 758

The consumption by metazooplankton varied significantly among stations (Table 3), in 759 relation with spatial variations of metazoan abundance ($r_s = 0.62-0.76$, p < 0.05) and prey 760 761 biomass ($r_s = 0.70-0.78$, p < 0.01). Besides, change in size structure of phytoplankton seemed 762 to influence the feeding of metazooplankton. Consumption rates of phytoplankton measured from S2 to S4 were 3-10 folds higher than that in S1, where the phytoplankton production was 763 dominated by the pico-sized fraction, which is inefficiently consumed by copepods (Berggreen 764 et al. 1988; Morales et al. 1993; Callieri and Stockner 2002). Conversely, the highest feeding 765 activity of metazooplankton was observed in the southernmost station (S4), where large 766 phytoplankton dominated the Chl a and primary production (Table 1, Fig. 6b). This coincided 767 with a high proliferation of herbivorous copepods (e.g., Centropages, Clausocalanus and 768 769 Paracalanus) and herbivorous cladocerans (e.g., Penilia, Katechakis et al. 2004) (Fig. 4a). The CCA also showed a clear association between the two metazoan groups and nano- and 770 microphytoplankton (Fig. 5), which might be due to trophic relationships. As explained, the 771 772 complex circulation in the GG favoured the accumulation of particles towards the South -

among which zooplankton and phytoplankton – leading to increased trophic interactions between the two planktonic components. Similarly, a recent work highlighted the role of hydrodynamics in the retention of metazooplankton in the Southern area of the GG and in the enhancement of its potential control of phytoplankton (Makhlouf Belkahia et al. 2021).

777 **4.4 Spatial variation of top-down control by protozooplankton**

Our study examined the impact of protozooplankton grazing on phytoplankton using the 778 779 standard dilution method. This simple technique, which gives simultaneous estimations of 780 growth and grazing rates, has been used over the past decades in open and coastal environments, 781 including Mediterranean systems (Calbet and Landry 2004; Calbet et al. 2008; Grinienė et al. 2016; Leruste et al. 2019; Pecqueur et al. 2022; Wickham et al. 2022). However, the dilution 782 method has been employed to a lesser extend for the estimation of protozooplankton grazing in 783 the Southern Mediterranean (Sakka Hlaili et al. 2008; Grami et al. 2008; Meddeb et al. 2018). 784 Furthermore, the functional role of protozooplankton is poorly documented in the GG, although 785 786 previous studies have reported high abundances of ciliates, heterotrophic and mixotrophic flagellates (Hannachi et al. 2008; Drira et al. 2008; Kchaou et al. 2009; Hamdi et al. 2015; Ben 787 Ltaief et al. 2017; Rekik et al. 2021). 788

Different size fractions of phytoplankton were measured in our dilution bottles rather than 789 total phytoplankton in order to give an insight into the size-selective protozooplankton feeding. 790 The dilution experiments provided statistically significant grazing estimates for different 791 phytoplankton size fractions in all stations (Fig. S2 in Supplementary Material). Grazing rates 792 may be over-estimated, if nutrient limitation occurs during experiment (Landry and Hassett 793 794 1982). In our work, although nutrients were not added, the phytoplankton growth was kept under unlimited conditions. Moreover, our estimates of grazing rates for pico-sized fraction 795 were in the range of values reported from dilution experiments (with or without nutrients) in 796 797 other coastal waters (Dong et al. 2021; Pecqueur et al. 2022). Using the same method, several

authors have also found grazing rates for nano- and microphytoplankton (Sakka Hlaili et al.

799 2007; Dong et al. 2021) comparable to our estimates (Table 2).

800 In general, there is a close and a positive trophic interaction between the growth of prev and their grazing by protozooplankton (Shinada et al. 2000; Martin-Cereceda et al. 2003; 801 Dopheide et al. 2011; Chen et al. 2020). Indeed, for each size-fraction, significant and positive 802 803 correlations were found between prey production and protozooplankton consumption rates. Several studies have shown that protozoan organisms were able to modify their growth 804 according to the availability of their potential prey and that the change in phytoplankton size 805 806 structure may influence the community composition of protozooplankton and its grazing pressure (Sherr and Sherr 2007; Mansano et al. 2014; Horn et al. 2020; Corradino and Schnetzer 807 2022; Li et al. 2022). The high proliferation of picophytoplankton in S1 was associated with a 808 clear dominance of small aloricate ciliates (20-50 µm Strombidium spp.; Fig. 3a), which are 809 known to have large predation on pico-sized cells (Rassoulzadegan et al. 1988; Sakka 2000; 810 Meddeb et al. 2018). Heterotrophic nanoflagellates (Commotion cryoporinum) and ebridian 811 812 flagellates (*Hermesinium sp.*), which can actively consume pico-sized prey (Hargraves 2002; 813 Calbet and Landry 2004; Berglund et al. 2007), were well represented in S1 (Fig. 3a). The CCA analysis showed likewise a strong association, likely through feeding links, between 814 picophytoplankton biomass and the abundances of all these microbivorous consumers (Fig. 5). 815 Accordingly, the protozooplankton displayed high consumption rate and grazing impact on the 816 pico-sized fraction in S1 (60% P grazed d⁻¹), testified by the large contribution of the 817 picophytoplankton to the protozoan diet (82%) (Table 2). Our result is consistent with the 818 finding of high grazing pressure of protozooplankton on picophytoplankton in other 819 Mediterranean coastal systems, such as the Bizerte Channel (84% P grazed d⁻¹) and Thau 820 Lagoon (71% P grazed d⁻¹) (Bec et al. 2005; Meddeb et al. 2018). Grazing and consumption 821 rates for the pico-sized fraction showed a decreased trend from S1 to S4, where the 822 823 protozooplankton community has clearly changed towards a dominance of heterotrophic and

mixotrophic dinoflagellates (Fig. 3a), concomitantly to the increase of large phytoplankton 824 proliferation (Table 1, Fig. 6). In S4, heterotrophic dinoflagellates were dominated by species 825 of Protoperidinum and Oxytoxym (Fig. 3d), which are known as potential grazers of chain-826 827 forming diatoms and small diatoms, respectively (Seong et al. 2006; Girault et al. 2013; Kase et al. 2021). Mixotrophic dinoflagellates were dominated by *Heterocapsa* and *Gymnodinium* 828 829 (Fig. 3c) that can feed on small diatoms and nano-sized cells (Du Yoo et al. 2009; Jeong et al. 2010). The loricate ciliates, mainly *Tintinnopsis*, *Helicostomella* and *Amphorellopsis*, which 830 commonly feed on large algae (Dolan et al. 2012; Yang et al. 2019), were more abundant in S4 831 than in other stations (Fig. 3a). All these herbivorous protozoans seemed to be tightly 832 associated, probably via feeding links, to nano- and micro-phytoplankton (CCA analysis, 833 Fig. 5). Thus, the highest consumption rates for nano- and micro-sized fractions were recorded 834 in S4. In this station, the protozoan's diet mainly relied on microphytoplankton (70%), which 835 accordingly was under the greatest protozooplankton grazing effect (~50% P grazed d^{-1}) 836 837 (Table 2). In S4, although metazoans displayed increased abundance and very high consumption rates (Table 3; Fig. 4), their grazing impact (24% P grazed d⁻¹) remained lower 838 than that of protozooplankton, which daily consumed 48% of the > 2-µm phytoplankton 839 production. Our finding is in good agreement with several authors stating that protozooplankton 840 is the major grazer of phytoplankton in productive waters dominated by large phytoplankton 841 842 (Aberle et al. 2007; Vargas et al. 2007; Meddeb et al. 2018; Yang et al. 2022). In S2 and S3, nano- and micro-sized fractions formed large proportions of phytoplankton production and 843 biomass (Chl a and carbon). The contribution of picophytoplankton was not as low, reaching 844 ~20% of biomass and production of phytoplankton (Table 1; Fig. 6a). Accordingly, 845 microbivorous protozoans (i.e., aloricate ciliates, heterotrophic nanoflagellates and ebridian 846 flagellates) and herbivorous organisms (i.e., dinoflagellates) were both important components 847 of the protozooplankton in both stations (Fig. 3). This resulted in significant protozooplankton 848 top-down control on large and small phytoplankton in S2 and S3 (Table 2). 849

850 **4.5 Implication for carbon transfer pathway**

Anthropogenic nutrient inputs coupled with a complex hydrodynamic circulation in the GG led to a clear spatial gradient in nutrients, associated with spatial changes in composition and size structure of phytoplankton and selective zooplankton grazing. Microbivory and herbivory would therefore have different roles in carbon transfer (Fig. 8), inducing different trophic structures among stations.

In the northernmost station (S1), characterized by less nutrient-rich waters, the high 856 contribution of picophytoplankton (78%) to the primary production was associated with a high 857 858 microbivory of protozooplankton, representing 76% of carbon transfer. Therefore, the feeding of the microbivorous protozoans played the main role in carbon transfer to upper consumers 859 (76%), as the herbivory of proto- and meta-zooplankton contributed together only 24% of the 860 channeled carbon. These trophic interactions suggest the prevalence of the microbial food web 861 in S1 (Legendre and Rassoulzadegan 1995; Sakka Hlaili et al. 2014), which is different from 862 863 the traditional view regarding the presence of the microbial pathway in oligotrophic waters. Nevertheless, there is increasing evidence that microbial food web can be significant for 864 eutrophic coastal areas (Grami et al. 2008; Viñas et al. 2013; Paklar et al. 2020). The situation 865 has changed in S2 and S3, evidenced by the increased contribution of microphytoplankton to 866 primary production (55-78%), albeit the pico-sized cells remained as substantial contributor to 867 carbon production (15-24%). Parallel to the increase of large phytoplankton production, the 868 herbivory of proto- and metazooplankton increased, forming 75-80% of biogenic carbon 869 channeling. The consumption of picophytoplankton allowed 20-25% transfer of biogenic 870 carbon. Therefore, pico-, nano- and micro-phytoplankton potentially contributed to the 871 production of biogenic carbon, which reached higher consumers through the microbivory and 872 the herbivory of zooplankton. This suggests that a multivorous food web (Legendre and 873 Rassoulzadegan 1995) was present in both stations. The multivorous pathway was already 874

observed in other productive waters (Vargas and González 2004; Siokou-Frangou et al. 2010; 875 Masclaux et al. 2015; Meddeb et al. 2018). In the southernmost nutrient-rich station (S4), the 876 herbivorous food web seemed to be dominant, since the high primary production was mainly 877 sustained by microphytoplankton (~60%) and the biogenic carbon was mainly channeled to 878 higher trophic levels through the proto- and meta-zooplankton herbivory, which represented 879 94% of total carbon transfer. The herbivorous pathway was reported in several coastal waters 880 with high trophic level and abundant diatoms (Sakka Hlaili et al. 2008; Masclaux et al. 2015; 881 882 Meddeb et al. 2018; D'Alelio et al. 2022). The co-existence of different and contrasted planktonic food webs during the same period in a highly productive system (i.e., the GG) 883 diverges from the traditional view that large phytoplankton and herbivorous pathway usually 884 dominate in nutrient-rich waters. 885

The spatial variability in planktonic food webs has an ecological implication, as biogenic 886 carbon can be exported with different efficiency to pelagos and benthos (Legendre and 887 Rassoulzadegan 1995; Sakka Hlaili et al. 2014). The microbial food web is known to be 888 inefficient in exporting organic matter, as most of the carbon is recycled and a small amount of 889 carbon can be exported to higher consumers or outside euphotic system (Legendre and 890 Rassoulzadegan 1995; Decembrini et al. 2009). This was consistent with the low vertical carbon 891 flux found in S1, which only accounted for 30% of total primary production. In the other 892 stations, the increase of primary production and of the dominance of large phytoplankton was 893 associated with the increase of vertical flux of organic particles (43-70% of primary 894 production). Furthermore, phytoplankton and zooplankton fecal material showed increased 895 contribution to the carbon flux toward the benthos (Fig. 7). This confirms that more biogenic 896 carbon is exported towards multivorous and herbivorous food webs (Legendre and 897 Rassoulzadegan 1995; Meddeb et al. 2019). The highest phytoplankton export to benthos was 898 observed in S4, coinciding with the largest contribution of microphytoplankton to primary 899

production. Conversely, the highest detritus sinking flux was not measured in S4 but in S3. Thisindicates that some of the sinking detrital material in S3 could be transported from elsewhere.

The hydrodynamic and hydrological features of this area change across seasons, which can impact the plankton dynamics (Bel Hassen et al. 2008, 2009; Makhlouf Belkahia et al. 2021) as well as planktonic interactions within the ecosystem. Thus, it is important to consider the seasonal variations in further investigations to better understand the overall functioning of this high dynamical and productive Mediterranean area.

907 **5 Conclusion**

Our study provides a detailed analysis of the plankton communities and the trophic links 908 between size fractionated phytoplankton and proto/metazooplankton in a nutrient-rich and 909 910 highly productive Mediterranean system, the GG. The complex hydrodynamic circulation within the GG seemed to induce a spatial gradient in nutrient concentrations driving a spatial 911 changes in size structure and production of phytoplankton and trophic interactions, ultimately 912 leading to various food webs structure with different efficiency in carbon export. Our results 913 allows changing our traditional view concerning the dominance of the herbivorous pathway in 914 915 highly productive areas and evidencing the presence of a trophic pathway continuum, with other types of planktonic food webs. Our study gives relevant insight on the functional roles of 916 phytoplankton size fractions, proto- and meta-zooplankton and proposes a first description of 917 carbon transfer pathways in the Southeastern Mediterranean area, where such information is 918 919 deficient. These results can improve the understanding of the dynamics of marine food webs, particularly in ecosystems strongly impacted by anthropogenic nutrient inputs and strong 920 921 hydrodynamics.

922

924 **References**

- Abdennadher J, Boukthir M (2006) Numerical simulation of the barotropic tides in the Tunisian
 Shelf and the Strait of Sicily. J Mar Syst 63:162–182.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2006.07.001
- Aberle N, Lengfellner K, Sommer U (2007) Spring bloom succession, grazing impact and herbivore selectivity of ciliate communities in response to winter warming. Oecologia 150:668–681. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-006-0540-y
- Allen JI, Somerfield PJ, Siddorn J (2002) Primary and bacterial production in the Mediterranean
 Sea: a modelling study. J Mar Syst 33–34:473–495. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924 7963(02)00072-6
- Ayata S-D, Irisson J-O, Aubert A, Berline L, Dutay JC, Mayot N, Nieblas AE, D'Ortenzio F,
 Palmiéri J, Reygondeau G, Rossi V, Guieu C (2018) Regionalisation of the
 Mediterranean basin, a MERMEX synthesis. Progress in Oceanography 163:7–20.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2017.09.016
- Bec B, Ratréma Husseini J, Collos Y, Souchu P, Vaquer A (2005) Phytoplankton seasonal dynamics in a Mediterranean coastal lagoon: Emphasis on the picoeukaryote community. J Plankton Res 0142-7873 Oxf Univ Press 2005-09 Vol 27 N 9 P 881-894 27:. https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/fbi061
- Béjaoui B, Ben Ismail S, Othmani A, Ben Abdallah-Ben Hadj Hamida O, Chevalier C, FekiSahnoun W, Harzallah A, Ben Hadj Hamida N, Bouaziz R, Dahech S, Diaz F, Tounsi
 K, Sammari C, Pagano M, Bel Hassen M (2019) Synthesis review of the Gulf of Gabes
 (eastern Mediterranean Sea, Tunisia): Morphological, climatic, physical oceanographic,
 biogeochemical and fisheries features. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 219:395–408.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2019.01.006
- Béjaoui B, Raïs S, Koutitonsky V (2004) Modélisation de la dispersion du phosphogypse dans
 le golfe de Gabès. Modelisation of the phosphogypsum spreading in the gulf of Gabes.
 Bull. Inst. Natn. Scien. Tech. Mer de Salammbô, Vol. 31.
- Bel Hassen M, Drira Z, Hamza A, Ayadi H, Akrout F, Issaoui H (2008) Summer phytoplankton
 pigments and community composition related to water mass properties in the Gulf of
 Gabes. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 77:645–656. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2007.10.027
- Bel Hassen M, Hamza A, Drira Z, Zouari A, Akrout F, Messaoudi S, Aleya L, Ayadi H (2009)
 Phytoplankton-pigment signatures and their relationship to spring–summer
 stratification in the Gulf of Gabes. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 83:296–306.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2009.04.002
- 958 Ben Ismail S, Sammari C, Pietro Gasparini G, Beranger K, Brahim M, Aleya L (2012) Water masses exchanged through the Channel of Sicily: Evidence for the presence of new 959 water masses on the Tunisian side of the channel. Deep Sea Research Part I: 960 Oceanographic Research Papers Vol 63. May 2012, Pages 65-81. 961 962 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2011.12.009

- Ben Ismail S, Sammari C, Béranger K (2015) Surface Circulation Features along the Tunisian
 Coast: Central Mediterranean Sea. 26th IUGG General Assembly, Prague. Czech
 Republic June 22 July 2.
- Ben Lamine Y, Pringault O, Aissi M, Ensibi C, Mahmoudi E, Kefi O D Y, Yahia M N D (2015)
 Environmental controlling factors of copepod communities in the Gulf of Tunis (south western Mediterranean Sea). Cah Biol Mar 56:213–229.
- Ben Ltaief T, Drira Z, Devenon J L, Hamza A, Ayadi H, Pagano M (2017) How could thermal
 stratification affect horizontal distribution of depth-integrated metazooplankton
 communities in the Gulf of Gabes (Tunisia)?. Mar. Biol. Res. 13: 3.
 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17451000.2016.1248847
- Ben Ltaief T, Drira Z, Hannachi I, Bel Hassen M, Hamza A, Pagano M, Ayadi H (2015) What are the factors leading to the success of small planktonic copepods in the Gulf of Gabes,
 Tunisia? J Mar Biol Assoc U K 95:747–761. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315414001507
- Berglund J, Müren U, Båmstedt U, Andersson A (2007) Efficiency of a phytoplankton-based
 and a bacterial-based food web in a pelagic marine system. Limnol Oceanogr 52:121–
 131. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2007.52.1.0121
- Berggreen U, Hansen B, Kiørboe T (1988) Food size spectra, ingestion and growth of the
 copepodAcartia tonsa during development: Implications for determination of copepod
 production. Mar Biol 99:341–352. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02112126
- Boudriga I, Thyssen M, Zouari A, Garcia N, Tedetti M, Bel Hassen M (2022)
 Ultraphytoplankton community structure in subsurface waters along a North-South
 Mediterranean transect. Marine Pollution Bulletin 182:113977.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2022.113977
- Boukthir M, Jaber IB, Chevalier C, Abdennadher J (2019) A high-resolution three-dimensional
 hydrodynamic model of the gulf of Gabes (Tunisia). In 42nd CIESM Congress.
- Boutrup PV, Moestrup Ø, Tillmann U, Daugbjerg N (2016) Katodinium glaucum
 (Dinophyceae) revisited: proposal of new genus, family and order based on ultrastructure and phylogeny. Phycologia 55:147–164. https://doi.org/10.2216/15-138.1
- Calbet A, Landry MR (2004) Phytoplankton growth, microzooplankton grazing, and carbon
 cycling in marine systems. Limnol Oceanogr 49:51–57.
 https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2004.49.1.0051
- Calbet A, Landry MR, Scheinberg RD (2000) Copepod grazing in a subtropical bay: species specific responses to a midsummer increase in nanoplankton standing stock. Mar Ecol
 Prog Ser 193:75–84. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps193075
- Calbet A, Trepat I, Almeda R, Saló V, Saiz E, Movilla JI, Alcaraz M, Yebra L Simó R (2008)
 Impact of micro- And nanograzers on phytoplankton assessed by standard and sizefractionated dilution grazing experiments. Aquat Microb Ecol 50:145–156.
 https://doi.org/10.3354/ame01171

- Callieri C, Stockner JG (2002) Freshwater autotrophic picoplankton: a review. J Limnol 61:1.
 https://doi.org/10.4081/jlimnol.2002.1
- Caroppo C, Roselli L, Di Leo A (2018) Hydrological conditions and phytoplankton community
 in the Lesina lagoon (southern Adriatic Sea, Mediterranean). Environ Sci Pollut Res
 25:1784–1799. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-017-0599-5
- Caroppo C, Stabili L, Aresta M, Corinaldesi C, Danovaro R (2006) Impact of heavy metals and
 PCBs on marine picoplankton. Environ Toxicol 21:541–551.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/tox.20215
- Casotti R, Landolfi A, Brunet C, D'Ortenzio F, Mangoni O, Ribera d'Alcalà M, Denis M (2003)
 Composition and dynamics of the phytoplankton of the Ionian Sea (eastern Mediterranean). J Geophys Res Oceans 108:. https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JC001541
- 1013 Cerino F, Bernardi Aubry F, Coppola J, et al (2012) Spatial and temporal variability of pico-,
 1014 nano- and microphytoplankton in the offshore waters of the southern Adriatic Sea
 1015 (Mediterranean Sea). Cont Shelf Res 44:94–105.
 1016 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2011.06.006
- 1017 Cermeño P, Marañón E, Pérez V, Serret P, Fernández E, Castroc CG (2006) Phytoplankton size
 1018 structure and primary production in a highly dynamic coastal ecosystem (Ría de Vigo,
 1019 NW-Spain): Seasonal and short-time scale variability. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 67:251–
 1020 266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2005.11.027
- 1021 Chen D, Guo C, Yu L, Lu Y, Sun J (2020) Phytoplankton growth and microzooplankton grazing
 1022 in the central and northern South China Sea in the spring intermonsoon season of 2017.
 1023 Acta Oceanol Sin 39:84–95. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13131-020-1593-1
- 1024 Christaki U, Van Wambeke F, Lefevre D, Lagaria A, Prieur L, Pujo-Pay M, Grattepanche JD ,
 1025 Colombet J, Psarra S, Dolan JR, Sime-Ngando T, Conan P, Weinbauer MG, and Moutin
 1026 T (2011) Microbial food webs and metabolic state across oligotrophic waters of the
 1027 Mediterranean Sea during summer. Biogeosciences 8:1839–1852.
 1028 https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-8-1839-2011
- Cibic T, Cerino F, Karuza A, Fornasaro D, Comici C, Cabrini M (2018) Structural and
 functional response of phytoplankton to reduced river inputs and anomalous physical chemical conditions in the Gulf of Trieste (northern Adriatic Sea). Science of The Total
 Environment 636:838–853. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.04.205
- 1033 Ciglenečki I, Vilibić I, Dautović J, Vojvodić V, Ćosović B, Zemunik P, Mihanović H (2020)
 1034 Dissolved organic carbon and surface active substances in the northern Adriatic Sea:
 1035 Long-term trends, variability and drivers. Sci Total Environ 730:139104.
 1036 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139104
- 1037 Corradino GL, Schnetzer A (2022) Grazing of a heterotrophic nanoflagellate on prokaryote and
 1038 eukaryote prey: ingestion rates and gross growth efficiency. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 682:65–
 1039 77. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps13921
- 1040 Courboulès J, Vidussi F, Soulié T, Mas S, Pecqueur D, Mostajir B (2021) Effects of
 1041 experimental warming on small phytoplankton, bacteria and viruses in autumn in the
 1042 Mediterranean coastal Thau Lagoon. Aquat Ecol 55:647–666.
 1043 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10452-021-09852-7

- D'Alcalà MR, Conversano F, Corato F, Licandro P, Mangoni O, Marino D, Mazzocchi MG,
 Modigh M, Montresor M, Nardella M, Saggiomo V, Sarno D, Zingone A (2004)
 Seasonal patterns in plankton communities in a pluriannual time series at a coastal
 Mediterranean site (Gulf of Naples): an attempt to discern recurrences and trends. Sci
 Mar 68:65–83. https://doi.org/10.3989/scimar.2004.68s165
- D'Alelio D, Russo L, Del Gaizo G, Caputi L (2022) Plankton under Pressure: How Water
 Conditions Alter the Phytoplankton–Zooplankton Link in Coastal Lagoons. Water
 14:974. https://doi.org/10.3390/w14060974
- 1052Dam HG, Peterson WT (1988) The effect of temperature on the gut clearance rate constant of1053planktonic copepods. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 123:1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-10540981(88)90105-0
- Decembrini F, Caroppo C, Azzaro M (2009) Size structure and production of phytoplankton
 community and carbon pathways channelling in the Southern Tyrrhenian Sea (Western
 Mediterranean). Deep Sea Res Part II Top Stud Oceanogr 56:687–699.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.07.022
- Decembrini F, Caroppo C, Bergamasco A (2020) Influence of lateral advection on
 phytoplankton size-structure and composition in a Mediterranean coastal area.
 Continental Shelf Research 209:104216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2020.104216
- Decembrini F, Caroppo C, Caruso G, Bergamasco A (2021) Linking Microbial Functioning
 and Trophic Pathways to Ecological Status in a Coastal Mediterranean Ecosystem.
 Water 13:1325. https://doi.org/10.3390/w13091325
- Dokulil MT, Qian K (2021) Photosynthesis, carbon acquisition and primary productivity of
 phytoplankton: a review dedicated to Colin Reynolds. Hydrobiologia 848:77–94.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-020-04321-y
- Dolan JR, Pierce RW, Yang EJ, Kim SY (2012) Southern Ocean Biogeography of Tintinnid
 Ciliates of the Marine Plankton. J Eukaryot Microbiol 59:511–519.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1550-7408.2012.00646.x
- Dong Y, Li QP, Wu Z, Shuai Y, Liu Z, Ge Z, Zhou W, Chen Y (2021) Biophysical controls on
 seasonal changes in the structure, growth, and grazing of the size-fractionated
 phytoplankton community in the northern South China Sea. Biogeosciences 18:6423–
 6434. https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-18-6423-2021
- Dopheide A, Lear G, Stott R, Lewis G (2011) Preferential Feeding by the Ciliates Chilodonella and Tetrahymena spp. and Effects of These Protozoa on Bacterial Biofilm Structure and Composition. Appl Environ Microbiol 77:4564–4572.
 https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.02421-10
- Drira Z, Bel Hassen M, Ayadi H, Aleya L (2014) What factors drive copepod community distribution in the Gulf of Gabes, Eastern Mediterranean Sea? Environ Sci Pollut Res 21:2918–2934. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-013-2250-4
- 1082 Drira Z, Chaari D, Hamza A, Hassen MB, Pagano M, Ayadi H (2017) Diazotrophic cyanobacteria signatures and their relationship to hydrographic conditions in the Gulf 1083 of Gabes. Tunisia. J Mar Biol Assoc U Κ 97:69-80. 1084 https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315415002210 1085

- Drira Z, Hamza A, Belhassen M, Ayadi H, Bouaïn A, Aleya L (2008) Dynamics of dinoflagellates and environmental factors during the summer in the Gulf of Gabes (Tunisia, Eastern Mediterranean Sea). Sci Mar 72:59–71.
 https://doi.org/10.3989/scimar.2008.72n159
- Drira Z, Hassen MB, Hamza A, Rebai A, Bouain A, Ayadi H, Aleya L (2009) Spatial and temporal variations of microphytoplankton composition related to hydrographic conditions in the Gulf of Gabès. J Mar Biol Assoc U K 89:1559–1569. https://doi.org/10.1017/S002531540900023X
- Drira Z, Kmiha-Megdiche S, Sahnoun H, Hammami A, Allouche N, Tedetti M, Ayadi H,
 (2016) Assessment of anthropogenic inputs in the surface waters of the southern coastal
 area of Sfax during spring (Tunisia, Southern Mediterranean Sea). Mar Pollut Bull
 1097 104:355–363. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.01.035
- 1098Du Yoo Y, Jeong HJ, Kim MS, Kang NS, Song JY, Shin W, Lee K (2009) Feeding by1099Phototrophic Red-Tide Dinoflagellates on the Ubiquitous Marine Diatom Skeletonema1100costatum. J Eukaryot Microbiol 56:413–420. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1550-11017408.2009.00421.x
- Duarte CM, Agustí S, Agawin NSR (2000) Response of a Mediterranean phytoplankton
 community to increased nutrient inputs: a mesocosm experiment. Mar Ecol Prog Ser
 1104 195:61–70. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps195061
- El Kateb A, Stalder C, Rüggeberg A, Neururer C, Spangenberg JE, Spezzaferri S (2018) Impact
 of industrial phosphate waste discharge on the marine environment in the Gulf of Gabes
 (Tunisia). PloS one, 13(5), e0197731. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0197731
- Estrada M, Varela RA, Salat J, Cruzado A, Arias E (1999) Spatio-temporal variability of the
 winter phytoplankton distribution across the Catalan and North Balearic fronts (NW
 Mediterranean). J Plankton Res 21:1–20. https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/21.1.1
- Feki-Sahnoun W, Hamza A, Njah H, Barrajd N, Mahfoudia M, Rebaie A, Bel Hassen M (2017)
 A Bayesian network approach to determine environmental factors controlling Karenia selliformis occurrences and blooms in the Gulf of Gabès, Tunisia. Harmful Algae 63:119–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hal.2017.01.013
- Ferland J, Gosselin M, Starr M (2011) Environmental control of summer primary production
 in the Hudson Bay system: The role of stratification. J Mar Syst 88:385–400.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2011.03.015
- Gaudy R, Youssara F, Diaz F, Raimbault P (2003) Biomass, metabolism and nutrition of zooplankton in the Gulf of Lions (NW Mediterranean). Oceanologica Acta, 26(4): 357-372.https://doi:10.1016/S0399-1784(03)00016-1
- Geyer NL, Huettel M, Wetz MS (2018) Phytoplankton Spatial Variability in the River Dominated Estuary, Apalachicola Bay, Florida. Estuaries and Coasts, 41(7), 2024-2038.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-018-0402-y
- Giannakourou A, Tsiola A, Kanellopoulou M, Magiopoulos I, Siokou I, Pitta P (2014)
 Temporal variability of the microbial food web (viruses to ciliates) under the influence
 of the Black Sea Water inflow (N. Aegean, E. Mediterranean). Mediterr Mar Sci 769–
 780. https://doi.org/10.12681/mms.1041

- Girault M, Arakawa H, Hashihama F (2013) Phosphorus stress of microphytoplankton
 community in the western subtropical North Pacific. Journal of plankton research,
 35(1), 146-157. https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/fbs076
- Grami B, Niquil N, Sakka Hlaili A, Gosselin M, Hamel D, Hadj Mabrouk H (2008) The
 plankton food web of the Bizerte Lagoon (South-western Mediterranean): II. Carbon
 steady-state modelling using inverse analysis. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 79:101–113.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2008.03.009
- Grattepanche JD, Vincent D, Breton E, Christaki U (2011) Microzooplankton herbivory during
 the diatom–Phaeocystis spring succession in the eastern English Channel. J Exp Mar
 Biol Ecol 404:87–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2011.04.004
- Grinienė E, Šulčius S, Kuosa H (2016) Size-selective microzooplankton grazing on the
 phytoplankton in the Curonian Lagoon (SE Baltic Sea). Oceanologia 58:292–301.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceano.2016.05.002
- Gueroun SM, Molinero JC, Piraino S, Dali Yahia MN (2020) Population dynamics and predatory impact of the alien jellyfish Aurelia solida (Cnidaria, Scyphozoa) in the Bizerte Lagoon (southwestern Mediterranean Sea). Mediterr Mar Sci 21:22–35. doi: https://doi.org/10.12681/mms.17358
- Halouani G, Abdou K, Hattab T, Romdhane MS, Lasram FBR, Le Loc'h F (2016) A spatiotemporal ecosystem model to simulate fishing management plans: A case of study in the Gulf of Gabes (Tunisia). Mar Policy 69:62–72.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.04.002
- Hamdi I, Denis M, Bellaaj-Zouari A, et al (2015) The characterisation and summer distribution
 of ultraphytoplankton in the Gulf of Gabès (Eastern Mediterranean Sea, Tunisia) by
 using flow cytometry. Cont Shelf Res 93:27–38.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2014.10.002
- Hannachi I, Drira Z, Belhassen M, Hamza A, Ayadi H, Bouain A, Aleya L (2008) Abundance
 and Biomass of the Ciliate Community during a Spring Cruise in the Gulf of Gabes
 (Eastern Mediterranean Sea, Tunisia). Acta Protozool 14
- Hargraves PE (2002) The ebridian flagellates Ebria and Hermesinum. Plankton Biology and
 Ecology, 49(1), 9-16.
- Hattour MJ, Sammari C, Ben Nassrallah S (2010) Hydrodynamique du golfe de Gabès déduite
 à partir des observations de courants et de niveaux. Rev Paralia 3:3.1-3.12.
 https://doi.org/10.5150/revue-paralia.2010.003
- He X, Wang Z, Bai Z, Han L, Chen M (2021) Diel Feeding Rhythm and Grazing Selectivity of
 Small-Sized Copepods in a Subtropical Embayment, the Northern South China Sea.
 Front Mar Sci 8: 611. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.658664
- Hillebrand H, Dürselen CD, Kirschtel D, Pollingher U, Zohary T (1999) Biovolume Calculation
 for Pelagic and Benthic Microalgae. J Phycol 35:403–424.
 https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1529-8817.1999.3520403.x

- Horn HG, Boersma M, Garzke J, Sommer U, Aberle N (2020) High CO2 and warming affect microzooplankton food web dynamics in a Baltic Sea summer plankton community. Mar Biol 167:69. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-020-03683-0
- Irigoien X (1998) Gut clearance rate constant, temperature and initial gut contents: a review. J
 Plankton Res 20:997–1003. https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/20.5.997
- Jafari F, Ramezanpour Z, Sattari M (2015) First record of Ebria tripartita (Schumann)
 Lemmermann, 1899 from south of the Caspian Sea. Casp J Environ Sci 13:283–288
- Jeong HJ, Yoo YD, Kang NS, Rho JR, Seong KA, Park JW, Yih W (2010) Ecology of
 Gymnodinium aureolum. I. Feeding in western Korean waters. Aquat Microb Ecol
 59:239–255. https://doi.org/10.3354/ame01394
- Jyothibabu R, Vinayachandran PN, Madhu NV, Robinc RS, Karnan C, Jagadeesan L, Anjusha A (2015) Phytoplankton size structure in the southern Bay of Bengal modified by the Summer Monsoon Current and associated eddies: Implications on the vertical biogenic flux. Journal of Marine Systems 143:98–119.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2014.10.018
- Kase L, Metfies K, Kraberg AC, Neuhaus S, Meunier CL, Wiltshire KH, Boersma M (2021) 1182 Metabarcoding analysis suggests that flexible food web interactions in the eukaryotic 1183 plankton community are more common than specific predator-prey relationships at 1184 Helgoland North ICES Mar Sci 78:3372-3386. Roads. Sea. J 1185 1186 https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsab058
- 1187 Katechakis A, Stibor H, Sommer U, Hansen T (2004) Feeding selectivities and food niche
 1188 separation of Acartia clausi, Penilia avirostris (Crustacea) and Doliolum denticulatum
 1189 (Thaliacea) in Blanes Bay (Catalan Sea, NW Mediterranean). J Plankton Res 26:589–
 1190 603. https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/fbh062
- 1191 Kchaou N, Elloumi J, Drira Z, Hamza A, Ayadi H, Bouain A, Aleya L (2009) Distribution of
 1192 ciliates in relation to environmental factors along the coastline of the Gulf of Gabes,
 1193 Tunisia. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 83:414–424. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2009.04.019
- Khammeri Y, Hamza IS, Zouari AB, Hamza A, Sahli E, Akrout F, Hassen MB (2018) 1194 Atmospheric bulk deposition of dissolved nitrogen, phosphorus and silicate in the Gulf 1195 of Gabès (South Ionian Basin); implications for marine heterotrophic prokaryotes and 1196 1197 ultraphytoplankton; implications for marine heterotrophic prokaryotes and ultraphytoplankton. Continental Shelf Research, 2018, vol. 159, p. 1-11. 1198 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2018.03.003 1199
- Khammeri Y, Bellaaj-Zouari A, Hamza A, Medhioub W, Sahli E, Akrout F, Barraj N, Ben 1200 Kacem MY, Bel Hassen M(2020) Ultraphytoplankton community composition in 1201 Southwestern and Eastern Mediterranean Basin: Relationships to water mass properties 1202 nutrients. Journal Sea Research 158:101875. 1203 and of 1204 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seares.2020.101875
- 1205
- 1206 Khedhri I, Lavesque N, Bonifácio P, Djabou H, Afli A (2014) First record of Naineris setosa
 1207 (Verrill, 1900) (Annelida: Polychaeta: Orbiniidae) in the Western Mediterranean Sea.
 1208 BioInvasions Rec 3:83–88. https://doi.org/10.3391/bir.2014.3.2.05

- Kleppel GS, Pieper RE (1984) Phytoplankton pigments in the gut concents of planktonic
 copepods from coastal waters off southern California. Mar Biol 78:193–198.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00394700
- Kojima D, Hamao Y, Amei K, Fukai Y, Matsuno K, Mitani Y, Yamaguchi A (2022) Vertical 1212 distribution, standing stocks, and taxonomic accounts of the entire plankton community, 1213 and the estimation of vertical material flux via faecal pellets in the southern Okhotsk 1214 Sea. Deep Sea Res Part Oceanogr Res Pap 185:103771. 1215 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2022.103771 1216
- Kovač Ž, Platt T, Ninčević Gladan Ž, Morović M, Sathyendranath S, Raitsos DE, Veža J (2018)
 A 55-Year Time Series Station for Primary Production in the Adriatic Sea: Data Correction, Extraction of Photosynthesis Parameters and Regime Shifts. https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/10/9/1460.
- Landry MR, Hassett RP (1982) Estimating the grazing impact of marine micro-zooplankton.
 Mar Biol 67:283–288. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00397668
- Landry MR, Swalethorp R (2021) Mesozooplankton biomass, grazing and trophic structure in
 the bluefin tuna spawning area of the oceanic Gulf of Mexico. Journal of Plankton
 Research fbab008. https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/fbab008
- Laurenceau-Cornec EC, Trull TW, Davies DM, Bray SG, Doran J, Planchon F, Carlotti F
 Jouandet MP, Cavagna AJ, Waite AM, Blain S (2015) The relative importance of
 phytoplankton aggregates and zooplankton fecal pellets to carbon export: insights from
 free-drifting sediment trap deployments in naturally iron-fertilised waters near the
 Kerguelen Plateau. Biogeosciences 12:1007–1027. https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-12-1007 2015
- Leblanc K, Quéguiner B, Diaz F, Cornet V, Michel-Rodriguez M, Durrieu de Madron X,
 Bowler C, Malviya S, Thyssen M, Grégori G, Rembauville M, Grosso O, Poulain J, de
 Vargas C, Pujo-Pay M, Conan P (2018) Nanoplanktonic diatoms are globally
 overlooked but play a role in spring blooms and carbon export. Nat Commun 9:953.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-03376-9
- Legendre and Le Fèvre L (1989) Hydrodynamical singularities as controls of recycled versus
 export production in oceans. In: Berger W.H., Smetacek V.S. and Wefer G. (ed.)
 Product Ocean Present Pasts, John Wiley and sons Limited, Dahlem, 49-63.
- 1240
- Legendre L, Rassoulzadegan F (1996) Food-web mediated export of biogenic carbon in
 oceans:hydrodynamic control. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 145:179–193.
 https://doi.org/10.3354/meps145179
- Legendre L, Rassoulzadegan F (1995) Plankton and nutrient dynamics in marine waters.
 Ophelia 41:153–172. https://doi.org/10.1080/00785236.1995.10422042
- Leruste A, Pasqualini V, Garrido M, Malet N, De Wit R, Bec B (2019) Physiological and
 behavioral responses of phytoplankton communities to nutrient availability in a
 disturbed Mediterranean coastal lagoon. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 219:176–188.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2019.02.014

- Li Q, Edwards KF, Schvarcz CR, Steward GF (2022) Broad phylogenetic and functional diversity among mixotrophic consumers of Prochlorococcus. ISME J 16:1557–1569.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-022-01204-z
- Liu Q, Chai F, Dugdale R, Chao Y, Xue H, Rao S, Zhang Y (2018) San Francisco Bay nutrients
 and plankton dynamics as simulated by a coupled hydrodynamic-ecosystem model.
 Cont Shelf Res 161:29–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2018.03.008
- Livanou E, Lagaria A, Santi I, Mandalakis M, Pavlidou A, Lika K, Psarra S, (2019) Pigmented
 and heterotrophic nanoflagellates: Abundance and grazing on prokaryotic picoplankton
 in the ultra-oligotrophic Eastern Mediterranean Sea. Deep Sea Res Part II Top Stud
 Oceanogr 164:100–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2019.04.007
- Lund, C. Kipling, E. D. Le Cren (1958) The inverted microscope method of estimating algal numbers and the statistical basis of estimations by counting. . Hydrobiologia. 11, 143-170. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00007865
- Makhlouf Belkahia N, Pagano M, Chevalier C, Devenon JL, Yahia MND (2021) Zooplankton
 abundance and community structure driven by tidal currents in a Mediterranean coastal
 lagoon (Boughrara, Tunisia, SW Mediterranean Sea). Estuar Coast Shelf Sci
 250:107101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2020.107101
- Mansano AS, Hisatugo KF, Hayashi LH, Regali-Seleghim MH (2014) The importance of protozoan bacterivory in a subtropical environment (Lobo-Broa Reservoir, SP, Brazil).
 Braz J Biol 74:569–578. https://doi.org/10.1590/bjb.2014.0081
- Mansouri B, Gzam M, Souid F, Telahigue F, Chahlaoui A, Ouarrak K, Kharroubi A, (2020)
 Assessment of heavy metal contamination in Gulf of Gabès coastland (southeastern Tunisia): impact of chemical industries and drift currents. Arab J Geosci 13:1180.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-020-06163-3
- Margalef R (1978) Life-forms of phytoplankton as survival alternatives in an unstable
 environment. Ocean Acta 1:493–509
- Marques F, Chainho P, Costa JL, Domingos I, Angélico MM (2015) Abundance, seasonal
 patterns and diet of the non-native jellyfish Blackfordia virginica in a Portuguese
 estuary. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 167:212–219.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2015.07.024
- Marquis E, Niquil N, Delmas D, Hartmann HJ, Bonnet D, Carlotti F, Dupuy C (2007) Inverse
 analysis of the planktonic food web dynamics related to phytoplankton bloom
 development on the continental shelf of the Bay of Biscay, French coast. Estuar Coast
 Shelf Sci 73:223–235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2007.01.003
- 1284Martin-Cereceda M, Novarino G, Young JR (2003) Grazing by Prymnesium parvum on small1285planktonicdiatoms.AquatMicrobEcol33:191–199.1286https://doi.org/10.3354/ame033191

Masclaux H, Tortajada S, Philippine O, Robin FX, Dupuy C (2015) Planktonic food web structure and dynamic in freshwater marshes after a lock closing in early spring. Aquat Sci 77:115–128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00027-014-0376-1

- Mauchline (1998) Adv. Mar. Biol. 33: The biology of calanoid copepods. Volume 33 1st
 Edition.
- Mayot N, D'Ortenzio F, Taillandier V, Prieur L, De Fommervault OP, Claustre H, Conan P
 (2017) Physical and Biogeochemical Controls of the Phytoplankton Blooms in North
 Western Mediterranean Sea: A Multiplatform Approach Over a Complete Annual Cycle
 (2012–2013 DEWEX Experiment). J Geophys Res Oceans 122:9999–10019.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JC012052
- Mayot N, Nival P, Levy M (2020) Primary Production in the Ligurian Sea. The Mediterranean
 Sea in the Era of Global Change 1: 30 Years of Multidisciplinary Study of the Ligurian
 Sea, 139-164. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119706960.ch6
- Meddeb M, Grami B, Chaalali A, Haraldsson H, Niquil N, Pringault O, Sakka Hlaili A (2018)
 Plankton food-web functioning in anthropogenically impacted coastal waters (SW
 Mediterranean Sea): An ecological network analysis. Prog Oceanogr 162:66–82.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2018.02.013
- Meddeb M, Niquil N, Grami B, Mejri K, Haraldsson M, Chaalali A, Sakka Hlaili A (2019) A
 new type of plankton food web functioning in coastal waters revealed by coupling
 Monte Carlo Markov chain linear inverse method and ecological network analysis. Ecol
 Indic 104:67–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.04.077
- 1308 MedECC (2020) Climate and Environmental Change in the Mediterranean Basin Current
- 1309 Situation and Risks for the Future. First Mediterranean Assessment Report [Cramer W,
- 1310 Guiot, J, Marini, K, [eds.]] Union for Mediterranean, Plan Bleu, UNEP/MAP, Marseille,
- 1311 France, 632pp. ISBN: 978-2-9577416-0-1/ DOI : 10.5281/zenodo.4768833
- Menden-Deuer S, Lessard EJ (2000) Carbon to volume relationships for dinoflagellates,
 diatoms, and other protist plankton. Limnol Oceanogr 45:569–579.
 https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2000.45.3.0569
- Moigis and Gocke (2003) Primary production of phytoplankton estimated by means of the
 dilution method in coastal waters. Journal of Plankton Research. 25: 10. doi:
 10.1093/plankt/fbg089,
- Morales CE, Harris RP, Head RN, Tranter PRG (1993) Copepod grazing in the oceanic northeast Atlantic during a 6 week drifting station: the contribution of size classes and vertical migrants. Journal of Plankton Research 15:185–212.
 https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/15.2.185
- Moran XAG, Estrada M (2001) Short-term variability of photosynthetic parameters and particulate and dissolved primary production in the Alboran Sea (SW Mediterranean).
 Mar Ecol Prog Ser 212:53–67. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps212053
- Morsy A, Ebeid M, Soliman A, Halim AA, Ali AE, Fahmy M (2022) Evaluation of the water quality and the eutrophication risk in Mediterranean sea area: A case study of the Port Said Harbour, Egypt. Environ Chall 7:100484.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envc.2022.100484

- Negrete-García G, Luo JY, Long MC, Lindsay K, Levy M, Barton AD (2022) Plankton energy
 flows using a global size-structured and trait-based model. bioRxiv.
 https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.01.478546
- Olson MB, Strom SL (2002) Phytoplankton growth, microzooplankton herbivory and community structure in the southeast Bering Sea: insight into the formation and temporal persistence of an Emiliania huxleyi bloom. Deep Sea Res Part II Top Stud Oceanogr 49:5969–5990. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0645(02)00329-6
- Othmani A, Béjaoui B, Chevalier C, Elhmaidi D, Devenon JL, Aleya L (2017) High-resolution
 numerical modelling of the barotropic tides in the Gulf of Gabes, eastern Mediterranean
 Sea (Tunisia). J Afr Earth Sci 129:224–232.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafrearsci.2017.01.007
- Paklar GB, Vilibić I, Grbec B, Matić F, Mihanović H, Džoić T, Kušpilić G (2020) Recordbreaking salinities in the middle Adriatic during summer 2017 and concurrent changes
 in the microbial food web. Progress in Oceanography 185: 102345.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2020.102345
- Parsons TR, Harrison PJ, Acreman JC, Dovey HM, Thompson PA, Lalli CM, Xiaolin C (1984)
 An experimental marine ecosystem response to crude oil and Corexit 9527: Part 2—
 biological effects. Marine Environmental Research 13(4), 265-275.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/0141-1136(84)90033-3
- Pecqueur D, Courboulès J, Roques C, Mas S, Pete R, Vidussi F, Mostajir B (2022)
 Simultaneous Study of the Growth and Grazing Mortality Rates of Microbial Food Web
 Components in a Mediterranean Coastal Lagoon. Diversity, 14(3),
 186.https://www.mdpi.com/1424-2818/14/3/186.
- Peters F, Arin L, Marrasé C, Berdalet E, Sala MM (2006) Effects of small-scale turbulence on the growth of two diatoms of different size in a phosphorus-limited medium. J Mar Syst 61:134–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2005.11.012
- Psarra S, Zohary T, Krom MD, Mantoura RFC, Polychronaki T, Stambler N, Thingstad TF (2005). Phytoplankton response to a Lagrangian phosphate addition in the Levantine Sea (Eastern Mediterranean). Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 52(22-23), 2944-2960. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2005.08.015
- Putt M, Stoecker DK (1989) An experimentally determined carbon : volume ratio for marine
 "oligotrichous" ciliates from estuarine and coastal waters. Limnol Oceanogr 34:1097–
 1103. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1989.34.6.1097
- Raimbault P, Garcia N, Cerutti F (2008) Distribution of inorganic and organic nutrients in the
 South Pacific Ocean − evidence for long-term accumulation of organic matter in
 nitrogen-depleted waters. Biogeosciences 5:281–298. https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-5 281-2008
- Rassoulzadegan F, Laval-Peuto M, Sheldon RW (1988) Partitioning of the food ration of
 marine ciliates between pico- and nanoplankton. Hydrobiologia, 159(1), 75-88.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00007369

- Raveh O, David N, Rilov G, Rahav E (2015) The Temporal Dynamics of Coastal Phytoplankton
 and Bacterioplankton in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea. PloS one, 10(10), e0140690.
 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0140690
- 1372 Rekik A, Denis M, Maalej S, Ayadi H (2015) Spatial and seasonal variability of pico-, nano1373 and microphytoplankton at the bottom seawater in the north coast of Sfax, Eastern
 1374 Mediterranean Sea. Environ Sci Pollut Res 22:15961–15975.
 1375 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-4811-1
- 1376 Rekik A, Kmiha-Megdiche S, Drira Z, Pagano M, Ayadi H, Zouari AB, Elloumi J (2021)
 1377 Spatial variations of planktonic ciliates, predator-prey interactions and their
 1378 environmental drivers in the Gulf of Gabes-Boughrara lagoon system. Estuar Coast
 1379 Shelf Sci 254:107315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2021.107315
- Riccardi N (2010) Selectivity of plankton nets over mesozooplankton taxa: implications for
 abundance, biomass and diversity estimation. J Limnol 69:287.
 https://doi.org/10.4081/jlimnol.2010.287
- Ross ON, Fraysse M, Pinazo C, Pairaud I (2016) Impact of an intrusion by the Northern Current
 on the biogeochemistry in the eastern Gulf of Lion, NW Mediterranean . Estuarine,
 Coastal and Shelf Science 170: 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2015.12.022
- Saiz E, Rodriguez V, Alcaraz M (1992) Spatial distribution and feeding rates of Centropages
 typicus in relation to frontal hydrographic structures in the Catalan Sea (Western
 Mediterranean). Mar Biol 112:49–56. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00349727
- Sakka Hlaili A, Grami B, Hadj Mabrouk H, Gosselin M, Hamel D (2007) Phytoplankton growth
 and microzooplankton grazing rates in a restricted Mediterranean lagoon (Bizerte
 Lagoon, Tunisia). Mar Biol 151:767–783. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-006-0522-y
- Sakka Hlaili A, Grami B, Niquil N, Gosselin M, Hamel D, Troussellier M, Mabrouk H (2008)
 The planktonic food web of the Bizerte lagoon (south-western Mediterranean) during
 summer: I. Spatial distribution under different anthropogenic pressures. Estuar Coast
 Shelf Sci 78:61–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2007.11.010
- Sakka Hlaili AS, Niquil N, Legendre L (2014) Planktonic food webs revisited: Reanalysis of
 results from the linear inverse approach. Prog Oceanogr 120:216–229.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2013.09.003
- Salgado-Hernanz PM, Racault M-F, Font-Muñoz JS, Basterretxea G (2019) Trends in phytoplankton phenology in the Mediterranean Sea based on ocean-colour remote sensing. Remote Sens Environ 221:50–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2018.10.036
- Sammari C, Koutitonsky VG, Moussa M (2006) Sea level variability and tidal resonance in the
 Gulf of Gabes, Tunisia. Continental Shelf Research 26:338–350.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2005.11.006
- Sautour B, Artigas LF, Delmas D, Herbland A, Laborde P (2000) Grazing impact of micro- and mesozooplankton during a spring situation in coastal waters off the Gironde estuary. J Plankton Res 22:531–552. https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/22.3.531

- Seong KA, Jeong HJ, Kim S, Kim GH, Kang JH (2006) Bacterivory by co-occurring red-tide
 algae, heterotrophic nanoflagellates, and ciliates. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 322:85–97.
 https://doi.org/10.3354/meps322085
- Sherr EB, Sherr BF (1993) Preservation and Storage of Samples for Enumeration of
 Heterotrophic Protists. In: Handbook of Methods in Aquatic Microbial Ecology. CRC
 Press
- Sherr EB, Sherr BF (2007) Heterotrophic dinoflagellates: a significant component of microzooplankton biomass and major grazers of diatoms in the sea. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 352:187–197. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps07161
- Shinada A, Ikeda T, Ban S, Tsuda A (2000) Seasonal changes in micro-zooplankton grazing on
 phytoplankton assemblages in the Oyashio region. Plankton Biol. Ecol. 47(2), 85-92.
- Siokou-Frangou I, Christaki U, Mazzocchi MG, Montresor M, Ribera d'Alcalá M, Vaqué D,
 Zingone A (2010) Plankton in the open Mediterranean Sea: a review. Biogeosciences
 7:1543–1586. https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-7-1543-2010
- Slaughter AM, Bollens SM, Bollens GR (2006) Grazing impact of mesozooplankton in an
 upwelling region off northern California, 2000–2003. Deep Sea Res Part II Top Stud
 Oceanogr 53:3099–3115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2006.07.005
- Smith VH, Joye SB, Howarth RW (2006) Eutrophication of freshwater and marine ecosystems.
 Limnol Oceanogr 51:351–355. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2006.51.1_part_2.0351
- Šolić M, Krstulović N, Kušpilić G, Ninčević Gladan Ž, Bojanić N, Šestanović S, Šantić D,
 Ordulj M (2010) Changes in microbial food web structure in response to changed
 environmental trophic status: A case study of the Vranjic Basin (Adriatic Sea). Marine
 Environmental Research 70:239–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2010.05.007
- Sorgente R, Olita A, Oddo P, Fazioli L, Ribotti A (2011) Numerical simulation and decomposition of kinetic energy in the Central Mediterranean: insight on mesoscale circulation and energy conversion. Ocean Sci 7:503–519. https://doi.org/10.5194/os-7-1434
 503-2011
- 1435Stibor H, Stockenreiter M, Nejstgaard JC, Ptacnik R, Sommer U (2019) Trophic switches in1436pelagicsystems.CurrOpinSystBiol13:108–114.1437https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coisb.2018.11.006
- Tanaka T, Zohary T, Krom MD, Law CS, Pitta P, Psarra S, Rassoulzadegan F, Thingstad TF,
 Tselepides A, Woodward EMS, Flaten GAF, Skjoldal EF, Zodiatis, G (2007). Microbial
 community structure and function in the Levantine Basin of the eastern Mediterranean.
 Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers, 54(10), 1721-1743.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2007.06.008
- 1443 Ter Braak (1986) Canonical Correspondence Analysis: A New Eigenvector Technique for
 1444 Multivariate Direct Gradient Analysis ter Braak 1986 Ecology Wiley Online
 1445 Library. https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.2307/1938672.
- Totti C, Cangini M, Ferrari C, Kraus R, Pompei M, Pugnetti A, Romagnoli T, Vanucci S, Socal
 G (2005), Phytoplankton size-distribution and community structure in relation to

- 1448mucilage occurrence in the northern Adriatic Sea. Science of the Total Environment1449353(1-3): 204-217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2005.09.028
- Trombetta T, Bouget F-Y, Félix C, Mostajir B, Vidussi F (2022) Microbial Diversity in a North
 Western Mediterranean Sea Shallow Coastal Lagoon Under Contrasting Water
 Temperature Conditions. Front Mar Sci 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2022.858744
- Trombetta T, Vidussi F, Roques C, Mas S, Scotti M, Mostajir B (2021) Co-occurrence networks
 reveal the central role of temperature in structuring the plankton community of the Thau
 Lagoon. Sci Rep 11:17675. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-97173-y
- Tseng LC, Kumar R, Dahms HU, Chen QC, Hwang JS (2008) Copepod Gut Contents, Ingestion
 Rates, and Feeding Impacts in Relation to Their Size Structure in the Southeastern
 Taiwan Strait. Zool Stud 15
- Utermöhl (1931) Neue Wege in der quantitativen Erfassung des Plankton.(Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Ultraplanktons.) Mit 4 Abbildungen im Text. Internationale Vereinigung für theoretische und angewandte Limnologie: Verhandlungen, 5(2), 567-596. https://doi.org/10.1080/03680770.1931.11898492
- Vargas CA, González HE (2004) Plankton community structure and carbon cycling in a coastal upwelling system. II. Microheterotrophic pathway. Aquat Microb Ecol 34:165–180. https://doi.org/10.3354/ame034165
- Vargas CA, Martínez RA, Cuevas LA, Pavez MA, Cartes C, Gonza lez HE, Escribano R,
 Daneri G (2007) The relative importance of microbial and classical food webs in a
 highly productive coastal upwelling area. Limnology and Oceanography 52:1495–1510.
 https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2007.52.4.1495
- 1470 Varkitzi I, Psarra S, Assimakopoulou G, et al (2020) Phytoplankton dynamics and bloom
 1471 formation in the oligotrophic Eastern Mediterranean: Field studies in the Aegean,
 1472 Levantine and Ionian seas. Deep Sea Res Part II Top Stud Oceanogr 171:104662.
 1473 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2019.104662
- 1474 Vascotto I, Mozetič P, Francé J (2021) Phytoplankton Time-Series in a LTER Site of the
 1475 Adriatic Sea: Methodological Approach to Decipher Community Structure and
 1476 Indicative Taxa. Water 13:2045. https://doi.org/10.3390/w13152045
- 1477 Verity PG, Robertson CY, Tronzo CR, Andrews MG, Nelson JR, Sieracki ME (1992)
 1478 Relationships between cell volume and the carbon and nitrogen content of marine
 1479 photosynthetic nanoplankton. Limnol Oceanogr 37:1434–1446.
 1480 https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1992.37.7.1434
- Vidussi F, Marty J-C, Chiavérini J (2000) Phytoplankton pigment variations during the transition from spring bloom to oligotrophy in the northwestern Mediterranean sea.
 Deep Sea Res Part Oceanogr Res Pap 47:423–445. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0637(99)00097-7
- Viñas MD, Negri RM, Cepeda GD, Hernández D, Silva R, Daponte MC, Capitanio FL (2013)
 Seasonal succession of zooplankton in coastal waters of the Argentine Sea (Southwest Atlantic Ocean): prevalence of classical or microbial food webs. Mar Biol Res 9:371– 382. https://doi.org/10.1080/17451000.2012.745003

- Ward BA, Dutkiewicz S, Jahn O, Follows MJ (2012) A size-structured food-web model for the
 global ocean. Limnol Oceanogr 57:1877–1891.
 https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2012.57.6.1877
- Wickham SA, Wenta P, Sinner A, Weiss R (2022) Microzooplankton grazing and community
 composition in a high-productivity marine ecosystem. J Plankton Res 44:414–426.
 https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/fbac015
- Xiang Y, Lam PJ, Burd AB, Hayes CT (2022) Estimating Mass Flux From Size-Fractionated
 Filtered Particles: Insights Into Controls on Sinking Velocities and Mass Fluxes in
 Recent U.S. GEOTRACES Cruises. Glob Biogeochem Cycles 36:e2021GB007292.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GB007292
- Yang J, Wei H, Yalin T, et al (2019) Combined effects of food resources and exposure to ammonium nitrogen on population growth performance in the bacterivorous ciliate
 Paramecium caudatum. Eur J Protistol 71:125631.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejop.2019.125631
- Yang J, Löder MGJ, Wiltshire KH, Montagnes DJ (2022) Comparing the Trophic Impact of Microzooplankton during the Spring and Autumn Blooms in Temperate Waters .
 Estuaries and Coasts, 44(1), 189-198. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-020-00775-4
- Zayen A, Sayadi S, Chevalier C, Boukthir M, Ismail SB, Tedetti M (2020) Microplastics in surface waters of the Gulf of Gabes, southern Mediterranean Sea: Distribution, composition and influence of hydrodynamics. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 242:106832.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2020.106832
- Zhang S, Liu H, Ke Y, Li B (2017) Effect of the Silica Content of Diatoms on Protozoan
 Grazing. Front Mar Sci 4:202. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2017.00202