

Working document

November 25, 2019

General idea: How can the terrestrial plant literature on seed bank be applied to phytoplankton coexistence?

Introduction

%%% Begin here by the biodiversity question in more details than below.

The high biodiversity of plant communities has long been a subject of both experimental and theoretical ecologists. Analyses of coexistence in terrestrial plant communities often take into account several life stages [refs]. Considering at least two stages, seeds/juveniles and adults, different models have uncovered mechanisms that might explain long-term coexistence. Examples of such mechanisms are the bet-hedging strategy, the storage effect and the Janzen-Connell effect. Bet-hedging is a long-term strategy relying on the creation of seeds which can remain dormant for a long period of time (over a year, often much longer). Dormant seeds can tolerate harsher years during which adults cannot maintain, but they also reduce part of the population that could germinate from one year to another (in case of an annual plant). The storage effect has first been defined by the presence of a long-lived life stage and temporal variation in recruitment from this long-lived life stage that helps escape interspecific competition (Chesson 1986, Cáceres, 1997). This has been later generalized as a negative correlation between the effect of the environment and the effect of competition (Ellner et al. 2016). In good environmental conditions, competition from other individuals is stronger as seeds might germinate at the same time. Finally, models and experiments suggest that adults can have a negative effect on seed survival, through the Janzen-Connell effect (Comita et al. 2014).

Even though different coexistence mechanisms have been unveiled through the use of several life stages and a focus on the youngest stage (seeds) for terrestrial plants, aquatic plants, and more specifically phytoplanktonic algae, have not been modeled with the same precision. Although theoreticians have proposed for a long time that the blooms may initiate after the resuspension and germination of seeds (Gran 1912, Marcus and Boero 1998), it is unusual to see an explicit model of such process [[Note: not necessarily theoreticians, but they have done small review of the existence of spores and the possible benthic-pelagic coupling.]]. The classical view behind phytoplankton dynamics is that bloom formation is mostly seasonal, due to the variation in light and temperature, assuming that there are always enough cells in the environment to duplicate. However, a recent review suggests that there might be more complexity behind phytoplanktonic seeds/cysts [Ellegaard and Ribeiro, 2018]. Neglecting explicit modeling of this life stage can modify the understanding we have of the dynamics of the populations [Nguyen et al., 2019].

Phytoplankton communities in coastal environments may benefit from seed banks even more than the oceanic communities, as the distance to the bottom is lower. Similarly to the seed bank approach, Smayda [2002] has proposed the term “pelagic seed bank” to characterize the contribution of the ocean to coastal communities. This has been noticed for dinoflagellate especially [[ref Dinophysis, check what we have on diatoms]]. We can wonder, however, to which extent the seed banks can contribute to the biodiversity in the ocean, especially in the long term. Indeed, spores are able to germinate again after tens of years [McQuoid et al., 2002, Ellegaard and Ribeiro, 2018] or even thousands of years [Sanyal et al., 2018] of dormancy, which can play a huge role on biodiversity in both oceanic and coastal environments.

Param	Name	Value (unit)
$r_i(T)$	growth rate of species i	from Picoche and Barraquand [2019a]
T	temperature	
$\alpha_{ij,c/o}$	interaction strength of species j on i	
m_i	seed mortality of species i	
s_i	sinking rate of species i	
e	exchange rate between ocean and coast	
γ_i	germination + resuspension rate of species i	

Table 1: Definition of main parameters in our model [[These are not the notations from Wisnoski et al., 2019]]

Here we build on the work by Shoemaker and Melbourne [2016], Wisnoski et al. [2019], and previous findings in Picoche and Barraquand [2019a,b], to examine the effect on coexistence and feedbacks from the different compartments (ocean, coastal water column and bottom).

Model

Let's consider two steps in the discrete-time model: species first grow following a Beverton-Holt model for the coastal and oceanic cells, while seeds only survive. Then, we take into account exchange with the open-ocean and with the benthic seeds.

$$\begin{cases} N_{t+h,i,c/o} &= \frac{e^{r_i(T)} N_{t,i,c/o}}{1 + \sum_j \alpha_{ij,c/o} N_{t,j,c/o}} \\ N_{t+h,i,b} &= N_{t,i,b}(1 - m_i) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} N_{t+1,i,c} &= N_{t+h,i,c}(1 - s_i - e) + \gamma_i N_{t+h,i,b} + e N_{t+h,i,o} \\ N_{t+1,i,o} &= N_{t+h,i,o}(1 - e) + e N_{t+h,i,c} \\ N_{t+1,i,b} &= N_{t+h,i,b}(1 - \gamma_i) + s_i N_{t+h,i,c} \end{cases}$$

Interactions For the interactions, we can have $\alpha_{ij,c} \ll \alpha_{ij,o}$ and $\alpha_{ii} \sim 10|\bar{\alpha}_{ij}|$ and $\alpha_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma)$ with μ and σ from Picoche and Barraquand [2019b] (that is, very approximately, around 0.0 and 0.01¹ for the coast (and have a fixed conversion ratio k from coast to ocean, $\alpha_{ij,c} = k\alpha_{ij,o}$?)). We could also use the formula for the 20-species example in the Granger-causality paper (based on a beta-distribution and much less facilitation).

Growth rate

$$r_i(T) = a_r(T_0) e^{E_r \frac{(\tau - \tau_0)}{k\tau\tau_0}} f_i(T) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{where } f_i(T) = \begin{cases} e^{-|T - T_i^{opt}|^3 / b_i}, & T \leq T_i^{opt} \\ e^{-5|T - T_i^{opt}|^3 / b_i}, & T > T_i^{opt} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{and } b_i \text{ is defined by numerically solving } \int r_i(\tau) d\tau = A \quad (3)$$

We could also use a simpler Gaussian distribution for the growth rate, as in Wisnoski et al. [2019].

Exchange rate This parameter depends on the estuary. In the Arcachon Bay, the exchange rate for each tide has been estimated around 64% [Plus et al., 2009]. If we take a tidal time-step, $e=0.64$.

¹I know it is not the same model, I am just starting with some values here...

Seed mortality, sinking rate, germination For mortality, we have maximum values in McQuoid et al. [2002]. Average values could be taken from Fig. 3 in this same paper(?). Or could be taken from Hinners et al. [2019].

Sinking rate can be an indicator of size. (so there will be two traits in this model: optimal temperature and size). Sinking can also be related to other events (for instance, overcrowding leading to reproduction as in Eilertsen and Wyatt [2000], but reasons behind reproduction are still not clear... Best is related to shrinking as in D’Alelio et al. [2010], but for now, we do not have an explicit representation of the size variation).

Results

References

- C. E. Cáceres. Temporal variation, dormancy, and coexistence: A field test of the storage effect. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 94(17):9171–9175, 1997.
- Domenico D’Alelio, Maurizio Ribera d’Alcala, Laurent Dubroca, Diana Sarno, Adriana Zingone, and Marina Montresor. The time for sex: A biennial life cycle in a marine planktonic diatom. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 55(1):106, 2010.
- H.C. Eilertsen and T. Wyatt. Phytoplankton models and life history strategies. *South African Journal of Marine Science*, 22(1):323–337, 2000.
- M. Ellegaard and S. Ribeiro. The long-term persistence of phytoplankton resting stages in aquatic ‘seed banks’. *Biological Reviews*, 93(1):166–183, 2018.
- J. Hinners, I. Hense, and A. Kremp. Modelling phytoplankton adaptation to global warming based on resurrection experiments. *Ecological Modelling*, 400:27–33, 2019.
- M. R. McQuoid, A. Godhe, and K. Nordberg. Viability of phytoplankton resting stages in the sediments of a coastal Swedish fjord. *European Journal Phycology*, 37(2):191–201, 2002.
- V. Nguyen, Y. M. Buckley, R. Salguero-Gómez, and G. M. Wardle. Consequences of neglecting cryptic life stages from demographic models. *Ecological Modelling*, 408:108723, 2019.
- C. Picoche and F. Barraquand. How self-regulation, the storage effect, and their interaction contribute to coexistence in stochastic and seasonal environments. *Theoretical Ecology*, 2019a.
- C. Picoche and F. Barraquand. Strong self-regulation and widespread facilitative interactions between genera of phytoplankton. preprint, bioRxiv, 2019b.
- M. Plus, F. Dumas, J.-Y. Stanisière, and D. Maurer. Hydrodynamic characterization of the Arcachon Bay, using model-derived descriptors. *Continental Shelf Research*, 29(8):1008–1013, 2009.
- A. Sanyal, J. Larsson, F. van Wirdum, T. Andrén, M. Moros, M. Lönn, and E. Andrén. Not dead yet: Diatom resting spores can survive in nature for several millennia. preprint, bioRxiv, 2018.
- L. G. Shoemaker and B. A. Melbourne. Linking metacommunity paradigms to spatial coexistence mechanisms. *Ecology*, 97(9):2436–2446, 2016.
- T. J. Smayda. Turbulence, watermass stratification and harmful algal blooms: an alternative view and frontal zones as “pelagic seed banks”. *Harmful Algae*, 1(1):95–112, 2002.
- N. I. Wisnoski, M. A. Leibold, and J. T. Lennon. Dormancy in Metacommunities. *The American Naturalist*, 194(2):135–151, 2019.