

1 Ocean acidification challenges copepod phenotypic 2 plasticity

3 A. Vehmaa^{1,2}, A.-K. Almén^{2,3}, A. Brutemark^{1,2*}, A. Paul⁴, U. Riebesell⁴, S.
4 Furuhagen⁵⁺, J. Engström-Öst²

5

6 [1]{Tvärminne Zoological Station, University of Helsinki, J.A. Palménin tie 260, FI-10900
7 Hanko, Finland}

8 [2]{Novia University of Applied Sciences, Coastal Zone Research Team, Raseborgsvägen 9,
9 FI-10600 Ekenäs, Finland}

10 [3]{Environmental and Marine Biology, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Åbo Akademi
11 University, Tykistökatu 6, FI-20500 Turku, Finland}

12 [4]{GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel, Düsternbrooker Weg 20, 24105
13 Kiel, Germany}

14 [5]{Department of Environmental Science and Analytical Chemistry, Stockholm University,
15 Svante Arrhenius väg 8, SE-11418, Stockholm, Sweden}

16

17 [*]{present address: Calluna AB, Torsgatan 30, SE-11321 Stockholm, Sweden}

18 [+]{present address: Swedish Chemical Agency, Esplanaden 3A, SE-17267 Sundbyberg,
19 Sweden}

20 Correspondence to: A. Vehmaa (asvehmaa@gmail.com)

21

22 **Abstract**

23 Ocean acidification is challenging phenotypic plasticity of individuals and populations.
24 Calanoid copepods (zooplankton) are shown to be fairly plastic against altered pH conditions,
25 and laboratory studies indicate that transgenerational effects are one mechanism behind this
26 plasticity. We studied phenotypic plasticity of the copepod *Acartia* sp. in the course of a pelagic,
27 large-volume mesocosm study that was conducted to investigate ecosystem and
28 biogeochemical responses to ocean acidification. We measured copepod egg production rate,

1 egg hatching success, adult female size and adult female antioxidant capacity (ORAC) as a
2 function of acidification ($f\text{CO}_2$ ~365–1231 μatm), and as a function of quantity and quality of
3 their diet. We used an egg transplant experiment to reveal if transgenerational effects can
4 alleviate the possible negative effects of ocean acidification on offspring development. We
5 found significant negative effects of ocean acidification on adult female size. In addition, we
6 found signs of a possible threshold of $f\text{CO}_2$ concentration (~1000 μatm), above which adaptive
7 maternal effects cannot alleviate the negative effects of acidification on egg hatching and
8 nauplii development. We did not find support for the hypothesis that insufficient food quantity
9 (total particulate carbon < 55 μm) or quality (C:N) weakens the transgenerational effects.
10 However, females with high ORAC produced eggs with high hatching success. Overall, these
11 results indicate that *Acartia* sp. could be affected by projected near future CO_2 levels.

12 Keywords: *Acartia bifilosa*, climate change, maternal effects, total particulate carbon, C:N,
13 oxidative stress

14

15 **1 Introduction**

16 Increased concentrations of carbon dioxide (CO_2) in the atmosphere is changing the carbon
17 chemistry of the world's oceans. CO_2 dissolves in seawater thereby decreasing ocean pH. Ocean
18 acidification is increasing fast and pH is expected to decrease by a further 0.14–0.43 pH units
19 during the coming century (IPCC, 2007). Acidification can cause various problems to
20 biochemical and physiological processes in aquatic organisms. In addition to affecting
21 calcification of calcareous organisms, maintenance of acid-base equilibrium of body fluids may
22 become more difficult and have consequences for example on protein synthesis, metabolism
23 and volume control (Whiteley, 2011).

24 In a changing environment, populations can respond in three main ways: through plastic
25 responses of individuals, through genetic changes across generations, or through escaping in
26 space or in time by phenology modifications. Under a rapid change, phenotypic plasticity, i.e.,
27 the ability of an individual or a population to alter its physiological state, appearance or
28 behaviour in response to the environment is of major importance (West-Eberhard, 2003).
29 Theory predicts that higher plasticity evolves in extreme environments, and that spatial
30 heterogeneity and dispersal select for higher plasticity (Chevin et al., 2013). One could therefore
31 hypothesise that organisms inhabiting a variable environment, such as the study area, could be

1 fairly plastic in their response to ocean acidification because they have to cope with both
2 seasonal and sudden changes in pH (Almén et al., 2014; Lewis et al., 2013).

3 Proteomic studies suggest that oxidative stress is a common co-stress of temperature and
4 acidification (Tomanek, 2014). Increased production of reactive oxygen species (ROS) may
5 result in increased antioxidant and/or repair costs, and further in reduced investment in
6 reproduction or other functions, such as immune defence. In addition, increased production of
7 ROS may lead to accumulation of oxidative damage and further to acceleration of senescence
8 (Monaghan et al., 2009). There can also be a connection between maternal oxidative balance
9 and offspring quality. In birds, for example, females allocate diverse antioxidants to the eggs
10 that protect the embryo from oxidative stress. This maternal effect has a positive effect on
11 offspring development and growth (Rubolini et al., 2006).

12 Copepods (zooplankton) are indispensable to the functioning of the whole pelagic ecosystem
13 and contribute significantly to many ecosystem services (Bron et al., 2011). For example, they
14 provide food for early-life stages as well as some adult fishes of many economically important
15 fish species (Steele, 1974; Cushing, 1990).

16 Previous results suggest that calanoid copepods have high buffering capacity against projected
17 ocean acidification for the year 2100 and beyond (Kurihara and Ishimatsu, 2008; Weydmann
18 et al., 2012; McConville et al., 2013; Vehmaa et al., 2013), meaning that they are able to survive,
19 grow, develop and reproduce in lower pH (Reusch, 2014). However, there are also studies
20 showing negative impacts on moderate CO₂ levels (Fitzer et al. 2012), whereas most of the
21 negative impacts have been discovered for extreme, carbon storage scenarios (Kurihara et al.,
22 2004; Mayor et al., 2007; Weydmann et al., 2012). Many studies have tested only one life-
23 stage, adult females, and have therefore possibly underestimated the effects of ocean
24 acidification on copepods (Cripps et al., 2014a). There are indications that transgenerational
25 effects are one mechanism responsible for the high plasticity of copepod reproduction against
26 altered pH conditions (Vehmaa et al., 2012). This maternal effect is most likely dependent on
27 the condition of the mother and the availability of food and quality of her diet (Vehmaa et al.,
28 2012; Pedersen et al., 2014a). Paternal effects can also influence offspring traits. Exposure of
29 both parents to CO₂ leads to fewer adverse effects on egg production and hatching than
30 exposure of only gravid copepod females (Cripps et al., 2014b). Thor and Dupont (2015) also
31 highlight the importance of testing transgenerational effects. They found significantly lower
32 copepod egg production after two generations when exposed to 900 and 1500 μ atm compared

1 to 400 μatm , but transgenerational effects alleviated the negative CO_2 response in 1500 μatm
2 (Thor and Dupont, 2015).

3 We tested direct and indirect effects of ocean acidification (i.e., via food quantity and quality)
4 on the copepod *Acartia* sp. egg production (EPR), egg hatching success (EH), female body size
5 (measured as prosome length (PL)), as well as antioxidant capacity (ORAC). The study was
6 conducted in association with the KOSMOS (Kiel Off-Shore Mesocosms for Ocean
7 Simulations) project in the Baltic Sea (Paul et al., 2015). The study was intended to cover the
8 low productivity late spring and early summer period, i.e., the post-spring bloom period when
9 $p\text{CO}_2$ concentrations are at the annual minimum. Over the annual cycle, $p\text{CO}_2$ and pH vary
10 substantially at the study site as a result of biological activity and mixing/upwelling of CO_2 -
11 enriched deep water (Niemi, 1975; Omstedt et al., 2014). There are also strong spatial gradients
12 in seawater $p\text{CO}_2/\text{pH}$, most prominently between the surface layer and the CO_2 -rich deeper
13 waters (Almén et al., 2014). Thus, the copepods in the study area are likely to experience strong
14 changes in seawater carbonate chemistry, both seasonally and during their diurnal migration.
15 Total particulate carbon (TPC $<55 \mu\text{m}$) was used as the measure of food quantity. Food quality
16 was indicated by carbon to nitrogen ratio of the same size fraction of seston (C:N $<55 \mu\text{m}$)
17 (Elser and Hasset, 1994; Sterner and Hessen, 1994). In addition, in order to separate
18 transgenerational plasticity (i.e., maternal and paternal effects) and the effect of environment
19 on copepod egg hatching and development, we performed an egg-transplant experiment. Half
20 of the produced eggs were allowed to develop in respective mesocosm water and the other half
21 in water collected outside the mesocosm bags.

22 Due to the high buffering capacity of *Acartia* sp., we hypothesised that there are no $f\text{CO}_2$ related
23 differences in egg production rate, egg hatching success and prosome length between the
24 mesocosms. In addition, we hypothesised that copepod eggs hatch and develop better in the
25 same environment in which they are produced, because transgenerational effects can alleviate
26 the negative effects of environmental change. Our third hypothesis stated that low food quantity
27 (TPC) and poor quality (high C:N) will weaken the maternal effect by deteriorating the
28 condition of the mother. Finally, we tested if mothers with higher antioxidant capacity (ORAC)
29 produce better quality offspring (EH) by calculating correlation coefficients between the two
30 variables.

1 **2 Materials and Methods**

2 The study was performed in summer 2012 in the vicinity of Tvärminne Zoological Station on
3 the south-western coast of Finland. Six large mesocosms were moored on site in the beginning
4 of June. To enclose the natural plankton community, the mesocosms were left open with only
5 3 mm mesh size net covering the top and the bottom during filling. After four days, the net was
6 removed and the top was pulled up 1.5 m above the water surface and closed at the bottom
7 (Riebesell et al., 2013; Paul et al., 2015). pH was ~8 and $f\text{CO}_2$ concentrations in the mesocosms
8 prior to adjustment were $237 \pm 9 \mu\text{atm}$ (average \pm std of daily measurements from all bags). Four
9 mesocosm were manipulated with CO_2 enriched seawater, during three consecutive days to
10 reach $f\text{CO}_2$ concentrations of 600-1650 μatm (Paul et al., 2015). Two untreated mesocosms
11 were used as controls. The water column was mixed in the beginning of the experiment to avoid
12 salinity stratification. Due to outgassing, CO_2 was also added on day 15 to the upper 7 m of the
13 high CO_2 mesocosms to maintain the treatment levels. No nutrients were added.

14 **2.1 Sampling**

15 Sampling took place once a week during the first four weeks of the experiment, and once more
16 at the end of the whole experiment (days 3, 10, 17, 24 and 45). Mesozooplankton were sampled
17 by taking two hauls with a 300 μm net (17 cm diameter) from 17 m depth and from all
18 mesocosms. The samples were rinsed into containers with 4 l of seawater from respective
19 mesocosm taken from 9 m depth with a water sampler (Limnos, Hydrobios). On the same day,
20 integrated water samples (0-17 m) were collected from all mesocosms and the Baltic Sea
21 directly into 1.2 l Duran bottles that were closed without head space. Water samples were kept
22 in cool bags and zooplankton samples were protected from light until transported to a
23 temperature and light controlled room at Tvärminne Zoological Station within 4 h. The light:
24 dark cycle in the room was 16:8 h and light intensity was 7 $\mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ (LI-COR LI-
25 1000). Temperature followed the *in situ* temperature [9°C (day 3), 11°C (day 10), 15°C (day
26 17), 16°C (days 24 and 45)].

27 **2.2 Measurements of egg production, egg hatching success and prosome** 28 **length**

29 Twenty adult *Acartia* sp. (17 females and 3 males) were picked with pipettes from each sample
30 using stereo microscopes, and gently placed in pre-filled glass bottles with respective

1 mesocosm water. The bottles were closed without head-space, to minimise CO₂-outgassing
2 during the incubation. pH was measured from the bottles before closing and right after opening
3 them at the end of the incubation using Ecosense pH10 pH/temperature pen (Table S1). The
4 pen was calibrated with standard buffer solutions (Certipur, Titripac pH 4.00, 7.00, and 10.00)
5 every second day. The bottles were incubated in temperature and light controlled room in
6 conditions described above (Materials and Methods 2.1), and mixed three times a day and their
7 place on the shelf was changed randomly. After the incubation (24.3 ± 2.3 h, average \pm std),
8 the copepods and produced eggs were filtered using 250 μ m and 30 μ m sieves, respectively.
9 The copepods were counted and their viability checked before preserving them in RNAlater
10 (Sigma). RNAlater can affect size (Foley et al., 2010), and the effect depends on the number of
11 segments in the animal, i.e., the more segments the larger effect. Shrinkage is ~15% for
12 copepods (Prof. Elena Gorokhova, Stockholm University, pers. comm.). Prosome length of the
13 preserved female copepods was measured using a stereo microscope (Leica MZ12) and ocular
14 micrometer (total magnification 100 \times). As all the measured copepods were adult females, we
15 assume the shrinkage to be in proportion similar for all individuals, which means that our results
16 are quite conservative and comparable between mesocosms.

17 In the egg transplant experiment, the collected eggs were divided for hatching into two 50 ml
18 petri dishes with different conditions; one dish was filled with respective mesocosm water and
19 the other filled with Baltic water. pH of the water was measured as above before the incubations
20 and right after the petri dishes were opened after the incubation (Table S1). The eggs were
21 counted before the petri dishes were completely filled and sealed without head-space using
22 Parafilm. Egg hatching was followed by counting the number of remaining eggs on the dish
23 through the lid using a stereomicroscope twice a day. When the number of eggs had remained
24 the same on two consecutive counting times, the dishes were opened and the water containing
25 the remaining eggs and hatched nauplii was preserved with acid Lugol's solution. Therefore
26 the hatching incubation time varied between 63.9 and 137.6 h, depending on incubation
27 temperature. *Acartia* sp. nauplii stages were determined and the number of nauplii and
28 remaining copepod eggs counted using a stereo microscope.

29 Some adults, copepodites, nauplii or eggs could have ended up in the incubation bottles or petri
30 dishes with the unfiltered incubation water. The possible extra adults and their contribution to
31 the egg production rate (EPR, eggs copepod⁻¹ d⁻¹) were taken into account as EPR was
32 calculated using the number of eggs and adult *Acartia* sp. females found in the incubation

1 bottles after the 24 h incubation. When estimating the egg hatching success (EH, %), the total
2 number of hatched *Acartia* sp. nauplii and remaining eggs at the end of the hatching incubation
3 was compared with the number of eggs counted before the hatching incubation. If the total
4 number exceeded the egg number prior to hatching, the most developed nauplii (>N4) were
5 considered to be carry-over individuals, and were therefore not considered in the estimation of
6 EH. For estimation of nauplii development, rate the development index (DI) was calculated
7 (Knuckey et al., 2005) accordingly,

$$8 \quad DI = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^3 (N_i \times n_i)}{\sum_{i=0}^3 n_i} \quad (1)$$

9 where N_i is the assigned stage value (0 for eggs, 1 for N1, 2 for N2 and 3 for N3 and N4) and
10 n_i the number of individuals at that stage. We assume all the *Acartia* sp. adults and nauplii to
11 be species *A. bifilosa*. However, because another *Acartia* species, *A. tonsa* occurs in the area
12 in late summer too (Katajisto et al., 1998), we cannot be totally sure that we only had one
13 species in the experiments.

14 **2.3 Antioxidant capacity**

15 For antioxidant capacity (ORAC) samples ~25 live female *Acartia* sp. were picked from every
16 zooplankton sample onto a piece of plankton net in the temperature and light controlled room
17 on days 3, 10, 17 and 31. The net containing the copepods was folded and stored in Eppendorf
18 tubes at -80°C. The samples were homogenised in 150 µl Tris-EDTA buffer containing 1%
19 sarcosyl. The antioxidative capacity was assayed as ORAC (Ou et al., 2001). As a source of
20 peroxy radicals, 2, 2-azobis (2-amidinopropane) dihydrochloride (AAPH) (152.66 mM) was
21 used and fluorescein was used as a fluorescent probe (106 nM). We used trolox (218 µM,
22 Sigma-Aldrich) as a standard and the assay was performed on a 96-well microplate and to each
23 well, 20 µL sample, 30 µL AAPH and 150 µL fluorescein were added. ORAC values were
24 normalized to protein and expressed as mg Trolox eq. mg protein⁻¹. Protein concentration was
25 measured with NanoOrange® (Life Technologies).

26 **2.4 C:N and TPC**

27 Samples for TPC and C:N were collected onto GF/F filters (Whatman, nominal pore size 0.7
28 µm) using gentle vacuum filtration (<200 mbar) and then stored in glass petri dishes at -20°C.
29 GF/F filters and petri dishes were combusted at 450°C for 6 hours before use. Gauze pre-filters

1 were used to separate the size fraction < 55 μm . Filters were not acidified to remove inorganic
2 carbon, therefore total particulate carbon is used. C and N concentrations were determined on
3 an elemental analyser (EuroEA) following Sharp (1974), coupled by a Conflo II to a Finnigan
4 Delta^{Plus} mass spectrometer and were used to calculate C:N ratios in mol:mol. For further details
5 on sampling and analyses, please refer to Paul et al. (2015).

6 **2.5 Statistics**

7 The effect of acidification and food quantity and quality on *Acartia* sp. egg production (EPR),
8 prosome length (PL), antioxidant capacity (ORAC) and nauplii development index (DI) was
9 tested using linear mixed effect models (LMM) with restricted likelihood (REML)
10 approximation from the nlme-package (Pinheiro et al., 2014), where EPR, PL or ORAC were
11 used as response variables, $f\text{CO}_2$, TPC (<55 μm) and C:N as fixed explanatory variables and
12 repeated measure of the mesocosms over time as a random factor (Table 1). Due to the binomial
13 nature of the data, the effect of $f\text{CO}_2$, TPC (<55 μm) and C:N on egg hatching success (EH)
14 was tested with generalized linear mixed model (GLMM) with Laplace likelihood
15 approximation, binomial error structure and logit-link function from the lme4-package (Bates
16 et al., 2014) (Table 1). The average of $f\text{CO}_2$, TPC (<55 μm) and C:N measurements from each
17 mesocosm within three days before the zooplankton sampling were used as explanatory
18 variables for EPR, ORAC and EH, because 2–3 days are considered to be an appropriate
19 acclimatisation period for *A. bifilosa* (Yoon et al., 1998; Koski and Kuosa, 1999). For PL, the
20 average of all $f\text{CO}_2$, TPC (<55 μm) and C:N measurements from the start of the mesocosm
21 experiment were used since PL reflects the environmental conditions of the whole lifespan of
22 the animal. In addition, Day 3 was excluded in the LMM testing the PL (Table 1), since three
23 days is too short period for detecting differences in copepod size. Egg–adult generation time
24 for *A. bifilosa* at 17°C is approximately 16 days of which ~7.5 d taken by nauplii stages and
25 ~8.5 d by copepodite stages (Yoon et al., 1998). Collinearity between all explanatory variables
26 was checked. Temperature was not considered in the models, because it changed similarly in
27 all the bags (Paul et al., 2015). The model simplifications were done manually in backward
28 stepwise manner by removing the non-significant effects and by using Akaike’s information
29 criterion (AIC). We report t- or z-statistics (EH) of the retained fixed effects. To separate the
30 effect of hatching environment from maternal environment, EH and DI were divided with the
31 corresponding values measured in the Baltic Sea water. The ratio of Mesocosm EH (or DI) /
32 Baltic EH (or DI) >1 indicates that eggs hatch or develop better in the maternal conditions

1 (Mesocosm water), whereas the ratio <1 indicates that eggs hatch or develop better in the Baltic
2 Sea water. The effect of maternal environment ($f\text{CO}_2$, TPC ($<55 \mu\text{m}$) and C:N) on the ratio was
3 tested with LMM, where the ratio of Mesocosm EH / Baltic EH and Mesocosm DI / Baltic DI
4 were used as response variables; $f\text{CO}_2$, TPC ($<55 \mu\text{m}$) and C:N as fixed explanatory variables;
5 and repeated measure of the mesocosms over time as a random factor. The model
6 simplifications were made as above.

7 To test if maternal antioxidant capacity (ORAC) correlates with egg hatching success,
8 Spearman rank correlation tests were used. Data from Days 3, 10 and 17 were included in the
9 test ($n = 17$, EH result for MC 6 in Day 3 is missing) because those are the days when both
10 ORAC and EH were measured.

11 All the statistical analyses were performed using software R 3.0.2 (R Core Team, 2013), and
12 the significance level was 0.05.

13 **3 Results**

14 **3.1 Egg production, prosome length, antioxidant capacity and egg hatching** 15 **success**

16 *Acartia* sp. egg production (EPR) increased in all mesocosms between Day 3 and Day 10, but
17 decreased after that, reaching very low rates ($1-2 \text{ eggs copepod}^{-1} \text{ d}^{-1}$) on Days 24 and 45 (Fig.
18 1a). Neither food quantity (TPC, $<55 \mu\text{m}$), food quality (C:N, $<55 \mu\text{m}$), nor ocean acidification
19 ($f\text{CO}_2$) had a statistically significant effect on copepod egg production (Table 2), even though
20 there seemed to be variations in those parameters between the mesocosms (Table 3).

21 Prosome length (PL) of *Acartia* sp. females increased during the first week of the study;
22 however there seemed to be some differences between the mesocosms already on Day 3, which
23 was not included in the analysis (Fig. 1b). From Day 10 onwards, the smallest *A. bifilosa* adults
24 were found in the mesocosm with the highest $f\text{CO}_2$ concentration (Fig. 1b). $f\text{CO}_2$, but also TPC
25 ($<55 \mu\text{m}$) had a statistically significant negative impact on copepod body size (Table 2).

26 Antioxidant capacity (ORAC) of the female copepods increased from Day 3 to Day 10 in all
27 mesocosms (Fig. 1c). Interestingly, on Day 3 ORAC was highest in the three mesocosms with
28 highest $f\text{CO}_2$ treatment, whereas on Day 31 the situation was opposite and ORAC was lowest
29 in the three mesocosms with highest $f\text{CO}_2$ (Fig. 1c). Despite this, only TPC ($<55 \mu\text{m}$) had a
30 statistically significant effect on ORAC; ORAC decreases with increasing TPC (Table 2).

1

2 The overall egg hatching success (EH) was high throughout the study; over 80 % of the *Acartia*
3 sp. eggs hatched. As seen for EPR, PL, and ORAC, EH also increased from Day 3 to Day 10
4 in all mesocosms (Fig. 1d). Variance in the EH between the four samplings was highest in the
5 mesocosms with highest $f\text{CO}_2$, whereas EH varied the least and remained >90 % in both control
6 mesocosms (MC1, MC5). In spite of this, only TPC (<55 μm) had a statistically significant
7 negative effect on EH (Table 4). Eggs that were produced in MCs 3, 5, 6 and 7 had fairly similar
8 hatching success in Baltic water, whereas hatching success of eggs that were produced in MCs
9 1 (control) and 8 (the highest $f\text{CO}_2$) was alternately either lower or higher than in the other MCs
10 (Fig. 1e).

11 **3.2 Egg hatching and nauplii development in mesocosm vs. Baltic Sea** 12 **conditions**

13 Neither the maternal food quantity (TPC) nor the quality (C:N) affected the offspring quality
14 (EH and DI) statistically significantly in the egg transplant experiment (Table 5). The $f\text{CO}_2$ was
15 the only detected variable in the maternal environment that influenced the ratio of EH and DI
16 between mesocosm and Baltic conditions.

17 Egg hatching success for eggs hatching in the mesocosm water differed from eggs hatching in
18 the Baltic water. On Days 3 and 10, hatching success was higher in the mesocosm water for the
19 control (MC1, MC5) and for low $f\text{CO}_2$ -treatment bags (MC7, MC6), whereas eggs produced in
20 high $f\text{CO}_2$ -treatment bags (MC3, MC8) showed higher hatching in the Baltic water (Fig. 2a).
21 Thus, there seems to be a threshold $f\text{CO}_2$ for hatching success between 821-1007 μatm .
22 However, on Days 17 and 24 the $f\text{CO}_2$ treatment did not have a clear effect on hatching success.
23 Nevertheless, $f\text{CO}_2$ had a statistically significant negative effect on the ratio of EH mesocosm /
24 Baltic, meaning that egg hatching was higher in the Baltic water than in the maternal
25 environment when the maternal environment had a high $f\text{CO}_2$ (Table 5). When maternal
26 environment had low $f\text{CO}_2$ the situation was vice versa. The level of $f\text{CO}_2$ had also a significant
27 negative effect on the DI mesocosm / Baltic ratio (Fig. 2b; Table 5).

28 **3.3 Correlations between antioxidant capacity and offspring quality**

29 Copepod antioxidant capacity (ORAC) was correlated significantly with copepod egg hatching
30 success. The relationship between the two variables is positive and stronger for eggs developing

1 in the mesocosm water ($\rho = 0.75$, $p < 0.001$) than for eggs developing in the Baltic water (ρ
2 $= 0.62$, $p = 0.007$) (Fig. 3).

3 **4 Discussion**

4 In this study, conducted in semi-natural mesocosm environments, reproduction of the *Acartia*
5 sp. copepod showed high phenotypic buffering against acidification, i.e., the species was able
6 to maintain similar egg production rate and also high egg hatching success in all $f\text{CO}_2$
7 conditions. Nevertheless, we found significant negative effect of ocean acidification on adult
8 female size. Even more interestingly, we found signs of a possible threshold of $f\text{CO}_2$
9 concentration ($\sim 1000 \mu\text{atm}$) for offspring development, above which adaptive maternal effects
10 cannot alleviate the negative effects of acidification on egg hatching and nauplii development
11 (Fig. 2). However, we did not find support for the third hypothesis that poor food quantity
12 (lower TPC) and quality (higher C:N) would weaken the maternal effect by deteriorating the
13 condition of the mother. Conversely, higher food quantity (TPC $< 55 \mu\text{m}$) correlated negatively
14 with egg hatching success, adult female size and antioxidant capacity, whereas C:N ratio did
15 not correlate with any of the measured variables significantly. Copepods were possibly food
16 limited in all the mesocosms, especially after Day 17 due to a sharp decline in Chl *a*
17 concentrations and in phytoplankton community size structure (Paul et al., 2015). Dominance
18 of picophytoplankton that is too small to be consumed by copepods could be the reason for the
19 observed negative effects of food quantity, and that may have also masked the food quality
20 effect. Also, after Day 17 egg production rate was so low that it was practically impossible to
21 find differences in egg production between the mesocosms. Finally, we found a positive
22 correlation between maternal antioxidant capacity and egg hatching success, suggesting that
23 the female antioxidant defence might also protect the embryo from oxidative stress.

24 The fact that *Acartia* sp. egg production and egg hatching were unaffected by high $f\text{CO}_2$ but
25 egg transplant experiment revealed that development was slower for nauplii at high CO_2
26 supports the importance of looking beyond egg production and egg hatching, which is also
27 pointed out by Pedersen et al. (2014b). They concluded that the first endogenously feeding
28 nauplii stages of *Calanus finmarchicus* are more sensitive to CO_2 -induced acidification than
29 eggs or later nauplii stages (Pedersen et al. 2014b). Longer developmental times in high
30 CO_2 /low pH have been observed in crustaceans, echinoderms and molluscs (Cripps et al., 2014a
31 and references therein). Weydmann et al. (2012) also reported a significant developmental delay
32 for *Calanus glacialis* eggs when exposed to highly acidified conditions. Pedersen et al. (2014a)

1 observed that development of C4 copepodites of *C. finmarchicus* was delayed by 8.9 days in
2 high CO₂ treatments in comparison to control condition, when also the previous generation had
3 been exposed to the same conditions.

4 We expected maternal effects to be most obvious in a high stress situation (high *f*CO₂
5 treatments), as seen for three-spined sticklebacks in a study testing the effects of global
6 warming (Shama et al., 2014). Instead, egg hatching was higher and nauplii development faster
7 in the maternal environment than in the Baltic water, when the maternal environment had a low
8 *f*CO₂ (low stress). In high *f*CO₂ maternal environment the opposite response was observed, thus
9 indicating that maternal effects are in fact weak and cannot compensate for the higher *f*CO₂
10 levels that correspond to near-future levels or that the eggs are damaged by the high *f*CO₂. This
11 suggests that *Acartia* sp. and its reproduction are after all somewhat sensitive to ocean
12 acidification. However, the effects were not as clear over the following weeks as in the
13 beginning of the study, which may be due to an overall low egg number and large variation in
14 hatching after Day 17, or due to acclimation of the copepods to the treatment conditions. In
15 addition, the maternal effects seemed to weaken over time. This could be due to weakening
16 condition of the mothers. In the absence of fish predators, zooplankton density, and especially
17 *Bosmina* sp. (cladocerans) increased strongly in the mesocosms (Lischka et al., 2015).
18 Senescence and food limitation were thus plausible problems for copepods, and a likely cause
19 of weakening maternal provisioning. In addition, conditions in the Baltic Sea changed after Day
20 17 due to an upwelling event, which caused an increase in *f*CO₂ and decrease in pH (Paul et al.,
21 2015). This might have made the Baltic conditions less favourable for copepod egg
22 development and evened out the differences between high *f*CO₂ mesocosms and the Baltic
23 conditions.

24 A few studies have highlighted the importance of testing for transgenerational effects to avoid
25 over- or underestimation of the effects of ocean acidification on copepods. Thor and Dupont
26 (2015) found decreasing egg hatching of *Pseudocalanus acuspes* with increasing *p*CO₂. In
27 addition, transgenerational effects alleviated the negative effects on egg production and
28 hatching of the second generation when the mothers had been acclimatised to the same
29 treatment. Also, reciprocal transplant experiment showed that the effect was reversible and an
30 expression of phenotypic plasticity (Thor and Dupont, 2015). Contrary to the current study,
31 Pedersen et al. (2014a) found no effect of the CO₂ environment on egg hatching or development
32 of pre-feeding nauplii stages N1 and N2 in their multigenerational study using *C. finmarchicus*.

1 However, the development time of larger nauplii and copepodite stages was increased by $p\text{CO}_2$,
2 although the development delay was not detected in the following generation (Pedersen et al.,
3 2014a). Vehmaa et al. (2012) studied combined effects of ocean acidification and warming, and
4 found indications that negative effects on *Acartia* sp. reproductive success can partly be
5 combated with maternal effects. The used pH treatments (-0.4 from ambient) were at the same
6 level as the low $f\text{CO}_2$ -treatments in this study (MC6, MC7), which makes the results of the two
7 studies consistent.

8 The measurements of female copepod antioxidant capacity were done in order to provide
9 possible additional information of the maternal provisioning on the offspring. A preferable
10 practice in oxidative stress studies is to measure several of the four components consisting of
11 free radical production, antioxidant defences, oxidative damage, and repair mechanisms
12 (Monaghan et al., 2009). In the current study we only have the estimate for the defences,
13 antioxidant capacity (ORAC) measurements, which makes our conclusions slightly more
14 uncertain. However, an earlier study with the same species has indicated that at intermediate
15 stress levels an upregulation of the antioxidant system enhances protection against oxidative
16 damage, but at higher stress, the pro-oxidants may exceed the capacity of the antioxidant system
17 and lead to oxidative damage (Vehmaa et al., 2013). In this study, upregulated antioxidant
18 defence seemed to have a positive effect on offspring quality, as indicated by the positive
19 correlation between female ORAC and egg hatching success. Higher ORAC in the two highest
20 $f\text{CO}_2$ mesocosms in the beginning of the study could be a sign of an upregulated antioxidant
21 system in a sudden stressful situation, whereas the lowest ORAC in the high $f\text{CO}_2$ treatments
22 at day 31 (Fig. 1c) could be caused by prolonged stress and exhausted antioxidant defence. The
23 change from positive to negative effect in the course of the study could explain why $f\text{CO}_2$ did
24 not show a significant correlation with ORAC, whereas food quantity (TPC <55 μm) did.

25 Ismar et al. (2008) showed that *Acartia* spp. development can be either slow or altered by certain
26 algal groups causing death before the first copepodite or reproductive stage. A non-optimal diet
27 could explain why higher food quantity would cause smaller adult female size, lower egg
28 hatching success or lower antioxidant capacity. *Skeletonema*-diatoms had fairly high abundance
29 in the mesocosms during the first days of the experiment when egg hatching success was lowest
30 in every mesocosm, but then declined rapidly. Diatom-dominated phytoplankton composition
31 has been shown to cause low copepod egg hatching success in the field (Miralto et al., 1999).
32 Another quality aspect is the size and shape of the food, which may make it difficult to ingest

1 or assimilate. From day 16 onwards, over 50% of chlorophyll *a* was in picophytoplankton (<2
2 μm) (Paul et al., 2015), which is too small for *Acartia* consumption (Rollwagen Bollens and
3 Penry, 2003). Since we did not study what the copepods preyed upon we can only speculate on
4 diet quantity and quality. Satiated food conditions can strengthen the maternal or
5 transgenerational effects. The transgenerational effects were of minor importance for hatching
6 success in *C. finmarchicus* when exposed to long term high CO_2 and food limited conditions
7 (Pedersen et al., 2014a). Long term stress and food limitation could thus also be the reason for
8 weakening maternal effects in the current study.

9 We found body size (prosoma length) to be negatively affected by high CO_2 . The result seems
10 to be mostly driven by the mesocosm with the highest $f\text{CO}_2$ (MC 8), where the adult *Acartia*
11 sp. copepods were smallest on all the four sampling times that were included in the analysis
12 (Days 10, 17, 24 and 45) (Fig. 1b). It takes ~ 8.5 days for a sixth stage nauplius of *A. bifilosa* to
13 develop through the five copepodite stages and reach adulthood at 17°C (Yoon et al., 1998).
14 According to the Bělehrádek's temperature function it takes 12–15 days for VI nauplii to reach
15 adulthood at $9\text{--}11^\circ\text{C}$ (Bělehrádek, 1935; McLaren, 1966). The constants used in the equation
16 ($\alpha=1008$, $a=-8.701$) were the same as used in Dzierzbicka-Glowacka et al. (2009) for the Baltic
17 Sea *Acartia* spp. It is thus possible that the copepods could have developed through several
18 stages causing the differences in prosoma length between the treatments on Day 10. Lowered
19 pH may have increased copepods' energy requirements and if energy is reallocated towards
20 maintaining homeostasis, their somatic growth can be reduced. Pedersen et al. (2014a) found
21 *C. finmarchicus* body size to be inversely related to $p\text{CO}_2$. They also found higher respiration
22 rate under more acidified conditions, and claimed that increased energy expenditure via rising
23 respiration and consecutive decreasing growth and reproduction could lower the energy transfer
24 to higher trophic levels and thus hamper the productivity of the whole ecosystem (Pedersen et
25 al., 2014a). This is especially alarming when considering the projected climate warming, since
26 copepod size is negatively correlated with temperature (Foster et al., 2011). In addition to
27 temperature, food quantity and quality can affect the copepod body size (Hart and Bychek,
28 2011), and create surprising combined effects with acidification. Garzke et al. (2016) reported
29 an indirect positive effect of $p\text{CO}_2$ on copepod body size, which was explained by higher food
30 availability when acidification acted as a fertilizer for phytoplankton. Temperature and food
31 also interact because temperature affects the respiration and metabolism, thus the satisfying diet
32 depends on temperature (Boersma et al., 2016). If high CO_2 treatment (MC 8) caused a
33 developmental delay in maturation, as could be interpreted from the prosoma length results

1 (Fig. 1b), the maturation would have occurred at different temperature than in other mesocosms
2 and possibly in non-optimal food conditions. Anyway, higher food quantity and quality would
3 be expected to increase copepod size, contrary to our results. It is therefore possible that the
4 used food quantity (TPC <55 μm) and quality estimates (C:N <55 μm) do not fully describe the
5 diet that *Acartia* sp. was consuming in the mesocosms.

6 Adult copepods have in general shown robustness against acidification (Mayor et al., 2012,
7 McConville et al., 2013), whereas eggs and nauplii appear to be more sensitive (Cripps et al.,
8 2014b; Fitzer et al., 2012). In addition, there seems to be notable differences in sensitivity
9 between species. Nauplii production, adult female fatty acid content and antioxidant capacity
10 (ORAC) of *Eurytemora affinis* were not affected by $f\text{CO}_2$ in the current mesocosm campaign
11 (Almén et al., 2016). Similarly, Lewis et al. (2013) found differences in ocean acidification
12 sensitivity between the species *Oithona similis* and *Calanus* spp. (*C. glacialis* and *C.*
13 *hyperboreus*). They argued that *O. similis* is more sensitive to future ocean acidification than
14 *Calanus* spp., because *O. similis* remains in the surface waters whereas *Calanus* spp. migrates
15 vertically, and encounters a lot wider $p\text{CO}_2$ ranges daily than *O. similis* (Lewis et al., 2013).
16 The same applies to *Acartia* sp. and *E. affinis* in our study area. Although *Acartia* spp. is
17 exposed to natural variability in pH environment due to daily variations as well as due to staying
18 at greater depths during the day (low pH in deep water), it does not reside as deep as *E. affinis*
19 (Almén et al., 2014) and may therefore show higher sensitivity than *E. affinis* during the current
20 mesocosm campaign (Almén et al., 2016).

21 The results obtained for *Acartia* sp. reproduction in the current study seem to contradict the
22 results obtained for the *Acartia* sp. abundance determined in the mesocosms. Although our
23 results indicate that *Acartia* sp. reproduction is in fact sensitive to ocean acidification, no $f\text{CO}_2$
24 effect was found for the abundance of this species (Lischka et al., 2015). It is possible that 45
25 days was not long enough to detect small negative effects of CO_2 on copepod size, egg hatching
26 and nauplii development, to be reflected in copepod abundance. In addition, especially in the
27 beginning of the study *Acartia* eggs in the mesocosms might have ended up in the sediment
28 trap before hatching due to slow development at low temperature, which might have made it
29 difficult to detect differences in *Acartia* abundance between the mesocosms. On a longer time
30 scale, small acidification induced delays in offspring development could translate into negative
31 effects for the copepod population, and further on energy transfer within the pelagic food web.

1 In addition, warming will probably enhance the sensitivity of the species towards ocean
2 acidification (Vehmaa et al., 2012, 2013).

3

4 **5 Conclusions**

5 Our results support the idea that it is important to look beyond egg production as hatching and
6 development can be more sensitive to ocean acidification. Parental effects will likely be
7 important in mediating some of the negative effects of ocean acidification. For *Acartia* sp., the
8 transgenerational (maternal) effects may alleviate negative impacts of ocean acidification but
9 only under exposure to medium levels of CO₂. We did not find support for the hypothesis
10 suggesting that poorer food quantity and quality would weaken the maternal effect by
11 deteriorating the condition of the mother, which could be due to the overall food limitation
12 especially during the latter half of the study or the fact that our estimates of food quantity and
13 quality did not describe the diet in a satisfactory manner. Nevertheless, maternal antioxidant
14 defence seems to correlate positively with offspring egg hatching success. Overall, these results
15 indicate that *Acartia* sp. could in fact be affected by CO₂ levels predicted for the year 2100
16 (IPCC, 2007). However, it is important to remember that this study shows how today's
17 copepods would react to tomorrow's world; thus these results do not take into account the
18 possible effects of evolutionary adaptation. Transgenerational effects can buffer short-term
19 detrimental effects of ocean acidification and thus give time for genetic adaptation and
20 consequently assist persistence of populations under climate change.

21

22 **Author contributions**

23 A.V. planned the experiment; A.V., A.-K.A., J.E.-Ö., A.B. conducted the laboratory
24 experiment; A.V. performed the statistical analyses; A.P. analysed TPC and C:N; S.F analysed
25 ORAC; U.R. coordinated the whole project; A.V. and A.-K.A. shared responsibility of writing
26 the manuscript with contributions from all co-authors..

27

28 **Acknowledgements**

29 We thank the KOSMOS team and all of the participants in the mesocosm campaign for their
30 support during the experiment and the Tvärminne Zoological Station for their warm hospitality,

1 support and use of facilities for this experiment. In particular, we would like to thank Andrea
2 Ludwig for co-ordinating the campaign logistics and assistance with CTD operations, Silke
3 Lischka and Bettina Grönlund for assisting with the zooplankton sampling, and the diving team.
4 We also gratefully acknowledge the captain and crew of R/V ALKOR (AL394 and AL397) for
5 their work transporting, deploying and recovering the mesocosms. This collaborative project
6 was funded by BMBF projects BIOACID II (FKZ 03F06550), SOPRAN Phase II (FKZ
7 03F0611), and MESOAQUA (grant agreement number 228224), Cluster of Excellence ‘The
8 Future Ocean’ (Project CP1141), and Academy of Finland (project nr. 276947).

9
10

1 **References**

- 2 Almén, A-K., Vehmaa, A., Brutemark, A., and Engström-Öst, J.: Coping with climate change?
3 Copepods experience drastic variations in their physicochemical environment on a diurnal
4 basis, *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.*, 460, 120–128, doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2014.07.001, 2014.
- 5 Almén, A-K., Vehmaa, A., Brutemark, A., Bach, L., Lischka, S., Stuhr, A., Furuhaugen, S., Paul,
6 A., Bermúdez, R., Riebesell, U., and Engström-Öst, J.: Negligible effects of ocean acidification
7 on *Eurytemora affinis* (Copepoda) offspring production,
8 *Biogeosciences*, 13, 1037–1048, doi:10.5194/bg-13-1037-2016, 2016.
- 9 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S.: lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using
10 Eigen and S4, R package version 1.1-7, available at: <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4>,
11 Last access: 11 November 2014.
- 12 Bělehrádek, J.: Temperature and living matter, *Protoplasma Monograph*, No. 8 Borntager,
13 Berlin, 1935.
- 14 Boersma, M., Mathew, K.A., Niehoff, B., Schoo, K.L., Franco-Santos, R.M., and Meunier,
15 C.: Temperature driven changes in the diet preference of omnivorous copepods: no more meat
16 when it's hot?, *Ecol. Lett.*, 19, 45–53, doi: 10.1111/ele.12541, 2016.
- 17 Bron, J.E., Frisch, D., Goetze, E., Johnson, S.C., Lee, C.E., and Wyngaard, G.A.: Observing
18 copepods through a genomic lens, *Front. Zool.*, 8, 22, doi:10.1186/1742-9994-8-22, 2011.
- 19 Chevin, L.-M., Collins, S., and Lefèvre, F.: Phenotypic plasticity and evolutionary demographic
20 responses to climate change: taking theory out to the field, *Funct. Ecol.*, 27, 966–979,
21 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2012.02043.x, 2013.
- 22 Cripps, G., Lindeque, P., and Flynn, K. J.: Have we been underestimating the effects of ocean
23 acidification in zooplankton?, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 20, 3377–3385, doi:10.1111/gcb.12582,
24 2014a.
- 25 Cripps, G., Lindeque, P., and Flynn, K. J.: Parental exposure to elevated pCO₂ influences the
26 reproductive success of copepods, *J. Plankton Res.*, 36, 1165–1174, doi:10.1093/plankt/fbu052,
27 2014b.
- 28 Cushing, D.H.: Plankton production and year-class strength in fish populations: an update of
29 the match/mismatch hypothesis, *Adv. Mar. Biol.*, 26, 249-292, 1990.

- 1 Dzierzbicka-Glowacka, L., Lemieszek, A., and Zmijewska, M.I.: Parameterisation of a
2 population model for *Acartia* spp. in the southern Baltic Sea. Part 1. Development time,
3 *Oceanologia*, 51, 165–184, 2009.
- 4 Elser, J.J., and Hassett, R.P. A stoichiometric analysis of the zooplankton-phytoplankton
5 interaction in marine and freshwater ecosystems, *Nature*, 3070, 211–213, 1994.
- 6 Fitzer, S.C., Caldwell, G.S., Close, A.J., Clare, A.S., Upstill-Goddard, R.C., and Bentley, M.G.:
7 Ocean acidification induces multi-generational decline in copepod naupliar production with
8 possible conflict for reproductive resource allocation, *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.*, 418–419, 30–
9 36, doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2012.03.009, 2012.
- 10 Foley, C.J., Ryan, D.J., and Höök, T.O.: Length reduction of larval yellow perch and freshwater
11 amphipods in RNA_{later} solution, *N. Am. J. Fish. Manage.*, 30, 1143–1148, DOI: 10.1577/M10-
12 035.1, 2010.
- 13 Foster, J., Hirst, A.G., and Atkinson, D.: How do organisms change size with changing
14 temperature? The importance of reproductive method and ontogenic timing, *Funct. Ecol.*, 25,
15 1024–1031, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2011.01852.x, 2011.
- 16 Garzke, J., Hansen, T., Ismar, S.M.H., Sommer, U.: Combined effects of ocean warming and
17 acidification on copepod abundance, body size and fatty acid content, *PLoS ONE*, 11,
18 e0155952, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0155952, 2016.
- 19 Hart, R.C., and E.A., Bychek: Body size in freshwater planktonic crustaceans: an overview of
20 extrinsic determinants and modifying influences of biotic interactions, *Hydrobiologia*, 668, 61–
21 108, doi:10.1007/s10750-010-0400-y, 2011.
- 22 IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change): *Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report*.
23 Fourth assessment report. Available: <http://www.ipcc.ch>, (last access: 27 July 2015), 2007.
- 24 Ismar, S.M.H., Hansen, T., and Sommer, U.: Effect of food concentration and type of diet on
25 *Acartia* survival and naupliar development, *Mar. Biol.*, 154, 335–343, doi:10.1007/s00227-
26 008-0928-9, 2008.
- 27 Katajisto, T., Viitasalo, M., and Koski, M.: Seasonal occurrence and hatching of calanoid eggs
28 in sediments of the northern Baltic Sea, *Mar. Ecol.–Prog. Ser.*, 163, 133–143, 1998.
- 29 Knuckey, R.M., Semmens, G.L., Mayer, R.J., and Rimmer, M.A.: Development of an optimal
30 microalgal diet for the culture of the calanoid copepod *Acartia sinjiensis*: Effect of algal species

1 and feed concentration on copepod development, *Aquaculture*, 249, 339–51,
2 doi:10.1016/j.aquaculture.2005.02.053, 2005.

3 Koski, M., and H. Kuosa: The effect of temperature, food concentration and female size on the
4 egg production of the planktonic copepod *Acartia bifilosa*, *J. Plankton Res.*, 21, 1779–1789,
5 1999.

6 Kurihara, H., and A. Ishimatsu: Effects of high CO₂ seawater on the copepod (*Acartia tsuensis*)
7 through all life stages and subsequent generations, *Mar. Pollut. Bull.*, 56, 1086–1090, doi:
8 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2008.03.023, 2008.

9 Kurihara, H., Shimode, S., and Shirayama, Y.: Effects of CO₂ concentration on the egg
10 production rate and early development of two marine copepods (*Acartia steueri* and *Acartia*
11 *erythraea*), *Mar. Poll. Bull.*, 49, 721–727, 2004.

12 Lewis, C.N., Brown, K.A., Edwards, L.A., Cooper, G., and Findlay, H.S.: Sensitivity to ocean
13 acidification parallels natural pCO₂ gradients experienced by Arctic copepods under winter sea
14 ice, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 110, E4960–E4967,
15 www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1315162110, 2013.

16 Lischka, S., Bach, L. T., Schulz, K.-G., and Riebesell, U.: Micro- and mesozooplankton
17 community response to increasing CO₂ levels in the Baltic Sea: insights from a large-scale
18 mesocosm experiment, *Biogeosciences Discuss.*, 12, 20025–20070, doi:10.5194/bgd-12-
19 20025-2015, 2015.

20 Mayor, D. J., Matthews, C., Cook, K., Zuur, A. F., and Hay, S.: CO₂-induced acidification
21 affects hatching success in *Calanus finmarchicus*, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 350, 91–97, 2007.

22 Mayor, D.J., Everett, N.R., and Cook, K.B.: End of century ocean warming and acidification
23 effects on reproductive success in a temperate marine copepod, *J. Plankton Res.*, 34, 258–262,
24 doi:10.1093/plankt/fbr107, 2012.

25 McConville, K., Halsband, C., Fileman, E.S., Somerfield, P.J., Findlay, H.S., and Spicer, J.I.:
26 Effects of elevated CO₂ on the reproduction of two calanoid copepods, *Mar. Pollut. Bull.*, 73,
27 428–434, doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.02.010, 2013.

28 McLaren, I.A.: Predicting development rate of copepod eggs, *Bioll. Bull.*, 131, 457-469, 1966.

- 1 Miralto, A., Barone, G., Romano, G., Poulet, S.A., Ianora, A., Russo, G.L., Buttino, I.,
2 Mazzarella, G., Laabir, M., Cabrini, M., and Giacobbe, M.G.: The insidious effects of diatoms
3 on copepod reproduction, *Nature*, 402, 173–176, 1999.
- 4 Monaghan, P., Metcalfe, N.B., and Torres, R.: Oxidative stress as a mediator of life history
5 trade-offs: mechanisms, measurements and interpretation, *Ecol. Lett.*, 12, 75–92,
6 doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01258.x, 2009.
- 7 Niemi, Å.: Ecology of phytoplankton in the Tvärminne area, SW coast of Finland. II. Primary
8 production and environmental condition in the archipelago and the seas zone, *Acta Botanica*
9 *Fennica*. 105:1-73, 1975.
- 10 Omstedt, A., Humborg, C., Pempkowiak, J., Perttilä, M., Rutgersson, A., Schneider, B., Smith,
11 B.: Biogeochemical Control of the Coupled CO₂–O₂ System of the Baltic Sea: A Review of the
12 Results of Baltic-C, *AMBIO* 43, 49–59. doi:10.1007/s13280-013-0485-4, 2014.
- 13 Ou, B. X., Hampsch-Woodill, M. and Prior, M.: Development and validation of an improved
14 oxygen radical absorbance capacity assay using fluorescein as the fluorescent probe, *J. Agr.*
15 *Food. Chem.*, 49, 4619-4626, 2001.
- 16 Paul, A.J., Bach, L.T., Schulz, K.-G., Boxhammer, T., Czerny, J., Achterberg, E.P., Hellemann,
17 D., Trense, Y., Nausch, M., Sswat, M., and Riebesell, U.: Effect of elevated CO₂ on organic
18 matter pools and fluxes in a summer Baltic Sea plankton community, *Biogeosciences*, 12,
19 6181–6203, doi:10.5194/bg-12-6181-2015, 2015.
- 20 Pedersen, S.A., Håkedal, O.L., Salaberria, I., Tagliati, A., Gustavson, L.M., Jenssen, B.M.,
21 Olsen, A.J., and Altin, D.: Multigenerational exposure to ocean acidification during food
22 limitation reveals consequences for copepod scope for growth and vital rates, *Environ. Sci.*
23 *Technol.*, 48, 12275–12284, doi:10.1021/es501581j, 2014a.
- 24 Pedersen, S.A., Våge, V.V., Olsen, A.J., Hammer, K.M., and Altin, D.: Effects of elevated
25 carbon dioxide (CO₂) concentrations on early developmental stages of the marine copepod
26 *Calanus finmarchicus* Gunnerus (Copepoda: Calanoidae), *J. Toxicol. Env. Heal. A*, 77, 535–
27 549, doi:10.1080/15287394.2014.887421, 2014b.
- 28 Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., and R Core Team: nlme: Linear and Nonlinear
29 Mixed Effects Models, R package version 3.1-118, available at: [http://CRAN.R-](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme)
30 [project.org/package=nlme](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme) (last access: 26 June 2015), 2014.

1 R Core Team, R: A language and environment for statistical computing, R Foundation for
2 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, available at: <http://www.R-project.org/> (last access:
3 27 March 2014), 2013.

4 Reusch, T.B.H.: Climate change in the oceans: evolutionary versus phenotypically plastic
5 responses of marine animals and plants, *Evol. Appl.*, 7, 104–122, doi:10.1111/eva.12109, 2014.

6 Riebesell, U., Czerny, J., von Bröckel, K., Boxhammer, T., Büden- bender, J., Deckelnick, M.,
7 Fischer, M., Hoffmann, D., Krug, S. A., Lentz, U., Ludwig, A., Mucbe, R., and Schulz, K. G.:
8 Technical Note: A mobile sea-going mesocosm system – new opportunities for ocean change
9 research, *Biogeosciences*, 10, 1835–1847, doi:10.5194/bg-10-1835-2013, 2013.

10 Rollwagen Bollens, G.C., and Penry, D.L.: Feeding dynamics of *Acartia* spp. copepods in a
11 largen, temperate estuary (San Francisco Bay, CA), *Mar. Ecol.–Prog. Ser.*, 257, 139–158, 2003.

12 Rubolini, D., Romano, M., Bonisoli Alquati, A., and Saino, N.: Early maternal, genetic and
13 environmental components of antioxidant protection, morphology and immunity of yellow-
14 legged gull (*Larus michahellis*) chicks, *J. Evol. Biol.*, 19, 1571–1584, doi:10.1111/j.1420-
15 9101.2006.01121.x, 2006.

16 Shama, L.N.S., Strobel, A., Mark, F.C., and Wegner, K.: Transgenerational plasticity in marine
17 sticklebacks: maternal effects mediate impacts of a warming ocean, *Funct. Ecol.*, 28, 1482–
18 1493, doi:10.1111/1365-2435.12280, 2014.

19 Sharp, J.: Improved analysis for particulate organic carbon and nitrogen from seawater, *Limnol.*
20 *Oceanogr.*, 19, 984–989, 1974.

21 Steele, J.H.: The structure of marine ecosystems, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1974.

22 Sterner, R.W., and D.O., Hessen: Algal nutrient limitation and the nutrition of aquatic
23 herbivores, *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*, 25, 1–29, 1994.

24 Thor, P., and S., Dupont: Transgenerational effects alleviate severe fecundity loss during ocean
25 acidification in a ubiquitous planktonic copepod, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 21, 2261–2271,
26 doi:10.1111/gcb.1281, 2015.

27 Tomanek, L.: Proteomics to study adaptations in marine organisms to environmental stress, *J.*
28 *Proteomics*, 105, 92–106, doi:10.1016/j.jprot.2014.04.009, 2014.

- 1 Vehmaa, A., Brutemark, A., and Engström-Öst, J.: Maternal effects may act as an adaptation
2 mechanism for copepods facing pH and temperature changes, PLoS ONE, 7, e48538.
3 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0048538, 2012.
- 4 Vehmaa, A., Hogfors, H., Gorokhova, E., Brutemark, A., Holmborn, T., and Engström-Öst, J.:
5 Projected marine climate change: effects on copepod oxidative status and reproduction, Ecol.
6 Evol., 13, 4548–4557, doi:10.1002/ece3.839, 2013.
- 7 West-Eberhard, M.J.: Developmental plasticity and evolution, Oxford University Press, New
8 York, 2003.
- 9 Weydmann, A., Søreide, J.E., Kwasniewski, S., and Widdicombe, S.: Influence of CO₂-induced
10 acidification on the reproduction of a key Arctic copepod *Calanus glacialis*, J. Exp. Mar. Biol.
11 Ecol., 428, 39–42, doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2012.06.002, 2012.
- 12 Whiteley, N.M.: Physiological and ecological responses of crustaceans to ocean acidification,
13 Mar. Ecol.–Prog. Ser., 430, 257–271, doi: 10.3354/meps09185, 2011.
- 14 Yoon, W.D., Shim, M.B., and Choi, J.K.: Description of the developmental stages in *Acartia*
15 *bifilosa* Giesbrecht (Copepoda: Calanoida), J. Plankton Res., 20, 923–942, 1998.
- 16
- 17

1 Tables

2 Table 1. The structure of the full LMM or GLMM models that were used to test effects of ocean
 3 acidification, food quantity, and food quality on copepod egg production (EPR), egg hatching
 4 success (EH), prosome length (PL), antioxidant capacity (ORAC), the ratio of EH mesocosm /
 5 EH Baltic, and the ratio of nauplii development index (DI) mesocosm / DI Baltic. The sampling
 6 days that were included in each of the models are listed. Repeated measures of same mesocosm
 7 bags was used as a random effect in all the models, because copepods that come from the same
 8 bags are more alike than copepods from different bags.

9

Response variable	Fixed effects	Effect tested	Days included in the model					
			3	10	17	24	31	45
EPR (LMM)	$f\text{CO}_2$	Ocean acidification	x	x	x	x		x
	TPC (<55 μm)	Food quantity						
	C:N (<55 μm)	Food quality						
EH (GLMM)	$f\text{CO}_2$	Ocean acidification	x	x	x	x		
	TPC (<55 μm)	Food quantity						
	C:N (<55 μm)	Food quality						
PL (LMM)	$f\text{CO}_2$	Ocean acidification		x	x	x		x
	TPC (<55 μm)	Food quantity						
	C:N (<55 μm)	Food quality						
ORAC (LMM)	$f\text{CO}_2$	Ocean acidification	x	x	x		x	
	TPC (<55 μm)	Food quantity						
	C:N (<55 μm)	Food quality						
EH MC/Baltic (LMM)	$f\text{CO}_2$	Ocean acidification	x	x	x	x		
	TPC (<55 μm)	Food quantity						
	C:N (<55 μm)	Food quality						
DI MC/Baltic (LMM)	$f\text{CO}_2$	Ocean acidification	x	x	x	x		
	TPC (<55 μm)	Food quantity						
	C:N (<55 μm)	Food quality						

10

11

1 Table 2. T-statistics of the retained fixed effects in the linear mixed effect models testing the
 2 effects of TPC (<55µm), C:N and $f\text{CO}_2$ on egg production rate (EPR), female prosome length
 3 (PL) and female antioxidant capacity (ORAC). Repeated measures of same mesocosm bags
 4 was used as a random effect in all the models, because copepods that come from the same bags
 5 are more alike than copepods from different bags.

6

Response variable	Fixed effect	Estimate	DF	t	p-value
EPR	TPC <55 µm	0.21±0.14	23	1.54	0.137
PL	$f\text{CO}_2$	-0.000027±0.000011	16	-2.39	0.030
	TPC <55 µm	-0.0037±0.0017	16	-2.21	0.042
ORAC	TPC <55 µm	-0.0045±0.0021	22	-2.17	0.041

7

8

1 Table 3. Ranges of $f\text{CO}_2$, $\text{TPC} < 55 \mu\text{m}$, and $\text{C:N} < 55 \mu\text{m}$ that were used as explanatory
2 variables in the full LMM and GLMM models. 3-day averages (measured within the latest
3 three days of the sampling day) were used in testing the effects of the explanatory variables
4 on copepod egg production (EPR), antioxidant capacity (ORAC), and egg hatching success
5 (EH), whereas average of all measurements since the start of the experiments until the
6 sampling day were used when testing the effects of the explanatory variables on copepod size
7 (PL). Variations in $f\text{CO}_2$, $\text{TPC} < 55 \mu\text{m}$, and $\text{C:N} < 55 \mu\text{m}$ in the course of the study are
8 presented in Paul et al. (2015).

	$f\text{CO}_2$ (μatm)		$\text{TPC} < 55 \mu\text{m}$		$\text{C:N} < 55 \mu\text{m}$	
	3-d average	Average since	3-d average	Average since	3-d average	Average since
		Day 1		Day 1		Day 1
MC 1	267–477	267–365	15.1–31.6	21.4–31.6	5.51–8.43	7.26–8.03
MC 3	745–1201	884–1121	17.4–29.7	20.4–29.7	6.94–8.36	7.79–8.20
MC 5	275–481	274–368	15.8–24.5	19.2–24.8	7.24–8.57	7.24–7.59
MC 6	663–991	683–896	16.5–34.3	21.0–34.3	7.14–8.25	7.60–7.81
MC 7	390–565	390–497	17.5–30.0	21.4–29.9	6.92–8.25	7.43–7.74
MC 8	874–1525	1117–1413	17.4–26.3	21.6–26.3	7.16–8.53	7.59–7.93

9

1 Table 4. Z-statistics of the retained fixed effects in the GLMM testing the effect of $f\text{CO}_2$, TPC
2 (<55 μm) and C:N on egg hatching success (EH). Repeated measures of same mesocosm bags
3 was used as a random effect in the model, because copepods that come from the same bags are
4 more alike than copepods from different bags.

5

Response variable	Fixed effect	Estimate	z	p-value
EH	$f\text{CO}_2$	-0.00062 \pm 0.00032	1.94	0.052
	TPC <55 μm	-0.09557 \pm 0.02505	3.82	<0.001

6

7

8

9

10

1 Table 5. T-statistics of the retained fixed effects in the LMMs testing the effect of $f\text{CO}_2$, TPC
 2 ($<55 \mu\text{m}$) and C:N on ratio of egg hatching success (EH) mesocosm / EH Baltic and nauplii
 3 development index (DI) mesocosm / DI Baltic. Ratio >1 : higher EH or DI in the mesocosm
 4 water (maternal environment) than in the Baltic Sea water, ratio <1 : lower EH or DI in the
 5 mesocosm water (maternal environment) than in the Baltic Sea water. Repeated measures of
 6 same mesocosm bags was used as a random effect in both models, because copepods that come
 7 from the same bags are more alike than copepods from different bags.

8

Response variable	Fixed effect	Estimate	DF	t	p-value
EH mesocosm / EH Baltic	$f\text{CO}_2$	-0.000061 ± 0.000028	16	-2.20	0.043
DI mesocosm / DI Baltic	$f\text{CO}_2$	-0.000145 ± 0.000067	16	-2.15	0.047

9

10

1 Figures.

2 Fig. 1. Development of *Acartia bifilosa* a) egg production, b) prosome length (average \pm s.e.),
3 c) antioxidant capacity, and d) egg hatching success in the mesocosms, and e) egg hatching
4 success in Baltic water when eggs are produced in mesocosms in the course of the study. The
5 $f\text{CO}_2$ (μatm) values represent the average in Days 1–43 (Paul et al., 2015).

6

7 Fig. 2. Development of the ratio of a) egg hatching success (EH) mesocosm / EH Baltic and b)
8 nauplii development index (DI) mesocosm / DI Baltic during the study. Ratio >1 : higher EH or
9 DI in the mesocosm water (maternal environment) than in the Baltic Sea water, ratio <1 : lower
10 EH or DI in the mesocosm water (maternal environment) than in the Baltic Sea water. Note that
11 because of different development times, the DI values are not comparable between the days.
12 The $f\text{CO}_2$ (μatm) values represent the average in Days 1–43 (Paul et al., 2015).

13

14 Fig. 3. Correlations of copepod egg hatching success (EH) with maternal antioxidant capacity
15 (ORAC).

16

17

18

19





