Effects of flooding on organic carbon consumption in the East China Sea

Chung-Chi Chen[1, *], Gwo-Ching Gong[2], Wen-Chen Chou[2], Chih-Ching Chung[2], Chih-Hao Hsieh[3], Fuh-Kwo Shiah[2, 4], Kuo-Ping Chiang[2]

[1]Department of Life Science
National Taiwan Normal University
No. 88, Sec. 4, Ting-Chou Rd., Taipei 116, Taiwan

[2]Institute of Marine Environmental Chemistry and Ecology
National Taiwan Ocean University
Keelung 202-24, Taiwan

[3]Institute of Oceanography
National Taiwan University
Taipei 10617, Taiwan

[4]Research Center for Environment Changes
Academia Sinica, NanKang
Taipei 115, Taiwan

*: Corresponding author:
Phone: 886.2.2930.2275
Fax #: 886.2.2931.2904
E-mail: ccchen@ntnu.edu.tw

Running head: Community respiration in the ECS

Re-submitted to “**Biogeosciences**” on 07/03/2015

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to determine the effects of flooding on plankton community respiration (CR) in the East China Sea (ECS). In July 2010, a devastating flood occurred in the Changjiang River; the mean monthly discharge was 60,527 $m^3 s^{-1}$. To compare, the variables were also examined in the low riverine flow of July 2009 (33,955 $m^3 s^{-1}$). During the flooding, the Changjiang diluted water (CDW) zone, the sea surface salinity (SSS) was ≤ 31 psu, covering almost two thirds of the ECS, which was approximately six times that in the non-flooding period. The mean nitrate concentration was higher in 2010 (6.2 μM) than in 2009 (2.0 μM). However, in the 2010 flood, the mean values of Chl *a* and the bacterial biomass were only slightly higher or even lower than in 2009. Surprisingly, however, the CR was still higher in the flood period than in the non-flood period, with mean values of 105.6 and 73.2 mg C $m^{-3} d^{-1}$, respectively. The higher CR in 2010 could be attributed to vigorous plankton activities, especially phytoplankton, at stations in the CDW zone, which were not mostly covered by low SSS in 2009. In addition, zooplankton might be another important component contributed to high CR rate observed in 2010. There was a huge amount of fCO_2 drawdown in the 2010 flood. These results suggested that the devastating flood in 2010 had a significant effect on the carbon balance in the ECS. This effect might become more pronounced as extreme rainfall events and flooding magnitudes are predicted to increase globally.

Keywords: Plankton community respiration; Primary production; Phytoplankton; Bacteria; dissolved inorganic nutrients; The Yangtze River; The East China Sea.

INTRODUCTION

Riverine run-off has a profound effect on the production of organic carbon and its consumption in coastal ecosystems (e.g., Dagg et al., 2004; Hedges et al., 1997 and references therein). Accompanying freshwater discharge, a substantial amount of dissolved inorganic nutrients has been delivered into coastal regions, thus enhancing primary productivity (e.g., Dagg et al., 2004; Nixon et al., 1996). In addition, a large quantity of particulate and dissolved organic matter is discharged through the riverine input (e.g., Wang et al., 2012). High rates of microbial metabolism associated with this discharge have been observed in local marine environments (e.g., Hedges et al., 1994; Malone and Ducklow, 1990). The river plume can extend for hundreds of kilometers along the continental shelf, as in the case of the Amazon River (e.g., Müller-Karger et al., 1988). Overall, the effects of river plumes on coastal ecosystems are strongly related to the volume of freshwater discharge (e.g., Chen et al., 2009; Dagg et al., 2004; Tian et al., 1993). Thus, understanding how freshwater discharge influences coastal ecological processes is an important factor in exploring global carbon cycling in the adjacent sea. Under the current conditions of climate change, it has become even more pronounced because of the dramatic increase in extreme rainfall events and flood magnitudes throughout the world (Christensen and Christensen, 2003; Knox, 1993; Milly et al., 2002; Palmer and Ralsanen, 2002).

The East China Sea (ECS) has an approximate area of 0.5 x 10^6 km^2 and is the largest marginal sea in the western Pacific. A tremendous amount of freshwater (956 km^3 $yr.^{-1}$) is discharged annually into the ECS, especially by the Changjiang (a.k.a Yangtze) River, which is the fifth largest river in the world in terms of volume discharge (Liu et al., 2010). On average, the maximum amount of discharge occurs in July, and mean monthly values have ranged from 33,955 to 40,943 m^3 s^{-1} in years of normal weather during the past decade (Gong et al., 2011; Xu and Milliman, 2009). After it discharges into the ECS, freshwater mixes with seawater to form the Changjiang diluted water (CDW) zone, the salinity of which is $\leq$ 31 psu (e.g., Beardsley et al., 1985; Gong et al., 1996). In the CDW, especially in summer, the regional carbon balance is regulated by high rates of plankton community respiration (CR) and primary production (PP) (Chen et al., 2006; Gong et al., 2003). The rates of CR were also positively related to the riverine flow rates (Chen et al., 2009). However, few previous studies have shown the effects of flood on biological activities in the ECS (Chung et al., 2014; Gong et al., 2011). Historically, the threshold discharge rates in Changjiang River flooding have been estimated at 4–6 x 10^4 m^3 s^{-1} (Committee, 2001). However, in recent decades, the frequency and magnitude of Changjiang River floods have increased, which have been attributed to extreme monsoon rainfall associated with climate warming (Jiang et al., 2007; Yu et al., 2009), suggesting that the influence of flooding on the ECS shelf ecosystem has intensified. Therefore, it is worthwhile exploring the responses of biological activities and ecological processes in the ECS to the periodic flooding of the Changjiang River.

In July 2010, a devastating flood occurred in the Changjiang River (Gong et al., 2011). This event provided an opportunity to understand how flooding affects the ECS shelf ecosystem. Comparative analyses were conducted to examine a number of variables, including physical, chemical, and biological parameters, in a period (July 2009) when the riverine flow was relatively low. The main objective of this study is to reveal the effects of the riverine input of dissolved inorganic nutrients on the plankton communities that support heterotrophic processes in the ECS shelf ecosystem between periods of non-flooding and flooding. To evaluate the differences between these periods, variations in biological variables were compared with CR in order to elucidate their relative importance to CR. In addition, the relationship between CR and the fugacity of CO_2 (fCO_2) was examined to determine the contribution of the plankton communities to variations in fCO_2 in periods of non-flooding and flooding.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area and sampling. This study is part of the Long-term Observation and Research of the East China Sea (LORECS) program. Samples were collected from the ECS in the summers of 2009 (June 29 to July 13) and 2010 (July 6 to 18) during two cruises, respectively, on the R/V Ocean Researcher I. The sample stations were located throughout the ECS shelf (Fig. 1). In July 2010, the mean monthly discharge from the Changjiang River reached 60,527 m^3 s^{-1}, which was significantly larger than the monthly discharge (33,955 $m^3 s^{-1}$) in the non-flooding year of 2009 (Gong et al., 2011; Yu et al., 2009). Water samples were collected using Teflon-coated Go-Flo bottles (20 L, General Oceanics Inc., USA) mounted on a General Oceanic Rosette® assembly (Model 1015, General Oceanics Inc., USA). At each station, six to nine samples were taken at depths of 3 to 50 m, depending on the depth of the water column. Subsamples were taken for immediate analyses (i.e., dissolved inorganic nutrients, chlorophyll *a*, and bacterial abundance) and on-board incubation of primary production and plankton community respiration (CR). The methods used to collect the hydrographic data and determine the variables followed Chen et al. (2006; 2013; 2009). Descriptions of the methods used are presented briefly in the following sections. It should also be noted that portions of our results were published by Chung et al. (2014) and Gong et al. (2011).

Physical and chemical hydrographics. Temperature, salinity, and transparency were recorded throughout the water column using a SeaBird CTD. Photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) was measured throughout the water column using an irradiance sensor (4π; QSP-200L). The depth of the euphotic zone (Z_E) was taken as the penetration depth of 1% of surface light. The mixed layer depth (M_D) was based on the potential density criterion of 0.125 units (Levitus, 1982).

A custom-made flow-injection analyzer was used for dissolved inorganic nutrients (e.g., nitrate, phosphate, and silicate) analysis (Gong et al., 2003). Integrated values for the nitrates and other variables in the water column above the Z_E were estimated using the trapezoidal method, in which depth-weighted means are computed from vertical profiles and then multiplied by Z_E (e.g., Smith and Kemp, 1995). The average nitrate concentration over Z_E was estimated from the vertically integrated value divided by Z_E. This calculation was adopted to determine the values of the other variables.

The fugacity of CO_2 (fCO_2) in the surface waters was calculated from data on dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) and total alkalinity (TA) using the designed program (Lewis and Wallace, 1998). For details of the TA and DIC measurements, refer to Chou et al. (2007).

Biological variables. The water samples taken for chlorophyll *a* (Chl *a*) analysis were immediately filtered through GF/F filter paper (Whatman, 47 mm) and stored in liquid nitrogen. The Chl *a* retained on the GF/F filters was determined fluorometrically (Turner Design 10-AU-005; Parsons et al., 1984). If applicable, Chl *a* was converted to carbon units using C:Chl values of 52.9, estimated from shelf waters of the ECS (Chang et al., 2003). To estimate total content of Chl *a* over Z_E integrated for the ECS and the Changjiang diluted water (please see below for details), Surfer 11 (Golden Software, Inc.) program has been applied. This estimation was also adopted to determine the values for heterotrophic bacteria and zooplankton.

The samples of heterotrophic bacteria were fixed in paraformaldehyde at a final concentration of 0.2% (w/v) in the dark for 15 min. They were then immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen and kept at -80 °C in preparation for the analysis. The heterotrophic bacteria were stained with the nucleic acid-specific dye SYBR-Green I (emission = 530 ± 30 nm) at the final concentration of 10^{-4} dilution of a commercial solution (Molecular Probes Inc., Oregon, USA) (Liu et al., 2002). They were then identified and enumerated using a flow cytometry unit (FACSAria, Becton-Dickinson Co., New Jersey, USA). Known numbers of fluorescent beads (TruCOUNT Tubes, Becton-Dickinson Co., New Jersey, USA) were simultaneously used to calculate the original cell abundance in each sample. Bacterial abundance was converted to carbon units using a conversion factor of 20 x 10^{-15} g C $cell^{-1}$ (Hobbie et al., 1977; Lee and Fuhrman, 1987).

Zooplankton samples were collected over the whole water column at selected stations, using a 330-µm mesh net with a mouth of 160 cm diameter. Zooplankton samples were digitized to extract the size information (e.g., body width and length) using the ZooScan integrated system, and the size information was used to calculated the ellipsoidal biovolume of zooplankton (Garcia-Comas, 2010). The biomass, in carbon unit, of zooplankton was then calculated using estimated biovolume following equations of Alcaraz et al. (2003). To estimate the biomass over Z_E, the total biomass of zooplankton over the whole water column was multiple by a fraction of “Z_E to depth of water column” at stations.

Primary production (PP) was measured by the ^{14}C assimilation method. The samples were collected and incubated from three depths within Z_E at stations occupied during daylight (Gong et al., 2003; Parsons et al., 1984). The samples were pre-screened through 200 μm woven mesh (Spectrum) and inoculated with $H^{14}CO_3^-$ (final conc. 10 μCi ml^{-1}) in clean 250 ml polycarbonate bottles (Nalgene). The samples were incubated on board for 2 hrs. in chambers filled with running surface seawater and illuminated by halogen bulbs with a light intensity corresponding to the *in situ* irradiance levels (Gong et al., 1999). Following each incubation, the samples were filtered on GF/F filters (Whatman, 25 mm), acidified with 0.5 ml 2N HCl, and then left overnight. After immersion in 10 ml of a scintillation cocktail (Ultima Gold, Packard), the total activity on the filter was counted using a liquid scintillation counter (Packard 1600). Please also note that PP was measured only at selected stations in 2010, but it was not measured in 2009.

The plankton community respiration (CR) was measured as the decrease in dissolved oxygen (O_2) during dark incubation (Gaarder and Grann, 1927). Incubation was conducted at most stations with duplicate samples taken from several (4–6) depths, at depth intervals of 3, 5, 10, 15, 20, or 25 m, within Z_E at each station. Treatment samples were siphoned into 350–mL biological oxygen-demand bottles. The treatment involved incubating the bottles for 24 hrs. in a dark chamber filled with running surface water and maximum temperature changes were 1.33 ± 0.81 and 2.70 ± 1.43 ℃ (mean ± SD) during each incubation in 2009 and 2010, respectively.

Concentration of O_2 was measured by a direct spectrophotometry method (Pai et al., 1993).The precision of this method may be indicated by the root-mean square of the difference between the duplicate samples over the course of 2009 and 2010, which are 0.02 and 0.03 mg L^{-1}, respectively. The difference in O_2 concentration between the initial treatment and the dark treatment was used to compute the CR. A respiration quotient of 1 was assumed in order to convert the respiration from oxygen units to carbon units (Hopkinson Jr., 1985; Parsons et al., 1984).

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

Comparison of hydrographic patterns between flooding and non-flooding periods

In July 2010, the Changjiang River flooded to a devastating extent, and this flood started in late May or early June. The mean monthly water discharge was 60,527 m^3 s^{-1}, and the threshold discharge rate was 4–6 x 10^4 m^3 s^{-1}, making it the largest recorded flooding of the Changjiang River over the last decade (http://yu-zhu.vicp.net/). This rate was almost two times larger than that recorded in the non-flooding period in July 2009 (33,955 m^3 s^{-1}) (Gong et al., 2011; Yu et al., 2009). During the flood, a tremendous amount of freshwater was delivered into the ECS, and the low salinity of the sea surface (SSS $\leq$ 31 psu) covered almost two thirds of the continental shelf (Fig. 1b). The SSS in the ECS during the 2010 flood was significantly lower than that during the 2009 non-flood; the mean (± SD) values were 30.32 (± 3.60) and 32.62 (± 2.07) psu, respectively

(Table 1). During periods of high discharge from the river, particularly during the summer, the Changjiang diluted water (CDW) zone is generally distributed within the 60-m isobath region between the latitudes of 27 and 32 °N along the coast (e.g., Beardsley et al., 1985; Gong et al., 1996). During the 2010 flood, the CDW dispersed towards the east and south and reached as far as the 100-m isobath (Fig. 1b). The enormous amount of freshwater discharged into the ECS could also be seen in the coverage area of the CDW (e.g., Gong et al., 2011). In the 2010 flood, the CDW area was approximately six times larger than in the 2009 non-flood; their values were 111.7 x 10^3 and 19.0 x 10^3 km^2, respectively.

Although the mean SSS differed significantly between the flooding and non-flooding periods, there was no difference in the temperature of the sea surface (SST; Table 1). The mean (± SD) values of SST in 2009 and 2010 were 26.8 (± 1.7) and 26.1 (± 2.2) ℃, respectively. These values were within the range of the mean SST of the ECS in summer (Chen et al., 2009). The mixed layer depth (M_D) did not significantly vary between the periods. The mean (± SD) values of M_D in 2009 and 2010 were 13.7 (± 7.3) and 11.3 (± 6.6 m), respectively (Table 1). However, the average M_D was shallower than observed values, ranged from 16.8 to 28.2 m, of the ECS in summer (Chen et al., 2009). Even though the mean ± SD values of the euphotic depth (Z_E) were slightly deeper in 2009 (38.9±36.4 m) than in 2010 (33.4±17.3 m), there was no statistically significant difference between the periods (Table 1). Regarding the M_D, the average Z_E in the

ECS was also shallower than in a previous study conducted during the summer (Chen et al., 2009). The shallower Z_E could also been indirectly supported by the transparency. The averaged transparency in summer in the ECS over the past six years (2003 – 2008) was 81.9% (C.C. Chen's unpublished data). The averaged transparency of the ECS in 2009 and 2010 were 76.7% and 80.5%, respectively (Table 1). The averaged values for the CDW zone was relatively low in 2009 (70.0%) and high in 2010 (78.4%) compared to that of over the past six years (72.7%; C.C. Chen's unpublished data). This might also explain that Z_E in the CDW of 2009 was only 16.83 m (Table 1). This finding suggests that the growth of phytoplankton might be limited by the availability of light, especially in the CDW zone in 2009. Generally, the transparency in the coastal ocean might be low during the flood due to riverine discharge of terrestrial matters. The low transparency was observed in June 2003 in the ECS with the CDW area of 43.1 x10^3 km^2 (Chen et al., 2009), and its averaged values for the ECS and the CDW were 70.9% and 66.0%, respectively (C.C. Chen's unpublished data). Surprisingly, as stated above, the averaged transparency in the ECS in the 2010 flood was similar to the value observed over the past six years, and its value (78.4%) in the CDW in 2010 was even higher than that of over the past six years' measurement (72.7%). It could be partially explained by that most large particulates from terrestrial source might be confined to and precipitated in the coastal region, not in the expanded CDW region (e.g., Chung et al., 2012). Furthermore, it should also be noted that the sampling period of 2010, even at the peak of the flood, was almost one month later since the beginning of this flood. Therefore, it is reasonable to speculate that plankton communities was in the late phase of succession in this flood event (please refer to discussion in next section). The transparency during the sampling period of 2010 might increase due to organic matters (particulate and dissolved) was uptake and transferred to higher trophic levels.

In general, a huge amount of dissolved inorganic nutrients is delivered from the Chinese coast into the ECS during the wet season, from May to September (Chen et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2009; Gong et al., 1996). This study found a higher concentration of nitrates in the ECS during flooding, mostly in the fluvial discharge of the Changjiang River. This finding was supported by the negative linear relationship between SSS and nitrate concentration of the ECS in 2010 (r^2 = 0.37, $p < 0.001$, n = 37). During the period of this study, the linear relationship was also negatively regressed between SSS and silicate concentration (r^2 = 0.60, $p < 0.001$, n = 37), but not phosphate concentration. The comparison of the periods showed that the nitrate concentration in the surface water of the ECS was significantly higher in the 2010 flood than in the 2009 non-flood, with mean (± SD) values of 6.2 (± 9.8) and 2.0 (± 5.3) μM, respectively (Table 1). This finding also applied to the average nitrate values over Z_E between both periods (data not shown). During the 2010 flood, the mean nitrate concentration, either in the surface water or averaged over $Z_{E,}$ was higher or comparable to that in high riverine discharge period in the ECS (Chen et al., 2009; Gong et al., 1996). Surprisingly, in the 2010 flood, nitrate levels reached 37.6 μM in the surface water, and most of the elevated nitrate concentrations were observed within the CDW (Fig. 1d). As for phosphate concentration, there was no significant difference in values of the surface water observed between the 2009 non-flood and the 2010 flood, with mean (± SD) values of 0.13 (± 0.17) and 0.17 (± 0.30) μM, respectively (Table 1). Although mean phosphate values of the surface water in the CDW zone were slight higher in 2010 (0.23 μM) than that of 2009 (0.13 μM), there was also not statistically different between periods (Table 1). However, it should be noted that there was one station with extremely high phosphate concentration (1.71 μM) in the surface water in the CDW zone of the 2010 flood (Fig. 1f). Even so, in this period, the mean ± SD molar ratio of nitrate to phosphate (N/P) was 22.3 ± 20.9. The high N/P molar ratio was even more pronounced in the CDW, where it was higher than 16 at 14 of the 20 stations, with a mean (± SD) value of 40.4 (± 22.6). This value was comparable to that of the CDW in high riverine flow of the ECS in summer (Chen et al., 2006). During the non-flooding period, the N/P molar ratio was lower than 16, with a mean (± SD) value of 11.5 (± 20.8). It has been suggested that phytoplankton growth might be regulated by the availability and/or the N/P ratio of nutrients in the ECS (Gong et al., 1996; Harrison et al., 1990). The results of this study indicate that in the 2009 non-flood, phytoplankton biomass might have been regulated by the availability of dissolved inorganic nitrogen to a greater extent than it was in the 2010 flood. However, in the

2010 flood, phytoplankton growth was likely limited by phosphates. Phytoplankton growth limited by different inorganic nutrients in varying periods has been observed in estuaries and coastal regions, such as Chesapeake Bay in the US (Fisher et al., 1992; Harding, 1994). In the ECS, phosphates have been frequently found as a factor limiting phytoplankton growth, especially in the CDW (Chen et al., 2004; Gong et al., 1996; Harrison et al., 1990).

Plankton activities associated with the Changjiang River flood

Following the discharge of fluvial nutrients into the ECS, phytoplankton is generally abundant in the CDW region. The Chl *a* concentration in the CDW even reached bloom criteria > 20 mg Chl m^{-3}, historically, in the ECS (Chen et al., 2009; Chen et al., 2003). Surprisingly, the phytoplankton biomass was not as high as expected even though a high nitrate concentration was observed in the 2010 flood. The mean (± SD) values of Chl *a* in the surface water of the ECS in 2009 and 2010 were 0.98 (± 1.52) and 1.26 (± 1.27) mg Chl m^{-3}, respectively (Table 1). However, these mean values were still at the high end of the Chl *a* concentration in the ECS in mid-summer—July and August (Chen et al., 2009). In both periods, the phytoplankton biomass in the surface water was generally higher in the CDW than in other regions of the ECS (Fig. 1e and f). For example, in the 2010 flood, the maximum Chl *a* value reached 5.32 mg Chl m^{-3} in the CDW (Table 1; Fig. 1f). In the 2010 flood, the Chl *a* values were positively related to nitrate and silicate concentrations (all $p < 0.001$), but not phosphate concentrations ($p = 0.09$), in the surface water. The linear relationship between Chl *a* and phosphate values in the surface water however became significance ($p < 0.001$) if excluded the data with the highest phosphate concentration from this analysis (Fig. 1f). In the 2009 non-flood, the Chl *a* concentration was significantly linearly regressed with all measured nutrients: nitrate, silicate, and phosphate (all $p < 0.01$). The spatial Chl *a* distribution pattern found in this study was similar to that found in previous studies on the ECS (Gao and Song, 2005; Gong et al., 2011). However, it should be noted that the CDW zone was extensive in the 2010 flood. Nevertheless, the phytoplankton biomass in the surface water (Table 1), or average over Z_E (data not shown), did not differ significantly between 2009 and 2010. The effect of flooding on phytoplankton biomass was however observed if using total content of Chl *a* over Z_E integrated for the entire ECS or the CDW zone. The total Chl *a* content in the ECS was higher in 2010 than that of 2009, with values of 5.5 and 4.4 x 10^6 kg Chl *a*, respectively (Table 2). The content of Chl *a* in the CDW zone was even higher in 2010 than that of 2009, with values of 3.9 and 1.2 x 10^6 kg Chl *a*, respectively (Table 2). In the 2010 flood, PP in the surface water was high, with a mean (± SD) value of 62.1 (±33.8) mg C m^{-3} d^{-1} (Table 1). This value was comparable to the high PP observed in the ECS in summer (Chen et al., 2009). In addition, the PP:Chl value was also higher in the 2010 compared to that in Chen et al. (2009), with mean (± SD) values of 27.1 (±17.2) and 19.7 (±5.5) mg C mg Chl^{-1} d^{-1}, respectively. Gong et al. (2011) estimated that over the past decade, the average rate of carbon fixation during the flood was about three times higher than during the non-flooding period. During the 2010 flood, the rate reached 176.0 x 10^3 tons C d^{-1} in the CDW (Gong et al., 2011). Gong et al. (2011) also showed that the abundance of phytoplankton was twice as high in the CDW than in the other regions. In the 2010 flood, the phytoplankton were predominantly diatom, especially *Chaetoceros* spp., *Rhizosolenia* spp. and *Nitzschia* spp. (Gong et al., 2011). However, the microphytoplankton assemblage was not measured in 2009. In July 2007, when the amount of freshwater discharge was similar to that in 2009 (Gong et al., 2011), the phytoplankton in the CDW, were predominantly diatoms and other algal taxa, including dinoflagellates, coccolithophorids, and green algae (Chien, 2009). Picocyanobacteria, particularly the phycocyanin-rich *Synechococcus*, were predominant in the CDW, and they showed similar spatial distribution patterns in both 2009 and 2010 (Chung et al., 2014). In addition, the phycoerythrin-rich *Synechococcus* covered most of the ECS continental shelf, but they were less abundant in 2010 than in 2009 (Chung et al., 2014). Furthermore, the lesser presence of *Prochlorococcus* was also observed in regions other than the CDW in both periods (Chung et al., 2014). These results imply that phytoplankton community assemblage might have differed between the flooding and non-flooding periods investigated in this study, even though the phytoplankton biomass did not vary significantly between the periods.

In summer, heterotrophic bacterioplankton are generally more abundant in the CDW of the

ECS than in other regions (Chen et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2009). Chen et al. (2006) suggested that the growth of bacteria along the coast might be stimulated by the enormous amount of organic matter derived from both autochthonous marine production and fluvial runoff. This spatial distribution pattern was also observed in 2009 and 2010. In the 2009 non-flood, the mean (± SD) values of the bacterial biomass in the surface water of the CDW and other areas were 77.5 (± 55.7) and 31.0 (± 18.6) mg C m^{-3}, respectively. Their mean (± SD) values in the 2010 flood were 24.4 (± 18.6) and 15.0 (± 11.5) mg C m^{-3} in the CDW and other regions, respectively. Further analyses revealed that the bacterial biomass in the surface water was significantly linearly regressed with Chl *a* concentrations in both 2009 ($p < 0.01$) and 2010 ($p < 0.05$). This finding applies to the values averaged over Z_E in both periods (both $p < 0.01$). These results suggest that in both study periods, bacterial growth might have been associated with the organic carbon derived from phytoplankton. However, the mean values of Chl *a* concentrations in the surface water were slightly higher in 2010 than in 2009 (Table 1). Furthermore, in general, an increased amount of organic matter was delivered through fluvial discharge into the ECS during high riverine flow (e.g., Wang et al., 2012). Although these results suggest that the bacterial biomass might be higher in the flooding period than in the non-flooding period, this difference was not verified if using averaged bacterial biomass in this study. The bacterial biomass in the surface water was significantly higher in the 2009 non-flood than in the 2010 flood, with mean (± SD) values of 39.8 (± 33.7) and 20.4 (± 16.5) mg C m^{-3}, respectively (Table 1). The average bacterial value over Z_E was even more pronounced in 2009 than in 2010 (data not shown). However, the total bacterial biomass in the CDW zone was two times higher in 2010 than in 2009, with values of 47.7 and 21.0 x 10^6 kg C, respectively (Table 2). In addition, the major taxa of bacterioplankton varied between both periods (C.-C. Chung's unpublished data). During the non-flooding period, cyanobacteria were predominant in more than 70% of bacterioplankton at the selected sampling stations located either in the CDW zone or in other regions of the ECS. In the 2010 flood, the pattern of predominant (e.g., > 70%) by cyanobacteria as that in 2009 was observed only at stations located in regions other than the CDW zone. During the 2010 flood, in addition to cyanobacteria, the dominant taxa of bacterioplankton in the CDW zone also included favobacteria, gammabacteria, alphabacteria, and actinobacteria. A potential cause of the low averaged bacterial biomass observed during the 2010 flood might be protozoan grazing. Protozoa have been recognized as important microbial grazers in the ECS and in many coastal ecosystems (e.g., Chen et al., 2009; Chen et al., 2003; Sherr and Sherr, 1984). Although protozoan abundance was not measured in this study, a high production rate of nanoflagellates was observed in the southern ECS, with mean values of 0.46 μg C l^{-1} h^{-1} during high riverine flow (Tsai et al., 2005).

Zooplankton is also one of important contributors for plankton community respiration (Calbet and Landry, 2004; Hernández-León and Ikeda, 2005; Hopkinson Jr. et al., 1989). In this study, zooplankton was only sampled for the whole water column. However, the averaged biomass of zooplankton over Z_E can be still estimated. The zooplankton biomass over Z_E was significantly higher in the 2010 flood than in the 2009 non-flood, with mean (± SD) values of 105.7 (± 144.4) and 22.6 (± 25.7) mg C m^{-3}, respectively ($p < 0.01$; data not shown). The averaged zooplankton value over Z_E for the CDW zone was even more pronounced in 2010 than that in 2009 (data not shown). During the 2010 flood, total biomass of zooplankton in the CDW zone was over ninety times higher than that in the 2009 non-flood (Table 2). The results suggest that the 2010 flood have significant effect on zooplankton biomass. The high zooplankton biomass observed in 2010 also implies that plankton communities might be in the late phase of succession of this flood event.

Effects of the Changjiang River flood on plankton community respiration

Plankton community respiration (CR) has been assumed an integrated rate of organic carbon consumption by plankton communities (e.g.., Hopkinson Jr. et al., 1989; Rowe et al., 1986). In summer, the mean CR rate in the surface water of the ECS ranges from 52.2 to 128.4 mg C m^{-3} d^{-1} (Chen et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2009). The CR rate has been significantly correlated with fluvial discharge from the Changjiang River (Chen et al., 2009). In this study, the CR in the surface water ranged from 2.7 to 311.9 mg C m^{-3} d^{-1}, with a mean (± SD) value of 73.2 (± 76.9) mg C m^{-3} d^{-1} in the 2009 non-flood (Table 1). During the 2010 flood, this rate in the surface water was significantly higher than in 2009 ($p < 0.01$; Table 1). The value of CR in the surface water was in the range of 10.9–325.3 mg C m^{-3} d^{-1}, with a mean (± SD) value of 105.6 (± 66.7) mg C m^{-3} d^{-1} (Table 1). The CR rate averaged over the Z_E was also higher in 2010 than in 2009, with mean (± SD) values of 76.8 (±53.0) and 66.8 (±68.4) mg C m^{-3} d^{-1}, respectively. However, the difference was not statistically significant ($p = 0.08$). In terms of spatial distribution, in both periods, higher CR rates were mostly observed in the CDW region, especially along the coast (Fig. 2). Nevertheless, it should be noted that the CDW widely expanded in 2010 compared to that of 2009. These results also showed that the CR in the summer of the 2010 flood was at the high end of the values observed in the ECS (Chen et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2009). This finding suggests that in 2010, the CR might have been enhanced by the Changjiang River flood.

To assess the biotic controls on CR, the rates were regressed against phytoplankton biomass, heterotrophic bacteria, zooplankton biomass, as well as primary production, if it was applicable. The analysis of the pooled data in each period showed that CR was significantly related to Chl *a* concentrations and bacterial biomass (all $p < 0.001$; Fig. 3). In both periods, the linear relationship was also statistically significant between CR and Chl *a* concentration and bacterial biomass, either for the surface water or for the average value over Z_E (all $p < 0.01$). In addition, in the 2010 flood, CR was significantly related to PP in the pooled data, surface water, or averaged value over Z_E (all $p \leqq 0.01$). Compared with a previous study on the ECS (Chen et al., 2009), CR (g O_2 m^{-3} d^{-1}) was also scaled as a power function of PP (g O_2 m^{-3} d^{-1}) in the 2010 flood, where CR = 5.78 $PP^{1.24}$ (p = 0.001; Fig. 4). Note that the exponential (1.24) is the slope of the log-log transformation. This value is larger than the relationships reported for the ECS (CR = 0.58 $PP^{0.46}$) and other coastal ecosystems in the world (CR = 1.1 $PP^{0.72}$) (Chen et al., 2009; Duarte and Agustí, 1998). This finding suggests that during the 2010 flood, the CR rate might have been dependent on *in situ* organic carbon production, such as PP. The important contribution of phytoplankton and/or bacterioplankton to CR has been identified in the ECS, even though its relative contribution might vary spatially or temporally (Chen et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2009; Chen et al., 2003). These results suggest that the CR rate might be dominated by phytoplankton and/or bacterioplankton in the 2009 non-flood and the 2010 flood.

Surprisingly, the mean Chl *a* value was slightly higher in 2010 than in 2009. In contrast, in this study, the bacterial biomass was significantly smaller in 2010 than in 2009 (Table 1). However, the CR rate was still higher in 2010 than in 2009. In a further analysis, the differences (i.e., 2010–2009) in the average variables over Z_E, that is, CR, Chl *a* concentration, and bacterial biomass, at the same station between two periods were compared. The values of differences in CR were significantly related to differences in Chl *a* concentration ($p < 0.001$) or bacterial biomass ($p < 0.01$; Fig. 5). The linear relationships were also statistically significant if the values of the differences in the surface water were applied (all $p < 0.01$; data not shown). Among the positive values (i.e., 20 of 33) of difference in CR, 15 stations had positive values of the difference in Chl *a* concentrations, but only two stations had positive values of the difference in bacterial biomass. Interestingly, the stations with positive values of Chl *a* concentration difference were mostly located within the CDW region in 2010, with the exception of the CDW in 2009. These results suggest that the higher CR in the 2010 flood might be attributed to phytoplankton. The mean Chl *a* concentration was only slightly higher in 2010 than in 2009, as previously stated. However, the phytoplankton assemblage varied between both periods. Therefore, it is reasonable to speculate that the differences in CR rate in both periods might have been partially caused by variants in the composition of the phytoplankton. Although the CR caused by different phytoplankton assemblage was not measured in this study, it was observed in various phytoplankton taxa (e.g., Lopez-Sandoval et al., 2014).

In addition, zooplankton might be also one of potential contributors for the higher CR rate observed in 2010 than that in 2009. As state above, biomass of zooplankton was significantly higher in 2010 than that in 2009. However, the linear relationships between CR and zooplankton biomass over Z_E were not statistically significant for 2009 or 2010. To further explore how plankton communities contributed to CR, the CR rate was regressed against total plankton biomass (i.e., summed biomass of phytoplankton, bacterioplankton, and zooplankton) for both periods. The linear relationships were significant between CR and total plankton biomass (mg C

m^{-3}) over Z_E either in 2009 ($p < 0.001$) or in 2010 ($p < 0.01$; Fig. 6). Similar significant relationship between CR and total planktonic biomass has also been observed in summer of the ECS, and phytoplankton and bacterioplankton might be the most important components contributing to CR (Chen et al., 2006). In this study, autotrophic plankton biomass (i.e., phytoplankton) accounted for 41.3% and 45.6% of total planktonic biomass in 2009 and 2010, respectively. As for heterotrophic plankton biomass, bacterioplankton attributed to 38.7% and 11.3% and zooplankton contributed for 20.0% and 43.1% of total plankton biomass in 2009 and 2010, respectively. It suggests that phytoplankton and bacterioplankton might be the most important components attributed to CR in the 2009 non-flood. During the 2010 flood, the CR rate might be mostly contributed by phytoplankton and zooplankton.

Implication of community metabolism in the coastal ecosystem

To evaluate the metabolic balance of the plankton community, the P/R ratio of primary production (PP) to CR can be used as an index (e.g., Duarte and Agustí, 1998; Kemp et al., 1997). It also should be noted that in this study, the P/R ratio might be under-estimated because the values of P (i.e., PP) and R (i.e., CR) were integrated over Z_E instead of the entire water column. In the 2010 flood, the P/R ratio was in the range of 0.11 to 1.33, but in 2009, its value was not available because PP was not measured in this period. Surprisingly, the mean P/R ratio was similar to that in summer of the ECS, with a mean ± SD value of 0.42 ± 0.33 (Chen et al., 2009). This value however was much lower than the P/R ratio (= 1.17) reported in other coastal ecosystems (Duarte and Agustí, 1998). This result implies that a large amount of organic carbon was respired by the plankton community into the water column during the flooding period. To support high CR in 2010, in addition to phytoplankton, zooplankton might be another important component contributed to CR. This assumption could be evidenced by high zooplankton biomass (mean value = 105.7 mg C m^{-3}) found in this period, and its biomass (per carbon unit) also accounted for 43.1% of total plankton biomass. This result also suggests that in the 2010 flood, the ECS shelf ecosystems were net heterotrophic. A heterotrophic ecosystem was found in the ECS in summer and in other seasons (Chen et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2003). A low P/R ratio (i.e., < 1) was also widely observed in coastal ecosystems (e.g., del Giorgio et al., 1997; Duarte and Agustí, 1998).

A further comparative analysis was conducted to determine whether the CR rate affected the fugacity of CO_2 (fCO_2) in the seawater. In 2009, the fCO_2 in the surface water was in the range of 118.7–599.8 µatm, with mean ± SD values of 362.9 ± 101.2 µatm (Table 1). This mean value is close to the mean value (369.6 µatm) observed in the ECS in August (Chen et al., 2006). In the 2010 flood, the mean value (297.6 µatm) of fCO_2 in the surface water was significantly lower than in 2009, ranging from 178.7 to 454.2 µatm (Table 1). It is well known that fCO_2 is temperature dependent, and it increases as the temperature increases (e.g., Goyet et al., 1993).

The effect of temperature on the large variation in fCO_2 observed between the 2009 non-flood and the 2010 flood might be trivial because the SST was similar in both periods (Table 1). The effect of freshwater on fCO_2 in the surface water in the ECS, has been suggested to be relatively minor compared to the inter-annual variation of fCO_2 in the spring (Chen et al., 2013). To evaluate, conservative mixing was applied by using TA and DIC data between freshwater and seawater end-members. The TA and DIC data reported by Zhai et al. (2007) for the Changjiang River in summer were used as freshwater endmembers (both TA and DIC = 1743 μmol kg^{-1}). The surface data at St. K, shown as the bottom right-hand side station in Fig. 1, were selected to represent the seawater end-members (SSS = 33.96, TA = 2241 μmol kg^{-1} and DIC = 1909 μmol kg^{-1} in 2009; SSS = 33.96, TA = 2240 μmol kg^{-1} and DIC = 1904 μmol kg^{-1} in 2010). The simulated result shows that the effect of mixing freshwater and seawater on fCO_2 was nearly the same in both periods. However, a large variation of fCO_2 in the surface water were estimated; it varied from 439.8 to 375.4 μatm within a salinity range of 20.38–33.96. This finding implies that surface water fCO_2 in the ECS might increase dramatically, especially during the devastating flood of 2010 where low SSS (≤ 31 psu) covered almost two thirds of the ECS shelf (Fig. 1b).

However, in the 2010 flood, surface water with low fCO_2 was observed in the ECS. Therefore, vigorous photosynthetic processes might be a potential cause for the drawdown of fCO_2 in the surface water during periods of flooding. Compared to PP observed in summer of the

ECS in previous study, primary production was indeed high in the 2010 flood (Table 1; Chen et al., 2009). Gong et al. (2011) also estimated that over the past decade, the carbon fixation rate during flooding was about three times higher than in non-flooding. However, no significant relationship was found between fCO_2 and PP in the 2010 flood, which might have been because PP data were rare in this period. Nevertheless, fCO_2 was significantly related to Chl *a* concentration in the pooled data of the 2010 flood ($p < 0.001$). This significant relationship indirectly supports that the drawdown of fCO_2 in the 2010 flood might be associated with vigorous phytoplankton activity. Furthermore, negative linear regressions were observed between fCO_2 and CR in the surface water during both the 2009 non-flood ($p < 0.01$) and the 2010 flood ($p < 0.001$; Fig. 7). Significant linear relationships were also found using pooled data from each period (all $p < 0.001$). CR has been assumed an integrated response in plankton activities. These results imply that fCO_2 in the surface water (or water column) is related to plankton activities. To explore the variations in fCO_2 between the non-flooding and flooding periods, the difference in fCO_2 and CR at the same station was estimated. Surprisingly, a negative linear relationship was found between the difference in fCO_2 and CR of the flooding and non-flooding periods ($p = 0.001$; Fig. 8). As previously stated, compared to the 2009 non-flood, the increase in CR rate in the 2010 flood might be associated with the increase in phytoplankton biomass (Fig. 5a). These results indicate that the significant amount of fCO_2 absorption in the 2010 flood was related to the strength of plankton activity, particularly phytoplankton at stations that were not covered by low SSS in the 2009 non-flood.

CONCLUSION

Riverine run-off has a profound effect on organic carbon production and consumption in coastal ecosystems globally. It has become even more pronounced with the dramatic increase in extreme rainfall events and flood magnitude in the Changjiang River and around the world. In July 2010, a devastating flood occurred in the Changjiang River, with a mean monthly discharge of 60,527 $m^3 s^{-1}$, and this flood started in late May or early June. This event provided an opportunity to investigate the effects of flooding on plankton community respiration (CR) in the ECS shelf ecosystem. A comparative analysis was conducted on variables, including physical, chemical and biological parameters, in the July 2010 flood and in July 2009, when the riverine flow was relatively low (mean monthly values = 33,955 $m^3 s^{-1}$). During the flood, a large amount of freshwater was discharged into the ECS. The Changjiang diluted water (CDW) zone, where sea surface salinity (SSS) $\leq$ 31 psu, covered almost two thirds of the continental shelf. In the 2010 flood, the CDW zone was approximately six times larger than in the 2009 non-flood; their values were 111.7 x 10^3 and 19.0 x 10^3 km^2, respectively. Higher nitrate concentrations, mostly in the fluvial discharge of the Changjiang River, were also measured in the ECS during the flood. The comparison of both periods showed that the nitrate concentration in the surface water of the

ECS was significantly higher in the 2010 flood than in the 2009 non-flood, with mean ± SD values of 6.2 ± 9.8 and 2.0 ± 5.3 μM, respectively. Nevertheless, the phytoplankton biomass in the surface water or averaged over the euphotic zone (Z_E) showed no significant difference between 2009 and 2010. The effect of flooding on phytoplankton biomass was however observed if using total content of Chl *a* over Z_E integrated for the entire ECS or the CDW zone. The total Chl *a* content in the ECS was higher in 2010 than that of 2009, with values of 5.5 and 4.4 x 10^6 kg Chl *a*, respectively. In addition, in the 2010 flood, primary production in the surface water was high, with mean ± SD values of 62.1±33.8 mg C m^{-3} d^{-1}, compared to PP observed in summer of the ECS in previous study (Chen et al., 2009). Gong et al. (2011) estimated that the average rate of carbon fixation during the flood was 176.0 x 10^3 tons C d^{-1}, which was about three times higher than during non-flooding over the past decade. Phytoplankton abundance was twice as high in the CDW than in other regions. In the 2010 flood, the phytoplankton was predominately diatom, especially *Chaetoceros* spp., *Rhizosolenia* spp. and *Nitzschia* spp., (Gong et al., 2011). A previous study showed that during non-flooding, phytoplankton assemblage in the CDW, in addition to diatoms, were predominately dinoflagellates, coccolithophorids, and green algae (Chien, 2009). Surprisingly, the bacterial biomass in the surface water was significantly higher in the 2009 non-flood than in the 2010 flood, with mean ± SD values of 39.8 ± 33.7 and 20.4 ± 16.5 mg C m^{-3}, respectively.

In this study, the mean value of Chl *a* was slightly higher in 2010 than in 2009, and the bacterial biomass was significantly lower in 2010 than in 2009. Interestingly, CR was still higher in the 2010 flood than in the 2009 non-flood, with mean ± SD values of 105.6 ± 66.7 and 73.2 ± 76.9 mg C m^{-3} d^{-1} in the surface water, respectively. The differences (i.e., 2010–2009) in the variables averaged over Z_E, such as CR, Chl *a* concentration, and bacterial biomass, at the same station in two periods were compared. The values of difference in CR were significantly related to the values of differences in Chl *a* concentration. This result suggested that higher CR in the 2010 flood might be attributed to a higher biomass with variant phytoplankton assemblage, especially in stations located within the CDW region, most of which were not covered by low SSS in the 2009 non-flood. In addition to phytoplankton, zooplankton might be another important component contributed to high CR rate observed in the 2010 flood. This could be evidenced from that zooplankton biomass (mean value = 105.7 mg C m^{-3}) in 2010 was account for 43.1% of total plankton biomass (i.e., summed biomass of phytoplankton, bacterioplankton, and zooplankton). A negative linear relationship was also found between the differences (i.e., 2010 – 2009) in surface water variables of CR vs. fCO_2. This finding implies that a tremendous amount of fCO_2 was absorbed by vigorous photosynthesis during the flood period. Overall, these results suggest that plankton activity flourished in the huge amount of dissolved inorganic nutrients in the riverine discharge during the flood. This effect was especially pronounced at stations not previously covered by low SSS. This finding indicates that the effects of flooding on the ECS shelf ecosystem might be scaled to the magnitude of the flood.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is part of the multidisciplinary "Long-term Observation and Research of the East China Sea" (LORECS) and "Effects of Global Chang on Ocean Biogeochemistry and Ecosystem in the Sea surrounding Taiwan in the Northwest Pacific" (ECOBEST) programs, which is supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology, ROC under grant Nos.: NSC-98-2611-M-003-001-MY3 and MOST 103-2611-M-003-001 to C.-C. Chen. The work of G.-C. Gong was partly supported by the Center of Marine Bioscience and Biotechnology, National Taiwan Ocean University. We are furthermore indebted to the officers and crew of the *Ocean Researcher I* for their assistance. The authors are also grateful to Prof. T. C. M. Malone at Horn Point Laboratory at UMCES and two anonymous reviewers for providing valuable and constructive comments to improve the manuscript. This article was subsidized by the National Taiwan Normal University (NTNU), Taiwan, ROC.

REFERENCES

Alcaraz, M., Saiz, E., Calbet, A., Trepat, I., and Broglio, E.: Estimating zooplankton biomass through image analysis, Mar. Biol., 143, 307-315, 2003.

Beardsley, R. C., Limeburner, R., Yu, H., and Cannon, G. A.: Discharge of the Changjiang (Yangtze River) into the East China Sea, Cont. Shelf Res., 4, 57-76, 1985.

Calbet, A., and Landry, M. R.: Phytoplankton growth, microzooplankton grazing, and carbon cycling in marine systems, Limnol. Oceanogr., 49, 51-57, 2004.

Chang, J., Shiah, F. K., Gong, G. C., and Chiang, K. P.: Cross-shelf variation in carbon-to-chlorophyll *a* ratios in the East China Sea, summer 1998, Deep-Sea Res Pt Ii, 50, 1237-1247, 2003.

Chen, C.-C., Shiah, F. K., Gong, G. C., and Chiang, K. P.: Planktonic community respiration in the East China Sea: importance of microbial consumption of organic carbon, Deep-Sea Res Pt Ii, 50, 1311-1325, 2003.

Chen, C.-C., Shiah, F. K., Chiang, K. P., Gong, G. C., and Kemp, W. M.: Effects of the Changjiang (Yangtze) River discharge on planktonic community respiration in the East China Sea, J GEOPHYS RES-OCEANS, 114, C03005, 10.1029/2008jc004891, 2009.

Chen, C.-C., Gong, G. C., Shiah, F. K., Chou, W. C., and Hung, C. C.: The large variation in organic carbon consumption in spring in the East China Sea, Biogeosciences, 10, 2931-2943, 2013.

Chen, C.-C., Chiang, K. P., Gong, G. C., Shiah, F. K., Tseng, C. M., and Liu, K. K.: Importance of planktonic community respiration on the carbon balance of the East China Sea in summer, Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles, 20, Gb4001, 10.1029/2005gb002647, 2006.

Chen, C. S., Zhu, J. R., Beardsley, R. C., and Franks, P. J. S.: Physical-biological sources for dense algal blooms near the Changjiang River, Geophys. Res. Lett., 30, 1515-1518, 2003.

Chen, Y. L. L., Chen, H. Y., Gong, G. C., Lin, Y. H., Jan, S., and Takahashi, M.: Phytoplankton production during a summer coastal upwelling in the East China Sea, Cont. Shelf Res., 24, 1321-1338, 2004.

Chien, C.-A.: Applying CHEMTAX to investigate the algal community composition relevant to water mass properties in the East China Sea, Msc, Institute of Bioscience and Biotechnology, National Taiwan Ocean Univeristy, Keeling, Taiwan, 93 pp., 2009.

Chou, W. C., Sheu, D. D., Chen, C. T. A., Wen, L. S., Yang, Y., and Wei, C. L.: Transport of the South China Sea subsurface water outflow and its influence on carbon chemistry of Kuroshio waters off southeastern Taiwan, J GEOPHYS RES-OCEANS, 112, C12008, doi:10.1029/2007jc004087, 2007.

Christensen, J. H., and Christensen, O. B.: Climate modelling: Severe summertime flooding in Europe, Nature, 421, 805-806, 2003.

Chung, C. C., Gong, G. C., and Hung, C. C.: Effect of Typhoon Morakot on microphytoplankton population dynamics in the subtropical Northwest Pacific, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 448, 39-49, 2012.

Chung, C. C., Huang, C. Y., Gong, G. C., and Lin, Y. C.: Influence of the Changjiang River Flood on Synechococcus Ecology in the Surface Waters of the East China Sea, Microbial Ecology, 67, 273-285, 2014.

Dagg, M., Benner, R., Lohrenz, S., and Lawrence, D.: Transformation of dissolved and particulate materials on continental shelves influenced by large rivers: plume processes, Cont. Shelf Res., 24, 833-858, 2004.

del Giorgio, P. A., Cole, J. J., and Cimbleris, A.: Respiration rates in bacteria exceed phytoplankton production in unproductive aquatic systems, Nature, 385, 148-151, 1997.

Duarte, C. M., and Agustí, S.: The CO_2 balance of unproductive aquatic ecosystems, Science, 281, 234-236, 1998.

Fisher, T. R., Peele, E. R., Ammerman, J. W., and Harding, L. W., Jr.: Nutrient limitation of phytoplankton in Chesapeake Bay, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 82, 51-63, 1992.

Gaarder, T., and Grann, H. H.: Investigations of the production of plankton in the Oslo Fjord. Rapport et Proces-Verbaux des Reunions, Conseil Permanent International pour l'Exploration de la Mer, 42, 3-31, 1927.

Gao, X., and Song, J.: Phytoplankton distributions and their relationship with the environment in the Changjiang Estuary, China, Mar. Pollut. Bull., 50, 327-335, 2005.

Garcia-Comas, C.: Short manual to work with the ZooScan. Zooprocess version 6.16, <http://www.zooscan.com> pp., 2010.

Gong, G.-C., Chen, Y.-L. L., and Liu, K.-K.: Chemical hydrography and chlorophyll *a* distribution in the East China Sea in summer: implication in nutrient dynamics, Cont. Shelf Res., 16, 1561-1590, 1996.

Gong, G.-C., Chang, J., and Wen, Y.-H.: Estimation of annual primary production in the Kuroshio waters northeast of Taiwan using a photosynthesis-irradiance model, Deep-Sea Res. I, 46, 93-108, 1999.

Gong, G.-C., Wen, Y.-H., Wang, B.-W., and Liu, G.-J.: Seasonal variation of chlorophyll *a* concentration, primary production and environmental conditions in the subtropical East China Sea, Deep-Sea Res Pt Ii, 50, 1219-1236, 2003.

Gong, G. C., Liu, K. K., Chiang, K. P., Hsiung, T. M., Chang, J., Chen, C. C., Hung, C. C., Chou, W. C., Chung, C. C., Chen, H. Y., Shiah, F. K., Tsai, A. Y., Hsieh, C. H., Shiao, J. C., Tseng, C. M., Hsu, S. C., Lee, H. J., Lee, M. A., Lin, I. I., and Tsai, F. J.: Yangtze River floods enhance coastal ocean phytoplankton biomass and potential fish production, Geophys. Res. Lett., 38, L13603, doi:10.1029/2011GL047519, 2011.

Goyet, C., Millero, F. J., Poisson, A., and Shafer, D. K.: Temperature dependence of CO_2 fugacity in seawater, Mar. Chem., 44, 205-219, 1993.

Harding, L. W., Jr. : Long-term trends in the distribution of phytoplankton in Chesapeake Bay: roles of light, nutrients and streamflow, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 104, 267-291, 1994.

Harrison, P. J., Hu, M. H., Yang, Y. P., and Lu, X.: Phosphate limitation in estuarine and coastal waters of China, J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol., 140, 79-87, 1990.

Hedges, J. I., Keil, R. G., and Benner, R.: What happens to terrestrial organic matter in the ocean?, Org. Geochem., 27, 195-212, 1997.

Hedges, J. I., Cowie, G. L., Richey, J. E., Quay, P. D., Benner, R., Strom, M., and Forsberg, B. R.: Origins and processing of organic-matter in the Amazon River as indicated by carbohydrates and amino-acids, Limnol. Oceanogr., 39, 743-761, 1994.

Hernández-León, S., and Ikeda, T.: A global assessment of mesozooplankton respiration in the ocean, J. Plankton Res., 27, 153-158, 2005.

Hobbie, J. E., Daley, R. J., and Jasper, S.: Use of nuclepore filters for counting bacteria by fluorescence microscopy, Appl. Environ. Microbiol., 33, 1225-1228, 1977.

Hopkinson Jr., C. S.: Shallow-water benthic and pelagic metabolism: evidence of heterotrophy in the nearshore Georgia Bight, Mar. Biol., 87, 19-32, 1985.

Hopkinson Jr., C. S., Sherr, B., and Wiebe, W. J.: Size fractionated metabolism of coastal microbial plankton, Mar Ecol-Prog Ser, 51, 155-166, 1989.

Jiang, T., Su, B., and Hartmann, H.: Temporal and spatial trends of precipitation and river flow in the Yangtze River Basin, 1961-2000, Geomorphology, 85, 143-154, 2007.

Kemp, W. M., Smith, E. M., Marvin-DiPasquale, M., and Boynton, W. R.: Organic carbon balance and net ecosystem metabolism in Chesapeake Bay, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 150, 229-

248, 1997.

Knox, J. C.: Large Increases in Flood Magnitude in Response to Modest Changes in Climate, Nature, 361, 430-432, 1993.

Lee, S., and Fuhrman, J. A.: Relationship between biovolume and biomass of naturally derived marine bacterioplankton, Appl. Environ. Microbiol., 53, 1298-1303, 1987.

Levitus, S.: Climatological atlas of the word ocean, NOAA professional paper No. 13, US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 173 pp., 1982.

Lewis, E., and Wallace, D. W. R.: Program developed for CO_2 system calculations, Rep. ORNL/CDIAC-105, Carbon Dioxide Inf. Anal. Cent., Oak Ridge Natl. Lab., Oak Ridege, Tenn., 1998.

Liu, H. B., Suzukil, K., Minami, C., Saino, T., and Watanabe, M.: Picoplankton community structure in the subarctic Pacific Ocean and the Bering Sea during summer 1999, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 237, 1-14, 2002.

Liu, K.-K., Gong, G.-C., Wu, C.-R., and Lee, H.-J.: The Kuroshio and the East China Sea, in: Carbon and Nutrient Fluxes in Continental Margins: A Global Synthesis, edited by: Liu, K. K., Atkinson, L., Quiñones, R., and Talaue-McManus, L., Springer, Berlin, 124-146, 2010.

Lopez-Sandoval, D. C., Rodriguez-Ramos, T., Cermeno, P., Sobrino, C., and Maranon, E.: Photosynthesis and respiration in marine phytoplankton: Relationship with cell size, taxonomic affiliation, and growth phase, J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol., 457, 151-159, 2014.

Müller-Karger, F. E., McClain, C. R., and Richardson, P. L.: The dispersal of the Amazon's water, Nature, 333, 56-59, 1988.

Malone, T. C., and Ducklow, H. W.: Microbial biomass in the coastal plume of Chesapeake Bay : phytoplankton-bacterioplankton relationships, Limnol. Oceanogr., 35, 296-312, 1990.

Milly, P. C. D., Wetherald, R. T., Dunne, K. A., and Delworth, T. L.: Increasing risk of great floods in a changing climate, Nature, 415, 514-517, 2002.

Nixon, S. W., Ammerman, J. W., Atkinson, L. P., Berounsky, V. M., Billen, G., Boicourt, W. C., Boynton, W. R., Church, T. M., Ditoro, D. M., Elmgren, R., Garber, J. H., Giblin, A. E., Jahnke, R. A., Owens, N. J. P., Pilson, M. E. Q., and Seitzinger, S. P.: The fate of nitrogen and phosphorus at the land-sea margin of the North Atlantic Ocean, Biogeochemistry, 35, 141-180, 1996.

Pai, S.-C., Gong, G.-C., and Liu, K.-K.: Determination of dissolved oxygen in seawater by direct spectrophotometry of total iodine, Mar. Chem., 41, 343-351, 1993.

Palmer, T. N., and Ralsanen, J.: Quantifying the risk of extreme seasonal precipitation events in a changing climate, Nature, 415, 512-514, 2002.

Parsons, T. R., Maita, Y., and Lalli, C. M.: A manual of chemical and biological methods for seawater analysis, Pergamon Press, New York, 173 pp., 1984.

Rowe, G. T., Smith, S., Falkowski, P., Whitledge, T., Theroux, R., Phoel, W., and Ducklow, H.: Do continental shelves export organic matter?, Nature, 324, 559-561, 1986.

Sherr, E. B., and Sherr, B. F.: Role of heterotrophic protozoa in carbon and energy flow in aquatic ecosystems, in: Current perspectives in microbial ecology, edited by: Klug, M. J., and Reddy, C. A., American society for microbiology, Washington, D.C., 412-423, 1984.

Smith, E. M., and Kemp, W. M.: Seasonal and regional variations in plankton community production and respiration for the Chesapeake Bay, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 116, 217-231, 1995.

Tian, R. C., Hu, F. X., and Martin, J. M.: Summer nutrient fronts in the Changjiang (Yangtze River) Estuary, Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci., 37, 27-41, 1993.

Tsai, A. Y., Chiang, K. P., Chang, J., and Gong, G. C.: Seasonal diel variations of picoplankton and nanoplankton in a subtropical western Pacific coastal ecosystem, Limnol. Oceanogr., 50, 1221-1231, 2005.

Wang, X. C., Ma, H. Q., Li, R. H., Song, Z. S., and Wu, J. P.: Seasonal fluxes and source variation of organic carbon transported by two major Chinese Rivers: The Yellow River and Changjiang (Yangtze) River, Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles, 26, Gb2025, doi:10.1029/2011gb004130, 2012.

Xu, K. H., and Milliman, J. D.: Seasonal variations of sediment discharge from the Yangtze River before and after impoundment of the Three Gorges Dam, Geomorphology, 104, 276-283, 2009.

Yu, F. L., Chen, Z. Y., Ren, X. Y., and Yang, G. F.: Analysis of historical floods on the Yangtze River, China: Characteristics and explanations, Geomorphology, 113, 210-216, 2009.

Zhai, W. D., Dai, M. H., and Guo, X. G.: Carbonate system and CO2 degassing fluxes in the inner estuary of Changjiang (Yangtze) River, China, Mar. Chem., 107, 342-356, 2007.

Table 1. Range of values for different variables in the surface water of the ECS during non-flood (2009) and flood (2010) periods, with mean ± SD in parentheses and in brackets for all sampling stations and for stations in the area of the Changjiang Diluted Water, respectively. Variables include transparency (CTD_{TM}; %), salinity (SSS; psu), temperature (SST; ℃), fugacity of CO_2 (fCO_2; μatm), nitrate (NO_3^-; μM), phosphate (PO_4^{3-}; μM), silicate (SiO_4^-; μM), chlorophyll *a* (Chl *a*; mg Chl m^{-3}), bacterial biomass (BB; mg C m^{-3}), primary production (PP; mg C m^{-3} d^{-1}), and plankton community respiration (CR; mg C m^{-3} d^{-1}). For reference, values of euphotic depth (Z_E; m) and mixed layer depth (M_D; m) are also shown. The Mann-Whitney Rank Sum test was applied for variable comparison between 2009 and 2010, and the results are indicated herein.

Variables	2009	2010
Z_E	1.3–190.6 (38.9±36.4) [16.8±7.4]	10.1–82.2 (33.4±17.3) [24.8±10.7]
M_D	5–37 (13.7±7.3) [7.3±3.6]	4–35 (11.3±6.6) [7.9±2.6]
CTD_{TM}	37.2–86.3 (76.7±12.2) [70.0±4.9]	67.7–88.5 (80.5±5.4) [78.4±4.3]**
SSS	23.80–34.11 (32.62±2.07) [29.24±2.52]	19.33–34.27 (30.32±3.60)* [27.95±3.03]
SST	23.3–29.6 (26.8±1.7) [25.0±0.9]	21.0–30.0 (26.1±2.2) [25.1±1.7]
fCO_2	118.7–599.8 (362.9±101.2) [230.4±105.3]	178.7–454.2 (297.6±79.0)* [248.6±54.5]
NO_3^-	0.0–24.3 (2.0±5.3) [4.0±9.1]	0.0–37.6 (6.2±9.8)* [10.3±11.3]*
PO_4^{3-}	0.00–0.83 (0.13±0.17) [0.13±0.07]	0.00–1.71 (0.17±0.30) [0.23±0.37]
SiO_4^-	1.5–24.5 (5.8±5.9) [9.8±7.2]	0.6–36.4 (6.4±7.8) [9.1±9.2]

Chl *a*	0.12–4.41 (0.98±1.52) [2.23±1.46]	0.03–5.32 (1.26±1.27) [1.83±1.35]
BB	10.6–184.8 (39.8±33.7) [54.9±39.6]	3.6–90.2 (20.4±16.5)** [24.4±18.6]**
PP	– –	10.0–111.3 (62.1±33.8) [71.0±29.1]
CR	2.7–311.9 (73.2±76.9) [172.0±109.2]	10.9–325.3 (105.6±66.7)* [142.0±61.2]

–: no data; *: $p < 0.01$; **: $p < 0.001$

Table 2. Total biomass of biological variables over the euphotic depth integrated for the whole ECS and the Changjiang Diluted Water (in parentheses) during non-flood (2009) and flood (2010) periods. Variables include chlorophyll *a* (Chl *a*; x10^6 kg Chl), bacterial biomass (BB; x10^6 kg C), and zooplankton (Zoo; x10^6 kg C). For reference, area (x 10^3 km^2) of the whole ECS and the CDW zone are also shown.

Variables	2009	2010
Area	186.0 (19.0)	182.7 (111.7)
Chl *a*	4.4 (1.2)	5.5 (3.9)
BB	222.5 (21.0)	87.3 (47.7)
Zoo	410.3 (6.2)	920.6 (560.8)

FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1. Contour plots of salinity (SSS), nitrate (NO_3^-), phosphate (PO_4^{3-}), and chlorophyll *a* (Chl *a*) in the surface water (2 - 3 m) of the ECS in non-flooding (2009) and flooding (2010) periods. Bottom depth contours are shown as dashed lines, both here and in Fig. 2. The sampling stations in both periods are marked by a cross (x) here and in Fig. 2. The contour intervals of SSS, nitrate, phosphate, and Chl *a* are 0.5 psu, 1.0 μM, 0.1 μM, and 0.5 mg Chl m^{-3}, respectively. For reference, contour lines of SSS = 31 psu, NO_3^- = 3.0 μM, PO_4^{3-} = 1.0 μM, and Chl *a* = 1.0 mg Chl m^{-3} are in bold. The range of variables is shown at the top of each panel.

Fig. 2. Contour plots of plankton community respiration (CR; mg C m^{-3} d^{-1}) over the euphotic zone of the ECS in a) non-flooding (2009) and b) flooding (2010) periods. The contour interval is 10 mg C m^{-3} d^{-1}. The range of CR is shown at the top of each panel.

Fig. 3. Relationships between plankton community respiration (CR; mg C m^{-3} d^{-1}) and a) chlorophyll *a* concentration (Chl *a*; mg Chl m^{-3}) and b) bacterial biomass (mg C m^{-3}) for all data from periods of non-flooding (2009; ●) and flooding (2010; ○). Linear regressions of data from 2009 (solid lines) and 2010 (dashed lines); r^2 and p values are included.

Fig. 4. Log-log relationships between averaged volumetric rates of primary production (PP, converted to O_2 units) versus volumetric rates of CR in 2010 (●). Please note the log scale

in both axes. The solid line show the relationship as a power function of PP. For comparison, the estimated power functions of CR versus PP (CR = 0.58 $PP^{0.46}$) in summer (○) in the ECS is shown as gray line (Chen et al., 2009).

Fig. 5. Differences between 2010 and 2009 in plankton community respiration (CR; mg C m^{-3} d^{-1}) vs. a) chlorophyll *a* (Chl *a*; mg Chl m^{-3}) and b) bacterial biomass (mg C m^{-3}) over the euphotic zone at the same station. Both r^2 and p values of linear regression (solid line) are included. For reference, the vertical and horizontal dashed lines represent the differences in variables equal to zero.

Fig. 6. Relationship between plankton community respiration (CR) and total plankton biomass (expressed per carbon unit) over Z_E in 2009 (●; solid line) and 2010 (○; dashed line). Both p and r^2 values of linear regression are shown. Total plankton biomass was the summated biomass of phytoplankton, bacterioplankton, and zooplankton. Please refer to "Materials and Methods" for details of carbon conversion for plankton communities.

Fig. 7. Relationships between the fugacity of CO_2 (fCO_2) and plankton community respiration (CR) in the surface water in 2009 (●; solid line) and 2010 (○; dashed line). Both p and r^2 values of linear regression are shown.

Fig. 8. Differences between 2010 and 2009 in fCO_2 (μatm) and plankton community respiration (CR; mg C m^{-3} d^{-1}) in the surface water at the same station. Both r^2 and p values of linear

regression (solid line) are included. For reference, the vertical and horizontal dashed lines represent the differences in variables equal to zero.