Dear Prof. Achterberg,

Thank-you for reviewing this manuscript, the previous reviews indeed helped us to strengthen the manuscript and we are very pleased that it is now acceptable for publication. We have made the minor amendments suggested, as can be seen in the marked up version attached, and addressed the one comment (in blue italic).

Associate Editor Decision: Publish subject to minor revisions (Editor review) (21 Jun 2017) by E.P. Achterberg

Comments to the Author:

The resubmitted manuscript has substantially improved following two rounds of reviews. In particular the substantial and thorough amendments to the manuscript following the latest reviews have greatly improved the manuscript. The text flows well, and the scientific reasoning is well laid out and expressed.

The use of statistical techniques to show the different behaviours with time of the various phytoplankton communities that were subjected to different CO2 treatments has strongly improved the manuscript.

The authors have followed the recommendations by the reviewers and thereby greatly strengthened the manuscript.

I suggest a number of minor amendments to the manuscript before it can be published.

Line 29: replace dissolution with uptake *amended*

Line 29: after carbon dioxide write (CO2) amended

Line 29: replace in with by *amended*

Line 30: replace atmosphere with ocean amended

Line 32: replace highly with strongly amended

Line 37: replace CO2 with fugacity of CO2 (fCO2) amended

Line 39: their abundances with its abundance amended

Line 429: between "shift towards" place with increasing fCO2 amended

Line 50: replace activities with emissions amended

Line 50: write: primarily caused by the burning..... amended

Line 56: replace productivity with production amended

Line 81: replace nutrients with nutrient amended

Line 81: replace concentration with concentration amended

Line 84: write: carbon sequestration in deep waters and sediments amended

Line 101: replace under with with amended

Line 101: write: temperature conditions amended

Line 117: replace hung with reached amended

Line 127: replace fCO2 with fugacity of CO2 (fCO2) amended

Line 134: write: threshold fCO2 level, if present..... amended

Line 136: write: Initial fCO2 was 240..... amended

Line 166: replace concentrations with levels amended

Line 300 and 302: replace of with in amended

Line 306: write: phytoplankton abundance amended

Line 337: write: low fCO2 compared to high fCO2 amended

Line 448: replace on with for amended

Line 499: is there evidence from other mesocosm experiments of stimulation of SYN due to bubbling or enclosing? Yes, this has been seen in a few other mesocosm experiments, we have added this into the text: "Alternatively, effects of enclosure and the techniques (bubbling) used to ensure a homogenous water column may have stimulated SYN within the mesocosms, which has been found to occur in several mesocosm experiments (Paulino et al., 2008; Gazeau et al., 2017)."(Line 498-501).

Line 504: replace occur with upwell amended

Line 660: replace predicted with projected *amended*

Alterations in microbial community composition with increasing fCO2: a mesocosm study in the eastern Baltic Sea Katharine J. Crawfurd¹, Santiago Alvarez-Fernandez², Kristina D. A. Mojica³, Ulf Riebesell⁴, Corina P. D. Brussaard^{1,5} [1] (NIOZ Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research, Department of Marine Microbiology and Biogeochemistry and Utrecht University, P.O. Box 59, 1790 AB Den Burg, Texel, The Netherlands} [2]{Alfred-Wegener-Institut Helmholtz-Zentrum für Polar- und Meeresforschung, Biologische Anstalt Helgoland, 27498, Helgoland, Germany} [3] {Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, Cordley Hall 2082, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon 97331-29052, USA} [4]{GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel, Biological Oceanography, Düsternbrooker Weg 20, 24105, Kiel, Germany} [5]{Aquatic Microbiology, Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Dynamics, University of Amsterdam, P.O. Box 94248, 1090 GE Amsterdam, The Netherlands} Correspondence to: K. Crawfurd (kate.crawfurd@gmail.com) and C. P. D. Brussaard (corina.brussaard@nioz.nl)

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

Abstract

Ocean acidification, resulting from the dissolution uptake of anthropogenic carbon dioxide in(CO₂) by the atmosphereocean, is considered a major threat to marine ecosystems. Here we examined effects of ocean acidification on microbial community dynamics in the eastern Baltic Sea, during the summer of 2012 when inorganic nitrogen and phosphorus were highlystrongly depleted. Large volume in situ mesocosms were employed to mimic present-to, future and far future CO₂ scenarios. All six groups of phytoplankton enumerated by flow cytometry (<20 µm cell diameter) showed distinct trends in net growth and abundance with CO₂ enrichment. The picoeukaryotic phytoplankton groups Pico-I and II displayed enhanced abundances, whilst Pico-III, Synechococcus and the nanoeukaryotic phytoplankton groups were negatively affected by elevated fugacity of CO₂ (fCO₂-). Specifically, the numerically dominant eukaryote, Pico-I, demonstrated increases in gross growth rate with increasing fCO₂ sufficient to double their abundances.its abundance. Dynamics of the prokaryote community closely followed trends in total algal biomass despite differential effects of fCO₂ on algal groups. Similarly, viral abundances corresponded to prokaryotic host population dynamics. Viral lysis and grazing were both important in controlling microbial abundances. Overall our results point to a shift, with increasing fCO2, towards a more regenerative system with production dominated by small picoeukaryotic phytoplankton.

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

1 Introduction

Marine phytoplankton are responsible for approximately half of global primary production (Field et al., 1998), with shelf sea communities contributing an average 15-30 % (Kulinski and Pempkowiak, 2011). Since the industrial revolution atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) concentrations have increased by nearly 40 % due to anthropogenic activitiesemissions, primarily caused by the burning of fossil fuels and deforestation (Doney et al., 2009). Atmospheric CO₂ dissolves in the oceans where

it forms carbonic acid which reduces seawater pH, a process commonly termed, ocean acidification (OA). Currently, along with warming sea surface temperatures and changing light and nutrient conditions, marine ecosystems face unprecedented decreases in ocean pH (Doney et al., 2009; Gruber, 2011). Ocean acidification is considered one of the greatest current threats to marine ecosystems (Turley and Boot, 2010) and has been shown to alter phytoplankton primary productivityproduction with the direction and magnitude of the responses dependent on community composition (eg. Hein and Sand-Jensen, 1997; Tortell et al., 2002; Leonardos and Geider, 2005; Engel et al., 2007; Feng et al., 2009; Eberlein et al., 2017). Certain cyanobacteria, including diazotrophs, demonstrate stimulated growth under conditions of elevated CO2 (Qiu and Gao, 2002; Barcelos e Ramos et al., 2007; Hutchins, 2007; Dutkiewicz et al., 2015). However, no consistent trends have been found for Synechococcus (Schulz et al., 2017 and references therein). The responses of diatoms and coccolithophores also appear more variable (Dutkiewicz et al., 2015 and references therein), although coccolithophore calcification seems generally negatively impacted (Meyer and Riebesell, 2015; Riebesell et al., 2017). OA has also been reported to increase the abundances of small-sized photoautotrophic eukaryotes in mesocosm experiments (Engel et al., 2007; Meakin and Wyman, 2011; Brussaard et al., 2013; Schulz et al., 2017). Recently, data regarding the effects of OA on taxa-specific phytoplankton growth rates were incorporated into a global ecosystem model. The results emphasized that elevated CO2 concentrations can cause changes in community structure by altering the competitive fitness, and thus competition between phytoplankton groups (Dutkiewicz et al., 2015). Moreover, OA was found to have a greater impact on phytoplankton community size structure, function and biomass than either warming or reduced nutrient supply (Dutkiewicz et al., 2015). Many OA studies have been conducted using single-species under controlled laboratory conditions and therefore cannot account for intrinsic community interactions that occur under natural conditions. Alternatively, larger-volume mesocosm experiments allow for OA manipulation of natural communities and as such, are more likely to capture and quantify the overall response of the natural ecosystems. To date, the majority of

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

these experiments started under replete nutrient conditions or received nutrient additions (Paul et al., 2015 and references therein). Thus, little data is available for oligotrophic conditions, which are present in ~75% of the world's oceans (Corno et al., 2007).

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

Whilst environmental factors such as temperature, light, nutrients nutrient and CO2 concentrationconcentrations regulate gross primary production, loss factors determine the fate of this photosynthetically fixed carbon. Grazing, sinking and viral lysis affect the cycling of elements in different manners, i.e. transferred to higher trophic levels through grazing, carbon storagesequestration in deep waters and sediments via sinking, and cellular content release by viral lysis (Wilhelm and Suttle, 1999; Brussaard et al., 2005). Released detrital and dissolved organic matter (DOM) is quickly utilized by heterotrophic bacteria, thereby stimulating activity within the microbial loop (Brussaard et al., 2008; Lønborg et al., 2013; Sheik et al., 2014; Middelboe and Lyck, 2002). Consequently, bacteria may be affected indirectly by OA through changes in the quality and/or quantity of DOM (Weinbauer et al., 2011). Viral lysis has been found to be as important as microzooplankton grazing to the mortality of natural bacterio- and phytoplankton (Weinbauer, 2004; Baudoux et al., 2006; Evans and Brussaard, 2012; Mojica et al., 2016). Thus far, most studies examining the effects of OA on microzooplankton abundance and/or grazing have found little or no direct effect (Suffrian et al., 2008; Rose et al., 2009; Aberle et al., 2013; Brussaard et al., 2013; Niehoff et al., 2013). To our knowledge, no viral lysis rates have been reported for natural phytoplankton communities under conditions of OA. A few studies have inferred rates based on changes in viral abundances under enhanced CO2, but the results are inconsistent (Larsen et al., 2008; Brussaard et al., 2013). Therefore, the effect of OA on the relative share of these key loss processes is still understudied for most ecosystems. Here we report on the temporal dynamics of microbes (phytoplankton, prokaryotes and viruses)

under the influence of enhanced CO_2 concentrations in the low-salinity (around 5.7) Baltic Sea. Using large mesocosms <u>underwith</u> in situ light and temperature <u>conditions</u>, the pelagic ecosystem was exposed to a range of increasing CO_2 concentrations from ambient to future and far future

concentrations. The study was performed during the summer in the Baltic Sea near Tvärminne when conditions were oligotrophic. Our data show, that over the 43 day long experiment, enhanced CO₂ concentrations elicited distinct shifts in the microbial community, most notably an increase in the net growth of small picoeukaryotic phytoplankton.

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

105

106

107

108

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Study site and experimental set-up

The present study was conducted in the Tvärminne Storfjärden (59° 51.5' N, 23° 15.5' E) between 14 June and 7 August, 2012. Nine mesocosms, each enclosing ~55 m³ of water, were moored in a square arrangement at a site with a water depth of approximately 30 m. The mesocosms consisted of open ended polyurethane bags 2 m in diameter and 18.5 m in length mounted onto floating frames covered at each end with a 3 mm mesh. Initially, the mesocosms were kept open for 5 days to allow for rinsing and water exchange while excluding large organisms from entering with the 3 mm mesh. During this time, the bags were positioned such that the tops were submerged 0.5 m below the water surface and the bottoms hungreached down to 17 m depth in the water column. Photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) transparent plastic hoods (open on the side) prevented rain and bird droppings from entering the mesocosms, which would affect salinity and nutrients, respectively. Five days before the CO₂ treatment was to begin, the water column of the mesocosms was isolated from the influence of the surrounding water. To do so, the 3 mm mesh was removed and sediment traps (2 m long) were attached to close off the bottom of the mesocosms. The top ends of the bags were raised and secured to the frame 1.5 m above the water surface to prevent water entering via wave action. The mesocosms were then bubbled with compressed air for 3.5 min, to remove salinity gradients and ensure that the water body was fully homogeneous. The present manuscript includes results from six of the original mesocosms, due to the unfortunate loss of three mesocosms which were compromised by leakage. The mean fugacity of CO₂ (fCO₂) during the experiment, i.e. days 1-43, for the individual mesocosms were as follows: M1, 365 µatm;

M3, 1007 μatm; M5, 368 μatm; M6, 821 μatm; M7, 497 μatm; M8, 1231 μatm (Table 1). The gradient of non-replicated fCO₂ of the present study (as opposed to a smaller number of replicated treatment levels) was selected as a balance between the necessary, but manageable, number of mesocosms and minimizing the impact of the high potential for loss of mesocosms to successfully address the underlying questions of the study (Schulz et al., 2013). Moreover, it maximizes the potential of identifying a threshold fCO2_level concentration, if present (by allowing for a larger number of treatment levels). Carbon dioxide manipulation was carried out in four steps and took place between days 0 to 4 until the target fCO_2 was reached. Initial fugacity of CO_2 (fCO_2) was 240 µatm. For fCO_2 manipulations, 50 µm filtered natural seawater was saturated with CO2 and then injected evenly throughout the depth of the mesocosms as described by Riebesell et al. (2013). Two mesocosms functioned as controls and were treated in a similar manner using only filtered seawater. On day 15, a supplementary fCO₂ addition was made to the top 7 m of mesocosms numbered 3, 6, and 8 to replace CO₂ lost due to outgassing (Paul et al., 2015; Spilling et al., 2016). Throughout this study we refer to fCO₂ which accounts for the non-ideal behavior of CO₂ gas and is considered the standard measurement required for gas exchange (Pfeil et al., 2012). Initial nutrient concentrations were 0.05 μ mol L⁻¹, 0.15 μ mol L⁻¹, 6.2 μ mol L⁻¹ and 0.2 μ mol L⁻¹ for nitrate, phosphate, silicate and ammonium, respectively. Nutrient concentrations remained low for the duration of the experiment (Paul et al., 2015, this issue) and no nutrients were added. Salinity was relatively constant around 5.7. Temperature was more variable; on average temperature within the mesocosms (0-17 m) increased from ~8 °C to a maximum on day 15 of ~15 °C and then decreased again to ~8 °C by day 30. For further details of the experimental set-up, carbonate chemistry dynamics and nutrient concentrations throughout the experiment we refer to the general overview paper by Paul et al. (2015). Collective sampling was performed every morning using depth integrated water samplers (IWS, HYDRO-BIOS, Kiel). These sampling devices were gently lowered through the water column collecting ~5 L of water gradually between 0-10 m (top) or 0-17 m (whole water column). Water was collected

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

from all mesocosms and the surrounding water. Subsamples were obtained for enumeration of phytoplankton, prokaryotes and viruses. Samples for viral lysis and grazing experiments were taken from 5 m depth using a gentle vacuum-driven pump system. Samples were protected against sunlight and warming by thick black plastic bags containing wet ice. Samples were processed at in situ temperature (representative of 5 m depth) under dim light and handled using nitrile gloves. As viral lysis and grazing rates were determined from samples taken from 5 m depth, samples for microbial abundances reported here were taken from the top 10 m integrated samples.

The experimental period has been divided into four phases based on major physical and biological changes (Paul et al., 2015): Phase 0 before CO₂ addition (days -5 to 0), Phase I (days 1-16), Phase II (days 17-30) and Phase III (days 31-43). Throughout this manuscript the data are presented using three colors (blue, grey and red), representing low (mesocosms M1 and M5) intermediate (M6 and

2.2 Microbial abundances

M7) and high (M3 and M8) fCO_2 concentrations levels (Table 1).

Microbes were enumerated using a Becton Dickinson FACSCalibur flow cytometer (FCM) equipped with a 488 nm argon laser. The samples were stored on wet ice and in the dark until counting. The photoautotrophic cells (<20 μm) were counted directly using fresh seawater and were discriminated by their autofluorescent pigments. Six phytoplankton clusters were differentiated based on the bivariant plots of either chlorophyll (red autofluorescence) or phycoerythrin (orange autofluorescence, for *Synechococcus* and Pico-III) against side scatter. The size of the different phytoplankton clusters was determined by gentle filtration through 25 mm diameter polycarbonate filters (Whatman) with a range of pore sizes (12, 10, 8, 5, 3, 2, 1, and 0.8 μm) according to Veldhuis and Kraay (2004). Average cell sizes for the different phytoplankton groups were 1, 1, 3, 2.9, 5.2, and 8.8 μm diameter for the prokaryotic cyanobacteria *Synechococcus* spp. (SYN), picoeukaryotic phytoplankton I, II and III (Pico-I-III), and nanoeukaryotic phytoplankton I, and II (Nano-I, II), respectively. Pico-III was discriminated from Pico-II (comparable average cell size) by a higher orange

autofluorescence signature, potentially representing small-sized cryptophytes (Klaveness, 1989); alternatively large single cells or microcolonies of *Synechococcus* (Haverkamp et al., 2009). The cyanobacterial species *Prochlorococcus* spp. were not observed during this experiment. Counts were converted to cellular carbon by assuming a spherical shape equivalent to the average cell diameters determined from size fractionations and applying conversion factors of 237 fg C μ m⁻³ (Worden et al., 2004) and 196.5 fg C μ m⁻³ (Garrison et al., 2000) for pico- and nano-sized plankton, respectively. Microbial net growth and loss rates were derived from exponential regressions of changes in the cell abundances over time.

frozen (-80 °C) samples according to Marie et al. (1999) and Brussaard (2004), respectively. The prokaryotes include heterotrophic bacteria, archaea and unicellular cyanobacteria, the latter accounting for maximal 10 % of the total abundance in our samples, as indicated by their autofluorescence. Briefly, thawed samples were diluted with sterile autoclaved Tris-EDTA buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl and 1 mM EDTA, pH 8.2; Mojica et al., 2014) and stained with the green fluorescent nucleic acid-specific dye SYBR-Green I (Invitrogen Inc.) to a final concentration of the commercial stock of 1.0×10^{-4} (for prokaryotes) or 0.5×10^{-4} (for viruses). Virus samples were stained at 80 °C for 10 min and then allowed to cool for 5 min at room temperature in the dark. Prokaryotes were stained for 15 min at room temperature in the dark (Brussaard, 2004). Prokaryotes and viruses were discriminated in bivariate scatter plots of green fluorescence versus side scatter. Final counts were corrected for blanks prepared and analyzed in a similar manner as the samples. Two groups of prokaryotes were identified by their stained nucleic acid fluorescence, referred here on as low (LNA) and high (HNA) fluorescence prokaryotes.

2.3 Viral lysis and grazing

Microzooplankton grazing and viral lysis of phytoplankton was determined using the modified dilution assay, based on reducing grazing and viral lysis mortality pressure in a serial manner allowing

for increased phytoplankton growth (over the incubation period) with dilution (Mojica et al., 2016). Briefly, two dilution series were created in clear 1.2 L polycarbonate bottles by gently mixing 200 μm sieved whole seawater with either 0.45 µm filtered seawater (i.e. microzooplankton grazers removed) or 30 KDa filtered seawater (i.e. grazers and viruses removed) to final dilutions of 20, 40, 70 and 100 %. The 0.45 µm filtrate was produced by gravity filtration of 200 µm mesh sieved seawater through a 0.45 µm Sartopore capsule filter. The 30 KDa ultrafiltrate was produced by tangential flow filtration of 200 µm pre-sieved seawater using a 30 kDa Vivaflow 200 PES membrane tangential flow cartridge (Vivascience). All treatments were performed in triplicate. Bottles were suspended next to the mesocosms in small cages at 5 m depth for 24 hours. Subsamples were taken at 0 and 24 h, and phytoplankton abundances of the grazing series (0.45 µm diluent) were enumerated by flow cytometry. Due to time constraint, the majority of the samples of the 30 kDa series were fixed with 1 % (final concentration) formaldehyde: hexamine solution (18 % v/v: 10 % w/v), for 30 min at 4 °C, flash frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80 °C until flow cytometry analysis in the home laboratory. Fixation had no significant effect (student's t-tests, p-value >0.05) as tested periodically against fresh samples. The modified dilution assay was only run for Mesocosms 1 (low fCO₂) and 3 (high fCO₂) due to the logistics of handling times. Experiments were performed until day 31. Grazing rates and the combined rate of grazing and viral lysis were estimated from the slope of a regression of phytoplankton apparent growth versus dilution of the 0.45 μm and 30 kDa series, respectively. A significant difference between the two regression coefficients (as tested by analysis of covariance) indicated a significant viral lysis rate. Phytoplankton gross growth rate, in the absence of grazing and viral lysis, was derived from the y-intercept of the 30 kDa series regression. Similarly, significant differences between mesocosms M1 and M3 (low and high fCO₂) were determined through analysis of covariance of the dilution series for the two mesocosms. A significance threshold of 0.05 was used and significance is denoted throughout the manuscript by an asterisk (*). Occasionally, the regression of apparent growth rate versus fraction of natural water resulted in a positive slope (thus no reduction in mortality with dilution). In addition, very low phytoplankton

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

abundances can also prohibit statistical significance of results. Under such conditions dilution experiments were deemed unsuccessful (see for limitations of the modified dilution method, Baudoux et al., 2006; Kimmance and Brussaard, 2010; Stoecker et al., 2015). Viral lysis of prokaryotes was determined according to the viral production assay (Wilhelm et al., 2002; Winget et al., 2005). After reduction of the natural virus concentration, new virus production by the natural bacterial community is sampled and tracked over time (24 h). Briefly, free viruses were reduced from a 300 ml sample of whole water by re-circulation over a 0.2 µm pore size polyether sulfone membrane (PES) tangential flow filter (Vivaflow 50, Vivascience) at a filtrate expulsion rate of 40 ml min⁻¹. The concentrated sample was then reconstituted to the original volume using virus-free seawater. This process was repeated a total of three times to gradually wash away viruses. After the final reconstitution, 50 ml aliquots were distributed into six polycarbonate tubes. Mitomycin C (Sigma-Aldrich) (final concentration, 1 µg ml⁻¹, maintained at 4 °C), which induces lysogenic bacteria (Weinbauer and Suttle, 1996) was added to a second series of triplicate samples for each mesocosm. A third series of incubations with 0.2 µm filtered samples was used as a control for viral loss (e.g. viruses adhering to the tube walls) and showed no significant loss of free viruses during the incubations. At the start of the experiment, 1 ml subsamples were immediately removed from each tube and fixed as previously described for viral and bacterial abundance. The samples were dark incubated at in situ temperature and 1 ml subsamples were taken at 3 h, 6 h, 9 h, 12 h and 24 h. Virus production was determined from linear regression of viral abundance over time. Viral production due to induction of lysogeny was calculated as the difference between production in the unamended samples and production of samples to which mitomycin C was added. Although mortality experiments were initially planned to be employed for mesocosms 1, 2, and 3 representing low, mid and high fCO₂ conditions, mesocosm 2 was compromised due to leakage. Additionally, due to logistical reasons assays were only performed until day 21. To determine grazing rates on prokaryotes, fluorescently labeled bacteria (FLBs) were prepared from enriched natural bacterial assemblages (originating from the North Sea) labeled with 5-([4,6-

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

Dichlorotriazin-2-yl]amino) fluorescein (DTAF, 36565 Sigma-Aldrich 40 μ g ml⁻¹) according to Sherr et al. (1993). Frozen ampoules of FLB (1-5 % of total bacterial abundance) were added to triplicate 1 L incubation bottles containing whole water gently passed through 200 μ m mesh. Twenty ml samples were taken immediately after addition (0 h) and the headspace was removed by gently squeezing air from the bottle. The 1 L bottles were incubated on a slow turning wheel (1 rpm) at in situ light and temperature conditions (representative of 5 m depth) for 24 h. Sampling was repeated after 24 h. All samples were fixed to a 1 % final concentration of gluteraldehyde (0.2 μ m filtered; 25 % EM-grade), stained (in the dark for 30 min at 4 °C) with 4',6-Diamidino-2-Phenylindole, Dihydrochloride (DAPI) solution (0.2 μ m filtered; Acrodisc *25 mm Syringe filters, PALL Life Sciences; 2 μ g ml⁻¹ final concentration; Sherr et al., 1993) and filtered onto 25 mm, 0.2 μ m black polycarbonate filters (GE Healthcare life sciences). Filters were then mounted on microscopic slides and stored at -20 °C until analysis. FLBs present on a ~0.75 mm² area were counted using a Zeiss Axioplan 2 microscope. Grazing (μ d⁻¹) was measured according to N_{T24} = N_{T0} * e^{- μ t}, where N_{T24} and N_{T0} are the number of FLBs present at 24 h and 0 h, respectively.

2.4 Statistics

Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) was used to follow microbial community development in each mesocosm over the experimental period. NMDS is an ordination technique which represents the dissimilarities obtained from an abundance data matrix in a 2-dimensional space (Legendre and Legendre, 1998). In this case, the data matrix was comprised of abundance data for each phytoplankton group in each mesocosm for every day of sampling. The treatment effect was assessed by analysis of similarity (ANOSIM; Clarke, 1993) and inspection of the NMDS biplot. ANOSIM compares the mean of ranked dissimilarities of mesocosms between fCO_2 treatments (low: 1, 5, 7; high: 6, 3, 8) to the mean of ranked dissimilarities within treatments per phase. The NMDS plots allowed divergence periods in the development and community composition between treatments to be visually assessed (period 1 from day 3-13 and period 2 from days 16-24). Net growth rates of each

of the different microbial groups were calculated for these identified divergence periods. Relationships between net growth rates and peak cell abundances with fCO_2 were evaluated by linear regression against the average fCO_2 per mesocosm during each period or peak day. A generalized linear model was used to test the relationship between prokaryote abundance and carbon biomass with an ARMA correlation structure of order 3 to account for temporal autocorrelation. The model fulfilled all assumptions such as homoscedasticity and avoiding autocorrelation of the residuals (Zuur et al., 2007). A significance threshold of p \leq 0.05 was used and significance is denoted by an asterisk (*). All analyses were performed using the statistical software program R, using packages nlme (Pinheiro et al., 2017) and vegan (Oksanen et al., 2017) (R core Team, 2017). Where average of low and high mesocosm abundance data are reported, values represent the average of mesocosms 1, 5, 7 (mean fCO_2 365-497 μ atm) and 6, 3, 8 (821-1231 μ atm), respectively.

3 Results

3.1 Total phytoplankton dynamics in response to CO₂ enrichment

During Phase 0, low variability in phytoplankton abundances $\frac{1.5 \pm 0.05}{\text{m}^{-1}}$ indicated good replicability of initial conditions prior to CO_2 manipulation (Fig. 1). This was further supported by the high similarity between microbial communities $\frac{1.5 \pm 0.05}{\text{m}^{-1}}$ the different mesocosms as indicated by the tight clustering of points in the NMDS plot during this period (Fig. 2). During Phase 0, the phytoplankton community (<20 μ m) was dominated by pico-sized autotrophs, with the prokaryotic cyanobacteria *Synechococcus* (SYN) and Pico-I accounting for 69 % and 27 % of total phytoplankton abundance, respectively. After CO_2 addition, there were two primary peaks in phytoplankton, which occurred on day 4 in Phase I and day 24 in Phase II (Fig. 1a). The phytoplankton community became significantly different over time in the different treatments (ANOSIM, p=0.01, Fig. 2). Two periods were identified based on their divergence (Fig.2), the first (NMDS-based period 1) followed the initial peak in abundance (days 3-13) with highest abundances occurring in the

elevated CO₂ mesocosms (Fig. 1a). During the second period (NMDS-based period 2, days 16-24), abundances were higher in the low fCO₂ mesocosms (Fig. 1a). In general the NMDS plot shows that throughout the experiment, mesocosm M1 followed the same basic trajectory as mesocosms M5 and M7, whilst mesocosm M3 followed M6 and M8 (Fig. 2). Thus, the two mesocosms (representing high and low fCO₂ treatments) deviated from each other during Phase I and were clearly separated during Phases II and III (Fig. 2).

Phytoplankton abundances in the surrounding water started to differ from the mesocosms during Phase 0 (on average 44 % lower) which was primarily due to lower abundances of SYN. This effect was seen from day -1, prior to CO₂ addition but following bubbling with compressed air (day -5). On day 15, a deep mixing event occurred as a result of storm conditions (with consequent alterations in temperature and salinity) and as a result phytoplankton abundances in the surrounding open water diverged more strongly from the mesocosms but remained similar in their dynamics (Fig. 3).

Microbial abundances in the 0-17 m samples were slightly lower but showed very similar dynamics to those in the 0-10 m samples (Fig. S1).

3.1.1 Synechococcus

The prokaryotic cyanobacteria *Synechococcus* (SYN) accounted for the majority of total abundance, i.e. 74 % averaged across all mesocosms over the experimental period. Abundances of SYN showed distinct variability between the different CO_2 treatments, starting on day 7, with the low CO_2 mesocosms exhibiting nearly 20 % lower abundances between days 11-15 as compared to high fCO_2 mesocosms (Fig. 3a). SYN net growth rates during days 3-13 (NMDS-based period 1) were positively correlated with CO_2 (p=0.10, R^2 =0.53; Table 2, Fig. S2a). One explanation for higher net growth rates at elevated CO_2 could be the significantly (p<0.05) higher grazing rate in the low fCO_2 mesocosm M1 (0.56 d⁻¹) compared to the high fCO_2 M3 (0.27 d⁻¹) as measured on day 10 (Fig. 4a). After day 16, SYN abundances increased in all mesocosms and during this period (days 16-24) net growth rates had a significant negative correlation to fCO_2 (p=0.05, R^2 = 0.63; Figs. 3a, Table 2 and Fig. S3a).

Consequently, the net increase in SYN abundances during this period was on average 20 % higher at low fCO_2 compared to high fCO_2 . This corresponded to higher total loss rates in high fCO_2 treatments measured on day 17 (0.33 vs 0.17 d⁻¹ for M3 and M1, respectively; Fig. 4a). The higher net growth most likely led to the peak in SYN abundance observed on day 24 (max. 4.7 x 10^5 ml⁻¹), which was negatively correlated with fCO_2 (p=0.01, R²=0.80; Table 3, Fig. S4a). After this period (days 24-28), SYN abundances declined at comparable rates in the different mesocosms, irrespective of fCO_2 (Fig. 3a). Abundances in the low fCO_2 mesocosms remained higher into Phase III (Fig. 3a). SYN abundances in the surrounding water were generally lower than in the mesocosms, with the exception of days 17-21.

3.1.2 Picoeukaryotes

In contrast to the prokaryotic photoautotrophs, the eukaryotic phytoplankton community showed a strong positive response to elevated fCO_2 (Fig. 1b). Pico-I was the numerically dominant group of eukaryotic phytoplankton, accounting for an average 21-26 % of total phytoplankton abundances. Net growth rates leading up to the first peak in abundance (from day 1 to 5) had a strong positive correlation with fCO_2 (p<0.01, R²=0.90; Fig. 3b, Table 3, Fig. S5a). Accordingly, the peak on day 5 (max. 1.1 x 10⁵ ml⁻¹; Fig. 3b) was also correlated positively with fCO_2 (p=0.01, R²=0.81; Table 3, Fig. S4b). During Phase I, from days 3-13 (i.e. NMDS-based period 1), net growth rates of Pico-I remained positively correlated to CO_2 concentration (p=0.01, R²=0.80; Table 2, Fig. S2b). However, during this period there was also a decline in abundance (days 5-9; p<0.01, R²=0.89; Table 3, Fig. S5b) with 23 % more cells lost in the low fCO_2 mesocosms. Accordingly, following this period, gross growth rate was significantly higher in the high fCO_2 mesocosm M3 as compared to the low fCO_2 mesocosm M1 (day 10, p<0.05; Fig. 4b). Pico-I abundances in the surrounding open water started to deviate from the mesocosms after day 10, and were on average around half that of the low fCO_2 mesocosms (Fig. 3b). Following a brief increase (occurring between days 11-13) correlated to fCO_2 (p<0.01, R²=0.94; Table 3, Fig. S4c), abundances declined sharply between days 13-16 (Fig. 3b), coinciding with a significantly

higher total mortality rate in the high fCO₂ mesocosm M3 (day 13; Fig. 4b). Viral lysis was a substantial loss factor relative to grazing, for this group, comprising an average 45 % and 70 % of total losses in M1 and M3, respectively (Table S1). During NMDS-based period 2, net growth rates of Pico-I were significantly higher at high fCO_2 (p=0.05, R²=0.64; Table 2, Fig S3b). By day 21, abundances in the high fCO2 mesocosms were (on average) ~2-fold higher than at low fCO2 (maximum abundances 8.7 x 10^4 ml⁻¹ and 5.9 x 10^4 ml⁻¹ for high and low fCO_2 mesocosms; p=0.01, R^2 =0.84; Table 3, Fig. S4d). Standing stock of Pico-I remained high in the elevated fCO_2 mesocosms for the remainder of the experiment (7.9 x 10⁴ vs 4.3 x 10⁴ ml⁻¹ on average for high and low fCO₂ mesocosms, respectively; Fig. 3b). Additionally, gross growth rates during this final period were relatively low (0.14 and 0.16 d⁻¹ in M1 and M3, respectively) and comparable to total loss rates (averaging 0.13 and 0.10 d⁻¹ over days 25-31, for M1 and M3, respectively; Fig. 4b). Another pico-eukaryote group, Pico-II, slowly increased in abundance until day 13, when it increased more rapidly (Fig. 3c). Gross growth rates measured during Phase I were high (0.69 and 0.72 d⁻¹ on average in the low and high fCO₂ mesocosms M1 and M3, respectively; Fig. 4c), and comparable to loss processes (0.46 and 0.58 d⁻¹), indicative of a relatively high turnover rate of production. Overall net growth rates during days 3-13 (NMDS-based period 1) did not correlate to CO₂ (p=0.52, R²=0.11; Table 2, Fig. S2c). However, during periods of rapid increases in net growth, abundances were positively correlated to CO₂ concentration (days 12-17; p=0.01, R²=0.82; Table 3, Fig. S5c). Accordingly, the peak in abundances of Pico-II on day 17 displayed a distinct positive correlation with fCO_2 (p<0.01, R²=0.93; Table 3, Fig. S4e), with maximum abundances of 4.6 x 10^3 ml⁻¹ and 3.4 x 10^3 ml⁻¹ for the high and low fCO₂ mecososms, respectively (Fig. 3c). In M8 (the highest fCO₂ mesocosm), abundances increased for an extra day with the peak occurring on day 18, resulting in an average 23 % higher abundances. During the decline of the Pico-II peak (days 16-24), net growth rates were negatively correlated with fCO_2 (p=0.10, R²=0.52; Table 2, Fig S3c). Moreover, the rate of decline was faster for the high fCO_2 mesocosms during days 18-21 (p<0.01, R²=0.85). The Pico-II abundances in

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

the surrounding water were comparable to the mesocosms during Phases 0 and I, lower during Phase II and higher during Phase III (Fig. 3c). Pico-III exhibited a short initial increase in abundances in the low fCO₂ treatments, resulting in nearly 2-fold higher abundances at low fCO₂ by day 3 compared to the high fCO₂ treatment (Fig. 3d). After this initial period, net growth rates of this group had a significant positive correlation with fCO_2 (days 3-13; p=0.04, R²=0.67; Table 2, Fig. S2d). In general, during Phase I gross growth (p<0.01, days 1, 3, 10; Fig. 4d) and total mortality (p<0.05, days 1, 6, 10; Fig. 4d) were significantly higher in the low fCO₂ mesocosm M1, as compared to the high fCO₂ mesocosm M3 resulting in low net growth rates. During Phase II (days 16-24, NMDS-based period 2) the opposite occurred; i.e. net growth rates were negatively correlated with fCO_2 (p<0.01, R²=0.86; Table 2, Fig S.3d). Maximum Pico-III abundances (day 24: 4.2×10^3 and 8.3×10^3 ml⁻¹ for high and low fCO_2) had a strong negative correlation with fCO_2 (p<0.01, R²=0.91; Table 3, Fig. S4f). Pico-III abundances remained noticeably higher in the low fCO₂ mesocosms during Phases II and III (on average 80 %; Fig. 3d). Unfortunately, almost half of the mortality assays in this second half of the experiment failed (see Materials and Methods), but the successful assays suggest that losses were minor (<0.15 d⁻¹; Fig. 4d) and primarily due to grazing, as no significant viral lysis was detected (Table S1).

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

405

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

3.1.3 Nanoeukaryotes

Nano-I showed maximum abundances $(4.3 \pm 0.4 \times 10^2 \text{ ml}^{-1})$ on day 6 (except M1 which peaked on day 5), independent of fCO_2 (p=0.23, R²=0.33; Fig. 3e). There was, however, a negative correlation of net growth rate with fCO_2 during days 3-13 (NMDS-based period 1; p=0.01, R²=0.79; Table 2, Fig. S2e). A second major peak in abundance of Nano-I occurred on day 17, with markedly higher numbers in the low fCO_2 mesocosms $(4.1 \times 10^2 \text{ ml}^{-1} \text{ as compared to } 2.4 \times 10^2 \text{ ml}^{-1} \text{ in high } fCO_2 \text{ mesocosms}$; p=0.04, R²=0.67; Fig. 3e, Table 3 and Fig. S4g). Total loss rates in the high fCO_2 mesocosm M3 on days 6 and 10 were 2.3-fold higher compared to the low fCO_2 mesocosms M1 (Fig. 4e), which may help to explain this discrepancy in total abundance between low and high fCO_2 mesocosms. Viral lysis made

up to 98 % of total losses in the high fCO₂ mesocosm M3 during this period, whilst in M1 viral lysis was only detected on day 13 (Table S1). Peak abundances (around 5.0 x 10² ml⁻¹) were much lower compared to those in the surrounding waters (max ~2.4 x 10³ ml⁻¹; Figs. 3e and S6a). During Phase II, Nano-I abundances in the surrounding waters displayed rather erratic dynamics compared to those of the mesocosms, but converged during certain periods (e.g. days 19-22). No significant relationship was found between net loss rates and fCO_2 for the second NMDS-based period (p=0.26, R²=0.30; Table 2, Fig S.3e). At the end of Phase II, abundances were similar in all mesocosms but diverged again during Phase III (days 31-39) due primarily to a negative effect of CO₂ on Nano-I abundances, as depicted in the average 36 % reduction in Nano-I. The temporal dynamics of Nano-II, the least abundant phytoplankton group analysed in our study, displayed the largest variability (Fig. 3f), perhaps due to the spread of this cluster in flow cytographs (which may indicate that this group represents several different phytoplankton species). No significant relationship was found between net growth rate and fCO2 for this group for the two NMDS-based periods (Table 2, Figs S2f and S3f) nor with the peak in abundances on day 17 (p=0.13, R²=0.46; Fig. S4h). Moreover, no consistent trend was detected in mortality rates (Fig. 4f). Similar to Nano-I, abundances in the surrounding water were often higher than in the mesocosms (max 3.5 x $10^2 \, \text{ml}^{-1} \, \text{vs} \, 1.1 \, \text{x} \, 10^4 \, \text{ml}^{-1}$, respectively; Figs. 3f and S6b).

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

3.1.4 Algal carbon biomass

The mean combined biomass of Pico-I and Pico-II showed a strong positive correlation with fCO_2 throughout the experiment (p<0.05, R²=0.95; Fig. 5a), an effect already noticeable by day 2. Their biomass in the high fCO_2 mesocosms was, on average 11 % higher than in the low fCO_2 mesocosms between days 10-20 and 20 % higher between days 20-39. Conversely, the remaining algal groups showed an average 10 % reduction in carbon biomass at enhanced fCO_2 (days 3-39, the sum of SYN, Pico-III, Nano-I and II; p<0.01; Fig. 5b). The most notable response was found for the biomass of Pico-III, which showed an immediate negative response to CO_2 addition (Fig. S7a) and remained, on

average, 29 % lower throughout the study period (days 2-39). For Nano-I and II the lower carbon biomass only became apparent during the end of Phase I and beginning of Phase II (days 14-20; Fig. S7b). Due to its small cell size, the numerically dominant SYN accounted for an average of 40 % of total carbon biomass.

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

442

443

444

445

3.2 Prokaryote and virus population dynamics

Prokaryote abundance in the mesocosms was positively related to total algal biomass independent of treatment (p<0.05, R²=0.33; Fig. 8) and generally followed total algal biomass (Fig. S7c). The initial increase in total prokaryote abundances occurred during the first few days following the closure of the mesocosms (Fig. 6a). This was primarily due to increases in the HNA-prokaryote group (Fig. 6b) which displayed higher net growth rates (0.22 d⁻¹) compared to the LNA-prokaryotes (0.14 d⁻¹ foron days -3 to 3; Fig. 6c). A similar, albeit somewhat lower, increase was also recorded in the surrounding waters (Fig. 6a). The decline of the first peak in prokaryote abundances coincided with the decay in phytoplankton abundance/biomass (Figs. 1a and S7c). Concurrently the share of viral lysis increased, representing 37-39 % of total mortality on day 11 (Fig. 7b). No measurable rates of lysogeny were found for the prokaryotic community during the experimental period (all phases). From days 10 to 15 prokaryote dynamics (total, HNA and LNA) became noticeably affected by CO2 concentration with a significant positive correlation between net growth and fCO₂ during Phase I (days 3-13 NMDS-based period 1; Table 2, Fig. S2 g and h). In the higher fCO₂ mesocosms, the decline in prokaryote abundance occurring between days 13 and 16 (Fig. 6a) was largely (70 %) due to decreasing HNAprokaryote numbers (Fig. 6b). The grazing was 1.6-fold higher in the high fCO₂ mesocosm M3 compared to M1 (0.36 \pm 0.13 and 0.14 \pm 0.08 d⁻¹ on day 14; Fig. 7a). At the same time, virus abundance increased in the high fCO₂ mesocosms (Fig. 6d). During Phase II, prokaryote abundances increased steadily until day 24 (for both HNA and LNA), corresponding to increased algal biomass (Figs. 6 and S7c) and lowered grazing rates (Fig. 7a). Specifically, during days 16-24 (NMDS-based period 2), the HNA-prokaryotes showed an average 10

% higher abundances in the low, as compared to the high fCO_2 mesocosms (Fig. 6b). However, a significant negative correlation of net growth rates and fCO_2 was only found for LNA (Table 2, Fig S3g and h). No significant differences in loss rates between M1 and M3 were found during Phase II (p=0.22, 0.46 days 18 and 21 respectively; Fig. 7). Halfway through Phase II (day 24), the prokaryote abundance in the surrounding water leveled off (Fig. 6a). Prokaryote abundance ultimately declined during days 28-35 (Fig. 6a), whereby the net growth of LNA was again negatively correlated with enhanced CO_2 (p=0.02, R^2 =0.76; Table 2, Fig S3g). Unfortunately, no experimental data on grazing and lysis of prokaryotes is present after day 25. However, viral abundances increased steadily at 2.2 x 10^6 d⁻¹, concomitant with a decline in prokaryote abundance (Fig. 6a and d). There was no significant correlation between viral abundances and fCO_2 during Phases II and III (p=0.36, R^2 =0.21).

4 Discussion

In most experimental mesocosm studies, nutrients have been added to stimulate phytoplankton growth (Schulz et al., 2017) therefore little data exists for oligotrophic phytoplankton communities. In this study, we describe the impact of increased fCO_2 on the brackish Baltic Sea microbial community during summer (nutrient depleted; Paul et al., 2015). Small-sized phytoplankton numerically dominated the autotrophic community, in particular SYN and Pico-I (both about 1 μ m cell diameter). Our results demonstrate variable effects of fCO_2 manipulation on temporal phytoplankton dynamics, dependent on phytoplankton group. In particular, Pico-I and Pico-II showed significant positive responses, whilst the abundances of Pico-III, SYN and Nano-I were negatively influenced by elevated fCO_2 . The impact of OA on the different groups was, at times, a direct consequence of alterations in gross growth rate, whilst overall phytoplankton population dynamics could be explained by the combination of growth and losses. OA effects on community composition in these systems may have consequences on both the food web and biogeochemical cycling.

Comparison with surrounding waters

During Phase 0, the microbial assemblage showed good replicability between all mesocosms, however they had already began to deviate from the community in the surrounding waters. This was most likely a consequence of water movement altering the physical conditions and biological composition of the surrounding water body. The dynamic nature of water movement in this region has been shown to alter the entire phytoplankton community several times over within a few months, due to fluctuations in nutrient supply, advection, replacement/mixing of water masses and water temperature (Lips and Lips, 2010). Alternatively, effects of enclosure and the techniques (bubbling) used to ensure a homogenous water column may have stimulated SYN within the mesocosms-, which has been found to occur in several mesocosm experiments (Paulino et al., 2008; Gazeau et al., 2017). By Phases II and III, the microbial abundances within the mesocosms were distinctly different from the surrounding waters, with generally fewer SYN and Pico-I, and more Nano-I and Nano-II. Our statistical analysis shows that during this time, there was little similarity between the surrounding waters and mesocosms regardless of the CO₂ treatment level. Thus, the deviations during this time were most likely due to an upwelling event in the archipelago (days 17-30; Paul et al., 2015). Cold, nutrient-rich deep water has been shown to occurupwell during summer, with profound positive influence on ecosystem productivity (Nômmann et al., 1991; Lehman and Myrberg, 2008). A relaxation from nutrient limitation in vertically stratified waters disproportionately favours larger-sized phytoplankton, due to their higher nutrient requirements and lower capacity to compete at low concentrations dictated by their lower surface to volume ratio (Raven, 1998; Veldhuis et al., 2005). Inside the mesocosms, which were isolated from upwelled nutrients, picoeukaryotes dominated similar to a stratified water column. Following this upwelling event, the pH of the surrounding waters dropped from 8.3 to 7.8, a level comparable to the highest CO₂ treatment (M8) on day 32 (Paul et al., 2015). Suggesting that other factors contributed to the observed differences between mesocosms and surrounding water, than can be accounted for by CO₂ concentration alone e.g. nutrients. Alternatively, the magnitude and source of mortality occurring in the surrounding water may have been altered, compared to within the mesocosms, after such an

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

upwelling event. Although the grazer community in the surrounding waters was not studied during this campaign, it is likely that the grazing community was completely restructured during the upwelling event (Uitto et al., 1997). It is nonetheless noteworthy that the phytoplankton groups with distinct responses to CO_2 enrichment (either positive or negative) in the low (ambient) fCO_2 mesocosms diverged from those in the surrounding water before the upwelling event occurred.

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

520

521

522

523

524

Phytoplankton dynamics

Synechococcus showed significantly lower net growth rates and peak abundances at higher fCO₂. Both in laboratory and mesoscosm experiments, Synechococcus has been reported to have diverse responses to CO₂, with approximately equal accounts of positive (Lu et al., 2006; Schulz et al., 2017), negative (Paulino et al., 20072008; Hopkins et al., 2010; Traving et al., 2014,) and insignificant changes (Fu et al., 2007; Lu et al., 2006) in net growth rate with fCO_2 . This variable response is probably due, at least in part, to the broad physiological and genetic diversity of this species. In the Gulf of Finland alone, 46 different strains of Synechococcus were isolated in July 2004 (Haverkamp et al. 2009). Direct effects on physiology have been implied from laboratory studies. One isolate, a phycoerythrin rich strain of Synechococcus WH7803 (Traving et al., 2014) elicited a negative physiological effect on the growth rate from increased CO2. This was most likely a consequence of higher sensitivity to the lower pH (Traving et al., 2014), and the cellular cost of maintaining pH homeostasis or conversely a direct effect on protein export. Additionally, Lu et al. (2006) reported increased growth rates in a cultured phycocyanin rich but not a phycoerythrin rich strain of Synechococcus, suggesting that pigments may play some part in defining the direct physiological response within Synechococcus. In addition, within natural communities (Paulino et al., 20072008; Hopkins et al., 2010; Schulz et al., 2017) variability can also arise from indirect effects such a altering competition with other picoplankton (Paulino et al., 20072008). The delay and dampened effect of fCO₂ on SYN abundances within our study was more likely due to indirect effects arising from alterations in food web dynamics than to direct impacts on the physiology of this species.

Specifically, significant differences in grazing rates of SYN between M1 and M3 (days 10 and 17, no significant lysis detected) could be responsible for the differing dynamics between the mesocosms at the end of Phase I and beginning of Phase II. The gross growth rates of Pico-I were significantly higher (p<0.05) at high fCO_2 compared to the low CO₂ concentrations during the first 10 days of Phase I. Moreover, no differences were detected in the measured loss rates, demonstrating that increases in Pico-I were the due to increases in growth alone. The stimulation of Pico-I by elevated fCO₂ may be due to a stronger reliance on diffusive CO₂ entry compared to larger cells. Model simulations reveal that whilst near-cell CO₂/pH conditions are close to those of the bulk water for cells <5 µm in diameter, they diverge as cell diameters increase (Flynn et al., 2012). This is due to the size-dependent thickness of the diffusive boundary layer, which determines the diffusional transport across the boundary layer and to the cell surface (Wolf-Gladrow and Riebesell, 1997; Flynn et al., 2012). It is suggested that larger cells may be more able to cope with fCO₂ variability as their carbon acquisition is more geared towards handling low CO₂ concentrations in their diffusive boundary layer, e.g. by means of active carbon acquisition and bicarbonate utilization (Wolf-Gladrow and Riebesell, 1997; Flynn et al., 2012). Moreover, as the Baltic Sea experiences particularly large seasonal fluctuations in pH and fCO_2 (Jansson et al., 2013) due to the low buffering capacity of the waters, phytoplankton here are expected to have a higher degree of physiological plasticity. Our results agree with previous mesocosm studies, which reported enhanced abundances of picoeukaryotic phytoplankton (Brussaard et al., 2013; Davidson et al, 2016; Schulz et al., 2017), and particularly the prasinophyte Micromonas pusilla at higher fCO_2 (Engel et al., 2007; Meakin and Wyman, 2011). Furthermore, Schaum et al. (2012) found that 16 ecotypes of Ostreococus tauri (another prasinophyte similar in size to Pico-I) increased in growth rate by 1.4-1.7 fold at 1,000 compared to 400 μ atm fCO_2 . All ecotypes increased their photosynthetic rates and those with most plasticity (those most able to vary their photosynthetic rate in response to changes in $f(CO_2)$ were more likely to increase in frequency within the community. It is possible that Pico-I cells are adapted to a highly variable carbonate system regime and are able to increase their

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

photosynthetic rate when additional CO2 is available. This ability would allow them to out-compete other phytoplankton (e.g. nanoeukaryotes in this study) in an environment when nutrients are scarce. The net growth rates and peak abundances of Pico-II were also positively affected by fCO₂. Gross growth rates were significantly higher at high fCO_2 on only two occasions (days 10 and 20) and were accompanied by high total mortality rates. Pigment analysis suggests that both Pico-I and Pico-II are chlorophytes (Paul et al., 2015) and as such may share a common evolutionary history (Schulz et al., 2017); thus Pico-II may be stimulated by fCO₂ in a similar manner to Pico I. Chlorophytes are found in high numbers at this site throughout the year (Kuosa, 1991), suggesting the ecological relevance of Pico-I and Pico-II in this ecosystem. In addition, Pico-II bloomed exactly when Pico-I declined which may suggest potential competitive exclusion. Pico-III showed the most distinct and immediate response to CO₂ addition. The significant reduction in gross growth rates observed during Phase I suggests a direct negative effect of CO2 on the physiology of these cells. For this group, the lower gross growth rates were matched by lower total mortality rates with increased fCO2. Although the mean cell size of Pico-III and Pico-II were comparable (2.9 and 2.5 μm, respectively), they showed opposing responses to fCO₂ enrichment (lower Pico-III abundances at high fCO₂). These differences may arise from taxonomic differences between the two groups. Pico-III displayed relatively high phycoerythrin orange autofluorescence, likely representing small-sized cryptophytes (Klaveness, 1989), although rod-shaped Synechococcus up to 2.9 µm in length (isolated from this region; Haverkamp et al., 2009) or Synechococcus microcolonies (often only two cells in the Baltic; Motwani and Gorokhove, 2013) cannot be excluded. In agreement with Pico-III response to CO₂ enrichment, Hopkins et al. (2010) reported reduced abundances of small cryptophytes under increased CO2 in a mesocosm study in a Norwegian fjord near Bergen. Lastly, the two nanoeukaryotic phytoplankton groups also displayed a negative response to fCO₂ enrichment, whereby Nano-II was the least defined, most likely due to a high taxonomic diversity in

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

this group. Nano-I started to display lower abundances at high fCO_2 during Phase I (after day 10), which was likely the result of greater differences between gross growth and total mortality (compared to low fCO_2). Alternatively, enhanced nutrient competition due to increased abundances of SYN and Pico-I (and later on also Pico-II) at elevated fCO_2 may also have contributed to the dampened response of Nano-I in the high fCO_2 mesocosms. The overall decline in Nano-I, during Phase II, and sustained low abundances during Phase III may well have been the result of grazing by the increased mesozooplankton abundances during Phase II (Lischka et al., 2017).

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

Microbial loop

The strong association of prokaryote abundance with algal biomass, present throughout the experiment, suggests that the effect of CO₂ was an indirect consequence of alterations in the availability of phytoplankton carbon. Others have reported a tight coupling of autotrophic and heterotrophic communities at this location, with an estimated 35 % of the total net primary production being utilized directly by bacteria or heterotrophic flagellates (Kuosa and Kivi, 1989), suggesting a highly efficient microbial loop in this ecosystem. In addition to phytoplankton exudation, viral lysis may also contribute to the dissolved organic carbon pool (Wilhelm and Suttle, 1999; Brussaard et al., 2005; Lønborg et al., 2013). We calculated that viral lysis of phytoplankton between days 9 and 13 resulted in the release of 1.3 and 13.1 ng C ml⁻¹ for M1 and M3, respectively. Assuming a bacterial growth efficiency of 30 % and cellular carbon conversion of 7 fg C cell⁻¹ (Hornick et al., 2017), we estimate that the organic carbon required to support bacterial dynamics during this period (taking into account the net growth and loss rates) was 2.9 and 11.5 ng C ml⁻¹ in low and high fCO₂ mesocosms M1 and M3, respectively. These results suggest that viral lysis of phytoplankton was an important source of organic carbon for the bacterial community. Our results are consistent with bacterial-phytoplankton coupling during this eastern Baltic Sea mesocosm study (Hornick et al., 2017), and agree with earlier work on summer carbon flow in the northern Baltic Sea showing that prokaryotic growth was largely supported by recycled carbon (Uitto et al., 1997). The average net

growth rates of the prokaryotes during the first period of increase in Phases 0 and I (0.2 d⁻¹) were comparable to rates reported for this region (Kuosa, 1991). In order to sustain the concomitant daily mortality (between 0.3-0.5 d⁻¹) measured during our study, prokaryotic gross growth rates must have been close to one doubling a day (0.5-0.7 d⁻¹). During Phase I, grazing was the dominant loss factor of the prokaryotic community although there was also evidence that viral lysis was occurring. Bermúdez et al. (2016) reported the highest biomass of protozoans around day 15. This was predominantly the heterotrophic choanoflagellate Calliacantha natans, which selectively feeds on particles <1 μm in diameter (Marchant and Scott, 1993; Hornick et al., 2017). Indeed, an earlier study in this area showed that heterotrophic nanoflagellates were the dominant grazers of bacteria, responsible for ingestion of approximately 53 % of bacterial production compared to only 11 % being grazing by ciliates (Uitto et al., 1997). During the first half of Phase II, grazing was reduced and likely contributed to the steady increase in prokaryote abundances. Specifically, a negative relationship between the abundances of HNA-prokaryotes and fCO₂ was detected and corresponded to reduced bacterial production and respiration at higher fCO₂ (Hornick et al., 2017; Spilling et al., 2016). Although CO₂ enrichment may not directly affect bacterial growth, co-occurring global rise in temperature can increase enzyme activities, affecting bacterial production and respiration rates (Piontek et al., 2009; Wohlers et al., 2009; Wohlers-Zöllner et al., 2011). Enhanced bacterial remineralization of organic matter may stimulate autotrophic production by the small-sized phytoplankton (Riebesell et al., 2009; Riebesell and Tortell, 2011; Engel et al., 2013), intensifying the selection of small cell size. Mean viral abundances were higher under CO₂ enrichment towards the end of Phase I and into Phase II which is expected under conditions of increased phytoplankton and prokaryote biomass. The estimated average viral burst size, obtained from this increase in total viral abundance and concurrent decline in bacterial abundances, was about 30 which is comparable to published values (Parada et al, 2006; Wommack and Colwell, 2000). Viral lysis rates of prokaryotes were measured until day 25 and indicated that during days 18-25 an average 10-15 % of the total prokaryote

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

population was lysed per day. Moreover, the concurrent steady increase in viral abundances during Phase III indicates that viral lysis of the prokaryotes remained important. Thus, the combined impact of increased viral mortality together with reduced production (Hornick et al., 2017) ultimately led to the decline in prokaryote abundance (this study). Lysogeny did not appear to be an important life strategy of viruses during our campaign. Direct effects of higher fCO_2 on viruses are not expected, as marine virus isolates are quite stable (both in terms of particle decay and loss of infectivity) over the range of pH of the present study (Danovaro et al., 2011; Mojica and Brussaard, 2014). The few studies which have inferred viral lysis rates based on changes in viral abundances show reduced abundances of algal viruses (e.g. *Emiliania huxleyi* virus) under enhanced CO_2 (Larsen et al., 2008) while mesocosm results by Brussaard et al. (2013) indicated a stronger impact of viruses on bacterial abundance dynamics with CO_2 enrichment.

5 Conclusions

Due to the low buffering capacity of the Baltic Sea and the paucity of data regarding OA impact in nutrient-limited waters, the results presented here are pertinent to increasing our understanding of how predicted projected rises in fCO_2 will affect the microbial communities in this region. Our study provides evidence that cell size, taxonomy and sensitivity to loss can all play a role in the outcome of CO_2 enrichment. Physiological constraints of cell size favour nutrient uptake by small cells under conditions of reduced nutrients and our results show that these effects can be further exacerbated by OA. Gross growth rates along with the complementary mortality rates allowed for a more comprehensive understanding of the phytoplankton population dynamics and thus perception of how microbial food web dynamics can influence the response of the autotrophic and heterotrophic components of the community. Our results further suggest that alterations in CO_2 concentrations are expected to affect prokaryote communities (mainly) indirectly through alterations in phytoplankton biomass, productivity and viral lysis. Overall, the combination of growth and losses (grazing and viral lysis) could explain microbial population dynamics observed in this study. It is noteworthy to

mention, a recent study in the oligotrophic northeast Atlantic Ocean reported a shift from grazing-dominated to viral lysis-dominated phytoplankton community with strengthening of vertical stratification (shoaling the mixed layer depth and enhancing nutrient limitation) (Mojica et al., 2016). Thus, we highly recommend that future research on OA combine mesocosm studies focusing on changes in microbial community composition and activity with experiments aimed at understanding the effects of OA on food web dynamics, i.e. partitioning mortality between grazing and viral lysis (Brussaard et al., 2008).

Author Contribution

Design and overall coordination of research by CB. Organization and performance of analyses in the field by KC. Data analysis by KC, CB, and SA-F. Design and coordination of the overall KOSMOS mesocosm project by UR. All authors contributed to the writing of the paper (KC, KM and CB are lead authors).

Acknowledgements

This project was funded through grants to C.B. by the Darwin project, the Netherlands Institute for Sea Research (NIOZ), and the EU project MESOAQUA (grant agreement number 228224). We thank the KOSMOS project organisers and team, in particular Andrea Ludwig, the staff of the Tvärminne Zoological Station and the diving team. We give special thanks to Anna Noordeloos, Kirsten Kooijman and Richard Doggen for their technical assistance during this campaign. We also gratefully acknowledge the captain and crew of R/V ALKOR for their work transporting, deploying and recovering the mesocosms. The collaborative mesocosm campaign was funded by BMBF projects BIOACID II (FKZ 03F06550) and SOPRAN Phase II (FKZ 03F0611).