

## Review bg-2018-115 Young & Gobler

“The ability of macroalgae to mitigate the negative effects of ocean acidification on four species of North Atlantic bivalve”

This paper evaluates the effect of the presence of the macroalga *Ulva rigida* on the growth of four North Atlantic bivalve species, *Mercenaria mercenaria*, *Crassostrea virginica*, *Argopecten irradians* and *Mytilus edulis*. The authors have used small and larger sizes of three out of four species, specifically the three obtained from hatcheries. The  $p\text{CO}_2$  levels the bivalves are exposed to are high, but conceivable for estuarine systems. The authors claim that “saturation states for calcium carbonate ( $\Omega$ ) were significantly higher in the presence of *Ulva* under both ambient and elevated  $\text{CO}_2$  delivery rates ( $p < 0.05$ )”, and that “alkalinity was increased by the presence of *Ulva*”. This might be statistically significant, but as alkalinity actually decreases (or is similar) in some treatments (small *Mercenaria*, large *Mercenaria* control pH, small *Crassostrea*, large *Crassostrea* low pH) it would be interesting to see the relationship between these parameters and growth directly and visually.

In treatments with *Ulva* additions, one would expect the variability in pH to be higher due to respiratory activity and production. However, the average pH is higher but the variability in pH seems similar to treatments without *Ulva*. In fact, I would expect the algal-addition treatments to have a fluctuating pH and the control treatments to be stable, which could arguably have caused the differences. However the authors do not discuss this and the tables do not show these differences in variability of pH. Was the pH fluctuating on a day-night scale in the *Ulva* treatments? Or was the gas flowrate so high this was not discernable, and what causes the variability in the control treatments?

The nutrient and algae addition to the vessels might cause different nutrient concentrations in the treatments, with *Ulva* taking up nutrients while they remain suspended in the control vessels, which could have influenced results.

It is unclear what time of the year the experiments have been done (presumably summer due to hatchery times), and how the results might vary in other seasons (i.e. when *Ulva* is not productive).

The various sizes and the amount of different species of bivalves used in this study make it an interesting read, even though it is not entirely clear what causes the beneficial effect of the presence of *Ulva* (its effect on the carbonate chemistry, nutrient concentration or something else).

Specific comments:

Methods

P.3, line 9 “light intensity ( $\sim 200 \mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ )”, how does this compare to ambient conditions?

P.3, line 23: *Isochrysis* should be *Isochrysis*

P.4, line 17: “some estuarine environments” – representable for the environments of the study organisms and their origin?

P.4, line 32-33: “Well-pigmented, circular sections of *Ulva* (~3.5 cm and ~7 cm for experiments in small containers and large vessels, respectively”. These small containers were 1L, while the large vessels had a volume of 8L. The biomass of *Ulva* however, is 2x as large for the larger volume, which does not respect the ratio biomass/water volume. The authors state that the weight was consistent with the benthic coverage in Shinnecock Bay, would that mean that the 8L vessels had 2x the diameter of the small containers and would water volume not be more important than surface in this case? Or was there more than 1 disk per container (p.5., line 23 states “disks”)? This section is a bit unclear.

P.5, line 16-17: “with discrete and continuous measurements of pH, dissolved oxygen, and temperature”, which measurements were discrete and which continuous?

#### Results

P.6, lines 19-20: “For the larger-sized cohort of *M. mercenaria* ( $5.00 \pm 0.41$  mm),  $\Omega_{\text{calcite}}$  and  $\Omega_{\text{aragonite}}$  were significantly higher in treatments containing *Ulva* and significantly lower in high CO<sub>2</sub> treatments” Throughout the manuscript’s result section this way of describing the differences between high CO<sub>2</sub> / *Ulva* treatments is confusing. In the highCO<sub>2</sub>+*Ulva* treatment the  $\Omega_{\text{calcite}}$  is actually lower than the control-*Ulva* treatment (as expected), however from the text it appears at a first glance that all *Ulva* containing treatments are higher, the sentences might be clarified to prevent confusion.

#### Discussion

Could the fact that *Mytilus* seems less sensitive to addition of *Ulva* be related to the more “natural” (no hatchery) origin of the juveniles and their exposure to environmental fluctuations vs. the more stable hatchery conditions?

If the presence of algae buffered the carbonate chemistry (p.9, line 23) and this is the mechanism for enhanced growth, this should be visible when  $\Omega_{\text{calcite/aragonite}}$  is plotted vs. growth. However, the saturation state with *Ulva* is still considerably below 1 in the highCO<sub>2</sub> treatments and the SD is high.

Did the authors measure nutrients at the end of the incubations? It would be interesting to explore their theory that through *Ulva* presence “the nitrogen assimilation effects on alkalinity outweighed the effects of photosynthetic consumption of DIC” (p.9, line 33)