Coral hosts actively accumulate inorganic carbon for zooxanthellae to maintain symbiotic relationships

Boya Zhang[1], Si Tang[1], Lu Liu[1], Meiting Xu[2], Yaqing Liu[1], Jianming Zhu[1], Weimin Xiao[3], Hongsheng Bi[4], Jin Zhou[1], Mark C. Benfield[5] & Zhonghua Cai[1,6,*]

[1]Shenzhen Public Platform for Screening and Application of Marine Microbial Resources, Tsinghua Shenzhen International Graduate School, Shenzhen 518055 Guangdong Province, PR China.

[2]School of Environment, Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin 150090 Heilongjiang Province, PR China.

[3]Shenzhen Academy of Metrology and Quality Inspection, Shenzhen 518109 Guangdong Province, PR China.

[4]Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, Solomons, MD, USA.

[5]College of the Coast and Environment Department of Oceanography and Coastal Sciences, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA.

[6]Technology Innovation Center for Marine Ecology and Human Factor Assessment of Natural Resources Ministry, Tsinghua Shenzhen International Graduate School, Shenzhen 518055 Guangdong Province, PR China.

*Corresponding author: Zhonghua Cai (caizh@sz.tsinghua.edu.cn)

Abstract

High primary productivity of coral reefs is widely attributed to the mutualistic symbiosis

between corals and zooxanthellae. The mechanisms that maintain this symbiosis

remain poorly explored. Given the high carbon demands by zooxanthellae, we

hypothesized that corals may have evolved strategies to actively accumulate

dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) to maintain the host-algae symbiosis. Carbon

supplies and consumption were evaluated in the scleractinian coral (*Goniopora lobata*)

and zooxanthellae under light and dark conditions. Results suggest that

zooxanthellae are high DIC consumers, requiring about 2-3 fold more DIC than

free-living species. The corals were high DIC producers, but were unable to effectively

eliminate all the DIC they produced and actively accumulated DIC in the light, with

concentrations up to 4.2 fold higher than in the surrounding seawater. Transcriptomic

analysis found several DIC enrichment pathways, including CO_2 concentrating

mechanisms, respiration, calcification and phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase. It

appears that corals actively enrich DIC for zooxanthellae.

Introduction

Coral reefs are recognized as having the highest levels of primary productivity ($1500-5000$ gC $m^{-2}a^{-1}$) in nature[1], while growing in shallow oligotrophic waters[2,3]. The high productivity of coral reefs is widely attributed to their symbiotic relationship with the microalgal zooxanthellae[4,5,6].

Within this mutualistic relationship, it is believed that coral provides living space for zooxanthellae, as well as some nutrients such as ammonia, urea, and polyphosphates[7,8,9]. In return, the symbiont algae transfer more than 90% of their photosynthesis to the coral host with organic products such as glucose, glycerol, amino acids and lipids[10,11,12]. A more detailed understanding of how the symbiosis is initiated and maintained remains poorly understood.

From a stoichiometric perspective, high productivity requires a high carbon supply, and providing the CO_2 to symbiotic zooxanthellae is potentially a challenge for corals for three reasons: (1) CO_2 diffuses 10,000 times more slowly in water than in air[13]; (2) the low CO_2 affinity of microalgal Rubisco (the type II Rubisco of zooxanthellae possesses an even lower CO_2 affinity[14,15]); and (3) symbiotic microalgae within the coral tissue are physically separated from dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC, including CO_2, HCO_3^-, CO_3^{2-} and H_2CO_3 etc.) in the surrounding seawater. However, based on their success as a whole, one could logically presume that DIC concentrations inside corals should at least equal or even exceed ambient levels. In addition, the supply of DIC to the symbionts and elimination between coral and symbionts should keep balance, otherwise, the microalgal photosynthesis may be stressed by low DIC, and

this symbiosis may no longer function optimally.

Understanding the DIC metabolism of corals is quite challenging because the DIC

within coral tissue is involved in several processes: (1) CO_2 generation by the

respiration of coral and zooxanthellae; (2) CO_2 consumption for microalgal

photosynthesis; and (3) HCO_3^- consumption and CO_2 generation due to coral

calcification. Generally, coral respiration is deemed to be the major contributor of CO_2,

but the fate of CO_2 remains contentious due to coral calcification[16]. Some suggest that

CO_2 from host respiration will be actively consumed via symbiont photosynthesis [17].

Others argue that CO_2 will be rapidly transformed into HCO_3^- and used by the host

itself for calcification to produce the $CaCO_3$ skeletons that are the structural basis of

coral reefs[18]. Moreover, there is competition for HCO_3^- in seawater between coral

calcification and microalgal photosynthesis[19,20,21], but some views hold that these two

DIC consumption pathways are non-competitive[22,23,24], and that calcification can even

contribute CO_2 required by photosynthesis. In addition, it is suggested that the

heterotrophic feeding of coral hosts also affects symbionts, especially in light-limited

deep water[25,26]. More research is needed to address these hypotheses.

Here, we explore the coral-algae symbiotic relationship based on the carbon supplies

to the symbiotic system, and propose that coral hosts may actively accumulate DIC

for high CO_2-demanding zooxanthellae. To test this hypothesis, the scleractinian coral

(*Goniopora lobata*) was employed as a model. Various carbon source (HCO_3^- or

glucose) utilization experiments were conducted under light or dark regimes to

determine the carbon consumption characteristics of the coral hosts and

zooxanthellae symbionts, respectively. Finally, a CO_2 enrichment experiment was

performed to simulate the impact of high external DIC concentrations on coral

symbiosis.

Results

Zooxanthellae DIC requirement

To determine the photosynthetic DIC requirements of the symbiotic microalgae, the

specific growth rates and carbon consumption rates of a zooxanthellae monoculture

were evaluated at various dosages of $NaHCO_3$. In general, zooxanthellae grew faster

at higher DIC concentrations. The highest cell growth rate reached 0.53 d^{-1} at 8 mM

$NaHCO_3$, which is 2.08 and 1.34 times higher than that of cells grown with 2 mM and

4 mM $NaHCO_3$, respectively (Fig. 1a, Two-way ANOVA, $F_{2,6}$ = 3.427, p < 0.05). As

expected, faster-growing cells consumed more DIC. The average DIC consumption

rates were 0.10 mM d^{-1}, 0.18 mM d^{-1}, and 0.26 mM d^{-1} corresponding to the 2 mM, 4

mM, and 8 mM $NaHCO_3$ treatments, respectively (Fig. 1b). In contrast, the DIC

concentration was almost constant in the control group (Fig. S1). It was noteworthy

that zooxanthellae grown with different $NaHCO_3$ concentrations all showed a linear

increase in biomass with DIC consumption, suggesting that external DIC

concentration is one of the limiting factors for its growth. Meanwhile, based on the

slope of linear regression (0.012 mol g^{-1}, Fig. 1b), it can be calculated that

zooxanthellae consume approximately 0.528 g of CO_2 per gram of biomass growth,

significantly higher than other free-living microalgae[27,28,29]. Evidently, natural seawater

with a DIC concentration around 3 mM is a carbon-deficient environment for

zooxanthellae, so whether the DIC concentration inside coral tissues is sufficiently high and how this is achieved merits investigation.

Fig. 1: Specific growth rate and carbon consumption analysis of monocultured zooxanthellae at different carbon concentrations. a, Specific growth rate of zooxanthellae at different stages. The graphs show the mean ± SD (n = 3). Letters above bars indicate a significant differences at $p < 0.05$. **b**, Relationship between carbon consumption and biomass growth of zooxanthellae (n = 3). Slopes indicate the carbon consumption for per gram of biomass growth of zooxanthellae. Data points are fitted with exponential decay functions. R^2 values indicating the goodness of fits are shown.

High DIC releases from corals require symbiont photosynthetic uptake

To investigate the carbon budget within the symbionic coral-zooxanthellae system, carbon supplies (organic (glucose) or inorganic ($NaHCO_3$)) experiments were performed under different light regimes. We first recorded the morphological responses of corals. As shown in Fig. 2a, when glucose was the only carbon source, the tentacles of the corals were obviously elongated in the light group (LG) compared with the dark group (DG). This morphological distinction in corals was also evident in

NaHCO$_3$, in which the coral remained healthy in the light group (LS) during 8 days,

while becoming lifelessness under dark conditions (DS). These results indicated that

the coral carbon utilization was influenced by the symbionts. Moreover, corals in the

DG still had tentacles protruding outward at day 8 compared with DS, while those in

the LG gradually shrank from day 4 compared with the LS. Theoretically, even though

glucose is not a preferred carbon source for zooxanthellae photosynthesis (LG vs LS),

as a nutrient that can be ingested by the host (DG vs DS), its supply in the dark should

have enabled the coral to grow normally. The question remains, why wasn't coral

growth healthy in the dark (DG vs LG)?

To further explain the reasons for the corals' morphological differences, we quantified

the changes in DIC and glucose concentrations in the external seawater and the coral

internal-tissues across all treatments. Although the corals grown with glucose can

consume glucose, we found that they cannot utilize glucose continuously after day 4

under dark conditions (from 0.1038 g L^{-1} to 0.0634 g L^{-1}, Fig. 2c), but were able to

continue glucose uptake in the presence of light (from 0.1027 g L^{-1} to 0.0304 g L^{-1}, Fig.

2c). Furthermore, we found that the utilization of external glucose was accompanied

by the accumulation of glucose and DIC in coral tissues (Fig. 2d,e). After the DG

group stopped taking up external glucose from day 4, the internal-tissue glucose

concentration stopped changing (0.0575 g L^{-1}), and the DIC concentration remained

stable after reaching a maximum (0.6009 g L^{-1}). While in LG group, the internal-tissue

glucose concentration kept increasing (from 0.0907 g L^{-1} to 0.1023 g L^{-1}), and the DIC

concentration gradually decreased (from 0.5632 g L^{-1} to 0.4297 g L^{-1}). These results

provided a good explanation for the morphological differences between corals in the

LG and LS treatments: that corals could continuously utilize glucose in the light due to

the consumption of internal-DIC by the symbiotic algae, whereas in the darkness,

corals could not take up glucose when their internal-DIC reached a certain threshold.

Unexpectedly, we detected significantly higher DIC concentrations inside coral tissues

compared to external seawater. Under natural conditions (LS), the DIC concentration

in coral tissues increased continuously, reaching a maximum of 4.2 times that of

seawater on day 4 (Fig. 2d). Similar patterns were also observed in all of the other

three treatments, and even in the DS also accumulated DIC in the tissues (Fig. 2bd).

We also found that the higher DIC within the coral tissues was not being released into

seawater in the organic carbon groups (LG and DG), because the DIC concentration

in external seawater remained stable (~0.02 g L^{-1}, Fig. 2b).

Fig. 2: Variation of coral morphology, DIC and glucose concentration in

seawater and corals under different carbon sources and light conditions. a,

Morphological changes of corals. Scale bars, 1 cm. **b**, DIC concentration in seawater.

c, Glucose concentration in seawater. **d**, DIC concentration in corals. **e**, Glucose

concentration in corals. Straight lines and dotted lines indicate corals and seawater,

respectively. The graphs show the mean ± SD (n = 3). DG indicates continuous

darkness and glucose as the only carbon source. DS indicates continuous darkness

and $NaHCO_3$ as the only carbon source. LG indicates light/dark = 12 h/12 h and

glucose as the only carbon source. LS indicates light/dark = 12 h/12 h and $NaHCO_3$

as the only carbon source.

Enzymatic activities and gene expression in carbon fixation

To resolve the origin of the high DIC pools in coral tissues, we analyzed the variance

in the activity of carbon fixation enzymes of coral as a whole, and the differentially

expressed genes (DEGs) of the host and zooxanthellae, respectively. Coral grown in

natural seawater (LS) was used as the control.

Carbonic anhydrases (CAs), catalyze the interconversion of CO_2 and HCO_3^-, and

indicators of CO_2 concentrating mechanisms (CCMs), were used to evaluate the DIC

transformation of the coral symbiotic system. As to the enzymatic activity of CAs,

compared to LS (42.16 U g^{-1} $prot^{-1}$), CAs activity was eventually lowered to less than

75% in two dark groups (DG = 27.31 U g^{-1} $prot^{-1}$, DS = 16.67 U g^{-1} $prot^{-1}$), while the LG

added glucose gradually elevated to 34.03 U g^{-1} $prot^{-1}$ (Fig. 3a), showing that the

CCMs of corals were affected by light. Subsequently, the expression of genes

encoding different types of CAs was found in both coral hosts and zooxanthellae. CAs

are generally divided into α, β, and γ categories, with only α-CA in animals and all

three categories in higher plants, algae, and cyanobacteria[30,31]. Notably, seven α-CA

genes were identified in coral hosts with extremely poor DIC exclusion capacity, and

180 the DEGs of CA compared to LS was down-regulated in both dark groups (DG and

181 DS), but up-regulated in the light group LG (Fig. 3d), indicating that the CCMs of coral

182 hosts are associated with zooxanthellae photosynthesis. Moreover, different CA

183 subtypes and locations in zooxanthellae may perform different functions. For example,

184 the α-CA located in the cytoplasm and the β-CA1 in the chloroplasts were also

185 up-regulated under light conditions (Fig. 3d), while the β-CA2 located in the cytoplasm

186 was up-regulated in the dark groups (Fig. 3d).

187 In addition, we also identified an interesting pattern on the phosphoenolpyruvate

188 carboxylase (PEPCase) and phosphoenolpyruvate carboxykinase (PEPCKase), two

189 key enzymes for the biochemical CCMs, i.e., C_4 and crassulacean acid

190 metabolism (CAM)[32]. PEPCase catalyses the conversion of phosphoenolpyruvate

191 (PEP) to oxaloacetate and releases a CO_2 around Rubisco in C_4/CAM plants or

192 supplements malate to the TCA cycle directly in all organisms[33]. PEPCKase catalyses

193 the reverse pathway of PEPCase, converting oxaloacetate to PEP, and also plays a

194 key role in gluconeogenesis[34].

195 In terms of enzymatic activities, compared to LS, PEPCase was lower in the two

196 glucose-added groups and higher in DS (Fig. 3b), while PEPCKase was more active

197 in all treatments (especially in the two dark groups) (Fig. 3c). We attempted to explain

198 the possible reasons by DEGs. Results showed that the PEPC genes were not found

199 in coral hosts (Fig. 3e). Moreover, microalgal PEPC was mainly annotated as CAM

200 types and highly expressed in DS. PEPCK genes in host and zooxanthellae were

201 generally up-regulated in the dark (Fig. 3e), which was consistent with the results of

202   PEPCKase activities (Fig. 3c), indicating that the limitation of photosynthesis would

203   have forced both host and symbiont to synthesise glucose themselves. Notably, three

204   sequences were up-regulated in coral hosts under light conditions, especially in LS

205   (Fig. 3e-LS in red Gene ID), which was consistent with changes in PEPCKase activity

206   at later stages (Fig. 3c-LS).

Fig. 3: CAs, PEPCase and PEPCKase activities and gene expressions in coral hosts and zooxanthellae. a, CAs activity in corals. **b**, PEPCase activity in corals. **c**, PEPCKase activity in corals. **d**, Differential expression of CA genes in coral hosts and zooxanthellae. **e**, Differential expression of PEPC and PEPCK genes in coral hosts and zooxanthellae. The gene sequences selected in the figure are more than 50% similar to the corresponding gene sequences included in the KEGG database. The

phylogenetic tree was drawn by MEGA software, and the values indicate the branch

lengths. Gene ID indicates the ID number of the sequence in the transcriptome on the

comparison, beginning with TRINITY for host and SymbC1.scaffold for zooxanthellae.

Type indicates the specific type of the enzyme encoded by the genes, which was

obtained through the KEGG module, Pfam, and Swissprot databases. Species

indicate the similar species to which the sequence was compared in the NCBI-NR

database. Relative expression levels are the log_2fc values of each treatment group

compared to the control LS. P indicates the significance of the difference between

each treatment group and LS.

Transcriptomic features of carbon metabolism of the coral host and

zooxanthellae

To explore the underlying mechanisms of DIC accumulation and transportation of the

symbiotic system on a molecular level, we investigated the carbon-involved

metabolisms in different coral treatments.

Glycolysis (purple arrows in Fig. 4c) and gluconeogenesis (red arrows in Fig. 4c)

pathways were used as indicators for glucose utilization activities. In zooxanthellae,

compared to LS, all 9 genes annotated in glycolysis were down-regulated in DG, DS,

and LG, and the genes encoding three rate-limiting enzymes of glycolysis,

glucokinase (GLK) / hexokinase (HK), 6-phosphofructokinase (PFK),

and pyruvate kinase (PK)[35,36], were 2 out of 3 significantly down-regulated (log_2fc > 1,

p < 0.05) in DG. These lines of evidence pointed to external glucose being poorly

utilized by zooxanthellae, as was also evident from its DEGs of photosynthesis (Fig.

S2). Meanwhile, the genes encoding the rate-limiting enzymes of gluconeogenesis, PEPCK2 and fructose-1,6-bisphosphatase (FBP)[37], were up-regulated in all three treatments, even significantly up-regulated ($\log_2 fc > 1$, $p < 0.05$) in DG, suggesting that it was consuming its own fatty acids to generate glucose. In contrast, in coral hosts, out of 9 glycolysis-related DEGs, although 7 and 9 genes were down-regulated in DG and DS, respectively, but 7 genes (including three rate-limiting genes) were unchanged or up-regulated in the light group LG, which is in accordance with the result from Fig. 2c-LG. Unsurprisingly, partial gluconeogenesis-related genes (e.g., PEPCK1) of the host were up-regulated in DG, DS and LG, probably due to the external glucose decrease in the post-culture period.

The TCA cycle (brown arrows in Fig. 4c), which is the central pathway for CO_2 production in aerobic organisms, was further explored. In zooxanthellae, compared to LS, the TCA cycle generally exhibited a decreased pattern, suggesting a deceleration in respiration. Specifically, 9, 8 and 7 out of 13 genes annotated in the TCA cycle were down-regulated in DG, DS, and LG, respectively. As to DEGs in coral hosts, almost all genes were down-regulated in both dark treatment groups. Conversely, 10 out of 14 TCA-related genes were unchanged or up-regulated in LG, indicating that the host accelerated respiration to produce CO_2 in the light, combined with the carbon consumption in coral tissues from Fig. 2d-LG. This CO_2 was likely to be supplied to the microalgae.

Fig. 4: DEGs of glycolysis, gluconeogenesis and TCA cycle genes in coral hosts

and zooxanthellae. The expression results of one sequence with the largest length of

the transcriptome compared with the reference sequence of the KEGG database

were selected for each gene in the figure. ○ indicates coral host, and □ indicates

zooxanthellae, where the colors indicate the log_2fc values of each treatment group

compared to the control LS, from left to right once for DG, DS, and LG. Heatmap

colors indicate relative expression levels, also the log_2fc values of each treatment

group compared with the control LS. P indicates the significance of the difference

between each treatment group and LS.

Calcification, the coral-specific DIC metabolic pathway central to coral physiology

and health[38], was also analyzed. In general, calcification-related genes displayed a

decreased trend under dark conditions and an increased trend under light conditions.

Specifically, compared to the no-glucose added group (LS), out of the 88 ion

transporters DEGs responsible for active transportation, i.e., calmodulin (CaM),

calcium-binding proteins (CaBPs), Na^+/H^+ transports, HCO_3^- transports and CAs[39,40],

71 and 85 displayed a down-regulation in DG and DS, respectively (Fig. 5a), for a

total decrease of 59.31-log_2fc and 77.57-log_2fc (Fig. 5b). In contrast, the expression of

DEGs in LG was 58 out of 88 genes unchanged or up-regulated (Fig. 5a), for a total

increase of 20.05-log_2-fold (Fig. 5b), suggesting a correlation between coral

calcification and light, rather than glucose. Furthermore, galaxins, the sole skeletal

organic matrix proteins definitively identified in corals[41], continued to show a

consistent down-regulation in DG and DS, while exhibiting a 2.19-log_2-fold

up-regulation in LG (Fig. 5b). The DEGs of other skeletal organic matrix proteins

associated with early calcification, i.e., small cysteine-rich proteins (SCRiPs), orphan

taxonomically restricted genes (Orphan TRGs), coral acid-rich proteins (CARPs),

neurexins, and cartilage-related proteins[42,43,44,45], were over 90% down-regulated as

well in two dark treatments, but 50% unchanged or up-regulated in LG (Fig. 5a), which

provides further evidence of the predominant influence of light conditions, rather than

carbon sources on calcification.

Fig. 5: Comparison of differential expression of genes related to calcification in

coral hosts. a, Summary of changes on calcification genes in different categories (ion

transporters, carbonic anhydrases, and skeletal organic matrix proteins) for DG, DS and

LG treatments. Column colors indicate log_2fc values for each treatment group compared

to control LS, with yellow up-regulated, blue down-regulated, and grey non-regulated. The

total numbers of transcripts in each category are indicated above the corresponding bars.

b, Summary of the corresponding mean log fold-change values for each of the classes of

genes responding in part a. Actual fold-change values are indicated above or below each

bar.

Elevated external CO_2 induced detachment of zooxanthellae

To examine our hypothesis that the coral may actively build a high concentration DIC

pool inside for symbiont photosynthesis as a primary evolutionary strategy to "retain"

symbiont microalga. Two scleractinian corals (*G. lobata* and *Acropora digitifera*) were

cultured at elevated CO_2 concentrations (1%) seawater. Results showed that

zooxanthellae would detach from the coral in the 1% CO_2 mixture gas supplied

seawater environments (Fig. 6a). At the same time, the corals maintained normal

zooxanthellae populations in the similar treatments with elevated CO_2 that contained

normal pH conditions (due to HCl addition), suggesting that higher CO_2 levels instead

of other factors play an decisive role in the loss of the corals' symbiotic algae. The

results of these experiments indicated that the chlorophyll of *G. lobata* and *A.*

digitifera decreased to about 50% of that in the control groups on day 12 and day 3 in

CO_2 supplied groups (Fig. 6b). We further explored whether the CO_2 solubility

impacted on the algae loss. In this study, the relationship between bubble diameter

and CO_2 solubility was determined by a Planktonscope and a total organic carbon

analyzer (Fig. S3abc). Results showed that smaller bubbles (d_{32} = 467 in group 2, Fig.

S3abc) in the microbubble plates led in higher CO_2 solubility (0.1703 g L^{-1} and 0.2000

g L^{-1} in group 2, Fig. 6c), and resulted in higher algal loss rates (59% and 84% in group

2, Fig. 6c). To determine whether stress impacted the coral bleaching, anti-oxidative

enzymes, i.e., superoxide dismutase (SODase) and catalase (CATase) activity were

detected. Compared to natural conditions, the CO_2 supplied treatments of two corals

were similar, but the HCl addition treatments significantly decreased the activities of

SODase and CATase (Fig. 6de, Two-way ANOVA, $p < 0.05$). Meanwhile, the

photosynthetic activity (Fv/Fm, Fig. S3d,e) of detached zooxanthellae in seawater

was similar to that of the symbiotic zooxanthellae and possessed higher CAs activity

(57.37 U g^{-1} $prot^{-1}$ and 46.32 U g^{-1} $prot^{-1}$, Fig. 6f) in two corals, suggesting that the

departure of zooxanthellae from the host was not caused by stress and they survived well outside of the corals.

Fig. 6: Characterization of *G. lobata* and *A. digitifera* after external CO_2 and HCl addition. a, Morphological changes of corals. **b**, Chlorophyll of corals on the last day. **c**, Zooxanthellae loss rates (bar charts) and CO_2 concentration in seawater (line graphs) of three CO_2 treatments on the last day. **d**, SODase activity of corals on the last day. **e**, CATase activity of corals on the last day. **f**, CAs activity of corals on the last day. Natural indicates natural seawater control groups. CO_2 indicates 1% CO_2 mixture gas supplied treatments. HCl indicates pH reduction with HCl addition treatments. The graphs show the mean ± SD (n = 3). Letters above bars indicate a significant difference at $p < 0.05$.

Discussion

Coral reefs are highly productive ecosystems that thrive in oligotrophic waters. The

success of this Darwinian paradox is mainly attributed to the successful symbiotic

relationship between the coral host and the symbiont zooxanthellae[46,47]. Evidently,

efficient algal photosynthesis is paramount for this symbiotic system. However,

zooxanthellae possess type II Rubisco enzymes characterised by a low CO_2

affinity[14,15], and they have a relatively higher CO_2 demand, which consumes about

0.528 g CO_2 per gram of biomass grown (Fig. 1b). This is a far higher DIC demand

than that of other free living algae. For example, *Haematococcus pluvialis* consumes

0.308 g CO_2 for per gram of biomass growth[29], *Spirulina platensis* requires 0.256 g

CO_2[27], and *Chlorella vulgaris* requires requires 0.218 g CO_2[28]. Obviously, the

zooxanthellae are "high consumers" of DIC, implying the symbiont microalgae must

somehow cope with DIC limitation and perform photosynthesis successfully and

efficiently. It is reasonable that they may find high DIC sites or habitats within coral

tissue.

In this study, we found that the coral hosts are "high producers" of DIC and they can

continuously consume external organic carbon only in the presence of microalgal

photosynthesis in the light treatments (Fig. 2c-LG), whereas they cannot sustainably

utilize glucose (Fig. 2c-DG) and contract significantly (Fig. 2a-DG) in the dark. These

results indicated that the coral hosts were unable to eliminate their own produced CO_2

without symbiont photosynthesis. Surprisingly, we identified a high dosage DIC pool

within coral tissues independent of external environments, reaching up to 4.2 times

greater than external seawater under natural conditions (Fig. 2d-LS). This is

consistent with the findings obtained with dynamic modeling by Xu et al.[18]. We further

discovered that the DIC pool remained when no external DIC was provided (Fig.

2d-DG/LG), showing that it does not depend on external DIC concentrations. Why did

the coral hosts have a low DIC removal capacity, but accumulated a DIC pool? For

what purposes do the corals accumulate DIC? We hypothesize that the DIC pool

accumulated by corals may be the basis of the coral host-zooxanthellae symbiosis.

Since we know that the symbiont microalgae require high levels of DIC for

photosynthesis, the seemingly detrimental behaviour of accumulating DIC within coral

tissues would be beneficial or even necessary to the microalgal photosynthesis, which

in return would benefit the coral host by providing food continuously.

Results from the transcriptome support and explain our hypothesis on a molecular

level. Foremost, we found that the coral have evolved several DIC enriched pathways,

and they mainly serve the photosynthesis of the microalgae. Although several studies

have proposed that the host's CAs are involved in calcification[40,48], our results provide

evidence that the host CAs do not act primarily on their own calcification or emission

of respiration CO_2, because they have relatively low CAs activity in the dark compared

to the light (Fig. 3a). The CAs are most likely functioning to supply DIC to the algal

photosynthesis. This fully explains why coral hosts, having taken up enough DIC (Fig.

2d), continue to enrich their quantities of it. More detailed CA annotation results

indicate that coral host-symbiont may possess different CA types with distinct

functions and enhance carbon synergistically (Fig. 3d). Similarly, Tansik et al.[49] also

found that the supply of DIC in the coral symbionts is usually under the control of the

hosts. If that is true, there may have been other pathways that evolved to "retain" the

zooxanthellae during coral symbiosis that have not been discovered yet.

More interestingly, we have identified a potential carbon fixation pathway within coral

hosts that could supplement the CCMs, i.e., the PEPCK pathway. Notably, PEPCKase

can act as a carboxylase in invertebrates[50,51]. In natural conditions, when the

symbionts lacked DIC at the late stage, CAs activity gradually weakened while

PEPCKase activity gradually increased. At the same time, the gene expression of

three PEPCK sequences was significantly up-regulated (Fig. 3e-LS in red Gene ID),

which is different from the role played by PEPCK in gluconeogenesis (Fig. 3e-LS in

black Gene ID). In this process, PEPCKase may serve as PEPCase, converting PEP

into oxaloacetate, which efficiently concentrates DIC in the C_4 pathway, just as the

microalgal C_4 pathway has been reported[52,53,54]. There is another possibility that

oxaloacetate formation by PEPCKase replenishes the TCA cycle under increased

malate efflux, which accelerates tissue carbon flux to meet the photosynthetic

requirements of the microalgae. This mechanism bears similarities to the increasing

number of microalgal studies in recent years[55,56,57]. Notably, in the case of corals, the

hosts play a pivotal role in facilitating this step of carbon fixation for the symbiont.

Furthermore, CO_2 produced by host respiration is an important carbon source for

zooxanthellae photosynthesis. Under light conditions, the hosts' glycolysis genes

(purple arrows in Fig. 4c-LG) and TCA cycle genes (brown arrows in Fig. 4c-LG) were

up-regulated, which showed that they were uptaking glucose to release CO_2. These

findings have similarities with previous studies that heterotrophic feeding and glucose

enrichment can elevate the respiration rate of coral hosts, subsequently enhancing

symbiont photosynthetic rates[58,59]. What's more, the hosts must prevent more CO_2

production without algal photosynthesis, i.e., by stopping the uptake of external

glucose and accelerating gluconeogenesis to meet its own metabolic needs (Fig.

4c-DG). All the above corroborate our physiological indicators (Fig. 2cde-DG, LG).

Surprisingly, our results suggest that coral calcification is more likely to be a provider

of DIC to microalgal photosynthesis rather than a competitor for DIC. Previous

experiments shown that calcification is a competitor for photosynthesis, consuming

60% of the respiration-based CO_2[19,20,21]. In contrast, it has been argued that there is

no competition, and calcification rates are higher under light conditions compared to

darkness[22,23,24]. Numerous hypotheses have been proposed to explain the

mechanisms behind light-enhanced calcification. The most widely supported

hypothesis suggests that the photosynthetic metabolites produced by algae can

supply ample nutrients for host growth, thereby accelerating the calcification

process[60,61,62]. However, in our experiment, even with sufficient external nutrition, all

coral calcification genes were down-regulated when exposed to darkness (Fig. 5-DG),

and up-regulated or unchanged in the light (Fig. 5-LG), suggesting that the correlation

between calcification and coral growth is not robust. This is consistent with

experimental results under dark conditions where both HCO_3^- in external seawater

and DIC in coral tissue remained utilized (Fig. 2b,d-DS), indicating that calcification

may not be an actively-driven process. It can be inferred that coral calcification

doesn't occur in tandem with host growth but is primarily fueled by the strong carbon

demands of symbiotic organisms. The CO_2 released during calcification isn't promptly

expelled from the coral body but is instead absorbed and utilized by zooxanthellae,

which may provide a new explanation for the controversial issue of the coral as a

carbon source or carbon sink[63,64].

Finally, to conclusively validate the significance of DIC in maintaining the health of this

symbiotic pair, we performed 1% CO_2 gas dosing addition experiments to increase the

DIC concentration by a factor of 1.2 times higher than the natural seawater. As

expected, two species of corals lost their zooxanthellae on day 3 and day 12,

respectively (Fig. 6ab), and interestingly the detached algae in seawater have higher

CAs activity (Fig. 6h) and similar photosynthetic efficiency (Fig. S3d,e) than those

within corals. This suggests that the coral bleaching in our experiments was not a

result of the coral host expelling zooxanthellae which not functioning properly, but

most likely a result of the algae actively departing from the coral. From an evolutionary

biology view, the algae's behavior is paradoxical, implying that they actively abandon

the protection of their hosts. However, our experiments dramatically increased CO_2

concentration in a short time, which could avoid the limitation of other nutrient factors

and make the algae respond more quickly. Notably, it was high CO_2 rather than low

pH that caused the algae to depart from the coral compared to the HCl addition

groups with the same pH. Meanwhile, the algal loss rates were positively correlated

with CO_2 solubility (Fig. 6b, c), suggesting that higher external CO_2 concentration was

more attractive to the algae. A study found a similar phenomenon that the increased

CO_2 caused stress and reduced zooxanthellae in *Galaxea fascicularis* and caused

bleaching[65]. This is good evidence explaining why coral hosts are desperately fixing

carbon because once the external DIC are sufficient for zooxanthellae growth, the

algal will no longer coexist in the host for "food".

In summary, in this study, we provide a new perspective proposing that the coral host

actively accumulates DIC for the symbiont microalgae to understand the basis of coral

symbiosis. Coral hosts CCMs, respiration and calcification are all critical for the

accumulation of DIC for algal photosynthesis, and there are even other possible

carbon fixation pathways, i.e., PEPCK (Fig. S4). Furthermore, our hypothesis argues

that the coral bleaching caused by heatwaves and acidification[66,67,68] may not be

comprehensive, because it is also possible that as more greenhouse gases are

incorporated into the ocean, it results in a situation where the hosts can no longer

provide a relatively high CO_2 environment, and thus lose the attraction to the

microalgae, resulting in the collapse of the symbiosis. This may provide a new

perspective on coral bleaching under climate change. Undoubtedly, further

experimental efforts are needed to confirm these hypotheses.

Methods

Coral collection

The colonies of scleractinian corals (*G. lobata*) were collected in Dapeng Bay

(22°59'N, 114°33'E), Shenzhen, in September 2022. The coral colonies were

collected at a water depth of ~5 m and divided into 5×2×2 cm^3 blocks and then were

immediately transported to the indoor aquaria facilities of the Marine Biological

Laboratory (22°59'N, 113°97'E) at the Tsinghua Shenzhen International Graduate

School. Groups of 10 corals were cultured in 120 L aquariums filled with artificial

seawater (salinity = 33‰, pH = 8.2, T = 23-24 °C, light/dark = 12 h/12 h, Illumination

with blue-dominated coral lamps in natural light, light intensity = 20 µmol m^{-2}s^{-1}). After

allowing the corals to acclimatise to the laboratory environments for one month, we

initiated our experiments.

Zooxanthellae isolation

Zooxanthellae were first isolated from the host. Coral tentacles were clipped, and the

Symbiodinium sp. were blown out repeatedly with a pipette gun and then

resuspended in seawater. The algae pellet was centrifuged at 1000 g for 5 min at

20 °C. Subsequently, the remaining host debris was removed using differential

gradient centrifugation (900 g for 5 min → 700 g for 5 min → 650 g for 5 min at

20 °C)[69,70,71]. The final pellet was centrifuged at 2000 g for 10 min at 20 °C and

resuspended in F/2 medium, and then examined through an inverted microscope

(Primo Vert, Germany) at 40× magnification. Isolated zooxanthellae were enriched in

F/2 medium for further experiments.

Zooxanthellae carbon demand measurement

The carbon demand of zooxanthellae was eveluted following the description by Wu et

al.[29]. The seawater used in the experiment was decarbonised by the method of

Yellowlees et al.[72] and then added with corresponding concentrations of bicarbonate

(NaHCO$_3$). In detail, the pH was first adjusted to 4.5 with 1 M HCl to convert all DIC to

CO$_2$. Then, CO$_2$ was removed by simultaneous aeration with N$_2$ and agitation for 1 h.

1 mM Tris was then added, after which the pH was adjusted to 8.2 with 1 M of NaOH

to ensure the pH stability. Different amounts of $NaHCO_3$ were added to 40 mL-sealed

headspace bottles containing 20 mL of artificial seawater medium as a carbon source,

resulting in a final HCO_3^- concentration of 2 mM, 4 mM, and 8 mM, respectively. An

aliquot of 2 mL of zooxanthellae culture (about $5.6×10^6$ cells mL^{-1}) was added to each

headspace bottle. Each dosage was triplicated independently. These experiments

were conducted with continuous illumination (blue light, 20 μmol $m^{-2}s^{-1}$) at 23-24 °C[73],

and pH was maintained at 8-8.5[74].

To ensure that DIC was the only variable and to exclude the effects of changes in

nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations and light on algal growth, the incubation

period was 36 h (Excluding other nutritional factors, i.e., N, P). To avoid CO_2 diffusion

to the air, the headspace bottles were sealed except during the sampling process, and

a control group with only 22 mL of the corresponding concentration of $NaHCO_3$ was

added at each treatment to serve as a blank for the changes of DIC concentrations.

The biomass and DIC concentration in solution were measured every 12 h. Cell

counts were performed with a hemocytometer under an inverted microscope (Primo

Vert, Germany). Cellular dry weight was calculated by drying the algae in an oven at

55 °C for more than 24 h to keep cell weight constant. The standard curve between

the cell counts and dry weight was established by preliminary experiments (Table. S2),

and the dry weight of the biomass in this experiment was estimated based on cell

counts. DIC concentrations were measured using a total organic carbon analyzer

(EC0075, Japan), which detects dissolved CO_2, HCO_3^-, and CO_3^{2-} in solution. The

average specific growth rate (g $L^{-1}d^{-1}$) over any two-time points was obtained by the

following equation:

$$\mu' = \frac{\ln N_2 - \ln N_1}{t_2 \quad t_1}$$

where N_2 and N_1 are the cell counts (g L^{-1}) at time t_2 and t_1, respectively.

Coral absorbance of organic and inorganic carbon under different light conditions

These experiments were carried out under two different light conditions: light (light/dark = 12 h/12 h, 20 µmol $m^{-2}s^{-1}$) and dark (continuous darkness), with or without organic carbon. Here, organic carbon is defined as decarbonised seawater with glucose (initial concentration of glucose 0.10 g L^{-1} based on the preliminary experiment) as the only carbon source, whereas inorganic carbon is defined as normal seawater with HCO_3^- (initial concentration of HCO_3^- 0.26 g L^{-1}) as the main carbon source.

In total, four experimental treatments were set: DG (Continuous darkness and glucose as the only carbon source), DS (Continuous darkness and $NaHCO_3$ as the only carbon source), LG (light/dark = 12 h/12 h and glucose as the only carbon source), and LS (light/dark = 12 h/12 h and $NaHCO_3$ as the only carbon source). Each coral was cultured independently in 1.6 L of the respective medium. To exclude possible interference from stored sugars, all corals used had been starved in darkness for 3 days before experiments. Triplicates of each treatment were conducted independently.

During the experiment, coral morphological changes were recorded every day using a camera at fixed points, and external DIC and glucose concentrations were detected

simultaneously. Whole coral tentacles were ground and homogenised, and then used for measurements of carbon concentration and carbon fixation enzyme activities in coral tissues every other day.

Coral bleaching induction by CO_2 gas exposure

Two different speciees of scleractinian corals (*G. lobata* and *A. digitifera*) were selected for the coral bleaching experiment. The experiments were set up with three treatments: CO_2 group (1% CO_2 mixture gas was continuously aerated into seawater at 0.05 L min^{-1}, with the microbubble plates generating microbubbles with an average size of 400-600 μm, pH = 7.0)，HCl group (1 M HCl was added to seawater daily to adjust the same pH as the CO_2 group to examine the possible effect of changes pH on the performance of coral, pH = 7.0) and control group (natural seawater, pH = 8.2), and other conditions were kept the same (salinity = 33‰, T = 23-24 °C, light intensity = 20 μmol m^{-2}s^{-1}, light/dark = 12 h/12 h). Each coral was placed in a 1.6 L system and cultured independently. Each treatment was triplicated. During the experiment, the pH of seawater and CO_2 solubility were measured daily. On the last day, free zooxanthellae were collected from seawater, and symbiotic algae on corals were separated with oral irrigation. Meanwhile, the symbiotic algae coverage, photosynthetic activity (Fv/Fm), chlorophyll, carbon fixation enzymes, and anti-oxidative enzymes' activities were detected. The dissolved CO_2 were measured using a total organic carbon analyzer (EC0075, Japan), and its relationship with microbubble diameter was determined with the Planktonscope image system (Oasis Photobio Tech, China).

Physiological parameters and enzymatic activities

DIC concentration in seawater was measured using a total organic carbon analyzer

following the instruction manual (EC0075, Japan), and glucose concentrations were

measured by the dinitrosalicylic acid (DNS) method[75], DIC and glucose consumption

was calculated, respectively. A multi-excitation chlorophyll fluorometer was used to

measure the photosynthetic activity (Fv/Fm) of microalgal cells. ChlorophyII was

quantified using the methods of Ji et al.[76] and Laura et al.[77], respectively. Protein

concentrations were determined with the bicinchoninic acid (BCA) method[78] for

homogenisation of all assay metrics. The activities of carbon fixation enzymes, i.e.,

CAs, PEPCase and PEPCKase, and anti-oxidative enzymes, i.e., SODase and

CATase were measured by double antibody sandwich method using ELISA kits

(Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA).

Transcriptomics analysis

On day 8 of the coral culture experiments, all the corals were taken out and

fast-frozen with liquid nitrogen for transcriptomic analysis. Total RNA was extracted

using the Trizol-centrifugal column method, and then sent to the Shanghai Majorbio

Bio-pharm Technology Co., Ltd. (Shanghai, China) for the construction of an RNA-seq

transcriptome library. Each treatment was replicated three times. Raw reads were

trimmed and quality controlled by fastp (Version 0.19.5).

To distinguish the sequences of coral and zooxanthellae, the clean data from the

samples were used to do *de novo* assembly with Trinity (Version 2.8.5) initially, and all

the assembled sequencs were filtered by CD-Hit (Version 4.5.7) and TransRate

(Version 1.0.3) to increase quality. Species annotation was performed through the

NCBI-NR database to select coral species for subsequent analysis. Meanwhile, the

clean reads were aligned to reference genome of zooxanthellae (*Cladocopium*

goreaui, http://sampgr.org.cn/index.php/download) with orientation mode using

HISAT2 (Version 2.1.0), and the alignment rates ranged from 31.23% to 36.9%. The

mapped reads were assembled by StringTie (Version 2.1.2).

The expression level of each transcript was calculated according to the transcripts per

million reads (TPM) method. DEGs between four treatments were identified using

DESeq2 (Version 1.24.0), and DEGs with $|\log_2 FC| \geq 1$ and P-value < 0.05 were

considered to be significantly different expressed genes. Subsequently, DIAMOND

(Version 0.9.24) was used to compare with the NCBI-NR database for species

annotation, and with the KEGG database for functional annotation (E-value < 10^{-5},

identity $\geq$ 50%, and comparison length $\geq$ 50%). Metabolic pathways were mapped

using the KEGG Pathway as the primary reference. BLAST+ (Version 2.9.0) was used

to compare with KEGG, Swissprot, and Pfam databases to obtain more coding genes

and classification information of PEPC, PEPCK, and CA in the transcriptome.

Statistical analysis and data availability

All experiments were conducted with a minimum of three biological replicates to

ensure result reproducibility. The results are presented as mean ± standard deviation

(SD). Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 20.0 (SPSS Inc.,

Chicago, IL, USA). All data were analyzed using an unpaired Two-way ANOVA.

Statistical significance was determined at thresholds of 0.05. Genetic distances were

calculated using MEGA11 based on the P-distance model, and phylogenetic trees

were constructed using the Neighbor-Joining (NJ) method[79]. Heatmaps were drawn

using the pheatmap package in R (Version 4.2.3) and Z-Score normalisation was

performed.

Data availability

The data of this study are available within the article. Source data collected in this

study are available from Zenodo online (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11276136).

Raw RNAseq reads for differential gene expression analyses have been submitted to

NCBI's SRA database (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) under BioProject PRJNA1115939.

The KEGG database (https://www.kegg.jp/) was used for functional enrichment

analyses.

References

1. Shi, T., Zheng, X. Q., Zhang, H., Wang, Q. F. & Zhong, X. Coral reefs: potential blue carbon sinks for climate change mitigation. *Bull. Chin. Acad. Sci.* **36**, 270-278 (2021).

2. Webb, K. L., DuPaul, W. D., Wiebe, W., Sottile, W. & Johannes, R. E. Enewetak (Enewetok) atoll: aspects of the nitrogen cycle on a coral reef. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **20**, 198-210 (1975).

3. Dobson, K. L. et al. Moderate nutrient concentrations are not detrimental to corals under future ocean conditions. *Mar. Biol.* **168**, 98 (2021).

4. Wooldridge, S. A. A hypothesis linking sub-optimal seawater pCO$_2$ conditions for cnidarian-*Symbiodinium* symbioses with the exceedence of the interglacial threshold (>260 ppmv). *Biogeosciences* **9**, 1709-1723 (2012).

5. Muller-Parker, G., D'elia, C. F. & Cook, C. B. Interactions between corals and their symbiotic algae. *Coral Reefs Anthropocene*, 99-116 (2015).

6. Wiedenmann, J. et al. Reef-building corals farm and feed on their photosynthetic symbionts. *Nature* **620**, 1018-1024 (2023).

7. Titlyanov, E. & Titlyanova, T. Reef-building corals-symbiotic autotrophic organisms: 1. general structure, feeding pattern, and light-dependent distribution in the shelf. *Russ. J. Mar. Biol.* **28**, 1-15 (2002).

8. Rädecker, N., Pogoreutz, C., Voolstra, C. R., Wiedenmann, J. & Christian, W. Nitrogen cycling in corals: the key to understanding holobiont functioning? *Trends Microbiol.* **23**, 490-497 (2015).

9. Ferrier-Pagès, C., Godinot, C., D'angelo, C., Wiedenmann, J. & Grover, R.

Phosphorus metabolism of reef organisms with algal symbionts. *Ecol. Monogr.* **86**,

262-277 (2016).

10. Falkowski, P. G., Dubinsky, Z., Muscatine, L. & Porter, J. W. Light and the

bioenergetics of a symbiotic coral. *Bioscience* **34**, 705-709 (1984).

11. Treignier, C., Grover, R., Ferrier-Pagès, C. & Tolosa, I. Effect of light and feeding

on the fatty acid and sterol composition of zooxanthellae and host tissue isolated

from the scleractinian coral *Turbinaria reniformis*. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **53**,

2702-2710 (2008).

12. Hayashida, H., Matear, R. J. & Strutton, P. G. Background nutrient concentration

determines phytoplankton bloom response to marine heatwaves. *Global Change*

Biol. **26**, 4800-4811 (2020).

13. Kumar, K. & Das, D. Carbon dioxide sequestration by biological processes.

In *Transformation and utilization of carbon dioxide*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer

Berlin Heidelberg. 303-334 (2014).

14. Whitney, S. M., Shaw, C. & Yellowlees, D. Evidence that some dinoflagellates

contain a ribulose-1, 5-bisphosphate carboxylase/oxygenase related to that of the

α-proteobacteria. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **259**, 271-275 (1995).

15. Raven, J. A., Suggett, D. J. & Giordano, M. Inorganic carbon concentrating

mechanisms in free-living and symbiotic dinoflagellates and chromerids. *J.*

Phycol. **56**, 1377-1397 (2020).

16. Xu, Y. et al. Coral symbiosis carbon flow: a numerical model study spanning

cellular to ecosystem levels. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **9**, 749921 (2022).

17. Al-horani, F. A., Al-mogherabib, S. M. & Beera, D. E. Microsensor study of

photosynthesis and calcification in the scleractinian coral, *Galaxea fascicularis*:

active internal carbon cycle. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* **288**, 1-15 (2003).

18. Allison, N., Cohen, I., Finch, A. A., Erez, J. & Tudhope, A. W. Corals concentrate

dissolved inorganic carbon to facilitate calcification. *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 5741

(2014).

19. Goldberg, W. M. Coral skeletal chemistry: physiological and environmental

regulation of stable isotopes and trace eetals in *Montastrea annularis*. Proc. *R.*

Soc. B **196**, 1166-1173 (1977).

20. Langdon, C. & Atkinson, M. J. Effect of elevated pCO$_2$ on photosynthesis and

calcification of corals and interactions with seasonal change in

temperature/irradiance and nutrient enrichment. *J. Geophys. Res.* **110**, C09S07

(2005).

21. Uthicke, S. & Fabricius, K. E. Productivity gains do not compensate for reduced

calcification under near-future ocean acidification in the photosynthetic benthic

foraminifer species *Marginopora vertebralis*. *Glob. Change Biol.* **18**, 2781-2791

(2012).

22. Moya, A. et al. Carbonic anhydrase in the scleractinian coral *Stylophora pistillata*.

J. Biol. Chem. **283**, 25475 (2008).

23. Tambutte, S. et al. Coral biomineralization: from the gene to the environment. *J.*

Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. **408**, 58-78 (2011).

24. De Goeyse, S., Webb, A. E., Reichart, G. J. & De Nooijer, L. J. Carbonic

anhydrase is involved in calcification by the benthic foraminifer *Amphistegina*

lessonii. *Biogeosciences* **18**, 393-401 (2021).

25. Palardy, J. E., Grottoli, A. G. & Matthews, K. Effects of upwelling, depth,

morphology and polyp size on feeding in three species of *Panamanian* corals.

Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. **300**, 79-89 (2005).

26. Palardy, J. E., Rodrigues, L. J. & Grottoli, A. G. The importance of zooplankton to

the daily metabolic carbon requirements of healthy and bleached corals at two

depths. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* **367**, 180-188 (2008).

27. Sydney, E. B. et al. Potential carbon dioxide fifixation by industrially important

microalgae. *Bioresour. Technol.* **101**, 5892-6 (2010).

28. Singh, S. P. & Singh, P. Effect of CO_2 concentration on algal growth: a review.

Renew. Sustain. *Energy Rev.* **38**,172-179 (2014).

29. Wu, K. et al. Optimizing the growth of *Haematococcus pluvialis* based on a novel

microbubble-driven photobioreactor. *Iscience* **24**, 103461 (2021).

30. Moroney, J. V., Bartlett, S. G. & Samulesson, G. Carbonic anhydrases in plants

and algae. *Plant Cell Environ.* **24**, 141-153 (2001).

31. Field, D., Tiwari, B. & Snape, J. Bioinformatics and data management support for

environmental genomics. *PLoS Biol.* **3**, 1352-1353 (2005).

32. Heyduk, K., Moreno-Villena, J. J., Gilman, I. S., Christin, P. A. & Edwards, E. J.

The genetics of convergent evolution: insights from plant photosynthesis. *Nat.*

Rev. Genet. **20**, 485-493 (2019).

33. O'Leary, B., Park, J. & Plaxton, W. C. The remarkable diversity of plant PEPC

(phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase): recent insights into the physiological

functions and post-translational controls of non-photosynthetic PEPCs. *Biochem.*

J. **436**, 15-34 (2011).

34. Koendjbiharie, J. G., van Kranenburg, R. & Kengen, S. W. M. The

PEP-pyruvate-oxaloacetate node: variation at the heart of metabolism. *FEMS*

Microbiol. Rev. **45**, fuaa061 (2021).

35. Liu, Y. Q., Tang, S., Yan, Q., Zhou, J. & Cai, Z. H. Effectiveness and associated

mechanisms of a combination of biofilm attached cultivation and mixotrophy in

promoting microalgal biomass. *Bioresour. Technol.* **393**, 130077 (2024).

36. Windhagauer, M. et al. Metabolic response to a heterologous

poly-3-hydroxybutyrate (PHB) pathway in *Phaeodactylum tricornutum*. *Appl.*

Microbiol. Biotechnol. **108**, 1-16 (2024).

37. Legouis, D., Faivre, A., Cippà, P. E. & de Seigneux, S. Renal gluconeogenesis:

an underestimated role of the kidney in systemic glucose metabolism. *Nephrol.*

Dial. Transplant. **37**, 1417-1425 (2022).

38. Weis, V. M. & Allemand, D. What determines coral health? *Science* **324**,

1153-1155 (2009).

39. Tohse, H., Murayama, E., Ohira, T., Takagi, Y. & Nagasawa, H. Localization and

diurnal variations of carbonic anhydrase mRNA expression in the inner ear of the

rainbow trout *Oncorhynchus mykiss*. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. Part B: Biochem.*

Mol. Biol. **145**, 257-264 (2006).

40. Allemand, D., Tambutté, É., Zoccola, D. & Tambutté, S. Coral calcification, cells to

reefs. *Coral Reefs: an Ecosystem in Transition*, 119-150 (2011).

41. Fukuda, I. et al. Molecular cloning of a cDNA encoding a soluble protein in the

coral exoskeleton. Biochem. *Biophys. Res. Commun.* **304**, 11-17 (2003).

42. Sunagawa, S., DeSalvo, M. K., Voolstra, C. R., Reyes-Bermudez, A. & Medina, M.

Identifification and gene expression analysis of a taxonomically restricted

cysteine-rich protein family in reef-building corals. *PLoS One* **4**, e4865 (2009).

43. Grasso, L. C. et al. The biology of coral metamorphosis: molecular responses of

larvae to inducers of settlement and metamorphosis. *Dev. Biol.* **353**, 411-419

(2011).

44. Mass, T. et al. Cloning and characterization of four novel coral acid-rich proteins

that precipitate carbonates in vitro. *Curr. Biol.* **23**, 1126-1131 (2013).

45. Wang, X. et al. The evolution of calcification in reef-building corals. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*

38, 3543-3555 (2021).

46. Goldberg, W. M. Coral food, feeding, nutrition, and secretion: a review. *Mar.*

Organisms as Model Systems in Biology and Medicine, 377-421 (2018).

47. Cui, G. et al. Molecular insights into the *Darwin paradox* of coral reefs from the

sea anemone *Aiptasia*. *Sci. Adv.* **9**, eadf7108 (2023).

48. Bertucci, A. et al. Carbonic anhydrases in anthozoan corals-a review. *Bioorg. Med.*

Chem. **21**, 1437-1450 (2013).

49. Tansik, A. L., Fitt, W. K. & Hopkinson, B. M. Inorganic carbon is scarce for

symbionts in scleractinian corals. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **62**, 2045-2055 (2017).

50. Fukuda, W., Fukui, T., Atomi, H. & Imanaka T. First characterization of an

archaeal GTP-dependent phosphoenolpyruvate carboxykinase from the

hyperthermophilic archaeon *Thermococcus kodakaraensis* KOD1. *J. Bacteriol.*

186, 4620-4627 (2004).

51. Allemand, D. & Furla, P. How does an animal behave like a plant? Physiological

and molecular adaptations of zooxanthellae and their hosts to symbiosis. *C. R.*

Biol. **341**, 276-280 (2018).

52. Mamedov, T. G. & Chollet, R. Discovery of novel phosphoenolpyruvate

carboxylase (PEPC) genes and their active polypeptides in the green microalga

Chlamydomonas reinhardtii. Proc. ANAS (Biol. Sci.) **65**, 99-105 (2010).

53. Wu, S. et al. Proteomic and biochemical responses to different concentrations of

CO_2 suggest the existence of multiple carbon metabolism strategies in

Phaeodactylum tricornutum. Biotechnol. Biofuels **14**, 1-17 (2021).

54. Kupriyanova, E. V., Pronina, N. A. & Los, D. A. Adapting from low to high: an

update to CO_2-concentrating mechanisms of *Cyanobacteria* and microalgae.

Plants **12**, 1569 (2023).

55. Seo, S., Jeon, H., Chang, K. S. & Jin, E. S. Enhanced biomass production by

Phaeodactylum tricornutum overexpressing phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase.

Algal Res. **31**, 489-496 (2018).

56. Wei, L. et al. Transcriptomic and proteomic responses to very low CO_2 suggest

multiple carbon concentrating mechanisms in *Nannochloropsis oceanica*.

Biotechnol. Biofuels **12**, 1-21 (2019).

57. Wang, Y. et al. Realization process of microalgal biorefinery: the optional

approach toward carbon net-zero emission. *Sci. Total Environ.* 165546 (2023).

58. Rädecker, N., Pogoreutz, C., Wild, C. & Voolstra, C. R. Stimulated respiration and

net photosynthesis in *Cassiopeia* sp. during glucose enrichment suggests in

hospite CO_2 limitation of algal endosymbionts. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **4**, 267 (2017).

59. Lyndby, N. H. et al. Effect of feeding and thermal stress on photosynthesis,

respiration and the carbon budget of the scleractinian coral *Pocillopora*

damicornis. bioRxiv 378059 (2018).

60. Gladfelter, E. H., Michel, G. & Sanfelici, A. Metabolic gradients along a branch of

the reef coral *Acropora palmata*. *Bull. Mater. Sci.* **44**, 1166-1173 (1989).

61. Colombo-Pallotta, M. F., Rodríguez-Román, A. & Iglesias-Prieto, R. Calcification

in bleached and unbleached *Montastraea faveolata*: evaluating the role of oxygen

and glycerol. *Coral Reefs* **29**, 899-907 (2010).

62. Bertucci, A., Forêt, S., Ball, E. E. & Miller, D. J. Transcriptomic differences

between day and night in *Acropora millepora* provide new insights into metabolite

exchange and light-enhanced calcification in corals. *Mol. Ecol.* **24**, 4489-4504

(2015).

63. Van der Heijden, L. H. & Kamenos, N. A. Calculating the global contribution of

coralline algae to carbon burial. *Biogeosciences* **12**, 7845-7877 (2015).

64. Van Dam, B. R. et al. Calcification-driven CO_2 emissions exceed "Blue Carbon"

sequestration in a carbonate seagrass meadow. *Sci. Adv.* **7**, eabj1372 (2021).

65. Hii, Y. S., Ambok Bolong, A. M., Yang, T. T. & Liew, H. C. Effect of elevated carbon

dioxide on two scleractinian corals: *Porites cylindrica* (Dana, 1846) and *Galaxea*

fascicularis (Linnaeus, 1767). *J. Mar. Sci.* 2009.

66. Heron, S. F., Maynard, J. A., van Hooidonk, R. & Eakin C. M. Warming trends and

bleaching stress of the world's coral reefs 1985-2012. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 38402 (2016).

67. Hughes, T. P. et al. Global warming and recurrent mass bleaching of corals.

Nature **543**, 373-377 (2017).

68. Dove, S. G., Brown, K. T., Van Den Heuvel, A., Chai, A. & Hoegh-Guldberg, O.

Ocean warming and acidification uncouple calcification from calcifier biomass

which accelerates coral reef decline. *Commun. Earth Environ.* **1**, 55 (2020).

69. Treignier, C., Tolosa, I., Grover, R., Reynaud, S. & Ferrier-Pagé sa, C. Carbon

isotope composition of fatty acids and sterols in the scleractinian coral *Turbinaria*

reniformis: effect of light and feeding. Limnol. Oceanogr. **54**, 1933-1940 (2009).

70. Ferrier-Pages, C. et al. Summer autotrophy and winter heterotrophy in the

temperate symbiotic coral *Cladocora caespitosa*. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **56**,

1429-1438 (2011).

71. Imbs, A. B., Yakovleva, I. M., Dautova, T. N., Bui, L. H. & Jones, P. Diversity of

fatty acid composition of symbiotic dinoflagellates in corals: evidence for the

transfer of host PUFAs to the symbionts. *Phytochemistry* **101**, 76-82 (2014).

72. Yellowlees, D. et al. Role of carbonic anhydrase in the supply of inorganic carbon

to the giant clam-zooxanthellate symbiosis. *Mar. Biol.* **115**, 605-611 (1993).

73. Gohari, M. Y. & Darki, B. Z. Physiological and biochemical responses of

dinoflagellate *Symbiodinium* sp. to the different light intensities. *Shahid Beheshti*

808   *Univ.* **4**, 524-533 (2020).

809   74. Søderberg, L. M. & Hansen, P. J. Growth limitation due to high pH and low

810   inorganic carbon concentrations in temperate species of the dinoflagellate genus

811   *Ceratium*. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **351**, 103-112 (2007).

812   75. Puspasari, F. et al. Characteristics of raw starch degrading α-amylase from

813   *Bacillus aquimaris* MKSC 6.2 associated with soft coral *Sinularia* sp. *Starch -*

814   *Stärke* **63**, 461-467 (2011).

815   76. Ji, M. K. et al. Biodegradation of bisphenol A by the freshwater microalgae

816   *Chlamydomonas mexicana* and *Chlorella vulgaris*. *Ecol. Eng.* **73**, 260-269

817   (2014).

818   77. Mydlarz, L. D. & Jacobs, R. S. An inducible release of reactive oxygen radicals in

819   four species of gorgonian corals. *Mar. Freshw. Behav. Physiol.* **39**, 143-152

820   (2006).

821   78. Rädecker, N. et al. Nutrient stress arrests tentacle growth in the coral model

822   *Aiptasia*. *Symbiosis* **78**, 61-64 (2019).

823   79. Koichiro, T., Glen, S. & Sudhir, K. MEGA11: molecular evolutionary genetics

824   analysis version 11. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **7**, 3022-3027 (2021).

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Projects of Shenzhen Science and Technology Program（KCXFZ20211020163557022, KCXFZ20211020165547011), and the Cross Research and Innovation Funding of Tsinghua SIGS (JC2022004).

Author contributions

BY.Z. and ZH.C. conceptualised and designed the experiments. BY.Z., L.L., XM.T., YQ.L. and WM.X. performed the experiments. BY.Z., S.T. and JM.Z. analysed and visualised the data. BY.Z. and S.T. interpreted the results and wrote the manuscript. HS.B., J.Z., MC.B. and ZH.C. revised the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

836 **Supplementary information**

838 **Fig. S1: DIC consumption of monocultured zooxanthellae at different carbon**

839 **concentrations. a-c**, DIC concentration in medium at 2 mM, 4 mM and 8 mM

840 NaHCO$_3$ group. The graphs show the mean ± SD (n = 3).

Fig. S2: Comparison of the differential expression of photosynthesis genes in zooxanthellae. a, Carbon fixation genes in zooxanthellae. P_2 bisphosphate. P phosphate. **b,** Photosynthesis photosystem genes in zooxanthellae. The expression results of one sequence with the largest length of the transcriptome compared with

the reference sequence of KEGG database were selected for each gene in the figure.

The colors indicate the $\log_2 fc$ values of each treatment group compared to the control

LS, from left to right once for DG, DS, and LG. Heatmap colors indicate relative

expression levels, also the $\log_2 fc$ values of each treatment group compared with the

control LS. P indicates the significance of the difference between each treatment

group and LS.

Fig. S3: Size range of microbubbles in CO₂ group and Chlorophyll fluorescence parameters of *G. lobata* and *A. digitifera*. a-c, Size range of microbubbles in CO_2 group 1-3. d_{32} indicate the diameters of microbubbles. **d-e**, Chlorophyll fluorescence parameters of *G. lobata* and *A. digitifera*, respectively. The related parameters used in chlorophyll fluorescence quantification were shown in Table. S1.

Fig. S4: Schematic diagram of the carbon fixation pattern of coral host-zooxanthellae symbiosis. The diagram indicates the internal tissue in one tentacle of the *G. lobata*. Arrow colors indicate different DIC pathways. Green indicates symbiotic algal CCM. Blue indicates host CCM. Yellow indicates host calcification. Purple indicates host respiration.

Parameters & Formula	Description
$V_J=(F_{2ms}-F_0)/(F_m-F_0)$	Relative variable fluorescence intensity at the J-step
$M_0=4(F_{300\mu s}-F_0)/(F_m-F_0)$	The rate at which QA is reduced
$F_V/F_m=1-(F_0/F_m)=\varphi_{p0}$	Maximum photochemical efficiency (at t=0)
$\varphi_{E0}=ET_0/ABS=[1-(F_0/F_m)]\ \Psi_0$	Quantum yield for electron transport (at t=0)
$\Psi_0=1-V_J$	Probability that a trapped exciton moves an electron into the electron transport chain beyond Q_A (at t=0)
$ABS/RC=M_0\ (1/V_J)\ (1/\varphi_{p0})$	Absorption flux per reaction center
$TR_0/RC=M_0\ (1/V_J)$	Trapped energy flux per reaction center for Q_A reduction (at t=0)
$ET_0/RC=M_0\ (1/V_J)\ \Psi_0$	Trapped energy flux per reaction center for electron transfer (at t=0)
$DI_0/RC=(ABS/RC)-(TR_0/RC)$	Dissipated energy flux per reaction center (at t=0)
$RC/CS=\varphi_{p0}\ (V_J/M_0)\ ABS/CS_0$	Density of per excited cross section
$PI_{ABS}=(RC/ABS)\quad [\varphi_{p0}/(1-\varphi_{p0})]\ [\Psi_0/(1-\Psi_0)]$	Performance index based on absorbed light energy
$PI_{CS}=(RC/CS)\quad [\varphi_{p0}/(1-\varphi_{p0})]\ [\Psi_0/(1-\Psi_0)]$	Performance index of light cross-section
$W_K=(F_k-F_0)/(F_J-F_0)$	The damage degree to the photosynthetic system

864 **Table. S1: The related parameters, formula and related-descriptions used in**

865 **chlorophyll fluorescence quantification.**

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Dry weight (g mL^{-1})	0.0031	0.0032	0.0029	0.0031	0.0032
Cell counts (cell mL^{-1})	7.64×10^6	7.80×10^6	7.50×10^6	7.60×10^6	7.68×10^6
Dry weight of individual cells (g cell^{-1})	4.06×10^{-10}	4.10×10^{-10}	3.87×10^{-10}	4.08×10^{-10}	4.17×10^{-10}

867   **Table. S2: Preliminary experiments to calculate the standard curve between the**

868   **cell counts and dry weight of zooxanthellae.** Average = 4.05×10^{-10}, SD = 1.12

869    $\times 10^{-11}$.