Alejandro Sosnovsky[1*], Mailén Elizabeth Lallement[1], Magalí Rechencq[1], Eduardo Enrique Zattara[1], María Valeria Fernández[1], Sergio Leiva[2], María José Suárez[3], Romina Daga[4] and Rodolfo Juan Carlos Cantet[3]

Title: Topography and Land Use Modulate Hydrological and Nutrient Export Dynamics in Andean Streams

Short Title: Hydrology and Nutrient exports in Andean streams

[1]Grupo de Evaluación y Manejo de Recursos Ícticos, INIBIOMA, CONICET-Universidad Nacional del Comahue, Quintral 1250, R8400FRF San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina

[2] Grupo de Nuevos Materiales y Dispositivos, Comisión Nacional de Energía Atómica Av. Ezequiel Bustillo Km 9.5 (8400) San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina

[3]Departamento de Producción Animal, Facultad de Agronomía, Universidad de Buenos Aires, e INPA, CONICET. Av. San Martín 4453, C1417DSQ Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina

[4]Laboratorio de Análisis por Activación Neutrónica, Centro Atómico Bariloche, Comisión Nacional de Energía Atómica, Av. Bustillo 9500, 8400 Bariloche, Argentina. Centro Científico Tecnológico CONICET. Patagonia Norte.

[*] Corresponding autor e-mail address: alejandro.sosnovsky@comahue-conicet.gob.ar

Telephone number: +54 294 423374 (452), Fax number: 0054-2944-422111

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Rio Negro's province Water Department and Argentina's National Weather Service for providing hydrological and meteorological data; and D.S. Ahearn for his interesting comments during the data analysis and writing periods. This study was funded by *Agencia Nacional de Promoción Científica y Tecnológica* (PICT 2959). Lallement, M.E. has a National Scientific and Technical Research Council (CONICET) postdoctoral fellowship. Sosnovsky, A, Cantet, R.J.J., Rechenq, M., Fernandez, M.V., Zattara, E.E. and Daga, R. are CONICET researchers.

ABSTRACT

Rivers and streams act as integrators of aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, their dynamics driven by multiple environmental factors and scales. Hydrological and nutrient dynamics of Andean fluvial ecosystems, and how they are affected by anthropic impacts is still poorly known. We characterized two adjacent streams with contrasting drainage basins: Casa de Piedra, originating in a small mountain lake and running through a pristine landscape, and Gutiérrez, originating in a large piedmont lake and running through an anthropized landscape. Despite both drainage basins sharing geology and temperature and precipitation regimes, we found that the streams presented contrasting hydrological dynamics and nutrient export values. Casa de Piedra had higher discharge flashiness with shorter response delays to precipitation, while Gutiérrez showed more stable hydrograms due to buffering by the large piedmont lake in Gutiérrez's basin. Streams showed differences in the quality and timing of coarse particulate organic matter export and basal export levels of phosphorus and nitrogen that could be explained by human activities affecting Gutiérrez but not Casa de Piedra. Moreover, nitrogen:phosphorus ratio indicates a possible future shift to phosphorus as the limiting nutrient as Andean basins become more densely populated. In summary, our results show that even under a common geology and a climate, stream dynamics of adjacent basins can be starkly different due to topographic and land use drivers.

INTRODUCTION

River ecosystems have traditionally been studied as isolated entities; however, over time it has become clear that they are deeply intertwined with their surroundings (Likens 1985). Climate, topography, geology and land cover are environmental factors that control spatial patterns in these ecosystems through often hierarchical influence (Snelder and Biggs 2002). In other words, a river is the product of its landscape (Wiens 2002) and thus riverine

hydrological, chemical and biological processes should be studied in relation to the river's overall drainage basin (Hynes 1975; Vannote *et al.* 1980).

Regional climate and drainage basin topography are factors acting at a macro and meso spatial scales upon the river ecosystem, strongly driving hydrological and chemical dynamics (Snelder and Biggs 2002). Climate directly drives the hydrological cycle, determining the flow regime of a stream, a key ecosystem variable (Poff *et al.* 1997). Rain, snowmelt and groundwater feed stream discharge, the relative importance of these factors varying over time and space (Brown *et al.* 2003). After a rain episode, surface and sub-surface run-off are favored at mountainous landscapes, while water infiltration and evapotranspiration are favored at highly vegetated lowlands with permeable soils. Snowfall at high altitudes contributes to formation of a snowpack, which will store water until the melt period, when this water flows down into a stream (Bailey 1995). Lakes are also topographic features of a drainage basin that can buffer run-off response and sediment transport (Snelder and Biggs 2002). Thus, headwater lakes influence directly the hydrograph and sediment dynamic of downstream fluvial ecosystems (Gordon *et al.* 2004). These hydrographs tend to be stable over time, furthermore, considering lakes as sediment and nutrient traps, low values of nutrient concentration and export could be expected in these streams (Little *et al.* 2008; Parker *et al.* 2009).

At a lower spatial scale, drainage basin traits also affect fluvial dynamics, since nutrients and contaminants generated at the basin eventually reach the river ecosystem (Allan 2004; Dodds and Smith 2016). Non-point source pollution, associated with changing land use patterns and practices, has resulted in increased impacts on water bodies (Carpenter *et al.* 1998; Jordan *et al.* 1997). For example, growth of urban areas favors nutrient export (Howarth *et al.* 1996; Meyer *et al.* 2005; Walsh *et al.* 2005). Moreover, direct dumping of sewage water to a stream greatly increases nutrient load (Pieterse *et al.* 2003) and can also change nutrient

stoichiometry (Merseburger *et al.* 2005). Thus, increases of nutrient load leading to eutrophication of running waters and carbon dynamics largely depend on the drainage basin state.

In Northern Patagonia, characteristics of Andean ecosystems are largely determined by the Andes mountain range. The region is characterized by a temperate-cold climate with warm and dry summers (Peel *et al.* 2007). The Andes represent an important barrier for humid air masses brought from the Pacific Ocean by westerly winds. Most of the humidity in these maritime air masses precipitates on the west side of the Andes as they are blown to higher, colder altitudes across the mountain range. Upon crossing the Andes, the air descends along the east slopes and becomes hotter and drier through adiabatic warming. East of the Andes, the amount of rainfall follows a steep west-east gradient: annual precipitation drops from 3500 mm to 700 mm in less than 60 km. Moreover, the precipitation regime shows marked seasonality, with most rain falling during fall and winter (Paruelo *et al.* 1998). As in other South American watersheds, N deposition is remarkably low (Holland *et al.* 1999), and forest (Diehl *et al.* 2003) and lake ecosystems (Diaz *et al.* 2007) are limited mainly by N. Moreover, a large fraction of drainage basins along the East side of the Andes are in a relatively pristine state because human population density is low. Diverse authors have studied anthropic (Miserendino *et al.* 2016) and natural (Carrillo *et al.* 2018; Lallement *et al.* 2016; Williams Subiza and Brand 2018) impacts on Andean drainage basins and their fluvial ecosystems. Work carried out in these drainage basins has revealed the oligotrophic character of the fluvial ecosystems (Pedrozo *et al.* 1993). Rivers and streams mainly originate from high-altitude wetlands and small lakes, or large piedmont lakes; and their hydrological regime can be divided into storm, snowmelt and basal periods (Sosnovsky *et al.* 2020). Recent research has revealed the dynamics of organic matter, which is intimately associated with the stream-basin interaction (Díaz Villanueva *et al.* 2016; García *et al.* 2018; García *et al.* 2015b).

Nevertheless, Andean Patagonian studies focusing on stream discharge (Barros and Camilloni 2016; Masiokas *et al.* 2008; Sosnovsky *et al.* 2020) and nutrient load or export (Oyarzún *et al.* 2004; Oyarzún *et al.* 1998; Temporetti 2006) are still scarce, despite the hydrological, ecological and human importance of these variables. Even scarcer are studies where natural processes and undisturbed nutrient cycling can be assessed in pristine ecosystems (Hedin *et al.* 1995) like the ones can be found in North Patagonian region.

The main hypothesis of our study is that climate is the main driver of stream ecosystems dynamics, which are in turn modulated by topography and land use. As a consequence, we expect precipitation, air temperature and stream discharge to be intimately connected. In turn, adjacent drainage basins with contrasting topography and land use should present differences in their hydrological, physical and chemical dynamics. To test this hypothesis, we selected two streams located in adjacent yet contrasting drainage basins: Casa de Piedra (CP) and Gutiérrez (G). CP drainage basin is pristine throughout its length, and the stream originates in a high-mountain lake. G drainage basin suffers from significant anthropization, and the stream originates from a large piedmont lake. On one hand, we expect to find buffered hydrological and chemical dynamics in G, relative to CP. On the other, higher anthropization of G's basin could impact the stream ecosystem, potentially causing elevated or unpredictable variability in discharge regime along with increase nutrient concentration and export. Our first goal was to characterize discharge in these fluvial ecosystems. To this end, we compare discharge magnitude and variability of CP and G, and study how it relates to climatic variables (basin precipitation and air temperature). Our second goal is to determine the trophic state of these two streams, by measuring basal concentration, export and stoichiometry of nitrogen (TN: total N) and phosphorous (TP: total P), and estimate basal export of coarse particulate organic matter (CPOM, organic matter > 1mm). Our third goal is to identify seasonal patterns of key physical and chemical variables.

MATERIALS Y METHODS

Study area

Regional landscapes of Andean North Patagonia are the result mainly of glaciation/deglaciation, fluvial and mass movement processes over the previous structural-tectonic landscape, resulting in geomorphologies like the huge longitudinal valley occupied by Gutiérrez lake (Fig. 1). In the region, most fluvial courses have clear structural control. Highest mountains show mainly the result of glacial erosion processes while both erosive and depositional geoforms are present in the hillsides corresponding to ancient lateral glacial valleys. The alluvial plains of streams and tributaries in the area run mainly on moraine systems and streams mouths form alluvial fans over glacifluvials plains (Pereyra *et al.* 2005).

The lithology of the study site is mainly composed of rocks of the Paleozoic metamorphic and granitic basement, Cretacic and Miocene granite porphyry, and limited outcrops of Jurasic volcanic and sedimentary rocks covering previous granitoids. Oligocene volcanic and marine sedimentary rocks are also present (Giacosa *et al.* 2001). In general, the rocky outcrops constitute the hydrogeologic basement with almost absent primary permeability and secondary permeability acquired by folding and fracturing of the rocks. Headwaters are dominated by rocky outcrops and poor soil development is associated mainly to presence of vegetation and lower slopes on the sides of glacial valleys. On the other hand, the lower parts of the landscape are represented by Pliocene-Pleistocene glacial material (moraines, glaciofluvial-fluvial and glaciolaustrine deposits) with poorly to moderately developed soils (Andisols reaching more than 80 cm in some places) under well drained conditions, well provided of superficial organic matter and phosphorus retention >85% (Satti *et al.* 2003). The most recent sedimentary deposits correspond to the present alluvial materials (gravel, sand, silt) in the flood plains surrounding the Gutiérrez lake and streams, with poorly developed soils due to active morphodynamics and coarse materials (Giacosa *et al.* 2001;

Pereyra *et al.* 2005). Associated to these deposits are unconfined aquifers of variable permeability and discontinuous character due to the heterogeneity on the grain size of the deposits (Pereyra *et al.* 2005).

Research was conducted at the drainage basin of the streams Casa de Piedra (CP; 41° 07’ 30.11” S 71° 27’ 13.16”W) and Gutiérrez (G; 41° 09’ 36.18” S 71° 24’ 37.19”W), both located in Nahuel Huapi National Park, Río Negro, Argentina (Fig. 1). These drainage basins are very different from each other, despite of their proximity (Table 1). CP’s basin covers 65.5 km^2 and the stream originates in lake Jakob, a small (0.15 km^2), ultra-oligotrophic (1-3 $\mu g\ l^{-1}$ TP), high altitude water body situated at 1550 m above sea level (García *et al.* 2015a). CP’s only perennial affluent is the Rucaco stream, which originates at a high-altitude wetland. CP flows 19.7 km through a steep V-shaped valley (average slope: 33.9 m km^{-1}) for most of its length. CP’s drainage basin is mostly pristine, with human activities restricted to hiking and infrequent camping; human population (less than 1000 inhabitants, 2010 National Census) is restricted to lowland areas. Forest below the tree line includes deciduous *Nothofagus pumilio* and evergreens *N. dombeyi* and *Austrocedrus chilensis*. In contrast, G’s drainage basin is larger (161.6 km^2), and the stream originates in lake Gutiérrez, a deep (111 m maximum depth) and large (17 km^2) water body that occupies ~10 % of the basin’s area. The seasonal concentration of TP is 3.4 $\mu g\ l^{-1}$ on average (Diaz *et al.* 2007). G’s only perennial affluent is the Cascada stream, whose catchment covers 13.0 km^2 and includes a major summer and winter sports resort. G flows 9 km through a wide, gently sloped valley (5.9 m km^{-1}). Its riverbanks are extensively colonized by the exotic crack willow, *Salix fragilis*, and pass through a series of populated areas (approximately 4500 inhabitants, 2010 National Census) belonging to the city of San Carlos de Bariloche (approximately 108000 inhabitants, 2010 National Census). In addition, two trout farms with a total production of ~3

tons year^{-1} use G's waters. In summary, CP's basin is largely free of impact from human activities, while G's basin is not.



Fig. 1 a) Nahuel Huapi National Park; the study site is shaded in black. The city marker indicates San Carlos de Bariloche downtown. b) Study area, Casa de Piedra and Gutiérrez drainage basins, Jakob lake and Gutiérrez lake sub-catchments are also delimitated. Curves represent 100 m slope on the terrain. Populated zones are shown in dark grey, crosses indicate sampling sites, black circles indicate the limnigraphic stations and the white circle indicate the rain meter location. R Str: Rucaco stream; C Str: Cascada stream (from Sosnovsky et al. 2020).

Data collection

The present study was carried out over a period of one year, from March 2013 to March 2014. Data on precipitation and discharge was kindly provided by the Rio Negro province's Water Department. Daily precipitation was recorded with a rain meter (Fig. 1) and did not differentiate between rain and snow. Discharge data were average daily records from limnigraphic stations. CP's limnigraphic station is located close to its mouth, while G's station is located at its source (Fig. 1). Values of discharge at our G sampling site were estimated as discharge as measured at the station plus discharge for the Cascada stream, determined using the Drainage-Area Ratio method (Emerson *et al.* 2005); based on the

specific daily values of discharge for the adjacent CP stream. Specific discharge (Q^{sp}) was defined as discharge per unit area. Daily average air temperature records were obtained from the National Weather Service.

	CP: Casa de Piedra	**G:** Gutiérrez
Drainage area (km^2)	65.5 (60.3)	161.6 (30.1)
Lake area (km^2)	0.15	17.21
Native forest (%)	60.2 (61.7)	61.1 (56.3)
Bare ground (%)	(27.7) 29.7	(9.5) 17.2
Exotic forest (%)	(10.5) 9.9	10.8 (34.2)
Population (N)	< 1000 (< 1000)	4528 (3580)
Urban area (km^2)	0.65 (0.65)	11.35 (5.08)

Table 1 Drainage basins characteristics. Values are expressed based on the entire area of the drainage basins, values between parentheses exclude the sub-catchment areas draining into Jakob lake and Gutiérrez lake.

Baseline levels of nutrients and relevant physical and chemical variables were obtained from monthly samples at both streams (Fig. 2). Water samples were taken to analyze total phosphorus (TP) and total nitrogen (TN) concentrations. Water turbidity was measured with a Velp turbidimeter. Temperature, electrical conductivity (EC) at 25 °C and pH were measured with an Oakton probe. Coarse particulate organic matter (CPOM) was sampled with 2 drift nets (1-mm, 20 X 20-cm opening at the mouth) that were staked in the streambed and left to collect material for intervals of 10 to 200 minutes, depending on the amount of CPOM present in the stream. During October, high and fast stream discharge prevented us from placing Surber sampler nets at G, so we performed linear interpolation for this value. Data were taken exclusively on days without precipitation.



Fig. 2 Temperature (solid line) and precipitation (dotted line) during the study period. Black dots and numbers indicate sampling dates.

Data processing and analysis

Discharge

Differences in stream discharge were evaluated using a heterogeneous variance model. For this purpose, data on the average daily discharge and average daily specific discharge were transformed to normality using the Box-Cox procedure as suggested by Peltier et al. (1998). To understand the dynamics of discharge, we used an autocorrelation analysis (Mangin 1984) and calculated Richard- Baker (R-B) index (Baker *et al.* 2004). The autocorrelation analysis examines how a value depends on preceding values over a period of time. The correlations are computed for a given lag time *k* to obtain an autocorrelation coefficient *r(k)*. For example, the correlation between today's and yesterday's stream discharges would be a lag-1 autocorrelation coefficient, *r(1)*. The autocorrelation function is represented with a correlogram, where slope is determined by the response of the system to an event. If the event has only a short-term influence on the response of the discharge, the slope of the correlogram will decrease steeply. In contrast, if the system is influenced by an event for a long time, the slope of the correlogram will decrease slowly. Generally the length of the influence of an event is given by the "memory effect" which is according to Mangin (1984) the lag number *k*

when *r(k)* reaches a value of 0.2. The formula for autocorrelation is (Larocque *et al.* 1998; Mangin 1984):

$$r(k) = \frac{C(k)}{C(O)}$$

with

$$C(k) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k}(x_t - \bar{x})\,(x_{t+k} - \bar{x})$$

Where *k* is the time lag and varies from 0 to *n.* According to Mangin (1984), *n* has to be taken as 1/3 of the whole dataset to avoid stability problems.

The annual variability in stream discharge (flashiness) was measured by the R-B index as follows:

$$R - B\ Index = \frac{\sum_{i=n}^{n}|q_i - q_{i-1}|}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i}$$

The variable q is the mean daily discharge whereas n is the number of observations. This index measures oscillations in discharge relative to total discharge. Thus, it is a dimensionless measure ranging between 0 and 2 (Fongers *et al.* 2012). A value of 0 represents a constant discharge; increased R-B index values indicate increased flashiness of streamflow. As such, the index appears to provide a useful characterization of the way drainage basins process hydrological inputs into their streamflow outputs.

In addition, we studied the relationship between discharge, precipitation and temperature by cross-correlation analysis. This analysis is widely used to analyze the linear

relationship between input and output signals in hydrology (Larocque *et al*. 1998). In this case, input signals were precipitation and temperature, and output signal was river discharge of CP and G streams. Cross-correlations are represented by a cross-correlogram. The maximum amplitude and the lag value of the cross-correlogram provide information on the delay, which indicates the time of the pulse transfer to the stream. According to Larocque *et al*. (1998) the formula for cross-correlation is:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{\mathrm{C}_{xy}\ (\mathrm{k})}{\sigma_x \sigma_y}$$

with

$$C_{xy}(k) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k}(x_t - \bar{x})\,(y_{t+k} - \bar{y})$$

Where σ_x and σ_y are the standard deviation of the two times series.

Physical and chemical analysis

We estimated concentration and export of nutrients (TN and TP) and CPOM. TN was analyzed through digestion and subsequent reduction in cadmium column (Grasshoff *et al.* 1983). TP was analyzed using acid digestion followed by evaluation of solubilized phosphorus as soluble reactive phosphorus (A.P.H.A. 2005). We estimated Ash Free Dry Weight of the CPOM using the Pozo et al. (2009) methodology. The annual export of TN, TP and CPOM were calculated by the following formula:

$$Nutrient\ export = \frac{[N]\ Q\ t}{A}$$

Where $[N]$ is nutrient concentration, Q is discharge, t is time and A is drainage basin area.

We performed a paired T-test to compare nutrient concentration and export between streams; to this end the data were transformed to comply with normality and homoscedasticity assumptions. Last, we performed a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) that included 12 variables: turbidity, temperature, EC, pH, discharge, TP, TN, TN TP^{-1}, CPOM, TP export, TN export and CPOM export. PCs were calculated based on standardized correlation matrix, using components with eigenvalues larger than 1. Number Cruncher (Hintze 1998) was employed for statistical analysis, GraphPad Prism version 6.01 was employed for graphics editing.

RESULTS

Climate and hydrology of the region

Air temperature and precipitation in the study area agreed with a Southern temperate climate. Air temperature was low between May and August and increased monotonically after September, reaching its highest values from December to February. Annual precipitation was 1164 mm and showed strong seasonality, with 80% falling between mid-May and mid-September. The first two (#1-2) and last three (#11-13) samples thus took place during a drier period; samples #3-6 were taken during the precipitation period; the remaining samples (#7-10) fell within the period of monotonic air temperature warming (Fig. 2). Thus, samples were evenly distributed across three climatically contrasting periods.

The flow regime was contrasting between the streams. CP had a lower annual average discharge value than G (Discharge $_{CP}$= 3.364 m^3/s; Discharge $_G$= 4.635 m^3/s; t =7.4437; P < 0.0001; d.f. = 728), but its Q^{sp} was higher (Q^{sp}_{CP}= 0.051 m^3/s; Q^{sp}_G= 0.029 m^3/s; t=-24.7917;

$P < 0.0001$; d.f. = 728). CP presented the most extreme discharge values (Fig. 3a): the R-B index was 0.143 for CP, compared to 0.031 for G, indicating that the average day-to-day fluctuations of streamflow were 14.3 % and 3.1 %, respectively. Furthermore, CP showed a steep autocorrelation function with a memory effect at $k = 38$, while G revealed a more gently sloped function with a memory effect at $k = 61$ (Fig 3b). Thus, CP showed higher flashiness and lower memory (i.e., temporal persistence) than G.



Fig. 3 a) Hydrographs of Casa de Piedra (CP) and Gutiérrez (G) streams, black dots and numbers indicate sampling dates. b) Autocorrelation functions and memory effects (r (k) = 0.2) of the discharge. c) Cross-correlations between discharge and precipitation, three different periods are shown, and d) cross-correlations between discharge and temperature.

Cross-correlation of discharge with precipitation and temperature showed opposing patterns. Discharge was positively correlated with precipitation, but negatively correlated with air temperature (Fig. 3c, d and Table S1). The discharge-precipitation correlogram shows three periods that coincide with peaks of the correlation function (Fig. 3c). Both streams show differences at each of these peaks: CP had higher correlation values (r_{max}) and lower lag times than G. Indeed, at CP the correlation reached its maximum the same day precipitation took place (lag = 0) during the first period, while *r* was not even significant for G at the time (Table S1). During the second period, correlation at CP reached an r_{max}=0.36 with a lag time of 34 days, while at G, correlation was lower (r_{max}=0.19) and the lag higher (lag = 40). The third, longest period presented a series of peaks and valleys, and lapsed from day 57 to day 110 after the precipitation event at CP and from day 62 to 142 at G. In contrast, the discharge-temperature correlogram did not show similar periods; cross-correlation was significant from day 0 to around day 90 for both streams (Fig. 3d, Table S1).

Physical and chemical characteristics of the streams studied

Although streams differed in the specific values, both had very low EC, turbidity, nutrient concentration and nutrient export (Table 2). G showed the highest TP and TN concentrations (Fig. 4a, c) and exports (Fig. 4b, d): CP exported 8.9 kg TP km^{-2} year^{-1} and 59.5 kg TN km^{-2} year^{-1}, while G exported 11.6 kg TP km^{-2} year^{-1} and 78.4 kg TN km^{-2} year^{-1} (approximately 30 % more P and N). No significant differences in TN:TP average ratios were found (~15; Fig. 4e), although the median value of TN:TP was 11 for CP and 16 for G. As to the amount of CPOM exported, no significant difference between streams was found. There were differences, however, in the quality of exported material; native *N. pumilio* leaves dominated in CP, while introduced *S. fragilis* leaves dominated in G. The peaks of CPOM export also differed among streams: highest export at CP was found during June and July (samples #3-4), while at G this peak occurred earlier, in April (sample #2). In summary, the drainage basin

showing more anthropic land uses also showed higher nutrient export, with most CPOM export represented by introduced tree species.

	Casa de Piedra	Gutiérrez
Temperature (°C)	7.8 (3.7-12.5)	10.6 (6.0-16.8)
Electrical Conductivity (µs cm^{-1})	43 (27-61)	74 (71-76)
Turbidity (NTU)	0.2 (0.0-0.8)	0.7 (0.0-2.0)
pH	7.8 (7.4-8.0)	7.9 (7.3-8.1)
Total Phosphorus (mg m^{-3})	5 (2-9)	14 (10-18)
Total Nitrogen (mg m^{-3})	29 (18-44)	94 (75-134)
TN TP^{-1} (molar)	15 (6-31)	15 (11-21)
Coarse Particulate Organic Matter (AFDW m^{-3})*10	0.46 (0.04-1.86)	0.91 (0.02-8.76)
Total Phosphorus export (kg km^{-2} y^{-1})	8.6 (1.7-25.4)	11.6 (3.8-22.5)
Total Nitrogen export (kg km^{-2} y^{-1})	57.5 (7.9-129.6)	78.4 (27.3-184.8)
Coarse Particulate Organic Matter export (kg km^{-2} y^{-1})	126.4 (1.3-750.4)	43.1 (1.5-317.9)

Table 2 Average values, maximum and minimum in brackets, of the physical and chemical variables in the streams (n=13, except for the Coarse particulate organic matter where n=12).



Fig. 4 Box plot showing annual differences in nutrient concentration, ratio and export in Casa de Piedra (CP) and Gutiérrez (G) streams (Paired T Test, * $P \leq 0.05$; * * $P \leq 0.01$; * ** $P \leq 0.001$; ns: not significant). f) The Y axis

is in logarithmic scale. Total Phosphorus (TP), Total Nitrogen (TN) and Coarse Particulate Organic Matter (CPOM).

Our PCA determined three Principal Component, FI, FII and FIII that respectively explain 33%, 24% and 13% of the variance, accounting for 70% of the total variance (Table 3). FI was mainly related to discharge and nutrient export (TP_{exp} and TN_{exp}) (Fig. 5a). Positive FI values corresponded to samples with high discharge, high nutrient export and high turbidity. The FII was mainly related to the EC of the water, and to a lesser extent with water temperature and nutrient concentration (Fig. 5a). The FIII was mainly related to the TN:TP ratio, and to a lesser extent with CPOM variables.

Variable	First Factor (33%)	Second Factor (24%)	Third Factor (13%)
Temperature		0.31	
EC		0.47	
Turbidity	0.35		
Q	0.38		
TP	0.35	0.41	
TN	0.36	0.32	
TN TP^{-1}			0.55
CPOM			-0.47
TP_{exp}	0.42		
TN_{exp}	0.42		
$CPOM_{exp}$		-0.35	-0.55

Table 3 Principal Component Analysis on physical and chemical variables. Factors are a linear combination of the different variables. Percent of variance explained and factor loadings (> 0.30) are shown. Abbreviations are as in Figure 5.

Both streams are clearly discriminated by PCA ordering, highlighting seasonal differences in each stream (Fig. 5b). Besides separating samples from each stream, plotting FI versus FII shows that each stream is temporally heterogeneous, allowing clustering in 3 groups for CP (CP_A, CP_B and CP_C) and 2 for G (G_A and G_B) (Fig. 5b). CP_A had low discharge and export rate values and high temperatures, taking place at the warmest period (Fig. 2). CP_B had higher nutrient concentration and export values, matching the period with more abundant precipitation (Fig. 2). CP_C was mainly characterized by low EC, nutrient concentration and turbidity values, and coincides with the period of diminishing rainfall and monotonic air temperature warming (Fig. 2). G_A had similar characteristics to CP_A and spans the same period. The remaining samples fall within G_B. Thus, the values of physical and chemical variables sampled monthly through the year show that both streams have marked seasonal differences that follow precipitation and air temperature patterns.



Fig 5 Principal Component Analysis (PCA) of physical and chemical variables in the study streams. a) The weight of variables in each of the axes is shown. b) First factorial plane of the PCA, Casa de Piedra sampling dates are represented by triangles and Gutiérrez ones are represented by rectangules, the numbers correspond to the sampling dates and they are grouped by climatic characteristics of the region (a, b and c). Electrical conductivity (EC), Discharge (Q), Total Phosphorus (TP), Total Nitrogen (TN), Coarse Particulate Organic Matter (CPOM), Export (exp).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We surveyed discharge and nutrient dynamics in two adjacent North Patagonian streams with contrasting drainage basins. Precipitation had a direct influence on the magnitude of stream discharge at both streams, but the response time varied between them. CP stream was flashy, showed a tighter relation between precipitation at the basin and discharge response and stronger seasonality of physical and chemical parameter values. G stream, in contrast, showed a more buffered discharge response to precipitation and higher nutrient exports. In general, similarities seen between streams can be related to regional climate and geology, while differences are better explained by contrasting topography and land use of the respective drainage basins.

Precipitation and temperature have opposite influence in river discharge in the Andean region (Masiokas *et al.* 2008). Precipitation increased stream discharge of our study sites. The different pathways taken by precipitated water to reach the streams (run-off, groundwater and snowmelt) (Brown *et al.* 2003) and their relative importance are evidenced by the three periods found in the discharge-precipitation correlogram. Surface run-off was more relevant at CP, a stream that feeds from run-off from a basin characterized by steep slopes and the lack of buffering from a large upstream lake. In this stream, discharge increased drastically during the same day precipitation occurred, and the following days. Water that does not reach the stream immediately as run-off, infiltrates into the soil and moves to the stream as sub-surface run-off or groundwater; these pathways usually results in a delayed stream discharge response (Kalff 2002). This delay time was close to a month for both streams; this similarity was due because both basins share the same lithological, geomorphological, and soil development (Giacosa *et al.* 2001), and these basin characteristics drives groundwater dynamics. The sub-surface run-off and groundwater pathways were also more relevant at CP, which showed a higher *r(max)* and shorter delay times. In colder regions, snow precipitation is stored during the winter months and released as snowmelt in spring and summer (Bailey 1995). This results in a delay time between precipitation and discharge response of about 2-4 months, as we found at both study sites during spring. The observed discharge dynamics and its relationship with precipitation (either rain or snow) match with the different water pathways to streams described at other mountainous regions (Ahearn *et al.* 2004; Brown *et al.* 2003). On the other hand, air temperature decreased stream discharge of our study sites, suggesting that direct evaporation and plant evapotranspiration across the basin might have a sizable effect on the amount of water reaching the streams. Interestingly, Sosnovsky et al. (2020) report a positive correlation between air temperature and discharge at shorter timescales during the melting season, suggesting that the influence of air temperature on discharge is both scale and context

dependent. Altogether, the same meteorological variable (air temperature) might modulate stream dynamics at several different points along the precipitation/runoff/discharge cycle, sometimes even in opposite direction (e.g., warm temperatures increasing snowmelt but decreasing runoff into stream through evaporation).

The presence of a headwater lake in the drainage basin regulates the flow regime of a stream (Baker *et al.* 2004). This was made evident by the contrasting values of discharge autocorrelation and flashiness R-B indices between the streams in our study. The autocorrelation function fell sharply for CP but sloped more gently for G, showing a shorter memory effect (Mangin 1984) in CP, and agreeing with differences in annual values of the R-B index. Flashiness values seen at CP (R-B = 0.14) are similar to those found for streams at Austria (R-B = 0.18) and Slovakia (R-B = 0.15) that flow through basins with steep slopes and small area (Holko *et al.* 2011). In contrast, flashiness at G was much lower (R-B=0.03), and more akin the values found for streams with regulated flows in the USA (Baker *et al.* 2004). Thus, the difference in flashiness between the adjacent streams we studied is explained by the contrasting topography of their drainage basins, including the presence of a large lake in one but not the other.

Leaves of riparian trees are generally the largest component of allochthonous inputs to stream located in forested drainage basins and are often the major source of energy to heterotrophic organisms (Vannote *et al.* 1980; Webster *et al.* 1999)**.** In the case of Andean streams, *N. pumilio* leaves cover large areas of the waterway during autumn (Albariño *et al.* 2009). A substantial amount of these may be transported downstream by spates occurring from late autumn to winter and eventually reaches the lake (Modenutti *et al.* 2010). We observed no significant differences in the amount of CPOM exported by the two streams studied. However, we highlight the fact that in stream CP the CPOM was mainly made up of native *N. pumilio* leaves, while in stream G introduced *S. fragilis* leaves dominated. This

corresponds to the tree species present in the different catchments, and could explain the temporal difference between streams in the surge of CPOM; the peak in CPOM export occurred during June and July in stream CP, and during April in stream G. This supports the claim that afforestation or invasion of exotic plants with different phenology, chemical and physical characteristics to those of the native riparian species changes the timing, quantity and quality of leaf litter standing stock in streams (Naiman *et al.* 2005).

Streams in the north Patagonian region are oligotrophic (García *et al.* 2015b; Pedrozo *et al.* 1993). The concentration and the annual export rate of the nutrients from CP stream reflected this characteristic. Values of N and P concentrations were much smaller than those found in a burned sub-catchment of this region (TN = 675.1 µg l^{-1} and TP = 12.0 µg l^{-1}) (Temporetti 2006). Values of N export were lower to those measured in areas of low anthropogenic impact in Patagonia (average TN export = 100 kg km^{-2} $year^{-1}$) (Little *et al.* 2008), and values of P export were between the lowest measured in South America (TP export range from 4 to 450 kg TP km^{-2} $year^{-1}$) (Álvarez-Cobelas and Angeler 2007). These results indicate that nutrient export in CP stream and similar ecosystems are among the lowest measured for any basin in the Southern hemisphere (Álvarez-Cobelas and Angeler 2007; Little *et al.* 2008; Quinn and Stroud 2002; Temporetti 2006) and worldwide (Álvarez-Cobelas *et al.* 2008; Álvarez-Cobelas *et al.* 2009). Such low export values could be explained by low atmospheric N deposition (Holland 1996) and relatively light land use in this region. It must be noted, however, that nutrient load was measured on a monthly basis, usually in the absence of precipitation, when overall nutrient export is lower (Abell *et al.* 2013; Tate and Singer 2013). This implies that our estimates should be considered as baseline values. In any case, it is interesting to note that these rates were higher for stream G than for CP, even though the opposite result could have been expected, given that headwater lakes act as nutrient and sediment traps (Parker *et al.* 2009). The higher nutrient concentration seen at G is

thus not explained by natural causes, but by the effects of land use in its drainage basin, namely the presence of human settlements and trout farms.

Increases in eutrophication levels of river ecosystems is due to both point and diffuse sources (Carpenter *et al.* 1998). While we did not formally weigh the relative impacts of fish farming and urbanization, we suspect that a growing residential settlement of the Gutiérrez stream drainage basin, often times without adequate wastewater treating infrastructure, is expected to have a larger impact than the detritus from fish farms producing ~3 tons of fish per year. This is partially supported by nutrient measurements at G stream during the low water period where dissolved inorganic nitrogen export (DIN_{exp}) was measured downstream the larger fish farm (DIN_{exp} = 7 kg km^{-2} $year^{-1}$) and at its mouth (DIN_{exp} = 108 kg km^{-2} $year^{-1}$) (Sosnovsky, unpublished results). Moreover, the additional nutrient sources of fish food and feces from salmonid production would be expected to decrease the TN:TP ratio of the water column in Patagonia reservoirs (Diaz *et al.* 2001), yet we saw an opposite effect at G steam. However, a more detailed spatial study in this drainage basin aimed to determine the sources and sinks of total and dissolved nutrients associated to eutrophication processes would be necessary to assess the respective roles of each potential impact source.

The molecular N:P ratio is said to distinguish nitrogen-limited systems from those constrained by phosphorus (Rhee and Gotham 1980). Kahlert (1998), in a review of the literature, found that the optimal N:P ratio of freshwater benthic algae was 18:1 (molar), which deviates from the phytoplankton optimal stoichiometric N:P ratio of 16:1 (Redfield ratio) (Goldman *et al.* 1979). CP and G streams had an arithmetic mean N:P molar ratio close to 15, which would indicate nitrogen deficit in these ecosystems, similar to what has been observed in other ecosystems of Northern Patagonia, either forests (Satti *et al.* 2003) or lakes (Diaz *et al.* 2007). However, considering that median values of N:P were 11 for CP and 16 for G, it becomes evident that nitrogen limitation is being lifted at G, most likely due to

wastewater from human settlements. These systems release phosphorus and nitrogen to the soil. Phosphorus is retained in the soil (Satti *et al.* 2003) and nitrates reach the groundwater. Thus this increase in the N leaching is expected to result in increased eutrophication of the G stream and downstream water bodies. Our findings at the drainage basin level are in line with observations at the global scale suggesting human actions generate a clear unbalance favoring N over P which may induce significant alterations at organism, community and ecosystem levels (Peñuelas *et al.* 2013).

By studying two Andean streams located at adjacent, yet contrasting drainage basins, we were able to investigate the influence of environmental factors acting at different spatial scales over these freshwater ecosystems. At a regional scale, climate determined seasonality of water flow for both streams. At a landscape scale, we found that the presence of a large, deep lake buffered the hydrological dynamic of its effluent stream. At a lower spatial scale, we found that more intense human impact at G's drainage basin correlated with higher nutrient export rates by the stream. Considering the strong demographic pressure at G's drainage basin, there is a high risk of change in N:P stoichiometry and ecosystem eutrophication. Gutiérrez basin situation thus shows a stark contrast to Casa de Piedra basin, which instead has the hydrological, physical and chemical dynamics of a pristine drainage basin characteristics of Andean streams originating at high altitude wetlands and small lakes (Sosnovsky *et al.* 2020). Besides geomorphology, the main differences between both basins are land use policies: CP's basin is mostly within protected areas, while most of G's lower basin is within the limits of San Carlos de Bariloche city and subject to several, potentially high impact uses, like residential neighborhoods, winter sports and fish farming, among others. Local and global environmental problems are currently burning issues in stream ecosystem processes and will be even more so in the future. Considering that lakes and streams are sentinels and integrators of environmental change in the surrounding terrestrial

landscape (Williamson *et al*. 2008), it is really important to implement monitoring schemes for key variables of these aquatic ecosystems (Lovett *et al*. 2007) and encourage restoration and sustainable management of their drainage basins.

REFERENCES

A.P.H.A. (2005) *Standard methods for examination of water and wastewater*. American Public Health Association, Washington DC.

Abell J. M., Hamilton D. P. & Rutherfor J. C. (2013) Quantifying temporal and spatial variations in sediment, nitrogen and phosphorus transport in stream inflows to a large eutrophic lake. *Envirnomental Science Processes and Impacts*.

Ahearn D. S., Sheibley R. W., Dahlgren R. A. & Keller K. E. (2004) Temporal dynamics of stream water chemistry in the last free-flowing river draining the western Sierra Nevada, California. *Journal of Hydrology* **295**, 47-63.

Albariño R. J., Díaz Villanueva V. & Buria L. (2009) Leaf litter dynamics in a forested small Andean catchment, northern Patagonia, Argentina. In: *Ecological advances on Chilean temperate rainforest* (eds C. Oyarzún, N. E. C. Verhoest, P. Boeckx and R. Godoy) pp. 183-211. Academia Press.

Álvarez-Cobelas M. & Angeler D. G. (2007) Exportación de nutrientes en las cuencas hidrográficas de Latinoamérica: una recopilación. *Revista Latinoamericana de Recursos Naturales* **3**, 31-43.

Álvarez-Cobelas M., Angeler D. G. & Sánchez-Carrillo S. (2008) Export of nitrogen from catchments: A worldwide analysis. *Environmental Pollution* **156**, 261-9.

Álvarez-Cobelas M., Sánchez-Carrillo S. & Angeler D. G. (2009) Phosphorus export from catchments: a global view. *Journal of American Benthological Society* **28**, 805-20.

Allan J. D. (2004) Landscapes and Riverscapes: The influence of land use on stream ecosystems. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and Systematics* **35**, 257-84.

Bailey R. G. (1995) *Ecosystem Geography*. Springer-Verlag, New York, New York.

Baker D. B., Richards R. P., Loftus T. T. & Kramer J. W. (2004) A new flashiness index: Characteristics and applications to midwestern rivers and streams. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* **40**, 503-22.

Barros V. & Camilloni I. (2016) *La Argentina y el cambio climático De la física a la política*. EUDEBA, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires.

Brown L. E., Hannah D. M. & Milner A. M. (2003) Alpine Stream Habitat Classification: An Alternative Approach Incorporating the Role of Dynamic Water Source Contributions. *Artic, Antartic, and Alpine Research* **35**, 313-22.

Carpenter S. R., Caraco N. F., Correll D. L., Howarth R. W., Sharpley A. N. & Smith V. H. (1998) Nonpoint Pollution of Surface Waters with Phosphorus and Nitrogen. *Ecol. Appl.* **8**, 559-68.

Carrillo U., Díaz Villanueva V. & Modenutti B. E. (2018) Sustained effects of volcanic ash on biofilm stoichiometry, enzyme activity and community composition in North-Patagonia streams. *Sci. Total Environ.* **621**, 235-44.

Diaz M. M., Pedrozo F. L., Reynolds C. S. & Temporetti P. F. (2007) Chemical composition and the nitrogen-regulated trophic state of Patagonian lakes. *Limnologica* **37**, 17-27.

Diaz M. M., Temporetti P. F. & Pedrozo F. L. (2001) Response of phytoplankton to enrichment from cage fish farm waste in Alicura Reservoir (Patagonia, Argentina). *Lake Reserv. Manage.* **6**, 151-8.

Díaz Villanueva V., Bastidas Navarro M. & Albariño R. (2016) Seasonal patterns of organic matter stoichiometry along a mountain catchment. *Hydrobiologia*.

Diehl L., Mazzarino M. J., Funes F., Fontenla S., Gobbi M. & Ferrari J. (2003) Nutrient conservation strategies in native Andean-Patagonian forests. *Journal of Vegetation Science* **14**, 63-70.

Dodds W. K. & Smith V. H. (2016) Nitrogen, phosphorus, and eutrophication in streams. *Inland Waters* **6**, 155-64.

Emerson D. G., Vecchia A. V. & Dahl A. L. (2005) Evaluation of Drainage-Area Ratio Method Used to Estimate Streamflow for the Red River of the North Basin, North Dakota and Minnesota. (ed S. I.-. 5017) p. 18. U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia.

Fongers D., Day R. & Rathbun J. (2012) Application of the Richards-Baker Flashiness Index to gaged Michigan rivers and Streams. pp. 1-141. Water Resources Division, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Lansing.

García D. R., Diéguez M. C., Gerea M. & García P. E. (2018) Characterisation and reactivty continuum of dissolved organic matter in forested headwater catchments of Andean Patagonia. *Freshw. Biol.* **63**, 1049-62.

García P., Diéguez M. C. & Queimaliños C. P. (2015a) Landscape integration of North Patagonian mountain lakes: a first approach using characterization of dissolved organic matter. *Lakes & Reservoirs: Research and Management* **20**, 1-14.

García R. D., Reissig M., Queimaliños C. P., García P. E. & Diéguez M. C. (2015b) Climate-driven terrestrial inputs in ultraoligotrophic mountain streams of Andean Patagonia revealed through chromophoric and fluorescent dissolved organic matter. *Sci. Total Environ.* **521-522**, 280-92.

Giacosa R., Heredia N., González R., Faroux A., Césari O. & Franchi M. (2001) Hoja Geológica 4172-IV, San Carlos de Bariloche. Provincias de Río Negro y Neuquén. In: *Programa Nacional de Cartas Geológicas de la República Argentina 1:250.000.*

Goldman J. C., Mc Carthy J. J. & Peavey D. G. (1979) Growth rate influence on the chemical composition of phytoplankton in oceanic waters. *Nature* **279**, 210-5.

Gordon N. D., McMahon T. A., Gippel C. J. & Natha R. J. (2004) *Stream Hydrology An Introduction for Ecologist*. John Wiley & Sons LTD, Chichester, England.

Grasshoff M., Ehrhardt K. & Kremling K. (1983) *Methods of seawater analysis.* Wiley, New York.

Hedin L. O., Armesto J. J. & Johnson A. H. (1995) Patterns of Nutrient Loss from Unpolluted, Old-Growth Temperate Forests: Evaluation of biogeochemical theory. *Ecology* **76**, 493-509.

Hintze J. L. (1998) *Number Cruncher Statistical System (NCSS). Version 2000. User´s Guide*. Kaysville, Utah.

Holko L., Parajka J., Kostka Z., Skoda P. & Blöschl G. (2011) Flashiness of mountain streams in Slovakia and Austria. *Journal of Hydrology* **405**, 392-401.

Holland E. A., Dentener F. J., Braswell B. H. & Sulzman J. M. (1999) Contemporary and pre-industrial global reactive nitrogen budgets. *Biogeochemistry* **46**, 7-43.

Howarth R. W., Billen G., Swaney D., Townsend A., Jaworski N. A., Lajtha K., Downing J. A., Elmgren R., Caraco N., Jordan T., Berendse F., Freney J., Kudeyarov V., Murdoch P. & Zhu Z. L. (1996) Regional nitrogen budgets and riverine N & P fluxes for the drainages to the North Atlantic Ocean: natural and human influences. *Biogeochemistry* **35**, 75-139.

Hynes H. B. N. (1975) The stream and its valley. *SIL, Proceedings, 1922-2010* **19**, 1-15.

Jordan T. E., Correll D. L. & Weller D. E. (1997) Effects of agriculture on discharges of nutrients from coastal plain watersheds of Chesapeake Bay. *Journal of Environmental Quality* **26**, 836-48.

Kahlert M. (1998) C:N:P ratios of freshwater benthic algae. *Archiv für Hydrobiologie, Special Issues, Advances in Limnology* **51**, 105-14.

Kalff J. (2002) Hidrology and Climate. In: *Limnology Inland Water Ecosystems* (ed T. Ryu) pp. 53-71. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.

Lallement M., Macchi P. J., Vigliano P. H., Juarez S., Rechencq M., Baker M., Bouwes N. & Crowl T. A. (2016) Rising from the ashes: Change in salmonid fish assemblages after 30 months of the Puyehue-Cordon Caulle volcanic eruption. *Sci. Total Environ*. **541**, 1041-51.

Larocque M., Mangin A., Razack M. & Banton O. (1998) Contribution of correlation and spectral analyses to the regional study of a large karst aquifer (Charente, France). *Journal of Hydrology* **205**, 217-31.

Likens G. E. (1985) *An Ecosystem Approach to Aquatic Ecology. Mirror Lake and Its Environment*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Little C., Soto D., Lara A. & Cuevas J. G. (2008) Nitrogen exports at multiple-scales in a southern Chilean watershed (Patagonian Lakes district). *Biogeochemistry* **87**, 297-309.

Lovett G. M., Burns D. A., Driscoll C. T., Jenkins J. C., Mitchell M. J., Rustad L., Shanley J. B., Likens G. E. & Haeuber R. (2007) Who need environmental monitoring? *Frontiers in Ecology and the Envirnonment* **5**, 253-60.

Mangin A. (1984) Pour une meilleure connaissance des systèmes hydrologgiques à partir des analyses corrélatoire et spectrale. *Journal of Hydrology* **67**, 25-43.

Masiokas M. H., Villalba R., Luckman B. H., Lascano M. E., Delgado S. & Stepanek P. (2008) 20th-century recession and regional hydroclimatic changes in northwestern Patagonia. *Global and Planetary Change* **60**, 85-100.

Merseburger G. C., Martí E. & Sabater F. (2005) Net changes in nutrient concentrations below a point source input in two streams draining catchments with contrasting land uses. *Sci. Total Environ.* **347**, 217-29.

Meyer J. L., Paul M. J. & Taulbee W. K. (2005) Stream ecosystem function in urbanizing landscapes. *J. N. Amer. Benthol. Soc.* **24**, 602-12.

Miserendino M. L., Kutschker M. A., Brand C., La Manna L., Di Prinzio Y. C., Papazian G. & Bava J. (2016) Ecological Status of a Patagonian Mountain River: Usefulness of Environmental and Biotic Metrics for Rehabilitation Assessment. *Environmental Management* **57**, 1166-87.

Modenutti B. E., Albariño R. J., Bastidas Navarro M., Villanueva V. D., Souza A. F., Trochine C., Laspoumaderes C., Cuassolo F., Mariluán G., Buria L. & Balseiro E. G. (2010) Structure and dynamic of food webs in Andean North Patagonian freshwater systems: organic matter, light and nutrient relationships. *Ecol. Austral* **20**, 95-114.

Naiman R. J., Décamps H. & McClain M. E. (2005) *Riparia: ecology, conservation and management of streamside communities*. Elsevier Academic Press, London, UK.

Oyarzún C. E., Godoy R., Schrijver De A., Staelens J. & Lust N. (2004) Water chemistry and nutrient budgets in an undisturbed evergreen rainforest of souther Chile. *Biogeochemistry* **71**, 107-23.

Oyarzún C. E., Godoy R. & Sepulveda A. (1998) Water and nutrient fluxes in a cool temperate rainforest at the Cordillera de la Costa in southern Chile. *Hydrol. Process.* **12**, 1067-77.

Parker B. P., Schindler D. E., Beaty K. G., Stainton M. P. & Kasian S. E. M. (2009) Long-term changes in climate, streamflow, and nutrient budgets for first-order catchments at the Experimental Lakes Area (Ontario, Canada). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **66**, 1848-63.

Paruelo J. M., Beltran A., Jobbágy E., Sala O. & Golluscio R. (1998) The climate of Patagonia: general patterns and controls on biotic processes. *Ecol. Austral* **8**, 85-101.

Pedrozo F. L., Chillrud S., Temporetti P. F. & Diaz M. M. (1993) Chemical composition and nutrient limitation in rivers and lakes of northern Patagonian Andes (39.5º-42º S; 71º W) (Rep. Argentina). *SIL Proceedings, 1922-2010* **25**, 207-14.

Peel M. C., Finlayson B. L. & McMahon T. A. (2007) Updated world map of the Köppen-Geiger climate classification. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* **4**, 439-73.

Peltier M. R., Wilcox C. J. & Sharp D. C. (1998) Technical Note: Application of the Box-Cox data transformation to animal science experiments. *Journal of Animal Science* **78**, 847-9.

Peñuelas J., Poulter B., Sardans J., Ciais P., van der Velde M., Bopp L., Boucher O., Godderis Y., Hinsinger P., Llusia J., Nardin E., Vicca S., Obersteiner M. & Janssens I. A. (2013) Human-induced nitrogen–phosphorus imbalances alter natural and managed ecosystems across the globe. *Nature Communications* **4**, 2934.

Pereyra F. X., Albertoni J., Bréard C., Cavaliaro S., Coccia M., Ducós E., Dzendoletas M., Fookes S., Getino E., Helms F., Kruck W., López R., Muzio C., Roverano D., Tobio M., Toloczki M. & Wilson C. (2005) Estudio geocientífico aplicado al ordenamiento territorial, San Carlos de Bariloche. p. 181.

Pieterse N. M., Bleuten W. & Jørgensen S. E. (2003) Contribution of point sources and diffuse sources to nitrogen and phosphorus loads in lowland rivers tributaries. *Journal of Hydrology* **271**, 213-25.

Poff N. L., Allan J. D., Bain M. B., Karr J. R., Prestegaard K. L., Richter B. D., Sparks R. E. & Stromberg J. C. (1997) The Natural Flow Regime. *Bioscience* **47**, 769-84.

Pozo J., Elosegi A., Díez J. & Molinero J. (2009) Dinámica y relevancia de la materia orgánica. In: *Conceptos y técnicas en ecología fluvial* (eds A. Elosegi and S. Sabater) pp. 141-66. Fundación BBVA, Bilbao, España.

Quinn J. M. & Stroud M. J. (2002) Water quality and sediment and nutrient export from New Zealand hill-land. *New Zeal. J. Mar. Fresh.* **36**, 409-29.

Rhee G. Y. & Gotham I. J. (1980) Optimum N:P ratios and co-existence of planktonic algae. *Journal of Phycology* **16**, 486-9.

Satti P., Mazzarino M. J. & Gobbi M. (2003) Soil N dynamics in relation to leaf litter quality and soil fertility in north-western Patagonian forests. *Journal of Ecology* **91**, 173-81.

Snelder T. H. & Biggs B. J. F. (2002) Multiscale river environment classification for water resources management. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* **38**, 1225-39.

Sosnovsky A., Rechencq M., Fernández V., Suarez M. J. & Cantet R. J. C. (2020) Hydrological and Physico-chemical dynamics in two Andean streams. *Limnetica* **39**, en prensa.

Tate K. W. & Singer M. J. (2013) Timing, Frecuency of Sampling Affect Accuracy of Water-Quality Monitoring. *California Agriculture* **53**, 44-8.

Temporetti P. F. (2006) Efecto a largo plazo de los incendios forestales en la calidad del agua de dos arroyos en la sub-región Andino-Patagónica, Argentina. *Ecol. Austral* **16**, 157-66.

Vannote R. L., Minshall G. W., Cummins K. W., Sedell J. R. & Cushing C. E. (1980) The River Continuum Concept. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **37**, 130-7.

Walsh C. J., Fletcher T. D. & Ladson A. R. (2005) Stream restoration in urban catchments through redesigning stormwater systems: looking to the catchment to save the stream. *J. N. Amer. Benthol. Soc.* **24**.

Webster J. R., Benfield E. F., Ehrman T. P., Schaeffer M. A., Tank J. L., Hutchens J. J. & D´angelo D. J. (1999) What happens to allochthonous material that falls into streams? A synthesis of new and published information from Coweeta. *Freshw. Biol.* **41**, 687-705.

Wiens J. A. (2002) Riverine landscapes: taking landscape ecology into the water. *Freshw. Biol.* **47**, 501-15.

Williams Subiza E. A. & Brand C. (2018) Short-term effect of wildfire on Patagonian headwater streams. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* **27**, 457-70.

Williamson C. E., Dodds W. K., Kratz T. K. & Palmer M. A. (2008) Lakes and streams as sentinels of environmental change in terrestrial and atmospheric processes. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Envirnonment* **6**, 247-54.

Table 1 annexed Cross-correlation between climatic variables and discharge (* $P \leq 0.05$; * * $P \leq 0.01$; * ** $P \leq 0.001$; ns: not significant).

Lag (days)	Discharge-Precipitation				Lag (days)	Discharge-Temperature			
	r_{CP}	P_{CP}	r_G	P_G		r_{CP}	P_{CP}	r_G	P_G
0	0.31	***	-0.04	ns	0	-0.38	***	-0.13	**
1	0.30	***	-0.03	ns	1	-0.37	***	-0.13	**
2	0.27	***	-0.03	ns	2	-0.38	***	-0.14	***
3	0.25	***	-0.02	ns	3	-0.39	***	-0.15	***
4	0.26	***	-0.01	ns	4	-0.40	***	-0.16	***
5	0.26	***	0.01	ns	5	-0.42	***	-0.17	***
6	0.25	***	0.01	ns	6	-0.44	***	-0.19	***
7	0.23	***	0.01	ns	7	-0.44	***	-0.20	***
8	0.24	***	0.02	ns	8	-0.44	***	-0.20	***
9	0.23	***	0.02	ns	9	-0.44	***	-0.21	***
10	0.19	***	0.01	ns	10	-0.44	***	-0.22	***
11	0.15	***	0.00	ns	11	-0.44	***	-0.22	***
12	0.13	**	-0.01	ns	12	-0.46	***	-0.24	***
13	0.14	**	-0.00	ns	13	-0.49	***	-0.25	***
14	0.14	**	-0.00	ns	14	-0.51	***	-0.27	***
15	0.14	**	0.00	ns	15	-0.53	***	-0.29	***
16	0.12	**	-0.00	ns	16	-0.55	***	-0.31	***
17	0.13	**	0.00	ns	17	-0.55	***	-0.32	***
18	0.11	**	0.00	ns	18	-0.55	***	-0.34	***
19	0.10	**	-0.00	ns	19	-0.59	***	-0.35	***
20	0.11	**	0.01	ns	20	-0.57	***	-0.36	***
21	0.14	**	0.02	ns	21	-0.57	***	-0.36	***
22	0.16	**	0.03	ns	22	-0.57	***	-0.37	***
23	0.17	**	0.03	ns	23	-0.57	***	-0.38	***
24	0.17	**	0.03	ns	24	-0.57	***	-0.39	***
25	0.19	***	0.05	ns	25	-0.58	***	-0.40	***
26	0.20	***	0.06	ns	26	-0.59	***	-0.41	***
27	0.19	***	0.06	ns	27	-0.60	***	-0.43	***
28	0.20	***	0.07	ns	28	-0.61	***	-0.44	***
29	0.20	***	0.08	ns	29	-0.61	***	-0.45	***
30	0.22	***	0.10	*	30	-0.61	***	-0.45	***
31	0.22	***	0.11	*	31	-0.61	***	-0.46	***
32	0.23	***	0.11	*	32	-0.61	***	-0.47	***
33	0.24	***	0.13	**	33	-0.60	***	-0.48	***
34	0.24	***	0.14	**	34	-0.60	***	-0.48	***
35	0.24	***	0.14	**	35	-0.59	***	-0.49	***
36	0.22	***	0.15	**	36	-0.59	***	-0.49	***
37	0.20	**	0.14	**	37	-0.58	**	-0.50	***
38	0.18	**	0.14	**	38	-0.58	**	-0.51	***
39	0.15	*	0.13	**	39	-0.57	**	-0.51	***
40	0.14	*	0.13	**	40	-0.58	**	-0.52	***
41	0.11	ns	0.12	*	41	-0.58	**	-0.52	***
42	0.10	ns	0.12	*	42	-0.58	**	-0.53	***
43	0.09	ns	0.12	*	43	-0.58	**	-0.54	***
44	0.09	ns	0.12	*	44	-0.59	**	-0.55	***
45	0.10	ns	0.12	*	45	-0.60	**	-0.56	***
46	0.11	ns	0.12	*	46	-0.61	**	-0.58	***
47	0.10	ns	0.11	*	47	-0.62	**	-0.59	***
48	0.10	ns	0.10	ns	48	-0.64	**	-0.60	***
49	0.11	ns	0.11	*	49	-0.66	**	-0.62	***
50	0.13	ns	0.12	*	50	-0.67	**	-0.63	***
51	0.12	ns	0.11	ns	51	-0.67	**	-0.64	***

52	0.13	ns	0.10	ns	52	-0.68	**	-0.65	***
53	0.13	ns	0.00	ns	53	-0.68	**	-0.66	***
54	0.16	ns	0.00	ns	54	-0.67	**	-0.66	***
55	0.17	*	0.00	ns	55	-0.66	**	-0.67	***
56	0.18	*	0.00	ns	56	-0.66	**	-0.67	***
57	0.20	*	0.00	*	57	-0.66	**	-0.68	***
58	0.23	**	0.00	*	58	-0.67	**	-0.69	***
59	0.25	**	0.00	*	59	-0.68	**	-0.69	***
60	0.24	**	0.00	*	60	-0.68	**	-0.70	***
61	0.25	**	0.00	**	61	-0.67	**	-0.69	**
62	0.25	**	0.00	**	62	-0.66	**	-0.69	**
63	0.24	**	0.00	**	63	-0.66	**	-0.69	**
64	0.23	*	0.00	**	64	-0.67	**	-0.69	**
65	0.23	*	0.00	**	65	-0.67	**	-0.69	**
66	0.23	*	0.00	**	66	-0.65	**	-0.69	**
67	0.24	**	0.00	**	67	-0.64	**	-0.69	**
68	0.27	**	0.00	**	68	-0.63	**	-0.68	**
69	0.30	**	0.00	***	69	-0.63	**	-0.68	**
70	0.31	**	0.00	***	70	-0.63	**	-0.68	**
71	0.33	***	0.00	***	71	-0.64	**	-0.69	**
72	0.33	***	0.00	***	72	-0.64	*	-0.69	**
73	0.33	***	0.00	***	73	-0.64	*	-0.69	**
74	0.32	**	0.00	***	74	-0.63	*	-0.69	*
75	0.32	**	0.00	***	75	-0.62	*	-0.69	*
76	0.31	**	0.00	***	76	-0.61	*	-0.69	*
77	0.30	**	0.00	***	77	-0.62	*	-0.69	*
78	0.27	**	0.00	***	78	-0.62	*	-0.70	*
79	0.25	*	0.00	***	79	-0.62	*	-0.70	*
80	0.26	*	0.00	***	80	-0.63	*	-0.71	*
81	0.25	*	0.00	***	81	-0.64	*	-0.72	*
82	0.26	*	0.00	***	82	-0.65	*	-0.73	*
83	0.30	**	0.00	***	83	-0.65	*	-0.73	*
84	0.30	**	0.00	***	84	-0.65	*	-0.73	*
85	0.30	**	0.00	***	85	-0.64	*	-0.73	*
86	0.29	**	0.00	***	86	-0.62	*	-0.72	*
87	0.29	**	0.00	***	87	-0.60	*	-0.71	*
88	0.29	**	0.00	***	88	-0.59	*	-0.71	*
89	0.30	**	0.00	***	89	-0.58	*	-0.70	*
90	0.30	**	0.00	***	90	-0.57	*	-0.69	*
91	0.30	**	0.00	***	91	-0.55	*	-0.68	ns
92	0.30	**	0.00	***	92	-0.54	*	-0.67	ns
93	0.31	**	0.00	***	93	-0.53	ns	-0.67	ns
94	0.31	**	0.00	***	94	-0.50	ns	-0.65	ns
95	0.30	**	0.00	***	95	-0.47	ns	-0.64	ns
96	0.31	**	0.00	***	96	-0.45	ns	-0.62	ns
97	0.33	**	0.00	***	97	-0.43	ns	-0.61	ns
98	0.34	**	0.00	***	98	-0.41	ns	-0.60	ns
99	0.35	**	0.00	***	99	-0.40	ns	-0.59	ns
100	0.37	**	0.00	***	100	-0.40	ns	-0.58	ns
101	0.37	**	0.00	***	101	-0.41	ns	-0.58	ns
102	0.38	**	0.00	***	102	-0.41	ns	-0.57	ns
103	0.37	**	0.00	***	103	-0.41	ns	-0.57	ns
104	0.34	**	0.00	***	104	-0.40	ns	-0.56	ns
105	0.34	**	0.00	***	105	-0.40	ns	-0.55	ns
106	0.33	**	0.00	***	106	-0.39	ns	-0.55	ns
107	0.31	**	0.00	***	107	-0.38	ns	-0.54	ns
108	0.30	*	0.00	***	108	-0.38	ns	-0.54	ns
109	0.29	*	0.00	***	109	-0.37	ns	-0.53	ns

110	0.28	*	0.41	***	110	-0.35	ns	-0.52	ns
111	0.27	*	0.41	***	111	-0.34	ns	-0.51	ns
112	0.26	*	0.40	**	112	-0.33	ns	-0.51	ns
113	0.24	*	0.39	**	113	-0.33	ns	-0.50	ns
114	0.22	ns	0.38	**	114	-0.33	ns	-0.50	ns
115	0.21	ns	0.37	**	115	-0.33	ns	-0.50	ns
116	0.22	ns	0.36	**	116	-0.34	ns	-0.51	ns
117	0.21	ns	0.35	**	117	-0.34	ns	-0.51	ns
118	0.22	ns	0.35	**	118	-0.34	ns	-0.51	ns
119	0.23	*	0.35	**	119	-0.32	ns	-0.50	ns
120	0.24	*	0.35	**	120	-0.29	ns	-0.49	ns
121	0.22	ns	0.34	**	121	-0.28	ns	-0.48	ns
122	0.24	*	0.34	*	122	-0.27	ns	-0.48	ns
123	0.24	*	0.34	*	123	-0.25	ns	-0.47	ns
124	0.26	*	0.34	*	124	-0.24	ns	-0.46	ns
125	0.25	*	0.34	*	125	-0.22	ns	-0.45	ns
126	0.23	ns	0.33	*	126	-0.21	ns	-0.43	ns
127	0.25	*	0.35	*	127	-0.20	ns	-0.43	ns
128	0.24	*	0.35	*	128	-0.21	ns	-0.42	ns
129	0.25	*	0.36	**	129	-0.21	ns	-0.41	ns
130	0.25	*	0.36	**	130	-0.21	ns	-0.40	ns
131	0.25	*	0.36	**	131	-0.20	ns	-0.40	ns
132	0.24	*	0.36	**	132	-0.19	ns	-0.39	ns
133	0.26	*	0.38	**	133	-0.17	ns	-0.38	ns
134	0.25	*	0.38	**	134	-0.15	ns	-0.36	ns
135	0.27	*	0.39	**	135	-0.12	ns	-0.35	ns
136	0.27	*	0.39	**	136	-0.10	ns	-0.33	ns
137	0.25	*	0.38	**	137	-0.08	ns	-0.32	ns
138	0.26	*	0.37	*	138	-0.06	ns	-0.30	ns
139	0.26	*	0.37	*	139	-0.06	ns	-0.29	ns
140	0.26	*	0.37	*	140	-0.06	ns	-0.28	ns
141	0.25	*	0.36	*	141	-0.06	ns	-0.27	ns
142	0.24	ns	0.35	*	142	-0.04	ns	-0.25	ns
143	0.22	ns	0.35	*	143	-0.01	ns	-0.23	ns
144	0.20	ns	0.33	*	144	0.02	ns	-0.21	ns
145	0.15	ns	0.31	*	145	0.04	ns	-0.20	ns