***Crocospaera* as a major consumer of fixed nitrogen despite its capability of nitrogen fixation**

Takako Masuda^{1,2*#}, Keisuke Inomura^{3#}, Taketoshi Kodama^{1,4}, Takuhei Shiozaki^{1,5},
Satoshi Kitajima^{1,6}, Gabrielle Armin³, Takato Matsui⁷, Koji Suzuki⁷, Shigenobu Takeda^{1,8},
Ondřej Prášil², Ken Furuya^{1,9}

¹Department of Aquatic Bioscience, The University of Tokyo, Yayoi, Bunkyo, Tokyo 113-8657 Japan

²Institute of Microbiology, The Czech Academy of Sciences, Opatovický mlýn, 379 01 Třeboň, Czech Republic

³Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, Narragansett, Rhode Island, 02882, USA

⁴Present address: Fisheries Resources Institute, Japan Fisheries Research and Education Agency, Fukuura, Yokohama, 236-8648, Japan

⁵Present address: Atmosphere and Ocean Research Institute, The University of Tokyo, Kashiwanoha, Kashiwa, Chiba, 277-8564, Japan

⁶Fisheries Resources Institute, Japan Fisheries Research and Education Agency, Taira-machi, Nagasaki, 851-2213, Japan

⁷Graduate School of Environmental Science/Faculty of Environmental Earth Science, Hokkaido University, Kita-ku, Sapporo, 060-0810, Japan

⁸Present address: Graduate School of Fisheries and Environmental Sciences, Nagasaki University, Bunkyo, Nagasaki, 852-8521, Japan

⁹Present address: Graduate School of Science and Engineering, Soka University, Tangi, Hachioji, Tokyo, 192-8577, Japan

27 Running title: Marine N₂ fixer *Crocospaera* may be a combined N consumer
28

29
30 #Authors contributed equally to the study
31 *Corresponding author:
32 Email address: takako@alga.cz (T. Masuda)
33

Abstract

Crocospaera watsonii (hereafter *Crocospaera*) is a key nitrogen (N) fixer in the ocean, but its ability to consume combined N sources is still unclear. Using *in situ* microcosm incubations with an ecological model, we show that *Crocospaera* has high competitive capability both under low and moderately high combined N concentrations. In field incubations, *Crocospaera* accounted for the highest consumption of ammonium and nitrate, followed by pico-eukaryotes. The model analysis shows that cells have a high ammonium uptake rate ($\sim 7 \text{ mol N (mol N)}^{-1} \text{ d}^{-1}$ at the maximum), which allows them to compete against pico-eukaryotes and non-diazotrophic cyanobacteria when combined N is sufficiently available. Even when combined N is depleted, their capability of nitrogen fixation allows higher growth rates compared to potential competitors. These results suggest the high fitness of *Crocospaera* in combined N limiting, oligotrophic oceans, and thus heightens its potential significance in its ecosystem and in biogeochemical cycling.

Introduction

Marine phytoplankton contribute about one half of the global net primary production and play a key role in regulating global biogeochemical cycles (1). Since phytoplankton are biochemically, metabolically, and ecologically diverse (2-4), understanding the contribution of different phytoplankton groups to ecosystem functioning is central to the precise estimation of the global carbon (C) and nitrogen (N) budget and in predicting the biogeochemical impact of future environmental changes (5).

In the oligotrophic subtropical gyres, combined N (defined as N covalently bonded to one or more elements other than N (6)) limits primary production and controls planktonic community composition (7-10). Therefore, N₂ fixing microorganisms (diazotrophs) are important as a source of combined N in oligotrophic ecosystems (11, 12). In the subtropic oligotrophic ocean, the unicellular diazotroph, *Crocospaera watsonii* (2.5 – 6 µm), is widely distributed (10, 13-16) in addition to pico-sized (<3 µm) cyanobacteria (e.g., *Prochlorococcus* and *Synechococcus*) and pico-eukaryotes (17-19). Recent studies reveal *Crocospaera watsonii*'s ability to assimilate dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN), such as ammonium (NH₄⁺) and nitrate (NO₃⁻), at a nanomolar level and keep fixing N₂ (20, 21). Model results indicate using DIN enables *Crocospaera* to increase their abundance and expand their niche (22). These studies proposed that unicellular diazotrophs can be competitors with non-diazotrophic phytoplankton for combined N. However, how *Crocospaera* competes for combined N is poorly evaluated. In this study, we combine an *in situ* microcosm experiment with N addition at the nanomolar level and model (23) to evaluate the competitiveness of *Crocospaera* in a N limiting environment.

Results

Summary of the experiment. We carried out five nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P)-addition bioassays (M1 to M5) at a station in the subtropical Northwestern Pacific (12°N, 135°E) from 6 to 25 June 2008 during the MR08-02 cruise on the R/V *MIRAI*. Nutrient concentrations initially were less than 36 nM for ammonium (NH_4^+), 7 nM for nitrate plus nitrite ($\text{NO}_3^- + \text{NO}_2^-$) and 64 nM for phosphorus (PO_4^{3-}) (24). The physical and biological parameters at the initial condition of the experiments are described in (24). Hydrography and biochemistry at the station are described in (25). Although we performed pre-filtration with a 1 μm -filter to eliminate the effect of grazing, water samples contained plankton with up to $\sim 5 \mu\text{m}$ in size.

Nutrient uptake and fate of enriched DIN. For 3 days of incubation, the phytoplankton community consumed NH_4^+ entirely at the end, while NO_3^- was not always consumed completely (Fig. 1, Fig. S1). Estimated biomass explains about half of consumed combined N sources (Figs. 1, 2A), possibly due to luxury uptake (26, 27).

Fig. 1 Temporal change in NH_4^+ and NO_3^- concentrations of Ex. M3. (A) NH_4^+ concentration in the NH_4^+ treatment exponentially decreased during the experiment down to the detection limit of 6 nM on day 3. (B) NO_3^- concentrations in the NO_3^- treatment exponentially decreased during the experiment, but enriched NO_3^- was not always entirely consumed. Error

bar shows a standard deviation of triplicate. Temporal change in Urea-N concentration is shown in Fig. S2.

The greatest portion of estimated C and N in biomass were found in *Crocospaera* (39-93% in all N addition incubations) followed by pico-eukaryotes (5-55% in N addition incubations) (Fig. 2A, Fig. S3). Although the origin of water mass changed from oligotrophic-water to mixed-water between experiments (Exs.) M1-M3 and M4-M5 (25), with more *Crocospaera* in cell density at the latter environment (Table S1), the dominance of *Crocospaera* as a C and N biomass was observed from all the experiments. N derived from N₂ fixation was not always sufficient to support the N demand of *Crocospaera*, especially in N amendment (Fig. S4). Estimated N₂ fixation supported 0.5 – 12.7% of N demand of *Crocospaera* in control and 0.5 – 11.6% in NH₄⁺ treatment (Fig. S4), suggesting that *Crocospaera* consumed amended N sources. Assimilation of combined nitrogen (NH₄⁺ and NO₃⁻), together with N₂ fixation by *Crocospaera*, has been reported earlier (20, 21). Although enriched 100 nM NH₄⁺ was completely consumed (< 6 nM; detection limit, on day 3), increases in N-biomass of non-diazotrophs for 3 days were limited to up to 58 nmol L⁻¹, again suggesting *Crocospaera* took up combined nitrogen.

Fig. 2 (A) N in biomass in each treatment and its contribution of each phytoplankton group of experiment M3. (B) Contribution to total carbon C in biomass as a function of the contribution of NH₄⁺ - N biomass for each phytoplankton group. (C) Contribution to total carbon C in biomass as a function of the contribution of NO₃⁻ - N biomass for each phytoplankton group. Each circle shows data from a different day, and the size of the dots represents the total C in biomass (nmol C L⁻¹). Pro; *Prochlorococcus*, Syn; *Synechococcus*, Cro; *Crocospira*, PicoE; pico-eukaryotes.

100

101 **Model analysis of the data.** To quantitatively interpret the observed data, we used a simple

102 model of the cellular growth, which is based on the uptake of NH₄⁺ and NO₃⁻ (see Methods).

We used the data from experiment M3 since it shows the clearest trends with low initial nutrient concentrations. The model captured the overall trend of the transition of cellular N (Fig. 3) based on the available nutrient (Fig. S5). The parameterization of the model reveals high rates of N uptake by *Crocospaera*. Especially, we used about 7 (mol N (mol N)⁻¹ d⁻¹) for maximum NH₄⁺ uptake to represent the data, which shows high combined-N uptake compared to other phytoplankton. Specifically, such parameterization was needed to reproduce the rapid growth of *Crocospaera* under NH₄⁺ added case between day 0 and day 1. The predicted maximum NO₃⁻ uptake rate for *Crocospaera* is also higher than for other phytoplankton, which is supported by *Crocospaera*'s faster growth with NO₃⁻ addition.

Fig. 3 Simulated transition of cellular N with nutrient addition compared with data. (A)(B) NH₄⁺ added case. (C)(D) NO₃⁻ added case. Croco: *Crocospaera*. Other: other phytoplankton. Data are from experiment M3.

To test the competitiveness of *Crocospaera*, we simulated a simple ecological situation. Here, we simulate zooplankton with Kill the Winner Theory (KTW) (28), which is based on a commonly observed active prey-switching behavior of zooplankton (29-31). The result shows the high competitiveness of *Crocospaera* both under high and low nutrient concentrations. Under high nutrient concentration, *Crocospaera* may dominate other phytoplankton due to the high rate of nutrient uptake (Fig. 4A, S6B). However, under extremely low nutrient conditions (NH_4^+ and NO_3^- are both at 1 nmol L^{-1}), *Crocospaera* is slightly outcompeted (Fig. 4B, S6B). This is due to the relatively high half-saturation constant for NH_4^+ , which is manifested by the sudden decrease in growth rate with a drop in NH_4^+ under NH_4^+ addition (Fig. 3A, S5A). However, this relationship flips if we consider the effect of N_2 fixation, which maintains their growth rates at a higher level rather than relying on external N under N depletion (Fig. 4C, S6C). These results suggest that possession of nitrogenase (an enzyme complex involved in N_2 fixation) allows for *Crocospaera*'s survival under low nutrient environments.

Fig. 4 Simulated transition of cellular N in a simple ecosystem model for three different scenarios. (A) The concentrations for NH_4^+ and NO_3^- are both 100 nmol L^{-1} (B)(C) The concentrations for NH_4^+ and NO_3^- are both 1 nmol L^{-1} . In only (C) *Crocospaera* may acquire N via N_2 fixation; in (A) and (B) the effect of N_2 fixation is neglected. Croco: *Crocospaera*. Other: other phytoplankton. Parameters are based on NH_4^+ added case.

Discussion

Our study shows high uptake of N by *Crocospaera* under relatively high N concentration. The results counter the general image of *Crocospaera* since it is mostly known as a diazotroph and is considered to be a provider of N to the environment. Rather, our result supports more recent studies, where *Crocospaera* does not increase the productivity of other phytoplankton (32) or even compete with other species over combined N (22). Surprisingly, our study even shows higher maximum uptake rates of NH_4^+ and NO_3^- , which allow its dominance just by uptake of combined N. When nitrogen concentration is extremely low, they could be outcompeted in N uptake, but their N_2 fixation allows maintaining *Crocospaera* biomass at a certain level, which can still be higher than those of non-diazotrophic phytoplankton. This high consumption of NO_3^- may differ from UCYN-A (15, 33-35), which keeps fixing nitrogen under high NO_3^- availability (36, 37), leading to their unique niche acquisition. These results suggest that *Crocospaera* has high competitiveness under both low and high nutrients.

Despite that, we generally do not observe the oligotrophic ocean completely dominated by *Crocospaera*. One reason might be the grazing selection. *Crocospaera* is a unicellular cyanobacterium a few microns to 6 μm in diameter (38), and its tight coupling with predators is reported recently (39). The new production of *Crocospaera* is estimated to support up to 400% of C demand of the main grazers, and the grazing rates of the main predator *Protoperdinium* were found to be nearly equivalent to growth rates of *Crocospaera* (39). On the other hand, its potential competitor, *Trichodesmium*, a major N_2 fixer in the ocean, is reported to produce a toxin (40-42), and creates large colonies of $\sim 10^4$ cells (43), potentially protecting themselves from grazing. Another reason might be the growth limitation by other nutrients such as P and Fe. Although there are some reports that *Crocospaera* shows adaptation for low P and low Fe, their relative fitness to such low P or low Fe environments compared to other organisms has not been quantified. Since having nitrogenase enzymes require a high concentration of Fe, non-nitrogen fixers, such as *Prochlorococcus* and

Synechococcus, may have lower Fe requirements and are more adapted to Fe depletion. Also, *Crocospaera* does not seem to fully utilize sulpholipid, which would save P use, as opposed to other cyanobacteria, such as *Synechococcus* (44, 45), and thus may not compete strongly under P limitation.

At the same time, it is largely possible that *Crocospaera* dominates at some regions in the oligotrophic ocean given its high competitiveness under N limitation, which is the characteristic of the oligotrophic ocean (7, 46). For example, a study of flow cytometry shows a high abundance of *Crocospaera*-like cells in a wide region of the North Pacific (47), where the abundance of *Trichodesmium* seems limited (48). Also, a recent study shows multiple gene copies of *Trichodesmium* (up to ~700 gene copied per cell) (49), which would overestimate their abundance (50). Given these factors and our analysis showing their high fitness to both low and high nitrogen concentration, it is possible that we are still underestimating the relative abundance and role of *Crocospaera* in global biogeochemical cycling.

Materials and methods

Experimental setup and sample collection. The dataset presented herein originates from an experimental setup described in (24). Briefly, we carried out five macro-nutrient (N and P)-addition bioassays (M1 to M5) using natural phytoplankton assemblages collected at a station in the subtropical Northwestern Pacific (12°N, 135°E) from 6-25 June 2008 during the MR08-02 cruise on the R/V *MIRAI*. For macro-nutrient bioassays, we distributed pre-filtered seawater from 10 m depth into 4-liter polycarbonate bottles. We performed three treatments with 100 nM addition of N as NaNO₃, NH₄Cl, or urea, and one treatment with 10 nM of NaH₂PO₄. Our control was without nutrient addition. Bottles were incubated on deck for three days with daily sample harvest in flow-through seawater tanks covered with a neutral density screen to attenuate light intensity to 50% of its corresponding surface value.

182

183 **Macro-nutrient and iron concentrations.** Concentrations of $\text{NO}_3^- + \text{NO}_2^-$ (N + N), NH_4^+ ,
184 Soluble Reactive Phosphorus (SRP), and urea were measured using a high-sensitivity
185 colorimetric approach with an AutoAnalyzer II (Technicon) and Liquid Waveguide Capillary
186 Cells (World Precision Instruments, USA) as outlined (51). We analyzed urea concentrations
187 using the diacetyl monoxime method (52). Detection limits of $\text{NO}_3^- + \text{NO}_2^-$, NH_4^+ , and SRP
188 were 3, 6, and 3 nM, respectively.

189

190 **Flow cytometry.** Flow-cytometry (FCM) identified *Prochlorococcus*, *Synechococcus*, pico-
191 eukaryotes, and *Crocospaera* based on cell size and chlorophyll- or phycoerythrin-
192 fluorescence. Aliquots of 4.5 mL were preserved in glutaraldehyde (1% final concentration),
193 flash-frozen in liquid N_2 , and stored at -80°C until analysis on land by flow cytometry (PAS-
194 III, Partec, GmbH, Münster, Germany) equipped with a 488 nm argon-ion excitation laser (100
195 mW). We recorded forward- and side-angle scatter (FSC and SSC), red fluorescence (>630 nm,
196 FL3), and orange fluorescence (570–610 nm, FL2). FloMax® (Partec, GmbH, Münster,
197 Germany) distinguished *Synechococcus*, *Prochlorococcus*, *Crocospaera*, and pico-
198 eukaryotes based on their auto-fluorescence properties and their size.

199

200 **Gene analysis.** We collected DNA samples from each treatment of the Fe addition bioassay
201 and collected aliquots of 0.5 to 1.0 L of sample on $0.2\ \mu\text{m}$ SUPOR® polyethersulfone
202 membrane filters, which we then placed in sterile tubes containing glass beads, frozen in liquid
203 N_2 , and stored at -80°C until further analysis. DNA was extracted according to (53) to
204 determine the abundance of *Crocospaera watsonii* by quantitative PCR (qPCR) using a 5'
205 nuclease assay as described in (54).

Quantitative PCR showed that cell densities of FCM-identified *Crocospaera* were significantly, positively correlated with *nifH* gene copies used to quantify the proportion of *Crocospaera*, indicating that *nifH* abundance accounted for 68% of the variation in FCM-identified *Crocospaera* ($r^2 = 0.463$, $n = 48$, $p=0.001$, Pearson Product Moment correlation). Therefore, this study treated FCM-identified *Crocospaera* as diazotroph *Crocospaera*. Cell abundance estimated by qPCR was 0.63 ± 0.23 fold lower than those measured by FCM.

Nitrogen fixation. To measure *in situ* N_2 fixation activity, we used the acetylene reduction assay of (55, 56). We dispensed a total of 550 milliliter bioassay samples into 1200 mL HCl-rinsed glass PETG bottles with 6 replicates and sealed with butyl rubber stoppers. Aliquots of 120 mL of acetylene (99.9999% (v:v), Kouatsu Gas Kogyo, Japan) were injected through the stopper by replacing the same volume of headspace. After 24 h in the on-deck flow-through seawater tanks, we analyzed ethylene concentrations by converting the ethylene to fixed nitrogen with a molar ratio of 4:1 (57).

Cellular C and N estimation. We used a conversion factor of $235 \text{ fg C } \mu\text{m}^{-3}$ for *Prochlorococcus*, *Synechococcus* and *Crocospaera* (58) to estimate cellular carbon content. For picoeukaryotes, we represented cell volume by converting it into carbon per cell, using a modified Strathmann equation (58, 59):

$$\log C(\text{pg/cell}) = 0.94 \times \log Vol(\mu\text{m}^3) - 0.6.$$

Then, using an earlier reported C:N ratio (C:N ratio = 9.1 for *Prochlorococcus*, 8.6 for *Synechococcus*, 8.7 for *Crocospaera*, 6.6 for picoeukaryotes), we converted the cellular C content into cellular N (21, 60, 61).

Statistical analysis. Phytoplankton cell densities of each bioassay were first compared between treatments using repeated measurements Analysis of Variance (RM-ANOVA) with nutrient treatments as a between-subjects factor (5 levels) and time (4 levels) as the within-subjects factor. Treatment effects were considered significant if $p < 0.05$. Then, means between five treatments were compared by post hoc Turkey test ($n = 3$ replicates per treatment throughout, degrees of freedom = 40).

Quantitative model of microbial growth. To quantitatively analyze the fitness of *Crocospaera* under N limiting conditions, we ran two simulations. One was to represent the incubation experiment to extract parameters manually and the other was the simple ecosystem model to simulate their competitiveness under different nutrient concentrations and scenarios. The list of parameters and used values are in Table S2 and S3, respectively.

Simulation of the incubation experiment. We used the following equations for the growth of phytoplankton to represent the field incubation experiment:

$$\frac{dN_i}{dt} = \mu_i N_i - m_i N_i \quad [\text{eq. 1}]$$

where N_i (nmol L⁻¹) is the cellular nitrogen concentration of phytoplankton i ($i = \text{Cro, Oth}$: *Crocospaera* and other phytoplankton, respectively) per volume water, t (d) is time, μ_i (d⁻¹) is the growth rate of phytoplankton i , and m_i (d⁻¹) is a mortality rate of phytoplankton i .

To represent the growth of *Crocospaera* and other phytoplankton, we used simple growth equations based on the sum of Monod kinetics (62) for each nutrient:

$$\mu_i = V_{Max,i}^{NH_4} \frac{[NH_4^+]}{[NH_4^+] + K_i^{NH_4}} + V_{Max,i}^{NO_3} \frac{[NO_3^-]}{[NO_3^-] + K_i^{NO_3}} \quad [\text{eq. 2}]$$

$V_{Max,i}^{NH_4}$ and $V_{Max,i}^{NO_3}$ (d⁻¹) are the maximum uptake rate of phytoplankton for NH₄⁺ and NO₃⁻ respectively, $[j]$ (nmol L⁻¹) is the concentration of nutrient j ($j = NO_3^-, NH_4^+$), and $K_i^{NH_4}$ and $K_i^{NO_3}$

(nmol L⁻¹) are half-saturation constant of nutrient for phytoplankton *i* respectively. We used the data-fitted quadratic curve of nutrient concentrations (Fig. S5).

Simple ecosystem simulation. To simulate the simple ecosystem situation, we introduced the grazing by zooplankton:

$$\frac{dN_i}{dt} = \mu_i N_i - G_i N_i \quad [\text{eq. 3}]$$

$$\frac{dN_{Zoo}}{dt} = (G_{Cro} + G_{Oth})N_{Zoo} - m_{Zoo}N_{Zoo}^2 \quad [\text{eq. 4}]$$

where G_i (d⁻¹) is the grazing rate of phytoplankton *i* by zooplankton, N_{Zoo} (nmol L⁻¹) is the nitrogen concentration in zooplankton per volume water, and M_{Zoo} (d⁻²) is a quadratic mortality rate of zooplankton. When we allow nitrogen fixation, we used $\mu_{Cro} = 0.31$ (d⁻¹) (a typical growth rate under diazotrophic conditions (63), if the computation based on [eq.2] yields a value below 0.31 (d⁻¹).

For G_i we have applied the KTW method:

$$G_i = G_{max} \left(\frac{N_i^2}{N_{Cro}^2 + N_{Oth}^2} \right) \left(\frac{(X_{Cro} + X_{Oth})^2}{(X_{Cro} + X_{Oth})^2 + K_G^2} \right) \quad [\text{eq. 5}]$$

where G_{max} (d⁻¹) is the maximum grazing rate and K_G (nmol L⁻¹) is grazing half-saturation. This equation reflects the commonly observed prey-switching behavior of zooplankton (29-31), which stabilizes ecosystems (64, 65).

Code availability

The model developed in this paper has been uploaded in GitHub/Zenodo and is freely available at <https://zenodo.org/record/5095790> (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.5095790).

Author contributions

T.Masuda, K.F and S.T designed the *in situ* microcosm experiments, T.Masuda. T.K, T.S, S.K, and T.Matsui carried out the experiment and analyzed data supervised by K.F, S.T and K.S. T.Masuda and K.I shaped the concept of the study with the supervision of O.P. K.I. and G.A. developed and ran the model. T.Masuda and K.I. wrote the original draft with substantial input from all the authors.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

We thank the captain, crew and technicians of the R/V *MIRAI* for assistance and support during the research cruise. This research was financially supported by MEXT grants for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas (24121001, 24121005, K.F.), Czech Research Foundation GAČR (project 20-17627S to O.P. and T.Masuda), the Simons Foundation (Life Sciences-Simons Postdoctoral Fellowships in Marine Microbial Ecology, Award 544338, K.I.), and the National Science Foundation (NSF) under EPSCoR Cooperative Agreement (#OIA-1655221, K.I.).

288 References

- 289 1. Field C, Behrenfeld M, Randerson J, Falkowski P. 1998. Primary production of the biosphere:
290 Integrating terrestrial and oceanic components. *Science* 281:237-240.
- 291 2. Arrigo KR, Robinson DH, Worthen DL, Dunbar RB, DiTullio GR, VanWoert M, Lizotte MP.
292 1999. Phytoplankton community structure and the drawdown of nutrients and CO₂ in the southern ocean.
293 *Science* 283:365-7.
- 294 3. Richardson TL, Jackson GA. 2007. Small phytoplankton and carbon export from the surface
295 ocean. *Science* 315:838-40.
- 296 4. Thomas MK, Kremer CT, Klausmeier CA, Litchman E. 2012. A global pattern of thermal
297 adaptation in marine phytoplankton. *Science* 338:1085 - 1088.
- 298 5. Le Quéré C, Harrison SP, Colin Prentice I, Buitenhuis ET, Aumont O, Bopp L, Claustre H, Da
299 Cunha LC, Geider R, Giraud X, Klaas C, Kohfeld KE, Legendre L, Manizza M, Platt T, Rivkin RB,
300 Sathyendranath S, Uitz J, Watson AJ, Wolf-Gladrow D. 2005. Ecosystem dynamics based on plankton
301 functional types for global ocean biogeochemistry models. *Glob Change Biol* 11:1-25.
- 302 6. Raven JA, Giordano M. 2016. Combined Nitrogen, In Borowitzka MA., Beardall J., Raven JA
303 (eds). *The Physiology of Microalgae*. (Springer Inc.) pp 143-154 doi:10.1007/978-3-319-24945-2_7.
- 304 7. Moore CM, Mills MM, Arrigo KR, Berman-Frank I, Bopp L, Boyd PW, Galbraith ED, Geider
305 RJ, Guieu C, Jaccard SL, Jickells TD, La Roche J, Lenton TM, Mahowald NM, Maraño E, Marinov
306 I, Moore JK, Nakatsuka T, Oschlies A, Saito MA, Thingstad TF, Tsuda A, Ulloa O. 2013. Processes
307 and patterns of oceanic nutrient limitation. *Nat Geosci* 6:701-710.
- 308 8. Moore JK, Doney SC, Lindsay K. 2004. Upper ocean ecosystem dynamics and iron cycling in
309 a global three-dimensional model. *Global Biogeochem Cy* 18:GB4028.
- 310 9. Monteiro FM, Dutkiewicz S, Follows MJ. 2011. Biogeographical controls on the marine
311 nitrogen fixers. *Global Biogeochem Cy* 25.
- 312 10. Stukel MR, Coles VJ, Brooks MT, Hood RR. 2014. Top-down, bottom-up and physical controls
313 on diatom-diazotroph assemblage growth in the Amazon River plume. *Biogeosciences* 11:3259-3278.
- 314 11. Falkowski PG. 1997. Evolution of the nitrogen cycle and its influence on the biological
315 sequestration of CO₂ in the ocean. *Nature* 387:272 - 275.
- 316 12. Tyrrell T. 1999. The relative influences of nitrogen and phosphorus on oceanic primary
317 production. *Nature* 400:525-531.
- 318 13. Monteiro FM, Follows MJ, Dutkiewicz S. 2010. Distribution of diverse nitrogen fixers in the
319 global ocean. *Global Biogeochem Cy* 24:GB3017.
- 320 14. Saito MA, Bertrand EM, Dutkiewicz S, Bulygin VV, Moran DM, Monteiro FM, Follows MJ,
321 Valois FW, Waterbury JB. 2011. Iron conservation by reduction of metalloenzyme inventories in the
322 marine diazotroph *Crocosphaera watsonii*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 108:2184-9.
- 323 15. Zehr JP, Waterbury JB, Turner PJ, Montoya JP, Omoregie E, Steward GF, Hansen A, Karl DM.
324 2001. Unicellular cyanobacteria fix N₂ in the subtropical North Pacific Ocean. *Nature* 412:635-638.
- 325 16. Moisaner PH, Beinart RA, Hewson I, White AE, Johnson KS, Carlson CA, Montoya JP, Zehr
326 JP. 2010. Unicellular cyanobacterial distributions broaden the oceanic N₂ fixation domain. *Science*
327 327:1512-1514.
- 328 17. Waterbury JB, Watson SW, Guillard RRL, Brand LE. 1979. Widespread occurrence of a
329 unicellular, marine, planktonic, cyanobacterium. *Nature* 277:293-294.
- 330 18. Platt T, Rao DVS, Irwin B. 1983. Photosynthesis of picoplankton in the oligotrophic ocean.
331 *Nature* 301:702 - 704.
- 332 19. Buitenhuis ET, Li WKW, Vault D, Lomas MW, Landry MR, Partensky F, Karl DM, Ulloa O,
333 Campbell L, Jacquet S, Lantoine F, Chavez F, Macias D, Gosselin M, McManus GB. 2012.
334 Picophytoplankton biomass distribution in the global ocean. *Earth Syst Sci Data* 4:37-46.
- 335 20. Dekazemacker J, Bonnet S. 2011. Sensitivity of N₂ fixation to combined nitrogen forms (NO₃⁻
336 and NH₄⁺) in two strains of the marine diazotroph *Crocosphaera watsonii* (Cyanobacteria). *Mar Ecol*
337 *Prog Ser* 438:33-46.
- 338 21. Masuda T, Furuya K, Kodama T, Takeda S, Harrison PJ. 2013. Ammonium uptake and
339 dinitrogen fixation by the unicellular nanocyanobacterium *Crocosphaera watsonii* in nitrogen-limited
340 continuous cultures. *Limnol Oceanogr* 58:2029–2036.

22. Inomura K, Masuda T, Gauglitz JM. 2019. Active nitrogen fixation by *Crocospaera* expands their niche despite the presence of ammonium - A case study. *Sci Rep* 9:15064.
23. Inomura K, Deutsch C, Masuda T, Prašil O, Follows MJ. 2020. Quantitative models of nitrogen-fixing organisms. *Computat Struct Biotechnol J* 18:3905-3924.
24. Masuda T, Inomura K, Mareš J, Kodama T, Shiozaki T, Matsui T, Suzuki K, Takeda S, Deutsch C, Prašil O, Furuya K. Pre print. Coexistence of dominant marine phytoplankton species sustained by nutrient specialization. <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-394978/v1>.
25. Shiozaki T, Kodama T, Kitajima S, Sato M, Furuya K. 2013. Advective transport of diazotrophs and importance of their nitrogen fixation on new and primary production in the western Pacific warm pool. *Limnol Oceanogr* 58:49-60.
26. Droop MR. 1974. The nutrient status of algal cells in continuous culture. *J Mar Biolog Assoc U K* 54:825-855.
27. Thingstad TF, Krom MD, Mantoura RFC, Flaten GAF, Groom S, Herut B, Kress N, Law CS, Pasternak A, Pitta P, Psarra S, Rassoulzadegan F, Tanaka T, Tselepides A, Wassmann P, Woodward EMS, Riser CW, Zodiatis G, Zohary T. 2005. Nature of phosphorus limitation in the ultraoligotrophic Eastern Mediterranean. *Science* 2005:1068-1071.
28. Vallina SM, Ward BA, Dutkiewicz S, Follows MJ. 2014. Maximal feeding with active prey-switching: A kill-the-winner functional response and its effect on global diversity and biogeography. *Prog Oceanogr* 120:93-109.
29. Murdoch WW. 1969. Switching in general predators: Experiments on predator specificity and stability of prey populations. *Ecol Monogr* 39:335-354.
30. Kiørboe T, Saiz E, Viitasalo M. 1996. Prey switching behaviour in the planktonic copepod *Acartia tonsa*. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 143:65-75.
31. Kalinkat G, Rall BC, Vucic-Pestic O, Brose U. 2011. The allometry of prey preferences. *PLoS One* 6:e25937.
32. Shiozaki T, Bombar D, Riemann L, Sato M, Hashihama F, Kodama T, Tanita I, Takeda S, Saito H, Hamasaki K, Furuya K. 2018. Linkage between dinitrogen fixation and primary production in the oligotrophic South Pacific Ocean. *Global Biogeochem Cy* 32:1028-1044.
33. Thompson AW, Foster RA, Krupke A, Carter BJ, Musat N, Vulot D, Kuypers MM, Zehr JP. 2012. Unicellular cyanobacterium symbiotic with a single-celled eukaryotic alga. *Science* 337:1546-50.
34. Hagino K, Onuma R, Kawachi M, Horiguchi T. 2013. Discovery of an endosymbiotic nitrogen-fixing cyanobacterium UCYN-A in *Braarudosphaera bigelowii* (Prymnesiophyceae). *PLoS One* 8:e81749.
35. Zehr JP, Shilova IN, Farnelid HM, Munoz-Marin MD, Turk-Kubo KA. 2016. Unusual marine unicellular symbiosis with the nitrogen-fixing cyanobacterium UCYN-A. *Nat Microbiol* 2:16214.
36. Mills MM, Turk-Kubo KA, van Dijken GL, Henke BA, Harding K, Wilson ST, Arrigo KR, Zehr JP. 2020. Unusual marine cyanobacteria/haptophyte symbiosis relies on N₂ fixation even in N-rich environments. *ISME J* 14:2395-2406.
37. Shiozaki T, Fujiwara A, Inomura K, Hirose Y, Hashihama F, Harada N. 2020. Biological nitrogen fixation detected under Antarctic sea ice. *Nat Geosci* 13:729-732.
38. Wilson ST, Aylward FO, Ribaut F, Barone B, Casey JR, Connell PE, Eppley JM, Ferron S, Fitzsimmons JN, Hayes CT, Romano AE, Turk-Kubo KA, Vislova A, Armbrust EV, Caron DA, Church MJ, Zehr JP, Karl DM, DeLong EF. 2017. Coordinated regulation of growth, activity and transcription in natural populations of the unicellular nitrogen-fixing cyanobacterium *Crocospaera*. *Nat Microbiol* 2:17118.
39. Dugenne M, Henderikx Freitas F, Wilson ST, Karl DM, White AE. 2020. Life and death of *Crocospaera* sp. in the Pacific Ocean: Fine scale predator-prey dynamics. *Limnol Oceanogr* 9999:1-15.
40. Hawser SP, O'Neil JM, Roman MR, Codd GA. 1992. Toxicity of blooms of the cyanobacterium *Trichodesmium* to zooplankton. *J Appl Phycol* 4:79-86.
41. Proença L, Tamanaha M, Fonseca R. 2009. Screening the toxicity and toxin content of blooms of the cyanobacterium *Trichodesmium erythraeum* (EHRENBERG) in northeast Brazil. *J Venom Anim Toxins incl Trop Dis* 15:204-215.
42. Kerbrat AS, Darius HT, Pauillac S, Chinain M, Laurent D. 2010. Detection of ciguatoxin-like and paralyzing toxins in *Trichodesmium* spp. from New Caledonia lagoon. *Mar Pollut Bull* 61:360-6.

43. LaRoche J, Breitbarth E. 2005. Importance of the diazotrophs as a source of new nitrogen in the ocean. *J Sea Res* 53:67-91.
44. Van Mooy BA, Fredricks HF, Pedler BE, Dyhrman ST, Karl DM, Koblizek M, Lomas MW, Mincer TJ, Moore LR, Moutin T, Rappe MS, Webb EA. 2009. Phytoplankton in the ocean use non-phosphorus lipids in response to phosphorus scarcity. *Nature* 458:69-72.
45. Pereira N, Shilova IN, Zehr JP. 2016. Molecular markers define progressing stages of phosphorus limitation in the nitrogen-fixing cyanobacterium, *Crocosphaera*. *J Phycol* 52:274-82.
46. Montoya JP, Holl CM, J.P. Z, Hansen A, Villareal TA, D.G. C. 2004. High rates of N₂ fixation by unicellular diazotrophs in the oligotrophic Pacific Ocean. *Nature* 430:1027–1032.
47. Sato M, Hashihama F, Kitajima S, Takeda S, Furuya K. 2010. Distribution of nano-sized Cyanobacteria in the western and central Pacific Ocean. *Aquat Microb Ecol* 59:273-282.
48. Sohm JA, Subramaniam A, Gunderson TE, Carpenter EJ, Capone DG. 2011. Nitrogen fixation by *Trichodesmium* spp. and unicellular diazotrophs in the North Pacific Subtropical Gyre. *J Geophys Res* 116.
49. Sargent EC, Hitchcock A, Johansson SA, Langlois R, Moore CM, LaRoche J, Poulton AJ, Bibby TS. 2016. Evidence for polyploidy in the globally important diazotroph *Trichodesmium*. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 363.
50. Pierella Karlusich JJ, Pelletier E, Lombard F, Carsique M, Dvorak E, Colin S, Picheral M, Cornejo-Castillo FM, Acinas SG, Pepperkok R, Karsenti E, de Vargas C, Wincker P, Bowler C, Foster RA. 2021. Global distribution patterns of marine nitrogen-fixers by imaging and molecular methods. *Nat Commun* 12.
51. Hashihama F, Furuya K, Kitajima S, Takeda S, Takemura T, Kanda J. 2009. Macro-scale exhaustion of surface phosphate by dinitrogen fixation in the western North Pacific. *Geophys Res Lett* 36:L03610.
52. Price NM, Harrison PJ. 1987. Comparison of methods for the analysis of dissolved urea in seawater. *Mar Biol* 94:307–317.
53. Short SM, Zehr JP. 2005. Quantitative analysis of *nifH* genes and transcripts from aquatic environments. *Methods Enzymol* 397:380-394.
54. Church MJ, Jenkins BD, Karl DM, Zehr JP. 2005. Vertical distributions of nitrogen-fixing phylotypes at Stn ALOHA in the oligotrophic North Pacific Ocean. *Aquat Microb Ecol* 38:3-14.
55. Capone DG, Montoya JP. 2001. Nitrogen fixation and denitrification. *Methods Microbiol* 30:501-515.
56. Kitajima S, Furuya K, Hashihama F, Takeda S, Kanda J. 2009. Latitudinal distribution of diazotrophs and their nitrogen fixation in the tropical and subtropical western North Pacific. *Limnol Oceanogr* 54:537–547.
57. Montoya JP, Voss M, Kahler P, Capone DG. 1996. A simple, high-precision, high-sensitivity tracer assay for N₂ fixation. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 62:986–993.
58. Shalapyonok A, Olson RJ, Shalapyonok LS. 2001. Arabian Sea phytoplankton during Southwest and Northeast Monsoon 1995: composition, size structure and biomass from individual cell properties measured by flow cytometry. *Deep Sea Res II* 48:1231-1261.
59. Eppley RW, Reid FM, Strickland JDH. 1970. Estimates of phytoplankton crop size, growth rate and primary production off La Jolla, CA in the period April through September 1967. In: Strickland, J.D.H. (ed.), *Bulletin of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography*. 17:33-42.
60. Heldal M, Scanlan DJ, Norland S, Thingstad F, Mann NH. 2003. Elemental composition of single cells of various strains of marine *Prochlorococcus* and *Synechococcus* using X-ray microanalysis. *Limnol Oceanogr* 48:1732 - 1743.
61. Redfield AC. 1958. The biological control of chemical factors in the environment. *Am Sci* 45:205 - 221.
62. Monod J. 1949. The growth of bacterial cultures. *Ann Rev Mar Sci* 3:371-394.
63. Follett CL, Dutkiewicz S, Karl DM, Inomura K, Follows MJ. 2018. Seasonal resource conditions favor a summertime increase in North Pacific diatom-diazotroph associations. *ISME J* 12:1543-1557.
64. Murdoch WW, Avery S, Smyth MEB. 1975. Switching in predatory fish. *Ecology* 56:1094-1105.

450 65. Morozov AY. 2010. Emergence of Holling type III zooplankton functional response: bringing
451 together field evidence and mathematical modelling. J Theor Biol 265:45-54.
452
453

Table S1. *In situ* nitrogen fixation rate at 10 m depth and cell density of *Crocospaera* in the incubation bottle at initial. For all data, means are shown with $\pm$ standard deviation for triplicate samples.

Ex.	Date	<i>In situ</i> N ₂ fixation rate (nmolN L ⁻¹ d ⁻¹)	<i>In situ</i> N ₂ fixation rate <10 μ m (nmolN L ⁻¹ d ⁻¹)	<i>Crocospaera</i> at initial (cells mL ⁻¹)
	In 2008			
M1	6 June	1.33 $\pm$ 1.81	2.75 $\pm$ 4.68	32 $\pm$ 62
M2	10 June	2.37 $\pm$ 0.59	0.66 $\pm$ 0.96	270 $\pm$ 225
M3	14 June	0.19 $\pm$ 2.06	0.28 $\pm$ 2.40	126 $\pm$ 32
M4	18 June	6.65 $\pm$ 2.52	2.37 $\pm$ 0.77	1513 $\pm$ 684
M5	22 June	4.94 $\pm$ 1.38	4.75 $\pm$ 1.72	306 $\pm$ 112

Table S2 Used symbols, units and definitions in the quantitative model

Symbol	Unit	Definition
i	n.a.	$i = \text{Cro, Oth}$
j	n.a.	$j = \text{NO}_3^-, \text{NH}_4^+$
N_i	nmol L ⁻¹	Cellular nitrogen concentration of phytoplankton i per volume water
t	d	Time
μ_i	d ⁻¹	Growth rate of phytoplankton i
m_i	d ⁻¹	Mortality rate of phytoplankton i
$V_{Max,i}^j$	d ⁻¹	Maximum uptake rate of nutrient j by phytoplankton i
$[j]$	nmol L ⁻¹	Concentration of nutrient j
K_i^j	nmol L ⁻¹	Half saturation constant of nutrient j
G_i	d ⁻¹	Grazing rate of phytoplankton i
N_{Zoo}	nmol L ⁻¹	Nitrogen concentration in zooplankton per volume water
m_{Zoo}	d ⁻²	Quadratic mortality rate of zooplankton
G_{max}	d ⁻¹	Maximum grazing rate
K_G	nmol L ⁻¹	Grazing half saturation

Table S3 Values used for parameters

Parameter	Unit	Value
m_i	d^{-1}	0.4
For NH_4^+ added case		
N_{Cro}	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	2.50*
N_{Oth}	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	5.00*
$V_{Max,Cro}^{NH_4}$	d^{-1}	6.6
$V_{Max,Cro}^{NO_3}$	d^{-1}	2.8
$V_{Max,Oth}^{NH_4}$	d^{-1}	1.1
$V_{Max,Oth}^{NO_3}$	d^{-1}	1.8
$K_{Cro}^{NH_4}$	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	140
$K_{Cro}^{NO_3}$	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	80
$K_{Oth}^{NH_4}$	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	6
$K_{Oth}^{NO_3}$	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	500
For NO_3^- added case		
N_{Cro}	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	4.36*
N_{Oth}	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	5.83*s
$V_{Max,Cro}^{NH_4}$	d^{-1}	8
$V_{Max,Cro}^{NO_3}$	d^{-1}	1.3
$V_{Max,Oth}^{NH_4}$	d^{-1}	0.9
$V_{Max,Oth}^{NO_3}$	d^{-1}	0.5
$K_{Cro}^{NH_4}$	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	70
$K_{Cro}^{NO_3}$	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	90
$K_{Oth}^{NH_4}$	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	2
$K_{Oth}^{NO_3}$	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	700
Ecosystem simulation		
N_{Cro}	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	1000*
N_{Oth}	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	1000*
N_{Zoo}	$nmol\ L^{-1}$	1000*
m_{Zoo}	d^{-2}	0.01 [#]
G_{max}	d^{-1}	7.5
K_G	d^{-1}	500 [#]

* Initial value. [#]Value from Inomura et al (2019).

Fig. S1. Temporal change in NH_4^+ and NO_3^- concentrations of Ex. M1, M2, M4 and M5.

(A) NH_4^+ concentration in the NH_4^+ treatment exponentially decreased during the experiment down to the detection limit of 6 nM on day 3. (B) NO_3^- concentrations in the NO_3^- treatment exponentially decreased during the experiment but enriched NO_3^- was not always entirely consumed. Error bar shows a standard deviation of triplicate.

459

460

Fig. S2 Temporal change in Urea-N concentration. Concentration in control was measured only at the initial. Error bar shows the standard deviation of triplicate samples.

Fig. S3 N in biomass in each treatment and its contribution of each phytoplankton group of experiment M1, M2, M4 and M5. Pro; *Prochlorococcus*, Syn; *Synechococcus*, Cro; *Crocosphaera*, PicoE; pico-eukaryotes.

466

467

Fig. S4 Nitrogen demand and N derived from N₂ fixation in Control (A) and NH₄⁺ treatment (B) for each experiment (M1-M5). Nitrogen demand is N in biomass in 3 days. N₂ fixation rate was estimated from the reported maximum cellular N₂ fixation rate 1.12 fmol N mol cell⁻¹ day⁻¹ (valued obtained in day 3 in Fe + N treatment of Fe3 (Masuda et al Pre print)) and cell density.

Fig. S5 Measured NH_4^+ and NO_3^- concentrations for NH_4^+ and NO_3^- added cases. Dashed lines show quadratic interpolation. Data are from experiment M3.

475

476

Fig. S6 Simulated transition of cellular N in a simple ecosystem model for three different scenarios. (A) The concentrations for NH_4^+ and NO_3^- are both 100 nmol L^{-1} . (B)(C) The concentrations for NH_4^+ and NO_3^- are both 1 nmol L^{-1} . In only (C) *Crocospaera* may acquire N via N_2 fixation. Croco: *Crocospaera*. Other: other phytoplankton. Parameters are based on NO_3^- added case.