# Submerged macrophytes affect the temporal variability of aquatic ecosystems

Moritz D. Lürig[1,2,3], Rebecca J. Best[2,4], Vasilis Dakos[5], Blake Matthews[2]

Running head: Macrophytes affect variability of ecosystems

[1]Eawag Kastanienbaum, Department of Aquatic Ecology, Seestr. 79, 6047 Kastanienbaum, Switzerland

[2]Eawag Kastanienbaum, Department of Fish Ecology and Evolution, Seestr. 79, 6047 Kastanienbaum, Switzerland

[3]ETH Zürich, Center for Adaptation to a Changing Environment (ACE), Inst. of Integrative Biology, CH-8092 Zürich, Switzerland

[4]School of Earth and Sustainability, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ 86011 USA

[5]ISEM, University of Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, Montpellier, France

Corresponding author:

Moritz D. Lürig, Eawag, Seestr. 79, 6047 Kastanienbaum

Email: moritz.luerig@gmail.con

Tel.: +41 774 87 79 34

keywords: phytoplankton, competition, variance, mesocosms, DOC, metabolism

# Abstract

1. Submerged macrophytes are important foundation species that can strongly influence the structure and functioning of aquatic ecosystems, but only little is known about the temporal variation and the timescales of these effects (i.e. from hourly, daily, to monthly).
2. Here, we conducted an outdoor experiment in replicated mesocosms (1000 L) where we manipulated the presence and absence of macrophytes to investigate the temporal variability of their ecosystem effects. We measured several parameters (chlorophyll-a, phycocyanin, dissolved organic matter [DOM], and oxygen) with high-resolution sensors (15 min intervals) over several months (94 days from spring to fall), and modelled metabolic rates of each replicate ecosystem in a Bayesian framework. We also implemented a simple model to explore competitive interactions between phytoplankton and macrophytes as a driver of variability in chlorophyll-a.
3. Over the entire experiment, macrophytes had a positive effect on mean DOM concentration, a negative effect on phytoplankton biomass, and either a weak or no effect on mean metabolic rates, DOM composition, and conductivity. We also found that macrophytes increased the variance of DOC composition and metabolic rates, and, at some times of the observed period, increased the variance of phytoplankton biomass and conductivity. The observation that macrophytes decreased the mean but increased the variance of phytoplankton biomass was consistent with the model that we implemented.
4. Our high-resolution time series embedded within a manipulative experiment reveal how a foundation species can affect ecosystem properties and processes that have characteristically different timescales of response to environmental variation. Specifically, our results show how macrophytes can affect short-term dynamics of algal

biomass, while also affecting the seasonal buildup of DOM and the variance of ecosystem metabolism.

# Introduction

Decades of research on submerged macrophytes have documented how these aquatic plants can influence a suite of ecosystem properties and processes (Carpenter & Lodge, 1986; Jeppesen *et al.*, 1997; Huss & Wehr, 2004; Reitsema, Meire & Schoelynck, 2018). Acting as foundation species (Dayton, 1972; Ellison *et al.*, 2005), macrophytes create and maintain habitats for other species, affect species interactions, and influence the dynamics of matter and energy in freshwater ecosystems (Carpenter & Lodge, 1986; Jeppesen *et al.*, 1997). Populations of individual macrophyte species, as well as species assemblages, can also influence how aquatic ecosystems respond to environmental change and the propensity of ecosystems to shift between alternative stable states in shallow lakes (Scheffer *et al.*, 1993; Blindow, Hargeby & Andersson, 1998; Faafeng & Mjelde, 1998). Importantly, while the net ecosystem effects of macrophytes in contrasting equilibrium states are well studied, much less is known about how macrophytes affect the temporal dynamics of ecosystem properties and processes over timescales ranging from hours, to days, to months (Mitchell & Rogers, 1985; Madsen & Adams, 1988; Iacarella *et al.*, 2018). High-resolution times series that capture both mean and variance responses of aquatic ecosystems are essential for predicting the effects of environmental change on aquatic ecosystems (Reitsema *et al.*, 2018; Hillebrand *et al.*, 2018) and improving their management in light of increasing disturbance and climate variability (Spears *et al.*, 2017).

The strong and persistent ecosystem effects of macrophyte communities are often linked to their competitive interactions with phytoplankton communities for dissolved nutrients and light (Carpenter & Lodge, 1986; Scheffer *et al.*, 1993). In shallow lakes, the positive

feedback between light transmission and macrophyte biomass is an important reason why macrophytes help maintain a clear water state over a wide range of nutrient loading (Scheffer *et al.*, 1993, 2003; Blindow *et al.*, 1998). Many types of macrophytes are efficient at taking up nutrients from the water and, if rooted, from the sediment, which can limit phytoplankton growth at low to intermediate nutrient loading (Yamamichi *et al.*, 2018). Furthermore, macrophytes can reduce fish predation pressure on the zooplankton communities that graze on phytoplankton (Jeppesen *et al.*, 1997), and can also produce allelopathic chemicals that inhibit phytoplankton growth (Gross, 2003; Hilt & Gross, 2008; Nakai *et al.*, 2012). While it is known that such mechanisms can contribute to the positive feedbacks that help maintain lakes in a clear water state (Kéfi, Holmgren & Scheffer, 2016; Iacarella *et al.*, 2018), surprisingly little is known about the seasonal dynamics of these interactions (Carpenter, 1988; Benedetti-Cecchi, 2003). This is a problematic knowledge gap because the variance of ecosystem properties is increasingly recognized as an important dimension of overall ecosystem resilience (Cottingham & Carpenter, 1998; Benedetti-Cecchi, 2003; Scheffer *et al.*, 2009; Vasseur *et al.*, 2014; Zelnik, Arnoldi & Loreau, 2018).

In addition to the effects on phytoplankton dynamics, macrophytes are known to affect the amount and composition of dissolved organic matter (DOM) (Bolan *et al.*, 2011; Kellerman *et al.*, 2015), which is a diverse mixture of low and high molecular weight components of different structure and composition (Bolan *et al.*, 2011; Kellerman *et al.*, 2015). In the clear water state, phototrophic organisms such as macrophytes, phytoplankton and bacteria produce low weight dissolved organic carbon (DOC) compounds such as carbohydrates that are byproducts of photosynthesis (Carpenter & Lodge, 1986; Retamal *et al.*, 2007; Bolan *et al.*, 2011; Reitsema *et al.*, 2018). Macrophytes can both directly produce DOC, and indirectly reduce it by stimulating higher rates of DOC degradation from epiphytic bacteria (Catalán, Obrador & Pretus, 2014). Given the importance of interactions between macrophytes and

different compositions of DOM in aquatic ecosystems (Reitsema *et al.*, 2018) it is important to experimentally test how macrophytes can simultaneously affect the mean and variance of DOM concentration and composition (Findlay & Sinsabaugh, 2003; Catalán *et al.*, 2014; Reitsema *et al.*, 2018), and to consider such effects in models of ecosystem resilience to nutrient perturbation (Kéfi *et al.*, 2016; Spears *et al.*, 2017).

DOC dynamics driven by competitive interactions between macrophytes and phytoplankton can also alter ecosystem metabolism (Mitchell, 1989; Kaenel, Buehrer & Uehlinger, 2000; Findlay & Sinsabaugh, 2003; Reitsema *et al.*, 2018). Growth and decay of macrophyte tissue can strongly affect metabolic rates of shallow lakes, depending on plant density, diversity and lake depth (Żbikowski *et al.*, 2019). In shallow lakes with a given nutrient load, ecosystem productivity is typically higher when macrophytes are dominant over phytoplankton (Wetzel, 1964; Carpenter & Lodge, 1986; Brothers *et al.*, 2013). Macrophytes are known to be efficient photosynthesizers (Kaenel *et al.*, 2000), but also provide additional substrate for the growth of autotrophic periphyton and bacteria (Wetzel & Søndergaard, 1998; Brothers *et al.*, 2013). Additionally, the effects of macrophytes on the dynamics of DOC accumulation and decomposition can affect shifts between net autotrophy and net heterotrophy (Mitchell & Rogers, 1985; Madsen & Adams, 1988; Nielsen *et al.*, 2013). Overall, the potential effects of interactions between macrophytes and phytoplankton on whole ecosystem metabolism are increasingly well documented. However, the ability of macrophytes to resist or moderate perturbations to ecosystem metabolism in the context of global change depends on the relative importance of the described mechanisms and the temporal scale on which they each occur (Zelnik *et al.*, 2018). To our knowledge, only a few studies have investigated the effects of competition for light and nutrients between macrophytes and phytoplankton on dynamics of DOC and metabolism at the temporal resolution necessary to understand how they interact (Benedetti-Cecchi, 2003; Zelnik *et al.*, 2018).

Here, we experimentally tested how macrophytes affect the temporal dynamics of oligotrophic aquatic ecosystems in 1000L mesocosms over an entire growing season. We manipulated the presence and absence of a macrophyte assemblage consisting of two common species, *Myriophyllum spicatum* and *Chara tomentosa*, and quantified several biotic (two phytoplankton pigments) and abiotic (temperature and conductivity, dissolved oxygen, dissolved organic matter) properties at high temporal resolution (15 min). We used this data set to test 3 hypotheses. First, we predicted that macrophytes would be able to suppress phytoplankton biomass across seasonal variation in light and temperature. Second, we predicted that macrophytes would increase overall rates of ecosystem metabolism because they are known to be efficient photosynthesizers. Third, we predicted that macrophytes should impact not only mean ecosystem properties such as phytoplankton biomass, DOM, and metabolism, but also their temporal variance in response to continual changes in resource availability. For this last hypothesis, we also tested whether we could generate observed contrasts in variability using a simple model of competitive interactions between phytoplankton and macrophytes. We compare our findings with previous empirical work and discuss the broad functional spectrum of macrophytes as foundation species in shallow lake ecosystems.

# Material and methods

### Experimental design and setup

In an outdoor mesocosm experiment, we manipulated the presence or absence of an assemblage of macrophytes including *Myriophyllum* spicatum (hereafter *Myriophyllum*), a perennial vascular plant that grows vertically towards the water surface forming a canopy, and *Chara tomentosa* (hereafter *Chara*), a green algae that forms tufts of calcium carbonate encrusted stems (typically <30cm) on the sediment surface. We chose this assemblage because both

145 species are common in Europe and other parts of the world, they commonly occur together in
146 macrophyte assemblages, and their strong influence on lake ecosystems has been previously
147 documented (Van den Berg *et al.*, 1998; Ibelings *et al.*, 2007; Hilt & Gross, 2008; Nakai *et al.*,
148 2012).

149 We set up the experiment on a site next to Eawag Kastanienbaum (eight tanks total)
150 with four pairs of 1000L mesocosms (1 x 1 x 1 m), with each pair consisting of a mesocosm
151 with (M+) and without (M-) a macrophyte assemblage (Fig. 1). To prepare the mesocosms, we
152 first established a 2 cm thick layer of limestone gravel from a local quarry (2-4 mm grain size)
153 and a 1 cm thick layer of fine, oligotrophic sediment (Fiskal *et al.*, 2019) that we collected from
154 a vegetation free area of Lake Lucerne (47°00'33.3"N 8°18'33.8"E). Afterwards the mesocosms
155 were filled with water from Lake Lucerne, an oligotrophic, clear water lake (Fiskal *et al.*, 2019),
156 which was pumped up from an inlet in 40 m depth and left in the mesocosms for two weeks to
157 allow the sediment to settle and the mesocosm community to assemble. On May 25th, 2015,
158 we collected *Myriophyllum* from a clear water stream in Oberriet (47°19'55.5"N 9°34'43.9"E)
159 and kept the plants overnight in additional outdoor mesocosms onsite. The following day we
160 collected *Chara* from a single location in Lake Lucerne (47°00'06.8"N 8°20'02.7"E) and
161 planted both species in the mesocosms. To do so we divided all the macrophyte material
162 manually (on a large and moist plastic sheet) into 18 similar sized portions based on either an
163 equal number of shoots (i.e. for (*Myriophyllum),* or similarly sized tufts (i.e. for *Chara*). We
164 used 10 portions to quantify the initial plant biomass (cleaned of sediment, infauna removed,
165 biomass dried for 48 hours at 45°C) and added 4 portions to the M+ tanks. Given that both
166 plant species were collected from clear water sites and planted in mesocosms filled with
167 oligotrophic water, we assumed that growing conditions were similar for both plant species.

168 To inoculate the M- mesocosms with macrophyte associated invertebrate and bacterial
169 communities, we submerged the remaining four portions of macrophytes in large mesh

enclosures in the middle of the water column for two weeks. On July 4th, we added 20 µg * $L^{-1}$ of P and 144.7 µg * $L^{-1}$ of N (i.e. Redfield ratio) to every mesocosm to supplement the Lake Lucerne source water with nutrients. Over the course of the experiment we measured dissolved nutrient concentrations in the mesocosms on four occasions (July 15, Aug. 5, Sept 8. and Oct 20, Fig. S1). At the end of the experiment (Oct 23rd) we quantified total macrophyte biomass in terms of above-ground dry weight (procedure: see above). This included both the original inoculated species and a filamentous algae species that colonized the sediment surface of all the mesocosms (see Table S1).

**Ecosystem dynamics measurement using multiparameter sondes**

We measured high-frequency ecosystem dynamics in the mesocosms from July 18th to Oct 23rd, 2015, using four autonomous multi parameter instruments (EXO2 modular sensor platform [YSI-WTW], hereafter referred to as sondes). The sondes were placed approximately at the center of the mesocosm (~0.5 m depth), away from the walls and outside of patches of macrophytes. Additionally, we measured photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) in 15 min intervals using a quantum sensor (Li-Cor) installed onsite to estimate surface light irradiance. PAR and temperature data (Fig. S2) were used together with the dissolved oxygen data to calculate metabolic rates (see *Ecosystem Metabolism Modelling*).

*Sensors* - The sondes were equipped with modular sensors that recorded the following ecosystem parameters at 15 minute intervals (see Table 1 for details): temperature, chlorophyll-a and phycocyanin (as proxies for phytoplankton biomass), dissolved oxygen, fluorescent dissolved organic matter (hereafter fDOM) and specific conductivity (hereafter conductivity). The sondes were equipped with an autonomous wiper that cleaned the sensor heads once every hour. All sensors were thoroughly cleaned whenever the sondes were moved to another mesocosm (see *Contrasts and sampling design*).

*Calibration* - Prior to the experiment, we performed a 48h cross-comparison trial where we installed all the sondes in a single mesocosm, enabling us to correct for differences among sensors and calibrate them against each other. During the cross-comparison trial we also quantified chlorophyll-a concentration by analyzing water samples with high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC, Jasco), and calibrated the optical sensors installed on the sondes in accordance with the manufacturer's manual (YSI-WTW). Hence, we report chlorophyll-a as µg * $L^{-1}$, Phycocyanin and fDOM as raw fluorescence units. The oxygen sensors were calibrated against water-saturated air.

*Contrasts and sampling design* - At the beginning of the experiment, all four sondes were randomly assigned to two pairs of M+ and M- tanks. Because we only had four sondes available, the four sondes were taken out of these tanks after 10 days, thoroughly cleaned, and then introduced to the two remaining pairs, where they were left for another 10-day period (Fig. 1). Over the entire study we repeated this two-part cycle five times, yielding five distinct periods in which all tanks were sampled (Fig. 2-4: t1-t5). On the third sampling period (t3) we reduced the length of the measurement period to 7 days per set of tanks due to battery issues with the Sondes. Between all transfers, we thoroughly cleaned the sondes by hosing down the sondes and sensor bodies with a power washer before reinstalling them. We included the distinct periods (t1-t5) resulting from the rotation scheme and each individual tank as a random effect in all statistical models (see *Statistical Analysis*).

**Ecosystem metabolism estimation**

We used the temperature and oxygen measurements (mg * $L^{-1}$) from the sondes and the PAR-measurements from the light sensor to model whole ecosystem metabolic rates of each mesocosm (for an overview of the abiotic conditions see Fig. S2). We used the "streamMetabolizer" package (Appling *et al.*, 2018) in the programming language R (R Core

Team 2017) which applies inverse modelling to estimate daily rates of ecosystem gross primary productivity (GPP), ecosystem respiration (ER) and gas exchange (K600) as g oxygen * $m^{-2}$ * $day^{-1}$. For every modelled rate we calculated the ratio of GPP and R. Prior to modelling we smoothed all input data with a 12-hour moving average window to facilitate model convergence (A. Appling, personal communication) and for more conservative estimates. Occasionally the model converged towards positive daily respiration rates (8 out of 312 estimates) and negative daily productivity rates (2 out of 312 estimates), which we omitted. We used a Bayes-type model with pooled K600 for gas-exchange and lognormal priors (K = 0-1). Because the dissolved oxygen time series reflects oxygen produced and consumed by all organisms in the whole ecosystem, we assumed the model reflects the net effects of any biomass changes throughout the experiment, for example, due to plant or epiphytic growth, or biomass decay.

**DOC sampling**

For each pair of tanks within each measurement period (i.e. every 10 or 7 days: Table S2) we took a water sample for the analysis of DOC concentration and absorbance properties (Fig. S3). Water samples were filtered through 47mm ashed GF/Fs (6 hours at 450°C), acidified with HCl 2 M and preserved at 4°C in the dark until analysis via high temperature catalytic oxidation (TOC-VCS, Shimadzu), with a detection limit of 0.5 mg * $L^{-1}$ (±0.5). Specific ultraviolet absorbances (SUVA) were measured on the same samples from scans (1 nm intervals) on a Shimadzu UV1700 spectrophotometer, using 1 cm quartz cuvettes. We selected absorbance at 254 nm ($SUVA_{254}$) as a proxy of aromaticity and reactivity of DOC (Weishaar *et al.*, 2003). Furthermore, we measured $SUVA_{350}$, which is an indicator for how much UVA radiation is absorbed in the water (Fischer et al., 2015). We normalized the SUVA measurements by dividing the sample absorbances by the total DOC concentration (Hansen et al., 2016). Finally,

we calculated spectral slope ratio (SSR) as the ratio of linear regressions of the log-transformed spectra of 275–295 nm and 350–400 nm (Helms *et al.*, 2008; Hansen *et al.*, 2016). SSR is a common proxy for DOC molecular weight, to which it should be inversely related. We were unable to analyze two DOC timepoints over the course of the experiment (Oct 2nd, and 17th) due to technical problems with the TOC analyzer.

**A model for competition between macrophytes and phytoplankton**

We used an existing model for competition between macrophytes and phytoplankton (Scheffer & Carpenter, 2003) to explore how mesocosm phytoplankton dynamics might differ in the presence and absence of macrophytes. This model assumes standard features of macrophyte-phytoplankton interactions and implicitly accounts for competition for light and nutrients (Fig. 5). In the model, growth of macrophytes *M* and of phytoplankton *P* is determined by a gain and a loss term following:

$$\frac{dP}{dt} = r_P \frac{n}{n+h_P} \frac{1}{1+\alpha_P P} P - l_P P + \sigma\varepsilon_P(t) \text{ (eq1a)}$$

$$\frac{dM}{dt} = r_M \frac{1}{1+\alpha_M M+bP} M - l_M M \ + \sigma\varepsilon_M(t) \text{ (eq1b)}$$

Phytoplankton grows with a maximum growth rate $r_P$ that is limited by nutrients n in a saturating function with half-saturation constant hp. Limitation of phytoplankton growth by macrophytes comes through nutrient availability given by eq2:

$$n = \frac{Ntot}{1+q_M M+q_P P} \text{ (eq2)}$$

where *Ntot* is the total amount of nitrogen in the system and nutrients decrease in a nonlinear way depending on the biomass of macrophytes and phytoplankton. Parameters $q_M$ and $q_P$ determine the strength of the response in decreasing nutrients per biomass increase in macrophytes and phytoplankton, respectively. Phytoplankton growth is also limited by light due to self-shading scaled by $\alpha_P$ where $1/\alpha_P$ is the biomass of phytoplankton that makes the

maximum growth rate equal to half, whereas loss is determined by loss rate $l_P$., Macrophyte maximum growth rate $r_M$ is limited only due to competition for light (in contrast to phytoplankton which is also limited by nutrients). In that case, light limitation is driven by self-shading through parameter $a_M$ and due to shading by phytoplankton by parameter $b$. Loss is determined by loss rate $l_M$. In this simplified model formulation, we ignore some potentially important interactions for which we had no empirical data, including nutrient uptake by macrophytes from the sediment, and interactions between macrophytes and periphyton biomass over time.

We used model parameters such that both macrophytes and phytoplankton were equivalent in the rates of growth ($r_P$=$r_M$=0.5), mortality ($l_P$=$l_M$=0.05), and self-shading ($\alpha_P$=$\alpha_M$=0.01). Instead, we modeled asymmetry between macrophytes and phytoplankton in terms of light and nutrient limitation. Phytoplankton growth was limited by nutrients ($h_P$ = 0.2), through macrophytes having a stronger impact on retaining the available nutrients in the water column (*Ntot*) ($q_M$ = 0.075 and $q_P$ = 0.005). Macrophytes became light limited by phytoplankton due to shading ($b$ = 0.02). We set *Ntot*=3.2. This is a total nutrient level value for which the model can give rise to 2 alternative states, one state with both macrophytes and phytoplankton present (M+) and an alternative with phytoplankton but no macrophytes (M-). These two states resemble our experimental setup. We simulated model dynamics at these two contrasting states in the presence of environmental stochasticity εP(t), εM(t) (iid and different for macrophytes and phytoplankton) with strength σ (=0.5). We produced 200 simulated sets of 1000 timepoints in length for each of the two states using the same sequence of stochastic realizations for both states. In that way, differences in the recorded standard deviation and coefficient of variation were independent of the stochasticity and only due to the stability of the two states. The model was implemented in MATLAB R2016b (Mathworks) using Grind v2 (https://www.sparcs-center.org/resources/dynamical-modelling-

tools.html). Equilibria and eigenvalues were estimated numerically, stochastic equations were solved with Euler-Murayama integration using a 0.01 step.

**Statistical analysis**

*Data treatment* - Prior to the statistical analysis we removed incomplete days at the beginning and end of each measurement period (five time series: t1-t5). After this, each of the five time series had 864 data points (15 min interval = 96 data points per day = 9 days) for t1-3 and 576 data points (= 6 days) for t4 and t5. In a second step, we identified residuals of the detrended data that were outside 2.5 times the interquartile range as outliers and removed them from the data set. Finally, we used sliding windows with a size of 96 timepoints (= 1 day) to calculate time series of mean and cv, resulting in 768 data points for t1-t3 and 480 data points for t4-t5 (8 and 5 days, respectively).

*Ecosystem dynamics* - We analyzed time series of chlorophyll-a, phycocyanin, dissolved oxygen and fDOM separately for each of the five measurement periods to account for any variation due to the sonde-switching. To test for effects of macrophytes on the mean and variance of each parameter we implemented a series of generalized additive models (GAM) using the R-package *mgcv (Wood, 2004)*: one model per parameter (chlorophyll-a, Phycocyanin, fDOM, oxygen concentration, conductivity) per measurement period (t1-t5) per metric (mean or CV), resulting in a total of 50 separate GAMs. Each model used data from all eight tanks to test for differences in the mean or coefficient of variation (CV), with the presence or absence of macrophytes as the independent variable and tank and pair (see Fig. 1) as random effects. All GAMs included a term that accounted for first order autocorrelation and used penalized thin plate regression splines with automatic knot selection.

In addition to the GAMs we also calculated pairwise log response ratios (LRR) for macrophyte presence in all five periods for the high frequency measurements. To do so we

divided vectors of mean and CV (coming either from the sliding window for the water parameters or from the daily estimates of metabolism) for M+ by the corresponding vector of M- for each given pair of tanks. We then calculated the natural logarithm for these ratios for each measurement period and for each tank (for a summary of all response ratios see Fig. 6).

*Ecosystem metabolism* - To test for statistical differences in metabolic rates, we used the output from the ecosystem metabolism models, which were 8 or 5 consecutive days for t1-t3, and t4-t5, respectively (streamMetabolizer does not provide estimates for the final day in a time series). In a similar fashion as for the ecosystem dynamics, each model used data from all eight tanks within a measurement period to test for differences in GPP, ER or GPP:ER, using macrophyte presence as the independent variable and pair and tank as random effects. We calculated LRRs in the same way as described for the high frequency ecosystem dynamics. We used paired t-tests to test for differences in metabolism CV for each measurement period.

*DOC* - We used paired t-tests to test for differences in mean and CV of total DOC concentration, $SUVA_{254}$ and $SUVA_{350}$, and SSR between mesocosms with and without macrophytes. For each date (10 dates in total, see Table S2) we performed separate tests for all four metrics (n=8 tanks). We performed t-tests with the *stats* R-package (R Core Team 2017) and calculated pairwise LRRs for all DOC metrics (for a summary of all response ratios see Fig. 6).

# Results

## Macrophyte biomass and nutrients

The overall biomass of the macrophyte community changed over the course of the experiment, decreasing in the M+ treatment and increasing slightly in the M- treatment. At the end of the experiment substantially less *Chara* biomass was present in the M+ mesocosms than at the

beginning (from 165.1 ± 21.65 to 5.08 ± 7.6 g dry weight per mesocosm, mean ± SD; Table S1), whereas *Myriophyllum* biomass increased threefold from 2.84 ± 0.54 g to 8.45 ± 1.6 g dry weight. In the M- treatment there was no *Myriophyllum*, but *Chara* biomass increased slightly due to growth from the sediment (from 0 to 0.27 ± 0.54 g dry weight per mesocosm, mean ± SD). In both treatments, filamentous algae grew over the course of the experiment to a final biomass of 8.33 ± 10.54 g dry weight (M+) and 3.21 ± 5.46 g dry weight per mesocosm (M-), mean ± SD, respectively. Throughout the experiment we observed no differences in concentrations of phosphate or nitrogen between mesocosms with and without macrophytes (Figure S1). The nutrients we supplied on July 4th were almost completely consumed by July 18th and were consistently low (<2µg P * $L^{-1}$, <50 µg N * $L^{-1}$) over the entire experiment. However, concentrations of both nutrients tended to increase towards the end of the experiment, likely due to decomposition of plant material (e.g. Chara, Table S1).

**Ecosystem dynamics**

As expected, solar radiation and water temperature decreased strongly over the course of the experiment from July 18th to Oct 20th (Fig. S2). Several parameters differed between M+ and M- tanks over the course of the experiment, with the magnitude of the difference depending on period (Fig 2 and Fig. 6; for P-values see Table 2). As expected, mean phytoplankton biomass was significantly higher without macrophytes (M-) in three of the five periods (t2, t4, and t5; Table 2), and, unexpectedly, the CV of phytoplankton biomass was higher in the tanks with macrophytes (M+) in three periods (t1, t2, and t5, Fig. 3). By comparison, mean phycocyanin was not significantly different between M+ and M- (Fig. 2), but the CV of phycocyanin was significantly higher in the M+ treatment during three periods (Fig. 3; t1, t2, t4). In tanks with macrophytes (M+), fDOM was higher in four periods (GAM, t2 - t5), and the CV was significantly lower in one period (GAM, t3). The mean concentration of dissolved oxygen was

significantly higher in M+, but only towards the end of the experiment (Fig. 3, t4 and t5). In these two periods when irradiance was decreasing (Fig. S2), the tanks lacking macrophytes (M-) became undersaturated with dissolved oxygen indicating net heterotrophy. During the entire experiment, there were no differences between M+ and M- in the CV of dissolved oxygen. Effect sizes of macrophyte presence on mean and variance of all parameters measured in high frequency are summarized in Figure 6.

**Ecosystem metabolism**

We found weak and seasonally variable differences in mean ecosystem metabolism between mesocosms with and without macrophytes (Fig. 4). In three measurement periods mesocosms with macrophytes had significantly higher gross primary productivity (t1, t3, and t5). During t1, mesocosms with macrophytes also had higher respiration (GAM, main effect of macrophytes, $P=0.001$). In t2 there was a tendency for higher GPP:ER ratio in mesocosms without macrophytes (GAM, main effect of macrophytes, $P=0.074$), but in t3 and t4 we found the opposite pattern with significantly higher GPP:ER ratio in the presence of macrophytes (GAM, main effect of macrophytes, $P<0.001$ and $P=0.002$, respectively. Overall, GPP and ER decreased significantly over the course of the experiment, likely due to seasonal dynamics (decreasing temperature and light, Fig. S2) but the GPP:ER ratio remained around one. Across all measurement periods, both productivity and respiration increased with chlorophyll-a biomass (slope in Fig. S4). However, for a given chlorophyll-a concentration, both metabolic rates were higher in the presence of macrophytes than in their absence (intercept in Fig. S4). Moreover, we found higher variance of metabolic rates when macrophytes were present (all t-tests of metabolism CV significantly different - Fig 6).

**DOC**

Total DOC concentration was not significantly different between M+ and M- mesocosms (Table S2, Fig. S3). However, there were clear effects of macrophytes on chromophoric (impacting light transparency) DOC components: $SUVA_{254}$ and $SUVA_{350}$ were often higher in the presence of macrophytes (Table S2, Fig. S3), indicating that less UV light was able to penetrate in these ecosystems. SSR diverged among treatments early in the experiment and remained higher in the –M treatment for most of the season (Fig. S3), potentially indicating dissolved substances of lower molecular weight in the absence of macrophytes (e.g. sugars or amino acids). We also found higher variance in all metrics of DOC composition in the presence of macrophytes (Fig 6).

**Simulated interactions between macrophytes and phytoplankton**

Our simulation model produced results parallel to those observed in the mesocosms. Under identical nutrient levels, phytoplankton biomass was on average lower in the presence of macrophytes, but also varied more strongly around the mean (i.e. lower mean and higher CV under M-). This was also reflected in the stability regimes measured as the dominant eigenvalue lambda, which was higher in the absence and lower in the presence of macrophytes (Fig. 5, panel B). These results emerged solely from differences in the relative effects of macrophytes vs. phytoplankton on nutrient vs. light limitation and illustrate that differential competition for these resources can impact both mean and variance in phytoplankton biomass.

# Discussion

Over the course of the mesocosm experiment macrophytes affected a wide range of ecosystem parameters. Most notably, from those measured at high frequency, chlorophyll-a fluorescence

(i.e. phytoplankton biomass) was significantly lower in the presence of macrophytes. Our high-resolution measurements also revealed some unexpected variance patterns of phytoplankton and DOC components in the presence of macrophytes. While the former may be explained by resource competition between macrophytes and phytoplankton, as indicated by our competition simulation, the mechanisms behind elevated DOC variability are currently speculative. Below we discuss the implications of our joint findings from the high-resolution time series and the simulation model, as well as the outcomes of the ecosystem metabolism models. Overall, our findings indicate that some macrophyte effects on ecosystem parameters are of more limited duration (e.g. phytoplankton was decreased only temporarily and most strongly in t2), whereas others remain stable across the season (e.g. fDOM was consistently higher from t2 onwards).

As expected from existing theoretical and experimental work, and confirming our first hypothesis, we observed higher phytoplankton biomass in the absence of macrophytes (Scheffer *et al.*, 1993; Blindow *et al.*, 1998). This is in agreement with a large body of previous work that documents the outcome of competition between macrophytes and phytoplankton for dissolved nutrients and light (Sand-Jensen & Borum, 1991; Scheffer *et al.*, 1993; Faafeng & Mjelde, 1998; van Nes, Rip & Scheffer, 2007). The ability of macrophytes to keep phytoplankton biomass low is also known to be important in maintaining a clear water state in response to nutrient additions (Scheffer *et al.*, 1993; Ibelings *et al.*, 2007). However, a finding we did not expect based on existing theory was the higher variability of phytoplankton biomass in the presence of macrophytes, a phenomenon that has not been previously reported. One mechanism for higher variability of phytoplankton biomass could be that the ongoing photosynthesis, growth, and decay of macrophytes increases the short-term variability of nutrient and carbon availability, and that phytoplankton respond more rapidly to these changes in nutrient concentrations than macrophytes themselves (Setaro & Melack, 1984; Mitchell, 1989; Eichel *et al.*, 2014). Importantly, however, the much larger reservoir of macrophytes

biomass can repeatedly suppress these rapid increases in phytoplankton growth. Rooted macrophytes build up biomass over time and can also store nutrients (Faafeng & Mjelde, 1998; Søndergaard & Moss, 1998; Yamamichi *et al.*, 2018), and thus probably prevented a high mean level of phytoplankton biomass and repeatedly suppressed multiple bouts of phytoplankton growth.

We implemented a model to explore how competitive interactions between macrophytes and phytoplankton might affect the mean vs. the variance of phytoplankton biomass. Specifically, we modelled competitive interactions such that macrophytes limit nutrient availability and phytoplankton limit light availability (Scheffer and Carpenter (2003)). This model reproduced the same contrast in phytoplankton biomass that we observed in the mesocosms: lower mean phytoplankton biomass but higher variance (CV) in the presence of macrophytes. Thus, the model predicted that a phytoplankton-dominated state would be more stable than a macrophyte-dominated state under the same nutrient loading condition. At first sight, this result might appear counterintuitive as a macrophyte-dominated state is expected to be more stable to the unfavorable phytoplankton-dominated state. The biological explanation may be that when macrophytes and phytoplankton are competing for nutrients (and light), variation arising from the depletion of these resources is larger than with just one consumer (i.e. only phytoplankton in M-). However, whether variability is always expected to be higher in a macrophyte dominated than in a phytoplankton-dominated state, or under what conditions, would require more empirical work to validate. The model shows that this is the case considering only one aspect of macrophyte-phytoplankton interactions (i.e. competition), which qualitatively matched with the high-resolution algal biomass data we collected. However, macrophytes can affect other compartments of the ecosystem (e.g. sediment, epiphytes, DOC) that are not considered in our model. Macrophytes can produce allelochemicals like polyphenols and fatty acids (Korner & Nicklisch, 2002; Nakai *et al.*, 2012)

458 that inhibit phytoplankton production (Hilt & Gross, 2008; Nakai *et al.*, 2012), can modify the
459 light environments via the production of DOC (Catalán *et al.*, 2014; Reitsema *et al.*, 2018),
460 which could potentially influence the variance of phytoplankton biomass. This may be
461 especially the case for *Myriophyllum*, which is known to produce large amounts of
462 allelochemicals (Hilt & Gross, 2008; Nakai *et al.*, 2012) and also was the dominant plant in the
463 mesocosms with macrophytes. Nevertheless, our study does illustrate that high resolution
464 monitoring of ecosystem conditions (Mandal *et al.*, 2019), might provide new insights into the
465 underlying mechanisms whereby macrophytes (or other foundation species) can affect
466 ecosystem dynamics in general, and the relationships between mean and variance of ecosystem
467 responses in particular.

468 In line with macrophytes being efficient primary producers in shallow lakes (Kaenel *et*
469 *al.*, 2000), we confirmed our second hypothesis that mesocosm ecosystems with macrophytes
470 had higher metabolic rates than those without macrophytes. Differences in productivity were
471 most pronounced in July, where mesocosms with macrophytes were significantly more
472 productive than macrophyte free mesocosms (t1). However, this difference disappeared during
473 the phytoplankton bloom in the second measurement period (t2). This suggests that at
474 intermediate concentrations, phytoplankton can increase productivity of aquatic ecosystems
475 and match rates of primary production of macrophytes. Yet for any given chlorophyll-a
476 biomass we measured, metabolic rates were higher when macrophytes were also present. This
477 indicates that even at relatively low density, macrophytes (Myriophyllum, Chara and
478 filamentous algae) can produce a significant metabolic signal. Higher productivity of
479 ecosystems with macrophytes was also reflected in GPP:ER ratio, which is on average slightly
480 higher for those mesocosms in t3 and t4 (Sep 5th - Oct 9th). During t2 (Aug 7th - Aug 27th)
481 there was a tendency for higher GPP:ER in mesocosms without macrophytes, probably due to
482 very high phytoplankton biomass. Towards the second half of the experiment, the growth of

filamentous algae may have also contributed to higher rates of whole ecosystem productivity in +M tanks, where filamentous algae biomass was higher (8.33 ± 10.54 g dry weight, mean ± SD) than in the -M tanks (3.21 ± 5.46 g dry weight, mean ± SD). Overall, these findings suggest that macrophytes, regardless of their growth form, might make shallow lake ecosystems more productive across the seasonal succession of ecosystem metabolism (Madsen & Adams, 1988; Blindow *et al.*, 2006; Brothers *et al.*, 2013). These dynamics require additional investigation, especially in the context of successive phytoplankton blooms and their effects on the macrophyte community, but also in the context of rising temperatures and eutrophication.

Another important axis by which macrophytes affected the experimental ecosystems is their effects on the concentration and composition of dissolved organic matter. From the beginning of t2 (August 8th) to the end of the experiment, fDOM measurements in mesocosms with macrophytes were nearly twice as high as in mesocosms without macrophytes. Higher mean, but also lower variance of DOM was expected, because especially *Myriophyllum*, which was the dominant plant in the +M mesocosms, is known to produce allelochemicals to inhibit algae growth that are broken down only slowly (Hilt & Gross, 2008; Nakai *et al.*, 2012). However, total DOC concentrations were similar in both treatments, suggesting that not all components of the DOM-pool are affected the same way by macrophytes (Catalán *et al.*, 2014; Reitsema *et al.*, 2018). Moreover, measurements from the scanning spectrophotometer showed consistently lower SSRs, indicating the presence of DOC compounds with higher molecular weight. The buildup and decay of macrophyte detritus could explain the low SSR ratios at similar total DOC levels, particularly since much of the initial *Chara* biomass contributed to decomposition rather than taking root, and/or grew but then decayed over the course of the experiment. However, *Myriophyllum* biomass also increased substantially, and could have added high MW compounds into the mesocosms. It is also possible that production rates of DOC were similar in M+ and M- treatments (as the total DOC was similar), but that material

originating from macrophytes has a higher MW, and is more difficult to break down by bacteria (Bolan *et al.*, 2011; Reitsema *et al.*, 2018). Overall, changes in DOC composition and variance might reflect differences in the balance of production and decomposition rates of different photosynthetic compounds, such as low MW sugars that are a byproduct of recent photosynthetic activity (Carpenter & Lodge, 1986; Bolan *et al.*, 2011; Reitsema *et al.*, 2018). However, more work needs to be done to understand the specific mechanisms behind such patterns, e.g. biomass production and decomposition or the production of secondary metabolites.

Using a common macrophyte assemblage, our experiment shows that communities of submerged plants can affect the mean and variance of a wide range of biotic and abiotic ecosystem properties and processes over a relatively short amount of time (Figure 6). Some of the effects we found on mean values, such as macrophytes decreasing phytoplankton biomass and increasing fDOM are not particularly surprising nor are they novel. However, the elevated variability of both phytoplankton pigments in the presence of macrophytes was unexpected, and potentially linked to competitive interactions. Across all our ecosystem metrics, we found that changes in CV covaried negatively with changes in the mean, or that CV increased despite no effect on the mean. Such results, show the importance of considering the variance of ecological dynamics, which is increasingly recognized as an important aspect of ecosystem dynamics (Carpenter, 1988; Benedetti-Cecchi, 2003) and is used in a wide array of applications, e.g. ecological forecasting (Petchey *et al.*, 2015; Pennekamp *et al.*, 2019), early warning signals for critical transitions (Scheffer *et al.*, 2009; Carpenter *et al.*, 2011), and ecological modelling (Bartell *et al.*, 1988; Cottingham & Carpenter, 1998). Furthermore, our high frequency measurements can begin to reveal and quantify characteristic differences in timescales of ecosystem change, such as the high variability in phytoplankton communities vs. the relative stability of DOM and oxygen concentration throughout the season. Future

experiments targeting shallow lake ecosystems should also encompass measurements in high resolution, e.g. to detect the potential outcome of interactions among different trophic levels (e.g. between macrophytes, zooplankton and fish) or quantify the response to perturbations (e.g. nutrients or temperature). Our study highlights how complex and temporally variable interactions around foundation species can be and underscores the need for further research that investigates biotic and abiotic components of these networks of interactions in detail.

# Acknowledgements

We thank Gilles Antoniazza, Emil Birnstiel, Laetitia Catalano, Daniel Steiner, Jaime M. Anaya-Rojas, and Marek Svitok for major contributions to mesocosm set-up, maintenance, and sampling. Patrick Kathriner, and Beat Kienholz provided lab facilities and infrastructure support. MDL was funded by the center for Adaptation to a changing Environment (ACE) at ETH Zürich and by the department of Aquatic Ecology at Eawag. The Eawag Directorate provided financial support for RJB and MDL.

# Author contributions

MDL, BM, and RJB designed the study. MDL and RJB implemented and maintained the experiment and collected the data. MDL, VD and BM analyzed the data. VD implemented the simulation model. All authors made substantial contributions to the manuscript.

# Data Availability Statement

A copy of the (cross) calibrated data is accessible at the Dryad open-access repository: https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.18931zcvt (Lürig *et al.* 2020), together with instructions on how to reproduce all shown results.

# Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

# References


Appling A.P., Hall R.O. Jr., Yackulic C.B. & Arroita M. (2018). Overcoming Equifinality: Leveraging Long Time Series for Stream Metabolism Estimation. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* **123**, 624–645. https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JG004140

Bartell S.M., Brenkert A.L., O'Neill R.V. & Gardner R.H. (1988). Temporal Variation in Regulation of Production in a Pelagic Food Web Model. In: *Complex Interactions in Lake Communities*. (Ed. S.R. Carpenter), pp. 101–118. Springer New York, New York, NY.

Benedetti-Cecchi L. (2003). The Importance of the Variance around the Mean Effect Size of Ecological Processes. *Ecology* **84**, 2335–2346

Blindow I., Hargeby A. & Andersson G. (1998). Alternative Stable States in Shallow Lakes: What Causes a Shift? In: *The Structuring Role of Submerged Macrophytes in Lakes*. Ecological Studies, (Eds E. Jeppesen, M. Søndergaard, M. Søndergaard & K. Christoffersen), pp. 353–360. Springer New York.

Blindow I., Hargeby A., Meyercordt J. & Schubert H. (2006). Primary production in two shallow lakes with contrasting plant form dominance: A paradox of enrichment? *Limnology and oceanography* **51**, 2711–2721. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2006.51.6.2711

Bolan N.S., Adriano D.C., Kunhikrishnan A., James T., McDowell R. & Senesi N. (2011). Chapter One - Dissolved Organic Matter: Biogeochemistry, Dynamics, and Environmental Significance in Soils. In: *Advances in Agronomy*. (Ed. D.L. Sparks), pp.

577 1–75. Academic Press.
578 Brothers S.M., Hilt S., Meyer S. & Koehler J. (2013). Plant community structure determines
579 primary productivity in shallow, eutrophic lakes. *Freshwater biology* **58**, 2264–2276.
580 https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12207
581 Carpenter S.R. (1988). Transmission of Variance through Lake Food Webs. In: *Complex*
582 *Interactions in Lake Communities*. (Ed. S.R. Carpenter), pp. 119–135. Springer New
583 York, New York, NY.
584 Carpenter S.R., Cole J.J., Pace M.L., Batt R., Brock W.A., Cline T., *et al.* (2011). Early
585 warnings of regime shifts: a whole-ecosystem experiment. *Science* **332**, 1079–1082.
586 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1203672
587 Carpenter S.R. & Lodge D.M. (1986). Effects of submersed macrophytes on ecosystem
588 processes. *Aquatic botany* **26**, 341–370. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3770(86)90031-8
589 Catalán N., Obrador B. & Pretus J.L. (2014). Ecosystem processes drive dissolved organic
590 matter quality in a highly dynamic water body. *Hydrobiologia* **728**, 111–124.
591 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-014-1811-y
592 Cottingham K.L. & Carpenter S.R. (1998). Population, Community, and Ecosystem Variates
593 as Ecological Indicators: Phytoplankton Responses to Whole-Lake Enrichment.
594 *Ecological applications: a publication of the Ecological Society of America* **8**, 508–530.
595 https://doi.org/10.2307/2641090
596 Dayton P.K. (1972). Toward an understanding of community resilience and the potential
597 effects of enrichments to the benthos at McMurdo Sound, Antarctica. In: *Proceedings of*
598 *the colloquium on conservation problems in Antarctica*. pp. 81–96. Allen Press
599 Lawrence, Kansas, USA.
600 Eichel K.A., Macrae M.L., Hall R.I., Fishback L. & Wolfe B.B. (2014). Nutrient Uptake and
601 Short-Term Responses of Phytoplankton and Benthic Algal Communities from a

602 Subarctic Pond to Experimental Nutrient Enrichment in Microcosms. *Arctic, antarctic,*
603 *and alpine research* **46**, 191–205. https://doi.org/10.1657/1938-4246-46.1.191
604 Ellison A.M., Bank M.S., Clinton B.D., Colburn E.A., Elliott K., Ford C.R., *et al.* (2005).
605 Loss of foundation species: consequences for the structure and dynamics of forested
606 ecosystems. *Frontiers in ecology and the environment* **3**, 479–486.
607 https://doi.org/10.1890/1540-9295(2005)003[0479:LOFSCF]2.0.CO;2
608 Faafeng B.A. & Mjelde M. (1998). Clear and Turbid Water in Shallow Norwegian Lakes
609 Related to Submerged Vegetation. In: *The Structuring Role of Submerged Macrophytes*
610 *in Lakes*. Ecological Studies, (Eds E. Jeppesen, M. Søndergaard, M. Søndergaard & K.
611 Christoffersen), pp. 361–368. Springer New York.
612 Findlay S. & Sinsabaugh R.L. (2003). *Aquatic Ecosystems: Interactivity of Dissolved*
613 *Organic Matter*. (Ed. F. Sinsabaugh), Academic Press.
614 Fiskal A., Deng L., Michel A., Eickenbusch P., Han X., Lagostina L., *et al.* (2019). Effects of
615 eutrophication on sedimentary organic carbon cycling in five temperate lakes
616 Gross E.M. (2003). Allelopathy of Aquatic Autotrophs. *Critical reviews in plant sciences* **22**,
617 313–339. https://doi.org/10.1080/713610859
618 Hansen A.M., Kraus T.E.C., Pellerin B.A., Fleck J.A., Downing B.D. & Bergamaschi B.A.
619 (2016). Optical properties of dissolved organic matter (DOM): Effects of biological and
620 photolytic degradation: DOM optical properties following degradation. *Limnology and*
621 *oceanography* **61**, 1015–1032. https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.10270
622 Helms J.R., Stubbins A., Ritchie J.D., Minor E.C., Kieber D.J. & Mopper K. (2008).
623 Absorption spectral slopes and slope ratios as indicators of molecular weight, source, and
624 photobleaching of chromophoric dissolved organic matter. *Limnology and oceanography*
625 **53**, 955–969. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2008.53.3.0955
626 Hillebrand H., Langenheder S., Lebret K., Lindström E., Östman Ö. & Striebel M. (2018).

627 Decomposing multiple dimensions of stability in global change experiments. *Ecology*
628 *letters* **21**, 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12867
629 Hilt S. & Gross E.M. (2008). Can allelopathically active submerged macrophytes stabilise
630 clear-water states in shallow lakes? *Basic and applied ecology* **9**, 422–432.
631 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2007.04.003
632 Huss A.A. & Wehr J.D. (2004). Strong indirect effects of a submersed aquatic macrophyte,
633 Vallisneria americana, on bacterioplankton densities in a mesotrophic lake. *Microbial*
634 *ecology* **47**, 305–315. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00248-003-1034-7
635 Iacarella J.C., Barrow J.L., Giani A., Beisner B.E. & Gregory-Eaves I. (2018). Shifts in algal
636 dominance in freshwater experimental ponds across differing levels of macrophytes and
637 nutrients. *Ecosphere* **9**. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.2086
638 Ibelings B.W., Portielje R., Lammens E.H.R.R., Noordhuis R., van den Berg M.S., Joosse
639 W., *et al.* (2007). Resilience of Alternative Stable States during the Recovery of Shallow
640 Lakes from Eutrophication: Lake Veluwe as a Case Study. *Ecosystems* **10**, 4–16.
641 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-006-9009-4
642 Jeppesen E., Peder Jensen J., Søndergaard M., Lauridsen T., Junge Pedersen L. & Jensen L.
643 (1997). Top-down control in freshwater lakes: the role of nutrient state, submerged
644 macrophytes and water depth. In: *Shallow Lakes '95: Trophic Cascades in Shallow*
645 *Freshwater and Brackish Lakes*. (Eds L. Kufel, A. Prejs & J.I. Rybak), pp. 151–164.
646 Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht.
647 Kaenel B.R., Buehrer H. & Uehlinger U. (2000). Effects of aquatic plant management on
648 stream metabolism and oxygen balance in streams. *Freshwater biology* **45**, 85–95.
649 https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2427.2000.00618.x
650 Kéfi S., Holmgren M. & Scheffer M. (2016). When can positive interactions cause alternative
651 stable states in ecosystems? *Functional ecology* **30**, 88–97. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-

2435.12601

Kellerman A.M., Kothawala D.N., Dittmar T. & Tranvik L.J. (2015). Persistence of dissolved organic matter in lakes related to its molecular characteristics. *Nature geoscience* **8**, 454. https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2440

Korner S. & Nicklisch A. (2002). Allelopathic growth inhibition of selected phytoplankton species by submerged macrophytes. *Journal of phycology* **38**, 862–871. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1529-8817.2002.t01-1-02001.x

Lürig, M.D., Best, R. J., Dakos, V, Matthews, B. (2020). Data from: Submerged macrophytes affect the temporal variability of aquatic ecosystems. *Dryad Digital Repository* https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.18931zcvt

Madsen J.D. & Adams M.S. (1988). The seasonal biomass and productivity of submerged macrophytes in a polluted Wisconsin stream. *Freshwater biology* **20**, 41–50. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.1988.tb01715.x

Mandal S., Smith S.L., Priyadarshi A. & Yamazaki H. (2019). Micro-Scale Variability Impacts the Outcome of Competition Between Different Modeled Size Classes of Phytoplankton. *Frontiers in Marine Science* **6**, 259. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00259

Mitchell D.S. & Rogers K.H. (1985). Seasonality/aseasonality of aquatic macrophytes in Southern Hemisphere inland waters. *Hydrobiologia* **125**, 137–150. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00045931

Mitchell S.F. (1989). Primary production in a shallow eutrophic lake dominated alternately by phytoplankton and by submerged macrophytes. *Aquatic botany* **33**, 101–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3770(89)90023-5

Nakai S., Zou G., Okuda T., Nishijima W., Hosomi M. & Okada M. (2012). Polyphenols and fatty acids responsible for anti-cyanobacterial allelopathic effects of submerged

macrophyte Myriophyllum spicatum. *Water science and technology: a journal of the International Association on Water Pollution Research* **66**, 993–999. https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2012.272

van Nes E.H., Rip W.J. & Scheffer M. (2007). A theory for cyclic shifts between alternative states in shallow lakes. *Ecosystems* **10**, 17–27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-006-0176-0

Nielsen A., Liboriussen L., Trolle D., Landkildehus F., Søndergaard M., Lauridsen T.L., *et al.* (2013). Daily net ecosystem production in lakes predicted from midday dissolved oxygen saturation: analysis of a five-year high frequency dataset from 24 mesocosms with contrasting trophic states and temperatures: Predicting lake net ecosystem production. *Limnology and oceanography, methods / ASLO* **11**, 202–212. https://doi.org/10.4319/lom.2013.11.202

Pennekamp F., Iles A.C., Garland J., Brennan G., Brose U., Gaedke U., *et al.* (2019). The intrinsic predictability of ecological time series and its potential to guide forecasting. *Ecological monographs* **89**, e01359. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecm.1359

Petchey O.L., Pontarp M., Massie T.M., Kéfi S., Ozgul A., Weilenmann M., *et al.* (2015). The ecological forecast horizon, and examples of its uses and determinants. *Ecology letters* **18**, 597–611. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12443

Reitsema R.E., Meire P. & Schoelynck J. (2018). The Future of Freshwater Macrophytes in a Changing World: Dissolved Organic Carbon Quantity and Quality and Its Interactions With Macrophytes. *Frontiers in plant science* **9**, 629. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.00629

Retamal L., Vincent W.F., Martineau C. & Osburn C.L. (2007). Comparison of the optical properties of dissolved organic matter in two river-influenced coastal regions of the Canadian Arctic. *Estuarine, coastal and shelf science* **72**, 261–272.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2006.10.022

Sand-Jensen K. & Borum J. (1991). Interactions among phytoplankton, periphyton, and macrophytes in temperate freshwaters and estuaries. *Aquatic botany* **41**, 137–175. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3770(91)90042-4

Scheffer M., Bascompte J., Brock W.A., Brovkin V., Carpenter S.R., Dakos V., *et al.* (2009). Early-warning signals for critical transitions. *Nature* **461**, 53–59. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08227

Scheffer M. & Carpenter S.R. (2003). Catastrophic regime shifts in ecosystems: linking theory to observation. *Trends in ecology & evolution* **18**, 648–656. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2003.09.002

Scheffer M., Hosper S.H., Meijer M.L., Moss B. & Jeppesen E. (1993). Alternative equilibria in shallow lakes. *Trends in ecology & evolution* **8**, 275–279. https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347(93)90254-M

Scheffer M., Szabo S., Gragnani A., Van Nes E.H., Rinaldi S., Kautsky N., *et al.* (2003). Floating plant dominance as a stable state. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **100**, 4040–4045. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0737918100

Setaro F.V. & Melack J.M. (1984). Responses of phytoplankton to experimental nutrient enrichment in an Amazon floodplain lake1: Amazon lake nutrient limitation. *Limnology and oceanography* **29**, 972–984. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1984.29.5.0972

Søndergaard M. & Moss B. (1998). Impact of Submerged Macrophytes on Phytoplankton in Shallow Freshwater Lakes. In: *The Structuring Role of Submerged Macrophytes in Lakes*. (Eds E. Jeppesen, M. Søndergaard, M. Søndergaard & K. Christoffersen), pp. 115–132. Springer New York, New York, NY.

Spears B.M., Futter M.N., Jeppesen E., Huser B.J., Ives S., Davidson T.A., *et al.* (2017).

727 Ecological resilience in lakes and the conjunction fallacy. *Nature ecology & evolution* **1**,
728 1616–1624. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0333-1
729 Van den Berg M.S., Coops H., Meijer M.-L., Scheffer M. & Simons J. (1998). Clear Water
730 Associated with a Dense Chara Vegetation in the Shallow and Turbid Lake Veluwemeer,
731 The Netherlands. In: *The Structuring Role of Submerged Macrophytes in Lakes*. (Eds E.
732 Jeppesen, M. Søndergaard, M. Søndergaard & K. Christoffersen), pp. 339–352. Springer
733 New York, New York, NY.
734 Vasseur D.A., DeLong J.P., Gilbert B., Greig H.S., Harley C.D.G., McCann K.S., *et al.*
735 (2014). Increased temperature variation poses a greater risk to species than climate
736 warming. *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society* **281**, 20132612.
737 https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.2612
738 Weishaar J.L., Aiken G.R., Bergamaschi B.A., Fram M.S., Fujii R. & Mopper K. (2003).
739 Evaluation of Specific Ultraviolet Absorbance as an Indicator of the Chemical
740 Composition and Reactivity of Dissolved Organic Carbon. *Environmental science &*
741 *technology* **37**, 4702–4708. https://doi.org/10.1021/es030360x
742 Wetzel R.G. (1964). A Comparative Study of the Primary Production of Higher Aquatic
743 Plants, Periphyton, and Phytoplankton in a Large, Shallow Lake. *Internationale Revue*
744 *der gesamten Hydrobiologie und Hydrographie* **49**, 1–61.
745 https://doi.org/10.1002/iroh.19640490102
746 Wetzel R.G. & Søndergaard M. (1998). Role of Submerged Macrophytes for the Microbial
747 Community and Dynamics of Dissolved Organic Carbon in Aquatic Ecosystems. In: *The*
748 *Structuring Role of Submerged Macrophytes in Lakes*. (Eds E. Jeppesen, M.
749 Søndergaard, M. Søndergaard & K. Christoffersen), pp. 133–148. Springer New York,
750 New York, NY.
751 Wood S.N. (2004). Stable and efficient multiple smoothing parameter estimation for

752 generalized additive models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **99**, 673–
753 686
754 Yamamichi M., Kazama T., Tokita K., Katano I., Doi H., Yoshida T., *et al.* (2018). A shady
755 phytoplankton paradox: when phytoplankton increases under low light. *Proc. R. Soc. B*
756 **285**, 20181067. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.1067
757 Żbikowski J., Simčič T., Pajk F., Poznańska-Kakareko M., Kakareko T. & Kobak J. (2019).
758 Respiration rates in shallow lakes of different types: contribution of benthic
759 microorganisms, macrophytes, plankton and macrozoobenthos. *Hydrobiologia* **828**, 117–
760 136. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-018-3807-5
761 Zelnik Y.R., Arnoldi J.-F. & Loreau M. (2018). The Impact of Spatial and Temporal
762 Dimensions of Disturbances on Ecosystem Stability. *Frontiers in ecology and evolution*
763 **6**, 224. https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2018.00224

764

765

# Figure captions

1. A: Scheme of experimental procedure. Because we were limited to four sondes, we could only measure two tank pairs of macrophyte (M+)/no macrophyte (M-) contrasts. To measure all eight tanks, we followed a rotation scheme in which every tank was measured for 10 consecutive days before the sondes were moved to another tank (for details refer to Methods section). B: Picture of experimental site showing the set up mesocosms (1000L). C: *Chara tomentosa* (Photo credit: Gustav Johansson). D: *Myriophyllum spicatum* (Photo credit: Alison Fox).

2. Sliding window results from high frequency measurements of chlorophyll-a and Phycocyanin over time (days 2-9 in each of five consecutive sampling periods). Lines show Mean ± SE (n = 8 tanks), asterisks indicate significant differences ($p <= 0.05$), dots indicate marginal significance ($p <= 0.1$). One GAM was used per period, including tank and the pair it was in (see Fig.1) as random effects. Here the sliding window time series of the Mean from both blocks are shown pooled for better illustration. Because the sliding window had a width of one day, only aggregate days 2-9 for each measurement are shown.

3. Sliding window results from high frequency measurements of fDOM and dissolved oxygen over time (days 2-9 in each of five consecutive sampling periods). Lines show Mean ± SE (n = 8 tanks), asterisks indicate significant differences ($p <= 0.05$). One GAM was used per period, including tank and the pair it was in (see Fig.1) as random effects. Here the sliding window time series of the Mean from both blocks are shown pooled for better illustration. Because the sliding window had a width of one day, only aggregate days 2-9 for each measurement are shown.

4. Ecosystem gross primary productivity (GPP), ecosystem respiration (ER) and GPP:ER, calculated from high frequency measurements of dissolved oxygen concentration (g * $m^{-2}$ * $day^{-1}$), temperature, light, and air pressure. Shown are Mean ± SE (n= 8 tanks), asterisks indicate significant differences (P<0.05), dots indicate marginal significance (P< 0.1). One GAM was used per period, including both consecutive blocks as random variables. Here the time series of metabolic rates from both blocks are shown pooled for better illustration. The modelling procedure requires full days to be included, but because of the model parameterization to start each day 1 hour before sunrise, the last day is incomplete and thus cannot be modeled. Hence, only aggregate days 1-8 are shown.

5. A simple model of competition for light and nutrients between macrophytes and phytoplankton (for details see Supplement). A: Schematic of interactions between macrophytes (M) and phytoplankton (P). Macrophytes consume nutrients, which has a negative indirect effect on phytoplankton. If phytoplankton biomass becomes too high, it reduces light levels such that there is a negative indirect effect on macrophytes. Thus, macrophytes are more strongly limited by light, and phytoplankton by nutrients. B: Zero-growth curves of macrophytes (green line) and phytoplankton (blue line). Black points mark the 2 alternative stable equilibria of either a macrophyte-and-phytoplankton state or an only-phytoplankton state. Although these two states exist for the same level of nutrients in the water, their stability (measured as the dominant eigenvalue lambda) differs: the only-phytoplankton is more stable than the macrophyte-and-phytoplankton state. C: Simulated time series of phytoplankton biomass in the presence (green) and in the absence (blue – note second y-axis) of macrophytes for the same level of nutrients in the water. D: Coefficient of variation of phytoplankton biomass estimated from 200 simulated sets.

812 6. Average log response ratios (LRR) for macrophyte presence on mean and CV. Effect sizes
813 were calculated differently for each data type: high frequency (●), metabolism (▲), or DOC
814 point measurements (■) – for details refer to the methods section. Each point shows the average
815 (mean ± se) macrophyte LRR across all tank pairs (N=4, Fig. 1) and in all measurement periods
816 (t1-t5, except for the DOC point measurements, where all 10 measurements were used to
817 calculate LRR for mean and CV).

Figure S1 - Point measurements of dissolved nutrients (top = phosphate, bottom = nitrite + nitrate). Throughout the experiment, on all four timepoints, there were no differences in dissolved nutrient concentrations between mesocosms with and without macrophytes. We only added nutrients at the beginning of the experiment; increasing nutrient concentrations therefore underlie natural dynamics (e.g. increase due to rain and decomposition, decrease due to uptake by plants).

Figure S2 - Abiotic conditions during experiment: Temperature was measured inside each mesocosm with a sensor that was installed on the sondes (Table 2: no significant difference among tanks). PAR was measured outside the mesocosms with a sensor (Li-Cor) that was installed at the center of the side at water level height.

Figure S3 - Point measurements of different DOC components: total DOC, specific UV absorbance (SUVA: smaller values = higher UV transmission) at 254 and 350 nm, and the ratio of spectral slopes (SSR; smaller values = higher molecular weight) at 275-295 and 350-400 nm. We used separate t-tests to test for differences in DOC components at each date (n per treatment level = 4). Significant differences ($P<0.05$) are indicated by asterisks, marginal significance ($P<0.1$) is indicated by dots. All p-values are reported in table S2.

Figure S4 - Metabolic rates as a function of Chlorophyll A concentration (top = ecosystem productivity [GPP], bottom = ecosystem respiration [ER]). Different symbols indicate the different measurement periods (t1-t5). Overall, metabolic rates are determined by chlorophyll biomass (slope of linear regression), but when macrophytes are present, metabolic rates are higher (intercept of linear regression).

# Tables

1. Parameters measured in high frequency using autonomous sondes. Prior to the experiment we performed a cross-comparison trial with all four sondes, after which we corrected all sensors for relative differences among them (i.e., "cross" = cross calibration = calibrated against each other). Chlorophyll-a sensors were additionally calibrated with samples taken during this trial that were analyzed for their chlorophyll-a content with high pressure liquid chromatography (HPLC). Oxygen sensors were calibrated against water-saturated air. (*fDOM-sensors measure emission at 365±5 and excitation at 480±40 nm. **For metabolism modelling, concentration [mg oxygen * $L^{-1}$] output was used).

| Parameter | Unit | Sensor type | Calibration |
|---|---|---|---|
| Chlorophyll A | mg * $L^{-1}$ | Optical, fluorescence | HPLC, cross |
| Phycocyanin | Raw fluorescence | Optical, fluorescence | cross |
| fDOM | Raw fluorescence | Optical, fluorescence * | cross |
| Dissolved oxygen | % saturation** | Optical, luminescence | Saturated air, cross |
| Conductivity (specific) | µS * $cm^{-1}$ | 4-electrode cell | Conductivity standard |
| Temperature | °C | Thermistor | cross |

2. Statistical results of GAM-models testing time series of water parameters and metabolic rates. Results are from individual models (one model per parameter and measurement period). For mean and CV of water parameters, N per model is 768 for t1-t3 and 480 for t4 and t5. For metabolic rates, N per model is 8 23for t1-t3 and 5 for t4 and t5. Trends (P<0.1) indicated by bold font; significant results (P<0.05) indicated by underlined bold font. t-value = model estimate / model estimate SD, Rsq = R squared of model fit.

| | t1 | | | t2 | | | t3 | | | t4 | | | t5 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Mean** | t-value | P-value | Rsq | t-value | P-value | Rsq | t-value | P-value | Rsq | t-value | P-value | Rsq | t-value | P-value | Rsq |
| Chlorophyll A | *1.724* | **0.085** | *0.809* | *2.696* | **0.007** | *0.945* | *0.355* | *0.722* | *0.863* | *3.14* | **0.001** | *0.916* | *3.6* | **<0.001** | *0.927* |
| Phycocyanin | *0.311* | *0.756* | *0.748* | *0.637* | *0.524* | *0.752* | *-0.445* | *0.656* | *0.865* | *0.006* | *0.995* | *0.883* | *-0.727* | *0.467* | *0.875* |
| fDOM | *-0.302* | *0.762* | *0.641* | *-4.923* | **<0.001** | *0.889* | *-9.62* | **<0.001** | *0.963* | *-6.69* | **<0.001** | *0.983* | *-6.553* | **<0.001** | *0.966* |
| Dissolved oxygen | *-0.877* | *0.38* | *0.758* | *1.163* | *0.245* | *0.779* | *-0.35* | *0.726* | *0.816* | *-2.013* | **0.044** | *0.856* | *-3.265* | **0.001** | *0.892* |
| Temperature | *-0.082* | *0.934* | *0.448* | *0.386* | *0.699* | *0.734* | *-0.37* | *0.711* | *0.646* | *0.657* | *0.511* | *0.775* | *-0.113* | *0.91* | *0.901* |
| Conductivity | *2.064* | **0.039** | *0.968* | *0.112* | *0.911* | *0.939* | *-1.165* | *0.244* | *0.907* | *-0.533* | *0.594* | *0.875* | *-0.019* | *0.985* | *0.884* |
| **CV** | t-value | P-value | Rsq | t-value | P-value | Rsq | t-value | P-value | Rsq | t-value | P-value | Rsq | t-value | P-value | Rsq |
| Chlorophyll A | *-2.041* | **0.041** | *0.784* | *-3.31* | **0.001** | *0.799* | *1.578* | *0.115* | *0.551* | *-0.388* | *0.698* | *0.661* | *-2.803* | **0.005** | *0.734* |
| Phycocyanin | *-4.846* | **<0.001** | *0.668* | *-2.092* | **0.037** | *0.557* | *-1.354* | *0.176* | *0.621* | *-2.105* | **0.035** | *0.541* | *-1.886* | **0.059** | *0.696* |
| fDOM | *-0.052* | *0.958* | *0.508* | *1.119* | *0.263* | *0.357* | *4.036* | **<0.001** | *0.426* | *0.746* | *0.456* | *0.629* | *0.431* | *0.666* | *0.492* |
| Dissolved oxygen | *0.244* | *0.808* | *0.617* | *1.186* | *0.236* | *0.558* | *0.949* | *0.343* | *0.319* | *0.566* | *0.571* | *0.363* | *0.312* | *0.755* | *0.404* |
| Temperature | *-0.233* | *0.816* | *0.324* | *-0.253* | *0.801* | *0.446* | *0.914* | *0.361* | *0.257* | *0.193* | *0.847* | *0.415* | *0.886* | *0.376* | *0.43* |
| Conductivity | *-0.278* | *0.781* | *0.339* | *-0.966* | *0.334* | *0.358* | *1.664* | ***0.096*** | *0.374* | *-0.989* | *0.323* | *0.464* | *-0.062* | *0.95* | *0.583* |
| **Metabolism** | t-value | P-value | Rsq | t-value | P-value | Rsq | t-value | P-value | Rsq | t-value | P-value | Rsq | t-value | P-value | Rsq |
| GPP | *-3.653* | **<0.001** | *0.705* | *-1.165* | *0.249* | *0.461* | *-2.147* | ***0.036*** | *0.169* | *1.381* | *0.176* | *0.046* | *-3.395* | **0.002** | *0.406* |
| ER | *-3.47* | **0.001** | *0.329* | *0.121* | *0.905* | *0.545* | *-0.367* | *0.36* | *0.456* | *-0.415* | *0.681* | *0.235* | *-0.346* | *0.34* | *0.23* |
| GPP:ER | *0.16* | *0.874* | *-0.033* | *1.816* | ***0.074*** | *-0.005* | *-4.812* | **<0.001** | *0.09* | *-3.389* | **0.002** | *0.303* | *-0.65* | *0.52* | *0.119* |