Egyptian Journal of Aquatic Biology & Fisheries Zoology Department, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt. ISSN 1110-6131 Vol. 28(2): 39 – 50 (2024) www.ejabf.journals.ekb.eg



Carbon Sources and Riverine Algal Biomass: An Experimental Study

Batool Kadhim¹, Mohammed Hamdan¹, Fikrat M. Hassan¹, Mostafa M. El-Sheekh²

¹Department of Biology, College of Sciences for Women, University of Baghdad, Iraq ²Botany Department, Faculty of Science, Tanta University, Tanta, 31527, Egypt

Corresponding Author: mostafaelsheikh@science.tanta.edu.eg

ARTICLE INFO

Article History: Received: Feb. 15, 2024 Accepted: March 1, 2024 Online: March 6, 2024

Keywords: CO₂, DOC. DIC, Phytoplankton, Chlorophyll

ABSTRACT

A lotic ecosystem is considered a source of carbon dioxide (CO_2) in the atmosphere where it becomes supersaturated with CO₂, which contributes to the global carbon cycle. To enhance our comprehension of the roles of CO₂ in rivers, an outdoor experiment was designed with controlled carbon source inputs to investigate the roles of the dissolved organic carbon (DOC) and dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) in the phytoplankton community. Plastic enclosures were installed in the Tigris River within Baghdad for that goal. Samples were collected on the first day, as well as on the 5th and the 12th days from 14 enclosures. The enclosures were treated by artificial glucose (C₆H₁₂O₆) (10, 20, 30mg/l) as DOC sources, while sodium bicarbonate (NaHCO₃) (10, 20, 30µM) was used as a DIC source. The results showed that the concentration of nitrate (NO₃⁻) and phosphate (PO₄³⁻) changed over time and weren't affected by the treatments. On the other hand pH, DOC, and CO₂ concentrations were affected by treatments. Moreover, our results indicated that DOC and DIC treatments had a direct impact on phytoplankton biomass growth via increasing chlorophyll (Chl) concentration. Overall, it was concluded that different carbon sources (DOC and CO₂) could be essential factors that shape river ecosystems function through influencing the base of food webs.

INTRODUCTION

Photosynthetic organisms hold a pivotal role in the earth ecosystems, particularly in aquatic environments. These minuscule organisms serve as the primary producers in aquatic food chains due to their ability to harness sunlight through the process of photosynthesis and convert inorganic compounds into organic matter (Utami et al., **2021**). They are not only a primary source of nutrition for a myriad of zooplankton, small fish, and filter-feeding organismsbut also influence the distribution and abundance of higher trophic levels, including larger fish, marine mammals, and seabirds (Fu et al., **2020**). For that reason, many researchers are concerned with studying phytoplankton communities in different Iraqi aquatic ecosystems (Al-Magdamy, 2019; Al-Saeedi & Salman, 2022; Hassan et al., 2023; Jalal, 2023). Phytoplankton communities are shaped by a complex interplay of environmental factors, including temperature, light availability, nutrient concentrations, dissolved oxygen, and pH. Therefore, several researchers focused







on the correlation between environmental variables and phytoplankton communities (EL-Sheekh et al., 2010; Bergström & Karlsson, 2019; Zhang et al., 2019; Xu et al., 2022; Wahhab & Hassan, 2023). The study of phytoplankton also extends to the intricate taxonomy and physiology of various species as different groups exhibit a wide range of adaptations to their respective environments, their life cycles, growth rates, and responses to changing conditions, providing critical insights into the dynamics of aquatic ecosystems (Albueajee et al., 2020). Weiss et al. (2018) reported that different aquatic ecosystems have undergone a deficiency of carbon sources. Phytoplankton are important in global biogeochemical cycles related to carbon release or sequester in an aquatic ecosystem. Environmental changes have a direct impact on phytoplankton communities through increasing carbon sources in aquatic ecosystems (Beardall et al., 2009). Different carbon sources (DOC and DIC) can originate from water within or outside the water body. Autochthonous DOC primarily stems from aquatic plants or algae, whereas allochthonous DOC originates outside the water body, usually coming from soils or terrestrial plants (Reitsema et al., 2018).

Allocthonous DIC, especially CO₂, can enter aquatic ecosystems through atmospheric diffusion, weathering of rocks and minerals, as well as deforestation and land-use changes (de Araújo *et al.*, 2019; Nisha *et al.*, 2021; Cao *et al.*, 2023). In contrast, autochthonous CO₂ is generated within the water body, arising from activities such as respiration and the mineralization of DOC, where DOC is the main indirect source of CO₂ (Kadhim & Hamdan, 2023).

In Iraqi inland aquatic ecosystems, many researchers focused on the study of the influences of environmental variables on phytoplankton communities (Hassan *et al.*, 2011; Jaffer *et al.*, 2023), and others addressedd phytoplankton as a biological indicator for the assessment of water quality (Bakaeva *et al.*, 2021). otably, there is a scarcity of studies related to carbon sources and their impacts on Iraqi aquatic ecosystems. Hence, our study focused on the role of carbon sources in aquatic ecosystems by studying their influences on phytoplankton biomass growth.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment desecration

To elucidate the roles of various carbon sources and their impact on phytoplankton biomass, we conducted an experiment mirroring the environmental conditions of the Tigris River. The experiment commenced on April 5, 2023 and ran for a duration of 12 days. Clear plastic enclosures were fixed with special bases at the water surface (Fig. 1) and filled each with seven liters of river water. The enclosures were treated with organic (glucose; 10, 20, and 30mg/ L) and inorganic carbon (sodium bicarbonate; 10, 20, and 30μ M). Glucose was used as an indirect CO₂ source (DOC), while sodium bicarbonate (NaHO₃) was considered as a direct CO₂ source. These materials were added in triplicates for each concentration compared to the control.



Fig. 1. Photos of *in situ* experiment showing samples collection: (a) Before filling out water in the enclosures, (b) during the treatment period.

Field measurements

Field measurements adhering to standard methods were conducted for various parameters (**APHA**, **2005**). Al-Hanan portable pocket were used in field measurement of water temperature (WT) and pH. Initially, the device underwent calibration before being used. Subsequently, the probe was immersed in water, and the recorded result was noted once the reading was stabilized.

Estimating NO₃ levels following procedure (**APHA**, **1998**) involved taking a 50ml water sample, adding 1ml of HCl (1N), and measuring an absorbance at 220 and 275nm with a spectrophotometer. The results were expressed in milligrams per liter $\mu g/l$.

For PO₄ measurement, the ascorbic acid method was employed (Lind, 1979), in which 8ml of a compound solution was added to a 50ml filtered sample, forming a blue complex solution. The optical absorption of this solution at 860nm wavelength was measured, and results were expressed in $\mu g/ l$.

 CO_2 concentrations were measured following the method which was approved by **Golterman (1978)** and adopted by **Hadi (1981)**. This involved titrating 100ml of water sample with 0.2N sodium carbonate until pH reached 8.4, then titrating another 100ml with 0.1N hydrochloric acid until pH equaled 4.2. The total CO_2 was calculated using the equation (1):

$$X = ((A + B) * 4.4)$$
(1)

(b)

Where, A is the volume of titration with $0.2N Na_2CO_3$, and B is the volume of titration with 0.1N HCl. The final CO₂ value was obtained by multiplying X by 10 and expressed in mg/ L.

Laboratory measurements

The water samples were transferred directly to the laboratory for analysis immediately after collection. For DOC measuring, we obtained a water sample and adjusted the pH to 2.0 by adding H_2SO_4 to eliminate particulate organic carbon. The filtered sample, using a 0.45 Millipore filter in the field, was then transported to the laboratory for chemical oxygen demand (COD) determination. In the lab, a digestion solution comprising distilled water, potassium dichromate, sulfuric acid, and mercuric sulfate was prepared. An acid reagent containing H_2SO_4 and silver sulfate was also prepared. Combining these solutions with 2ml of the sample, we subjected the mixture to 120 minutes of digestion at 150°C in a tube. The result was read on a color meter and expressed as mg/ 1. The COD result was later input into the plutocalc water program, selecting total organic carbon (TOC), which is equivalent to DOC since it was initially filtered as described in **Williams** *et al.* (2010).

To determine phytoplankton biomass, we followed the method outlined in **Vollenweider (1969)**. This involved filtering 1000ml of the water sample through a 0.45 μ m pore size filter paper using a vacuum. The filtered material was wrapped in cellophane paper and allowed to dry at 20°C. Subsequently, it was soaked in 6ml of 90% acetone and ground in a dark environment using a grinding bowl. The resulting extract was transferred to a test tube, and the grinding container was rinsed with 2ml of acetone, which was then added to the test tube. The sealed tube was kept in the dark at 4°C for 18-20 hours, with periodic shaking. After 24 hours, the extract was shaken again and concentrated by centrifugation at 3000 cycles for 30 minutes. The concentrated liquid was transferred to a test tube, and the volume was adjusted to 10ml with acetone. Readings were taken at wavelengths of 665 and 750. Following the addition of 2ml of 2N HCL, readings were repeated at the same wavelengths.

The Chl concentrations were determined using a specific equation (2):

11.9 [2.43 (Db – Da)] (V/L).....(2)

Where, Da = The optical density of the Chl extract after the addition of acid

Db = Optical density of Chl extract before adding the acid.

V = The volume of acetone utilized in the extraction process.

L = Photocell length (cm). The results are expressed in $\mu g/l$.

Statistics analysis

For statistical analysis, repeated measured ANOVA was used to estimate the differences of variables with time and with different treatment concentrations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings revealed that parameters such as WT, NO₃, and PO₄, exhibited temporal changes without detecting any interaction effects between treatments and time, while remaining unaffected by DOC and DIC treatments (Suppl. 1, 2), (Fig. 2). Conversely, pH, DOC, and CO₂ were influenced by DOC and DIC treatments and exhibited changes over time (Tables 1, 2 & Fig.2).

| F . | 0 1 | DOG | T : | |
|-------------------|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Factor | Stat.value | DOC input | Time | DOC * time |
| Water temperature | F | 0.0001 _(3,23) | 8616.5(2,23) | 1.83(6,23) |
| | Р | 1 | < 0.0001 | 0.17 |
| лЦ | F | 83.95 _(3,23) | 326.71 _(2,23) | $0.80_{(6,23)}$ |
| pm | Р | < 0.0001 | < 0.0001 | 0.58 |
| NO^{-1} | F | $1.17_{(3,23)}$ | $9.52_{(2,23)}$ | $1.54_{(6,23)}$ |
| 1103 | Р | 0.06 | 0.003 | 0.24 |
| PO_4^{-3} | F | $2.98_{(3,23)}$ | 9.67 _(2,23) | $1.85_{(6,23)}$ |
| | Р | 0.07 | 0.003 | 0.16 |
| DOC | F | 349.97 _(3,23) | 904.43 _(2,23) | 66.27 _(6,23) |
| | Р | < 0.0001 | < 0.0001 | < 0.0001 |

Table 1. The statistical outcomes of the repeated measures ANOVA (influence of DOC treatment on physical and chemical variables)

Table 2. The statistical outcomes of the repeated measures ANOVA (influence of DIC treatment on physical and chemical variables)

| Factor | Stat.value | DIC input | Time | DIC * time |
|--------------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Water temperature | F | 0.33(3,23) | 6543.37 _(2,23) | 0.70(6,23) |
| water temperature | Р | 0.08 | < 0.0001 | 0.64 |
| aU | F | 83.95 _(3,23) | 326.71 _(2,23) | $0.80_{(6,23)}$ |
| рп | Р | < 0.0001 | < 0.0001 | 0.58 |
| NO -1 | F | $1.44_{(3,23)}$ | $19.95_{(2,23)}$ | $0.86_{(6,23)}$ |
| 1103 | Р | 0.07 | < 0.0001 | 0.54 |
| \mathbf{PO}^{-3} | F | $2.73_{(3,23)}$ | $9.96_{(2,23)}$ | $2.39_{(6,23)}$ |
| PO ₄ | Р | 0.08 | 0.009 | 0.09 |
| DIC | F | $102.61_{(3,23)}$ | $175.23_{(2,23)}$ | $1.85_{(6,23)}$ |
| DIC | Р | < 0.0001 | < 0.0001 | 0.17 |



Fig. 2. Physicochemical parameters variations in the experiments of DOC and DIC treatments addition

The stability observed in water temperature and nutrient levels, contrasted with the alterations in DOC and CO_2 concentrations in response to treatments, can be attributed to the additives containing both organic and inorganic carbon. Their impact primarily increased the availability of DOC and CO_2 .

Furthermore, our results demonstrated that pH varied with the added concentration of DIC. This variation can be attributed to the dissolved high amount of CO₂ in water, forming carbonic acid (H₂CO₃) through the reaction (CO₂ + H₂O \rightarrow H₂CO₃). Subsequently, carbonic acid dissociates into hydrogen ions (H+) and carbonate ions (CO₃⁻²) (H₂CO₃ \rightarrow 2H+ + CO₃⁻²), leading to a decrease in pH levels (**Liu & Han**, **2021**).

The findings indicated temporal changes in phytoplankton biomass, coupled with direct effects of the treatments on their biomass (Tables 3, 4), as illustrated in Fig. (3). Notably, elevated DOC concentrations led to an increase in phytoplankton Chl concentration, and consequently, a rise in phytoplankton biomass. This effect can be attributed to glucose being a potent DOC source (**Brailsford** *et al.*, **2019**), and serving as an essential indirect source of CO_2 , contributing to the elevation of Chl concentration and subsequently enhancing phytoplankton biomass (**Ali** *et al.*, **2018; Hamdan** *et al.*, **2018; Hamdan** *et al.*, **2018**).

Table 3. Statistical results of repeated measured ANOVA (influence of DOC treatment on Phytoplankton)

| Factor | Stat.value | DOC input Time | | DOC * time |
|---------------|------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------|
| Phytoplankton | F | 10.01(3,23) | 259.34 _(2,23) | 5.15(6,23) |
| | Р | 0.001 | < 0.0001 | 0.007 |

Table 4. Statistical results of repeated measured ANOVA (influence of DIC treatment on Phytoplankton)

| Factor | Stat.value | DIC input | Time | DIC * time |
|---------------|------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Phytoplankton | F | 34.53(3,23) | 396.10 _(2,23) | 20.31 _(6,23) |
| | Р | < 0.0001*** | < 0.0001*** | <0.0001*** |
| | | | | |



Fig. 3. Chlorophyll-a concentrations in different treatments of DOC and DIC addition

Furthermore, the study revealed a positive impact of inorganic carbon on phytoplankton biomass. Higher concentrations of sodium bicarbonate led to an increase in Chl content, as sodium carbonate serves as a commendable source of CO_2 . Given that CO_2 is a crucial substrate for the photosynthetic enzyme, elevated CO_2 levels can stimulate the growth of phytoplankton and consequently enhance their biomass (Ma & Wang, 2021, Hamdan *et al.*, 2022).

CONCLUSION

Overall, direct and indirect sources of CO_2 can play a pivotal role in shaping the aquatic environment by the direct impact of DOC and DIC treatments in stimulating phytoplankton biomass growth by rising Chl concentrations. Given the significant impact of carbon sources on phytoplankton biomass, we recommend maintaining ongoing monitoring of carbon levels, pH, and phytoplankton dynamics in aquatic ecosystems. This will provide insights into long-term trends and help detect any potential shifts in the community composition. Therefore, it is important to pay attention to investigating the impact of DOC and CO_2 on the benthic community to have a clearer picture of the carbon sources role in lotic ecosystems.

REFERENCES

Ali, S.F.; Abdul-Jabar, R.A. and Hassan, F.M. (2018). Diversity measurement indices of diatom communities in the Tigris River within Wasit Province, Iraq. *Baghdad Sci. J.*, 15(2):117-22. DOI:10.21123/bsj.2022.19.3.0483

- Al-Magdamy, B. A. (2019). The seasonal changes of non-diatom phytoplankton algae after the confluence of Tariq project in the Tigris river north of Baghdad. *Mesop. Environ. J*, 2410-2598. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.31759/mej.2019.5.1.0009</u>
- Al-Saeedi, H.M.S. and Salman, I.M.A.A. (2022). Biodiversity of Phytoplankton in Two Aquatic Ecosystems (LOTIC and LENTIC) During the Autumn Season. *Pakistan Pak. J. Med. Health Sci.*, 16: 379-385. <u>https://doi.org/10.53350/pjmhs22166379</u>
- Albueajee, A.; Hassan, F. and Douabul, A. (2020). Phytoplankton Species Composition and Biodiversity Indices in Auda Marsh-Southern Iraq. *Iraqi J. Agric. Sci.*, 51. <u>https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/209daa9b696ea50d</u>
- **APHA** (1998). Standard method for the examination for water and wastewater. 17 th Edition, American Public Health Association 1015 fifteen Street, N.W, Washington DC .2006pp.
- **APHA** (2005). Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater,21st Edition Washington, DC.22621pp.
- Bakaeva, E.; Al-Ghizzi, M. A. B. and Aljanabi, Z. (2021). Using of Index Biological Integrity of Phytoplankton (P-IBI) in the Assessment of Water Quality in Don River Section. *Baghdad Sci. J.*, 18: 0087-0087. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.21123/bsj.2020.18.1.5280</u>
- Beardall, J., Stojkovic, S. and Larsen, S. (2009). Living in a high CO2 world: impacts of global climate change on marine phytoplankton. *Plant Ecol. Divers.*, 2: 191-205. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/17550870903271363.</u>
- Bergström, A. K. and Karlsson, J. (2019). Light and nutrient control phytoplankton biomass responses to global change in northern lakes. Glob. Chang. Biol., 25: 2021-2029. https://doi: 10.1111/gcb.14623
- Brailsford, F.L.; Glanville, H.C.; Golyshin, P. N.; Marshall, M.R.; Lloyd, C.E.;
 Johnes, P.J. and Jones, D.L. (2019). Nutrient enrichment induces a shift in dissolved organic carbon (DOC) metabolism in oligotrophic freshwater sediments.
 Sci. Total Environ., 690: 1131-1139.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.07.054.
- Cao, X., Wu, Q., Wang, W. and Wu, P. (2023). Carbon dioxide partial pressure and its diffusion flux in karst surface aquatic ecosystems: a review. *Acta Geochimica*, 42: 943-960. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11631-023-00625-7</u>
- de Araújo, K.R.; Sawakuchi, H.O.; Bertassoli Jr, D.J.; Sawakuchi, A.O.; da Silva, K.D., Vieira, T.B.; Ward, N.D. and Pereira, T.S. (2019). Carbon dioxide (CO₂)

concentrations and emission in the newly constructed Belo Monte hydropower complex in the Xingu River, Amazonia. *Biogeosciences*, 16: 3527-3542. https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-16-3527-2019

- **EL-Sheekh, M.M.; Khairy, H.M., and El-Shenody, R.A.** (2010). Allelopathic effects of the cyanobacterium *Microcystis aeruginosa* on the growth and photosynthetic pigments of some algal species. *Allelopathy Journal*, 26(2): 275-290.
- Fu, C.; Xu, Y.; Guo, C.; Olsen, N.; Grüss, A.; Liu, H.; Barrier, N.; Verley, P. and Shin, Y.-J. (2020). The cumulative effects of fishing, plankton productivity, and marine mammal consumption in a marine ecosystem. *Front. Mar. Sci*, 7: 565699. <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.565699</u>
- Golterman, H.L.; Clymo, R.S. and Ohnstad, M. A.M. (1978). *Methods for Physical* and Chemical Analysis of Fresh Waters, Oxford, Blackwell Scientific Publications.
- Hadi, R. A. M. (1981). Algae studies on the River USK Ph.D., Univ.College, Cardiff,UK.
- Hamdan, M.; Byström, P.; Hotchkiss, E.R.; Al-Haidarey, M.J.; Ask, J. and Karlsson, J. (2018). Carbon dioxide stimulates lake primary production. *Sci. Rep*, 8: 10878. <u>https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-018-29166-3</u>
- Hamdan, M.; Byström, P.; Hotchkiss, E.R.; Al-Haidarey, M.J. and Karlsson, J. (2021). An experimental test of climate change effects in northern lakes: Increasing allochthonous organic matter and warming alters autumn primary production. *Freshw. Biol.*, 66: 815-825. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13679</u>
- Hamdan, M.; Karlsson, J.; Byström, P.; Al-Haidarey, M. J. and Ask, J. (2022). Carbon dioxide limitation of benthic primary production in a boreal lake. *Freshw. Biol.*, 67: 1752-1760. doi: 10.1111/fwb.13972
- Hassan, F.M.; El-Sheekh, M.M. and Wahhab, T.A. (2023). Environmental factors drive phytoplankton primary productivity in a shallow Lake. *Egypt. J. Aquat. Biol. Fish.*, 27(2). https://doi.org/10.21608/ejabf.2023.288620
- Hassan, F.; Al-Kubaisi, A.; Talib, A.; Abdulah, D. and Taylor, W. (2011). Phytoplankton primary production in southern Iraqi marshes after restoration. *Baghdad Sci. J.*, 8: 519-530. <u>https://doi.org/10.21123/bsj.2011.8.1.519-530</u>
- Jaffer, E.M.; Al-Mousawi, N.J. and Al-Shawi, I.J. (2023). Impact of some environmental parameters on phytoplankton diversity in the eastern Al-Hammer marsh/southern Iraq. *Baghdad Sci. J.* DOI: https://doi.org/10.21123/bsj.2023.7590

- Jalal, T.K. (2023). Seasonal species diversity and density of non diatomic phytoplankton from the Tigris River, Baghdad Province, Iraq. J. Surv. Fish., 10: 5748-5765. https://sifisheriessciences.com/journal/index.php/journal/article/view/1964
- Kadhim, B. and Hamdan, M. (2023). Carbon Dioxide Availability in Inlands Rivers Is Driven by Dissolved Organic Carbon, Not Warming: A Case Study of Tigris River. *Baghdad Sci, J.* <u>https://doi.org/10.21123/bsj.2023.9009</u>
- Lind, O.T. (1979). Handbook of common methods in limnology, The CV Mosley Company.
- Liu, J. & Han, G. (2021). Controlling factors of riverine CO2 partial pressure and CO2 outgassing in a large karst river under base flow condition. J. Hydrol., 593: 125638. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125638</u>
- Ma, J. and Wang, P. (2021). Effects of rising atmospheric CO2 levels on physiological response of cyanobacteria and cyanobacterial bloom development: A review. Sci. Total Environ, 754: 141889. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141889</u>
- Nisha, B.K.; Balakrishna, K.; Udayashankar, H.N. and Manjunatha, B.R. (2021). Chemical weathering and carbon dioxide consumption in a small tropical river catchment, southwestern India. *Aquat. Geochem.*, 27: 173-206. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10498-021-09394-2
- Reitsema, R.E.; Meire, P. and Schoelynck, J. (2018). The future of freshwater macrophytes in a changing world: dissolved organic carbon quantity and quality and its interactions with macrophytes. *Front. Plant Sci.*, 9: 629. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.00629.
- Utami, E., Mahardika, R. and Rosalina, D. (2021). Chlorophyll a concentration of phytoplankton in estuary mangrove Kurau, Bangka Tengah, Indonesia. IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science. IOP Publishing, 012032. 10.1088/1755-1315/926/1/012032
- **Vollenweider, R.** (1969). Primary production in aquatic environments. IBP Handbook 12. Blackwell Sci. Publ., Oxford.
- Wahhab, T.A. and Hassan, F.M. (2023). Environmental parameters drive the phytoplankton community structure: a case study in Baghdad Tourist Island Lake, Iraq. *Ibn AL-Haitham J. Pure Appl. Sci.*, 36(1): pp.74-87.
- Williams, C.J.; Yamashita, Y.; Wilson, H.F.; Jaffé, R. and Xenopoulos, M.A. (2010). Unraveling the role of land use and microbial activity in shaping dissolved organic

matter characteristics in stream ecosystems. *Limnol. Oceanogr*, 55: 1159-1171. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2010.55.3.1159

- Xu, S.; Liu, Y.; Fan, J.; Xiao, Y.; Qi, Z. and Lakshmikandan, M. (2022). Impact of salinity variation and silicate distribution on phytoplankton community composition in Pearl River estuary, China. *Ecohydrol. Hydrobiol*, 22: 466-475. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecohyd.2022.01.004</u>
- Zhang, Y.; Gao, Y.; Kirchman, D. L.; Cottrell, M.T.; Chen, R.; Wang, K.; Ouyang, Z.; Xu, Y.-Y.; Chen, B. and Yin, K. (2019). Biological regulation of pH during intensive growth of phytoplankton in two eutrophic estuarine waters. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser*, 609, 87-99. <u>https://doi.org/10.3354/meps12836</u>