This article was downloaded by: [Orta Dogu Teknik Universitesi] On: 18 March 2014, At: 01:52 Publisher: Taylor & Francis Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



# Marine Biology Research

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information: <u>http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/smar20</u>

# Abundance and biomass of picoplanktonic Synechococcus (Cyanobacteria) in a coastal ecosystem of the northeastern Mediterranean, the Bay of İskenderun

Sevim Polat<sup>a</sup> & Zahit Uysal<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Çukurova University, Faculty of Fisheries , Adana, Turkey

<sup>b</sup> Middle East Technical University, Institute of Marine Sciences , Mersin, Turkey Published online: 16 Jun 2009.

To cite this article: Sevim Polat & Zahit Uysal (2009) Abundance and biomass of picoplanktonic Synechococcus (Cyanobacteria) in a coastal ecosystem of the northeastern Mediterranean, the Bay of İskenderun, Marine Biology Research, 5:4, 363-373, DOI: <u>10.1080/17451000802512275</u>

To link to this article: <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17451000802512275</u>

## PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <a href="http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions">http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions</a>



## Abundance and biomass of picoplanktonic *Synechococcus* (Cyanobacteria) in a coastal ecosystem of the northeastern Mediterranean, the Bay of İskenderun

SEVİM POLAT\*1 & ZAHİT UYSAL<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Çukurova University, Faculty of Fisheries, Adana, Turkey;* <sup>2</sup>*Middle East Technical University, Institute of Marine Sciences, Mersin, Turkey* 

#### Abstract

Changes in abundance and biomass of *Synechococcus* were studied during five cruises carried out between November 2004 and September 2005 in the İskenderun Bay, northeastern Mediterranean. In addition, spatial and temporal variations in physico-chemical factors and Chl *a* were measured. Abundance ranged from  $0.2 \times 10^4$  to  $23.09 \times 10^4$  cells ml<sup>-1</sup>, whereas the biomass ranged from  $0.19^{-1}$  to  $23.01 \ \mu$ gC l<sup>-1</sup> in the bay. *Synechococcus* was found most numerous during September 2005 in the shallower part of the bay while the population was observed least during November 2004 and January 2005. The contribution of  $<3 \ \mu$ m size fraction to total Chl *a* ranged between 48% and 74%, being low during the cold period and higher during the warm period. The observed spatial and temporal fluctuations in abundance seemed to be closely related to environmental conditions in the area. Small-sized phytoplankton dominated the bulk of biomass, at least for the summer period.

Key words: İskenderun Bay, northeastern Mediterranean, picophytoplankton, Synechococcus

#### Introduction

Picoplankton contributes to at least 10% of the total global aquatic net primary productivity (Agawin et al. 2000). In most oligotrophic and mesotrophic areas of the world's oceans, primary production is dominated by picophytoplankton (cells  $<2 \,\mu m$  in size) (Li et al. 1983). It contributes up to 90% of the phytoplankton biomass in oligotrophic areas, whereas lower contributions, <30% are recorded in eutrophic coastal waters (Modigh et al. 1996). Picoplankton is composed of heterotrophic bacteria, two types of photosynthetic prokaryotes, Synechococcus and Prochlorococcus, and picoeucaryotes (Jacquet et al. 1998; Guillou et al. 2001). Among them, the marine cyanobacterium Synechococcus is ubiquitous to both oligotrophic and mesotrophic ocean areas with abundances reaching  $10^5$  cells ml<sup>-1</sup> (Jacquet et al. 1998). It is also one of the main components of picoplankton in the highly oligotrophic eastern Mediterranean (Li et al. 1993; Uysal 2006; Uysal & Köksalan 2006). The high surface to volume ratio of these small cells permits an efficient nutrient uptake system (Veldhuis et al. 2005) and gives small cells an advantage in oligotrophic waters (Agawin et al. 2000).

The Mediterranean is considered to be one of the least productive seas of the world and the eastern Mediterranean forms the most oligotrophic part of it (Azov 1991; Krom et al. 1991). The basin-wide cyclonic circulation of nutrient-depleted water, hot and dry climate and low land runoff contribute to the low productivity levels (Turley et al. 2000). Furthermore, phosphorus is considered to be the limiting nutrient for the eastern Mediterranean (Krom et al. 1991). Primary production is, on the average, three times lower in the eastern Mediterranean (151 mgC m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>) than the northwestern basin (502.7 mgC m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>) (Turley et al. 2000). The most important characteristic of this oligotrophic environment is that it sustains a microbialdominated food web consisting of small unicellular phytoplankton, protozoa, bacteria and viruses (Thingstad & Rassoulazadegen 1999).

To date, a multitude of large-scale surveys on picophytoplankton have been carried out in the open ocean waters (Li 1998; Calvo-Diaz et al. 2004; Worden et al. 2004). Despite the large number of studies dealing with microphytoplankton in the eastern Mediterranean (Eker & Kideyş 2000; Polat & Piner 2002), little is known about the picophytoplankton community in the northern Levantine

(Accepted 7 July 2008; Printed 23 June 2009)

ISSN 1745-1000 print/ISSN 1745-1019 online © 2009 Taylor & Francis DOI: 10.1080/17451000802512275

<sup>\*</sup>Correspondence: Sevim Polat, Çukurova University, Faculty of Fisheries, Balcali, Adana, Turkey. E-mail: sevcan@cu.edu.tr. Published in collaboration with the University of Bergen and the Institute of Marine Research, Norway, and the Marine Biological Laboratory, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Basin (Uysal 2006; Uysal & Köksalan 2006). Moreover, no study has been conducted on the picophytoplankton abundance and composition in the İskenderun Bay prior to this study. Earlier studies in the bay mainly dealt with the taxonomy, ecology and biomass distribution of larger phytoplankton (Polat 2002; Polat & Piner 2002). However, studies are needed on heterotrophic bacteria and picophytoplankton to understand trophic interactions within the microbial food web. The aims of this study were to provide preliminary information on the abundance and biomass of *Synechococcus* in the area and explore possible environmental factors that control its dynamics in time and space.

#### Materials and methods

### Study area

Iskenderun Bay is located in the northeast corner of the Levantine Basin, eastern Mediterranean (Figure 1). The surface area of the bay is approximately 2275 km<sup>2</sup> and the average depth is around 70 m, while a maximum depth of 100 m is located at the entrance of the bay (Avşar 1999). The bay and its opening form one of the largest continental shelf areas in the eastern Mediterranean. The water column in the bay is stratified during summer due to warming and is homogenous during winter due to surface cooling and vertical mixing (Yilmaz et al. 1992). The hydrography of the bay is affected by the westerly flowing Asia Minor Current along the southwest Anatolian coast, having a wide opening to the open sea (Özsoy et al. 1993). Beside these, local storms as well as sporadic wind regimes control the hydrodynamics of the bay waters from time to time (Yilmaz et al. 1992). The coast can be regarded as highly industrialized with petroleum pipelines, iron-steel and fertilizer industries. In addition, the Ceyhan river drains significant amount of freshwater (180 m<sup>3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) into the bay (Yilmaz et al. 1992).

#### Methods

Sampling was carried out on 3 November 2004, 4 January, 30 March, 24 June and 27 September 2005 at the west coast of the İskenderun Bay  $(35^{\circ} 54' \text{ E}-36^{\circ} 11' \text{ E} \text{ and } 36^{\circ} 35.5' \text{ N}-36^{\circ} 44' \text{ N})$  (Figure 1). Samples were collected from seven stations on a nearcoast–offshore gradient in the bay. Water samples for picophytoplankton, Chl *a* and nutrient analyses were taken with a Universal water sampler at 10 m intervals depending on the total depth. Water column temperature and salinity were measured with a YSI 6600 CTD probe (Yellow Springs, USA). Transparency was measured with a Secchi disc and the depth of the euphotic zone was calculated according to Parsons et al. (1984a).

Samples for picoplankton counting were fixed with filtered 2% glutaraldehyde and kept refrigerated until analysis. Aliquots of 10 ml from each sample were filtered onto  $0.2 \,\mu\text{m}$  pore size, 25 mm diameter, black polycarbonate membrane filters. The filters were then placed onto glass slides, using



Figure 1. Map of the study area with sampling stations in İskenderun Bay.

immersion oil, for counting on an Olympus BX51 epifluorescent microscope with a filter combination of UMWB2 (blue excitation, DM 500, EX 460–490, BA 520) and UMWG2 (green excitation, DM 570, EX 510–550, BA 590). *Synechococcus* cells were identified by their size, shape and characteristic orange phycoerythrin-derived fluorescence under green light excitation. At least 20 microscopic fields randomly chosen at  $\times 1000$  magnification were counted on each slide (on average, 150–200 cells).

Cell dimensions were measured using an image analysis system composed of a digital camera (Olympus DP 70), computer and the image analysis software (Image Pro Plus 5.1). Cell volumes were calculated using the volume formula for an ellipsoid (Sieracki et al. 1989). To convert the cell volume to carbon, 0.123 pg carbon per cubic micrometer was used (Waterbury et al. 1986).

Two litres of seawater were filtered through GF/F filters for Chl *a* analysis. For Chl *a* belonging to the  $<3 \mu m$  size fraction, parallel samples of seawater were filtered through  $<3 \mu m$  polycarbonate filters and the filtrates collected onto GF/F filters. Filtrates were then extracted into 90% acetone and kept refrigerated at 4°C overnight. Following extraction, Chl *a* concentration was determined spectrophotometrically according to Parsons et al. (1984b) using a spectrophotometer (Schimadzu model).

Water samples for nutrient measurements were collected into 500 ml polyethylene bottles that were pre-cleaned with 10% HCl and kept frozen at  $-20^{\circ}$ C until analysis. Phosphate (PO<sub>4</sub><sup>-3</sup>-P) and nitrate+nitrite (NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>-N+NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup>-N) were determined according to methods given by Strickland & Parsons (1972). The Pearson correlation coefficient was applied to calculate relationships between *Synechococcus* abundance and biological, physical and chemical data.

#### Results

#### Physico-chemical data

The annual ranges and means of physico-chemical and biological data for all sampling stations and for the surface, 10 m and the water column are presented in Tables I and II. Horizontal distribution of nutrients at the surface and 10 m are shown in Figure 2. Profiles of the physico-chemical data for the deep station 7 are illustrated in Figure 3. Temperature varied in the range  $17.6-29.2^{\circ}C$  at the surface, and  $17-28.4^{\circ}C$  at 10 m depth (Figure 2)

The temperature dropped to a minimum of  $16.6^{\circ}$ C at 70 m of station 7 in March 2005 (Figure 3), while the maximum temperature (29.2°C) was measured at the surface of station 2 in September

2005. In November 2004, water column temperature was homogenous above 45 m and showed a significant decrease to as low as 18.2°C at 70 m depth. The water column was thoroughly mixed down to 70 m during the January-March 2005 period. The water column was stratified in June 2005, and a warmer surface mixed layer occupied the top 20 m due to increased solar heating in summer. The surface mixed layer extended farther down to 40 m in September being controlled much by the wind forcing (Figure 3). About 8-10°C temperature difference between surface and bottom waters was observed during November 2004, June and September 2005. Salinity varied from 35.3 to 39.9 in the bay (Table II). The highest values were recorded in November 2004 and January 2005. Salinity was measured as low as 35.9 and 35.3 at stations 1 and 3 (Table I), in June due to increased freshwater inflow during late spring and early summer. It remained almost constant at deeper parts of the offshore station in January and March 2005 (Figure 3). Secchi disc depth ranged between 5.4 and 26 m and the maximum euphotic zone depth was calculated to be around 70 m in September 2005 at the deep station.

Surface nutrient concentrations were highest at nearcoastal stations 1 and 2. The mean value for nitrate+nitrite at the surface was  $1.59 \,\mu\text{M}$  with a maximum level of  $6.5 \,\mu\text{M}$  that occurred in March 2005 (Figure 2). The minimum surface nitrate+ nitrite concentration was recorded in November 2004 at station 7 as  $0.38 \,\mu\text{M}$ . The mean value for 10 m depth was  $1.20 \,\mu\text{M}$  with minimum and maximum levels of 0.43 and  $3.87 \,\mu\text{M}$  found in November 2004 and January 2005, respectively (Figure 2).

At station 7, nitrate+nitrite concentrations were low between the surface and 40 m and showed a pronounced increase at 50 m depth in November 2004 (Figure 3). In January and March 2005, water column nitrate values varied in the range 0.52– 1.42  $\mu$ M. During this period, the difference in terms of nitrate+nitrite concentration between surface and 70 m was less than 0.5  $\mu$ M. In contrast, in June 2005, surface nitrate+nitrite concentrations were high at the surface (2.66  $\mu$ M) but decreased to 0.81  $\mu$ M at 50 m and increased again below 50 m. In September 2005, nitrate concentration slightly increased with depth, and the highest level was reached at 50 m.

The lowest and highest phosphate concentrations were found to be 0.05 and 0.76  $\mu$ M, with a mean value of 0.24  $\mu$ M at the surface. At 10 m depth, phosphate concentrations were found between 0.05 and 0.62  $\mu$ M with a mean value of 0.25  $\mu$ M (Table II). Timely changes in phosphate at the surface and at 10 m mimic each other. Lowest levels were

Table I. The minimum, maximum and mean values (mean  $\pm$  SD) of physical, chemical and biological parameters at the seven stations during five sampling periods.

	Station 1	Station 2	Station 3	Station 4	Station 5	Station 6	Station 7
Total depth (m)	12	11	22	32	44	53	72
Temperature (°C)	17.3-28.7	17.4-29.2	17.1-28.6	16.8 - 28.4	16.7-28.3	16.6-28.3	16.6-28.2
	$(23.4 \pm 4.60)$	$(23.4 \pm 4.7)$	$(23.1 \pm 4.60)$	$(22.9 \pm 4.50)$	$(22.9 \pm 4.50)$	$(22.4 \pm 4.2)$	$(21.5 \pm 4.10)$
Salinity	35.9-39.7	37.3–39.8	35.3-39.8	38.3-39.8	37.8-39.8	38.1-39.9	36.9–39.8
	$(38.6 \pm 1.23)$	$(38.8 \pm 0.73)$	$(38.6 \pm 1.28)$	$(39.03 \pm 0.53)$	$(38.8 \pm 0.65)$	$(39.02 \pm 0.56)$	$(38.7 \pm 0.75)$
Nitrate+nitrite (µM)	1.62 - 4.77	0.84-6.50	0.55 - 1.94	0.20 - 1.68	0.43 - 1.97	0.46 - 4.02	0.38-2.66
	$(2.77 \pm 0.99)$	$(1.83 \pm 1.7)$	$(1.13 \pm 0.43)$	$(0.78 \pm 0.34)$	$(1.13 \pm 0.43)$	$(1.12 \pm 0.71)$	$(1.06 \pm 0.51)$
Phosphate (µM)	0.05-0.62	0.05-0.76	0.05-0.43	0.05 - 0.52	0.05-0.57	0.04-0.62	0.05-0.62
	$(0.27 \pm 0.16)$	$(0.33 \pm 0.21)$	$(0.22 \pm 0.14)$	$(0.24 \pm 0.13)$	$(0.24 \pm 0.13)$	$(0.27 \pm 0.15)$	$(0.28 \pm 0.15)$
Total Chl a	0.45 - 2.86	0.54 - 1.71	0.24 - 1.05	0.16-1.35	0.15-1.50	0.10-0.76	0.13-0.65
$(\mu g l^{-1})$	$(1.33 \pm 0.74)$	$(0.98 \pm 0.35)$	$(0.52 \pm 0.26)$	$(0.42 \pm 0.28)$	$(0.42 \pm 0.27)$	$(0.34 \pm 0.15)$	$(0.34 \pm 0.12)$
Chl <i>a</i> ( $<3\mu$ m)	0.27-1.30	0.29 - 1.17	0.11 - 0.61	0.12 - 0.67	0.10-0.65	0.11 - 0.47	0.06 - 0.46
$(\mu g l^{-1})$	$(0.73 \pm 0.38)$	$(0.58 \pm 0.25)$	$(0.33 \pm 0.18)$	$(0.26 \pm 0.15)$	$(0.29 \pm 0.16)$	$(0.24 \pm 0.11)$	$(0.21 \pm 0.09)$
Synechococcus	0.79-23.09	0.79-17.9	0.91 - 7.05	0.76-6.81	0.7 - 8.2	0.91-6.81	0.20-7.82
(cells ml <sup>-1</sup> $\times$ 10 <sup>4</sup> )	$(7.67 \pm 8.21)$	$(6.43\pm5.72)$	$(3.2 \pm 2.20)$	$(2.59 \pm 1.84)$	$(2.63 \pm 2.07)$	$(2.43 \pm 1.48)$	$(2.04 \pm 1.68)$
Carbon biomass	0.78-23.01	0.69-13.4	0.64 - 7.29	0.33-6.54	0.45-8.03	0.60-3.31	0.19-5.57
$(\mu g C l^{-1})$	$(6.70\pm7.76)$	$(5.49 \pm 4.17)$	$(2.78 \pm 2.2)$	$(2.12 \pm 1.61)$	$(2.24 \pm 1.98)$	$(1.73 \pm 0.78)$	$(1.52 \pm 1.07)$
<i>n</i> (number of samples)	10	10	15	20	25	30	40

attained in November 2004, whereas the highest values were observed in June 2005 for both depths. Except in June 2005, water column phosphate concentration remained below 0.5  $\mu$ M throughout the sampling period. Phosphate showed noticeable fluctuations in June 2005 and increased to 0.62  $\mu$ M at 60 m of station 7, while it was distributed almost evenly from surface to bottom in September 2005 (Figure 3).

### Chl a

Chl *a* concentrations were found to be approximately 2–3-fold higher at the coastal stations (stations 1 and 2) compared to the offshore stations during the study period except March 2005. Total Chl *a* concentration varied from 0.11 to 2.86  $\mu$ g l<sup>-1</sup> with a mean value of 0.75  $\mu$ g l<sup>-1</sup> at the surface (Table II). Surface Chl *a* content was found to be highest in March and lowest in June 2005. At 10 m depth, the minimum and maximum Chl *a* concent

trations were 0.15 and 1.78  $\mu$ g l<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. The mean Chl *a* value at 10 m was 0.53  $\mu$ g l<sup>-1</sup> (Table II). In general, surface Chl *a* content was higher compared to concentrations at 10 m (Figure 4). However, its spatial distribution pattern for both depths was similar. For station 7 in November 2004, Chl *a* had a sub-maximum at 30 m and decreased below (Figure 5). In March 2005, when temperature and salinity values were almost homogenous below 20 m, Chl *a* concentration was highest at the surface and tended to decrease with depth. In June, concentrations were almost homogenous between the surface and 50 m and showed a pronounced increase at 60 m. Fluctuations in Chl *a* content occurred with depth in September 2005.

Chl *a* content of the  $<3 \,\mu\text{m}$  fraction varied between 0.06 and 1.30  $\mu\text{g}$  1<sup>-1</sup>. The lowest value was found in June and the highest in March 2005 (Figure 4). The distribution of  $<3 \,\mu\text{m}$  fraction in the water column was similar to total Chl *a*. The minimal contribution of  $<3 \,\mu\text{m}$  fraction to total Chl

Table II. The minimum, maximum and mean values (mean  $\pm$ SD) of physical, chemical and biological parameters for the surface, 10 m and whole depths.

	Surface $(n=35)$	10 m ( <i>n</i> =35)	Whole depths $(n = 150)$
Temperature (°C)	17.6–29.2 (23.4±4.45)	17.0–28.4 (23.0±4.55)	16.6–29.2 (22.5±4.39)
Salinity	$36.9 - 39.9 (38.9 \pm 0.67)$	35.9–39.8 (38.9±0.76)	35.3–39.9 (38.8±0.83)
Phosphate (µM)	$0.05 – 0.76 \ (0.24 \pm 0.14)$	$0.05 - 0.62 \ (0.25 \pm 0.13)$	$0.04 - 0.76 \ (0.26 \pm 0.15)$
Nitrite + nitrate ( $\mu$ M)	$0.38-6.50$ $(1.59\pm1.25)$	$0.43 - 3.87 (1.20 \pm 0.71)$	$0.20-6.50$ $(1.22\pm0.83)$
Total Chl <i>a</i> ( $\mu$ g l <sup>-1</sup> )	$0.11 - 2.86 \ (0.75 \pm 0.60)$	$0.15 - 1.78 \ (0.53 \pm 0.38)$	$0.10 - 2.86 (0.49 \pm 0.39)$
Chl <i>a</i> ( <3 $\mu$ m) ( $\mu$ g l <sup>-1</sup> )	$0.06 - 1.30 \ (0.32 \pm 0.25)$	$0.07 - 1.18 \ (0.33 \pm 0.23)$	$0.06 - 1.30 \ (0.33 \pm 0.25)$
Synechococcus (cells $ml^{-1} \times 10^4$ )	$0.80 - 23.09 \ (4.05 \pm 4.73)$	$0.76 - 22.7 (3.87 \pm 4.16)$	$0.20 - 23.09 (3.06 \pm 3.34)$
Carbon biomass ( $\mu$ gC l <sup>-1</sup> )	$0.49 - 23.01 (3.41 \pm 4.34)$	$0.57 - 19.0 \ (3.22 \pm 3.55)$	$0.19-23.01~(2.48\pm2.93)$



Figure 2. Phosphate and nitrate + nitrite levels at the surface and at 10 m depth of all the sampling stations.



Figure 3. Depth profiles of nutrients, temperature and salinity at station 7.



Figure 4. Total Chl a and size fractionated ( $<3 \mu$ m) Chl a concentrations at the surface and at 10 m depth of all the sampling stations.



Figure 5. Changes in total and size fractionated ( $<3 \mu m$ ) Chl *a* concentrations with depth in relation to temperature and salinity at station 7.

#### Synechococcus abundance and biomass

The lowest and highest Synechococcus cell concentrations were found to be  $0.8 \times 10^4$  and  $23.09 \times 10^4$ cells ml<sup>-1</sup>, with an annual mean level of  $4.05 \times 10^4$ cells  $ml^{-1}$  at the surface (Table II). Maximum Synechococcus abundance at the surface was observed in September 2005 (Figure 6). Synechococcus was found to be less abundant in November 2004 and January 2005. With regard to the spatial distribution of Synechococcus, higher abundances were found at the two shallow stations in September, whereas in other periods, the abundance distribution within the stations looked similar. Synechococcus abundance was quite similar at the surface and 10 m. At 10 m, the observed lowest and highest abundances were  $0.76 \times 10^4$  and  $22.7 \times 10^4$  cells ml<sup>-1</sup>, with a mean value of  $3.87 \times 10^4$  cells ml<sup>-1</sup>. The maximum abundance of Synechococcus at 10 m depth was observed in September 2005, as was the case for the surface.

*Synechococcus* abundance and biomass profiles are given only for Station 7 (Figure 7). Profiles of temperature and salinity are also included for comparison. Generally, cells were found to be more abundant at or near the surface. In November 2004, the majority of the population occupied the upper 40 m of the water column. Due to mixing of the water column in January and in March, differ-

ences in abundance with depth were insignificant despite the minor highs observed near the surface. In June and September 2005, cell abundances were higher in the warmer surface layers, and showed small fluctuations towards the bottom (Figure 7). Cell size (length) of *Synechococcus* varied in the range of  $0.8-2.3 \mu m$  with an average size of  $1.30 \mu m$ .

Synechococcus abundance and carbon biomass distribution with depth were similar. Higher biomass was observed at the two coastal stations. At the surface, the lowest biomass value of 0.49  $\mu$ gC 1<sup>-1</sup> was obtained in January 2005 and it started to increase in March 2005. In June 2005, biomass increased to 6.29  $\mu$ gC 1<sup>-1</sup>. Afterwards, the highest biomass value of 23.01  $\mu$ gC l<sup>-1</sup> was reached at the surface in September 2005 (Figure 6). The lowest and highest biomass values were found as 0.57- $19 \ \mu \text{gC} \ 1^{-1}$  at 10 m. Trends for the surface and 10 m were similar with lower values at 10 m. Since the cell size did not vary significantly with depth and in time, the distribution of both the abundance and biomass resembled each other (Figure 7). Thus, a significant positive correlation (n = 150, r = 0.947,p < 0.01) was measured between the biomass and the abundance. Carbon biomass was also positively correlated with Chl *a* (n = 150, r = 0.355, p < 0.01).

Considering all data, *Synechococcus* abundance was found to be positively correlated with temperature (n = 150, r = 0.467, p < 0.01), nitrate+nitrite (n = 150, r = 0.417, p < 0.01) and phosphate (n = 150, r = 0.448, p < 0.01) and negatively correlated with salinity (n = 150, r = -0.587, p < 0.01).



Figure 6. Synechococcus abundance and carbon biomass levels at the surface and at 10 m depth of all the sampling stations.



Figure 7. Changes in *Synechococcus* abundance and biomass with depth in relation to temperature and salinity at station 7 (*Synechococcus* abundance and carbon biomass are shown on the same axis).

#### Discussion

Seasonal changes in light, temperature, stratification and nutrients are among the most important factors affecting plankton dynamics in the marine environment. Changes in such factors can be more rapid, severe and frequent in the coastal areas. The study region, İskenderun Bay, receives a substantial amount of anthropogenic loads - a mixture of agricultural, industrial and domestic wastes - via the Ceyhan River flowing to the central basin, in addition to direct injections from the plants and settlements located in the periphery. Moreover, the land topography with very steep mountains and deep canyons leads to a constant wind pressure over the bay for most of the year. Because of the prevailing strong winds and existing current regime, the bay waters do not experience eutrophication over the year (Yilmaz et al. 1992). All the processes mentioned above in combination affect the microbial communities and production levels. Primary production in the bay was estimated to be 2–4 times higher than open waters of the eastern Mediterranean (Yilmaz et al. 1992).

The seasonal cycle of Synechococcus in the bay seem to be similar to those from many other coastal environments (Li 1998; Ribes et al. 1999; Mihalatou & Moustaka-Gouni 2002; Uysal & Köksalan 2006). Synechococcus abundance was low in November, January and March, but it was at its highest level at the end of the summer (September). Many similar studies show that high temperature stimulates its abundance and its annual maxima coincide with the warmest period (Caroppo et al. 2006; Uysal & Köksalan 2006). However, although the temperature was remarkably high in November (average 25°C), Synechococcus abundance was found to be low in this study. This points out that growth of Synechococcus was limited by other factors in this period. Chang et al. (2003) indicated that temperature was not the only factor controlling the growth of Synechococcus. They suggest that when temperature limitation is weak during the warm period, nutrients appear to be an important factor. Synechococcus need high nitrogen concentrations for their nitrogen-rich phycobilisomes (Moore et al. 2002); therefore, the lower nitrate levels may limit Synechococcus blooms (Fuller et al. 2005). Additionally, due to high cell phosphate quotas of Synechococcus (Bertilsson et al. 2003), their proliferation may be limited under low phosphate concentrations (Vaulot et al. 1996; Fuller et al. 2005). Low nutrient concentrations in the water column in November 2004 may have limited the population growth. Although surface nutrient concentration increased to a certain level with the help of deep mixing in January and March, Synechococcus abundance did not increase remarkably as the surface temperature was as cold as 17-18°C. In March 2005, the abundance of Synechococcus was just two-fold higher than the amount reached in January, whereas total Chl a concentration experienced its highest of that year. This increasing trend in Chl a is consistent with the spring phytoplankton bloom in the Mediterranean (Delgado 1990). However, the Chl a concentration was observed to decrease to half in June, when Synechococcus abundance did not change significantly compared to March. This indicates that larger phytoplankton had contributed greatly to Chl a in March and only slightly during June. Synechococcus abundance was at its highest in the surface mixed layer in September, when the temperature and euphotic zone depth were maximum. The contribution of  $<3 \,\mu m$  fraction to total Chl *a* was also the highest in this period and the Synechococcus maxima coincided with high nutrient concentrations in September. Elevated nutrient levels in this month may either be a product of regeneration processes or river input, or a combination of both. The pronounced thermocline below 40 m delimits sinking of particles to the bottom and hence promotes regeneration processes within the surface mixed layer. Moreover, compared to November and January, reduced salinities in the water column highlight considerable freshwater input during September. In addition to the fact that physico-chemical factors provided convenient conditions for Synechococcus increase, less competition with other phytoplankton may also have contributed to this increment in September 2005. Li (1998) stated that temperatures higher than 14°C do not affect Synechococcus dynamics any further and other factors can be important at higher temperature. However, in this study, the temperature was constantly above 14°C, and yet further increase in temperature at times when nutrient concentrations and light availability were favourable seemed to promote Synechococcus growth. The positive relationship between temperature and Synechococcus abundance (r=0.467, p < 0.01) indicates the role of temperature on the population dynamics. However, Delgado et al. (1992) suggested that the coincidence of abundance peaks at times when the temperature is at its highest may be due not only to temperature, but also to the differences in growth rate and predation pressure. Mihalotou & Moustaka-Gouni (2002) showed that low picoplankton concentrations in winter and spring may be because of grazing, if there are no other environmental limitations. However, since the effect of grazing was not studied in this study, we cannot comment on this subject.

Although Synechococcus plays an important part in phytoplankton biomass and productivity of oligotrophic environments (Fogg 1995), it may also be abundant in the nutrient-rich, coastal waters (Jochem 1986; Partensky et al. 1999). In this study, considering its spatial distribution, Synechococcus was observed to have higher abundance in the coastal stations that have higher nutrient levels due to terrestial inputs. Unlike the findings of many studies (Kormas et al. 2002; Mihalotou & Moustaka-Gouni 2002), significant relationships between nutrients and Synechococcus were found in the present study, which may signify that the nutrient pulses caused by wind-driven mixing and coastal freshwater runoff in the area are influencing Synechococcus dynamics. Regeneration processes also contribute positively to the nutrient budget during stratification periods. Synechococcus abundance in İskenderun Bay is similar to that given for the adjacent Mersin Bay  $(3.2 \times 10^3 - 1.6 \times 10^5$  cells ml<sup>-1</sup>) by Uysal & Köksalan (2006). However, our results are higher than those found for the northwest Mediterranean by Delgado et al. (1992) and Agawin et al. (1998) (0.008–7.3  $\times 10^4$  cells ml<sup>-1</sup> and 5.2  $\times$  $10^2$ -7 × 10<sup>4</sup> cells ml<sup>-1</sup>, respectively). Additionally, the mean abundance found in this study  $(2.9 \times 10^4)$ cells ml<sup>-1</sup>) is higher than that found for the northeastern Mediterranean  $(2.24\pm0.09\times10^4$  cells  $ml^{-1}$ ) by Ribes et al. (1999), but lower than the abundance observed by Jacquet et al. (1998) in the northwestern Mediterranean  $(43 \times 10^3 \text{ cells ml}^{-1})$ . It was found that Synechococcus were abundant in the upper layers and reached its maximum at the surface, which is akin to the results of Kuosa (1988) in the Baltic Sea and Uysal (2006) in the Black, Marmara, Aegean and eastern Mediterranean Seas.

Synechococcus cells in İskenderun Bay were spherical or elliptical in shape and their size varied in the range  $0.8-2.3 \mu m$ . Uysal & Köksalan (2006) found similar sizes ( $0.8-2 \mu m$ ) for Synechococcus in the adjacent Mersin Bay. However, sizes measured in this study were larger compared to many other studies. Modigh et al. (1996) stated that the size of Synechococcus is typically 1 µm, and El Hag & Fogg (1986) reported that the size increases towards the coast. The presence of large-sized cells in this study may be due to the fact that all the stations are generally located within a shallow bay. Another factor could be the time of sampling during the day. Cells are rather elongated and greatest in size prior to dividing during the afternoon. So, it is possible that cells at different stages of development could have been sampled during the day. Cell sizes did not vary significantly over time in the bay. Thus, the observed fluctuations in biomass are controlled by changes in abundance rather than changes in biovolume. As a result, biomass showed similar trends like the cell numbers throughout the year. Changes in Chl a did not match the changes in Synechococcus abundance. Despite the highest Chl a concentration measured in March, the highest Synechococcus abundance was observed in September. This indicates that the contribution of Synechococcus to total Chl a increases with increasing temperature and euphotic zone depth. Although the euphotic layer is found greatest in September, the relatively high Chl a content could be composed of a few but healthy, young cells. Similarly, the maximum contribution of pico- and nanoplankton to total Chl a occurred during summer in Maliakos Bay in the eastern Mediterranean (Kormas et al. 2002). In this study, Chl a of  $<3 \,\mu m$  fraction accounted for 48% of the total Chl a in March, whereas this amount increased as high as 74% in September 2005. Modigh et al. (1996) stated that picoplankton fraction becomes more important at times when Chl *a* concentration is less than  $1 \mu g$  $dm^{-3}$ . In general, the <3  $\mu m$  fraction was proportionally higher when the concentration of Chl a was lower in the present study.

In conclusion, it was shown that the abundance of Synechococcus has shown considerable spatial and temporal variability in the Iskenderun Bay. Although most of this variability may be attributable to variations in temperature and nutrient supply, local hydrographic conditions such as wind and circulation systems and biological processes may also play a significant role in determining Synechococcus dynamics in this area. In the present study, small-sized phytoplankton was found to dominate the bulk at least for the summer period. As a reflection of the oligotrophic Mediterranean ecosystem, Synechococcus comprised an important fraction of the phytoplankton biomass in the bay. In this coastal ecosystem, further field and laboratory studies are needed for a better understanding of the microbial

community dynamics and influence of environmental perturbations on them.

#### Acknowledgements

This research was funded by Academic Research Projects Unit of Çukurova University (SÜF 2004BAP13). Sincere thanks go to Mrs Bettina Fach (Institute of Marine Sciences, Middle East Technical University, Turkey) for her kind help in editing the manuscript.

#### References

- Agawin NSR, Duarte CM, Agusti S. 1998. Growth and abundance of *Synechococcus* spp. in a Mediterranean bay: Seasonality and relationship with temperature. Marine Ecology Progress Series 170:45–53.
- Agawin NSR, Duarte CM, Agusti S. 2000. Response of Mediterranean *Synechococcus* growth and loss rates to experimental nutrient inputs. Marine Ecology Progress Series 206:97–106.
- Avsar D. 1999. Physico-chemical characteristics of the eastern Mediterranean in relation to distribution of the new Scyphomedusae (*Rhopilema nomadica*). Turkish Journal of Zoology 23(2):605–16 (in Turkish).
- Azov Y. 1991. Eastern Mediterranean A marine desert? Marine Pollution Bulletin 23:225–32.
- Bertilsson S, Berglund O, Karl DM, Chisholm SW. 2003. Elemental composition of marine *Synechococcus* and *Prochlorococcus*: Implications for the ecological stoichiometry of the sea. Limnology and Oceanography 48:1721–31.
- Calvo-Diaz A, Moran XAG, Nogueira E, Bode A, Varela M. 2004. Picoplankton community structure along the northern Iberian continental margin in late winter–early spring. Journal of Plankton Research 26:1069–81.
- Caroppo C, Turicchia S, Margheri MC. 2006. Phytoplankton assemblages in coastal waters of the northern Ionian Sea (eastern Mediterranean), with special reference to cyanobacteria. Journal of the Marine Biological Association UK 86:927– 37.
- Chang J, Lin K-H, Chen K-M, Gong G-C, Chiang K-P. 2003. Synechococcus growth and mortality rates in the East China Sea: Range of variations and correlation with environmental factors. Deep Sea Research II 50:1265–78.
- Delgado M. 1990. Phytoplankton distribution along the Spanish coast of the Alboran Sea. Scientia Marina 54:169–78.
- Delgado M, Latasa M, Estada M. 1992. Variability in the size fractionated distribution of the phytoplankton across the Catalan front of the northwest Mediterranean. Journal of Plankton Research 14:753–71.
- Eker E, Kideys AE. 2000. Weekly variations in phytoplankton structure of a harbour in Mersin Bay (northeastern Mediterranean). Turkish Journal of Botany 24:13–24.
- El Hag GC, Fogg GE. 1986. The distribution of coccoid blue green algae (Cyanobacteria) in the Menai Straits and the Irish Sea. British Phycological Journal 21:45–54.
- Fogg GE. 1995. Some comments on picoplankton and its importance in the pelagic ecosystem. Aquatic Microbial Ecology 9:33–9.
- Fuller NJ, West NJ, Dominique M, Yallop M, Rivlin T, Post AF, Scanlan DJ. 2005. Dynamics of community structure and phosphate status of picocyanobacterial populations in the Gulf of Aqaba, Red Sea. Limnology and Oceanography 50:363–75.
- Guillou L, Jacquet S, Chretiennot-Dinet MJ, Vaulot D. 2001. Grazing impact of two small heterotrophic flagellates on

*Prochlorococcus* and *Synechococcus*. Aquatic Microbial Ecology 26:201–7.

- Jacquet S, Lennon JF, Marie D, Vaulot D. 1998. Picoplankton population dynamics in coastal waters of the northwestern Mediterranean Sea. Limnology and Oceanography 3:1916–31.
- Jochem F. 1986. On the distribution and importance of picoplankton in a boreal inshore area (Kiel Bight, Western Baltic). Journal of Plankton Research 10:1009–22.
- Kormas KA, Garametsi V, Nicolaidou A. 2002. Size fractionated chlorophyll a in an eastern Mediterranean coastal system (Maliakos Gulf, Greece). Helgoland Marine Research 56:125–33.
- Krom MD, Kress N, Brenner S, Gordon LI. 1991. Phosphorus limitation of primary productivity in the eastern Mediterranean Sea. Limnology and Oceanography 36:424–32.
- Kuosa H. 1988. Occurrence of autotrophic picoplankton along an open sea–inner archipelago gradient in the Gulf of Finland, Baltic Sea. Ophelia 28:85–93.
- Li WKW. 1998. Annual average abundance of heterotrophic bacteria and *Synechococcus* in surface ocean waters. Limnology and Oceanography 43:1746–53.
- Li WKW, Subba Rao DV, Harrison WG, Smith JC, Culler JJ, Irwin B, Platt T. 1983. Autotrophic picoplankton in the trophic ocean. Science 219:292–5.
- Li WKW, Zohary T, Yacobi YZ, Wood AM. 1993. Ultraphytoplankton in the eastern Mediterranean Sea: towards deriving phytoplankton biomass from flow cytometric measurements of abundance, fluorescence and light scatter. Marine Ecology Progress Series 102:79–87.
- Mihalatou HM, Moustaka-Gouni M. 2002. Pico-, nano-, microplankton abundance and primary productivity of a eutrophic coastal area of the Aegean Sea, Mediterranean. International Review of Hydrobiology 87:439–56.
- Modigh M, Saggiomo V, Riberad'Alcala M. 1996. Conservative features of picoplankton in a Mediterranean eutrophic area, the Bay of Naples. Journal of Plankton Research 18:87–95.
- Moore LR, Post AF, Rocap G, Chisholm W. 2002. Utilization of different nitrogen sources by the marine cyanobacteria Synechococcus and Prochlorococcus. Limnology and Oceanography 47:989–96.
- Özsoy E, Hecht A, Ünlüata Ü, Brenner S, Sur HI, Bishop J, et al. 1993. A synthesis of the Levantine Basin circulation and hydrography, 1985–1990. Deep-Sea Research II 40(6):1075– 119.
- Parsons TR, Maita Y, Lalli CM. 1984b. A Manual of Chemical and Biological Methods for Seawater Analysis. Oxford: Pergamon Press. 173 pages.
- Parsons TR, Takahashi M, Hargrave B. 1984a. Biological Oceanographic Processes. Oxford: Pergamon Press. 330 pages.
- Partensky F, Blanchot J, Vaulot D. 1999. Differential distribution and ecology of *Prochlorococcus* and *Synechococcus* in oceanic waters: A review. Bulletin de l'Institut Oceanographique, Monaco 19:457–75.
- Polat S. 2002. Nutrients, chlorophyll a and phytoplankton in the İskenderun Bay (Northeastern Mediterranean). P.S.Z.N.: Marine Ecology 23: 115–26.
- Polat S, Piner MP. 2002. Seasonal variations in biomass, abundance and species diversity of phytoplankton in the

Iskenderun Bay (NE Mediterranean). Pakistan Journal of Botany 34:101–12.

- Polat S, Sarihan E, Koray T. 2000. Seasonal changes in the phytoplankton of the Northeastern Mediterranean (Bay of Iskenderun). Turkish Journal of Botany 24:1–12.
- Ribes M, Coma R, Gili JM. 1999. Seasonal variation of particulate organic carbon, dissolved organic carbon and the contribution of microbial communities to the live particulate organic carbon in a shallow near-bottom ecosystem at the Northwestern Mediterranean Sea. Journal of Plankton Research 21:1077–100.
- Sieracki ME, Viles CL, Webb KL. 1989. An algorithm to estimate cell biovolume using image analyzed microscopy. Cytometry 10:551–7.
- Strickland JDH, Parsons TR. 1972. A Practical Handbook of Seawater Analysis. Fisheries Research Board of Canada Bulletin. Ottawa. 310 pages.
- Thingstad TF, Rassoulazadegen F. 1999. Conceptual models for the biochemical role of the photic zone microbial food web, with particular reference to the Mediterranean Sea. Progress in Oceanography 44:271–86.
- Turley CM, Bianchi M, Christaki U, Conan P, Harris JRW, Psarra S, et al. 2000. Relationship between primary producers and bacteria in an oligotrophic sea – the Mediterranean and biochemical implications. Marine Ecology Progress Series 193:11–8.
- Uysal Z. 2006. Vertical distribution of marine cyanobacteria Synechococcus spp. in the Black, Marmara, Aegean and eastern Mediterranean seas. Deep-Sea Research II 53:1976–87.
- Uysal Z, Köksalan I. 2006. The annual cycle of *Synechococcus* (cyanobacteria) in the northern Levantine Basin shelf waters (Eastern Mediterranean). Marine Ecology 27:187–97.
- Vaulot D, Lebot N, Marie D, Fukai E. 1996. Effect of phosphorus on the *Synechococcus* cell cycle in surface Mediterranean waters during summer. Applied Environmental Microbiology 62:2527–33.
- Veldhuis MJW, Timmermans KR, Croot P, Wagt B. 2005. Picophytoplankton: A comperative study of their biochemical composition and photosynthetic properties. Journal of Sea Research 53:7–24.
- Waterbury JB, Watson SW, Valois FW, Franks DG. 1986. Biological and ecological characterization of the marine unicellular cyanobacterium *Synechococcus*. In: Platt T, WKW L, editors. Photosynthetic Picoplankton. Canadian Bulletin of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 214:71–120.
- Worden AZ, Nolan JK, Palenik B. 2004. Assessing the dynamics and ecology of marine picophytoplankton: The importance of the eucaryotic component. Limnology and Oceanography 49:168–79.
- Yilmaz A, Baştürk Ö, Saydam C, Ediger D, Yilmaz K, Hatipoğlu E. 1992. Eutrophication in İskenderun Bay, northeastern Mediterranean. Science of the Total Environment Supplement: 705–17.

Editorial responsibility: Birgitta Bergman