

Review



**Cite this article:** Van de Waal DB, Litchman E. 2020 Multiple global change stressor effects on phytoplankton nutrient acquisition in a future ocean. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **375**: 20190706.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0706>

Accepted: 20 December 2019

One contribution of 19 to a theme issue 'Conceptual challenges in microbial community ecology'.

**Subject Areas:**  
ecology

**Keywords:**  
climate change, phytoplankton, traits, resource allocation, eco-physiology

**Author for correspondence:**  
Dedmer B. Van de Waal  
e-mail: [d.vandewaal@nioo.knaw.nl](mailto:d.vandewaal@nioo.knaw.nl)

# Multiple global change stressor effects on phytoplankton nutrient acquisition in a future ocean

Dedmer B. Van de Waal<sup>1</sup> and Elena Litchman<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Aquatic Ecology, Netherlands Institute of Ecology (NIOO-KNAW), Droevendaalsesteeg 10, Wageningen 6871 CM, The Netherlands

<sup>2</sup>W. K. Kellogg Biological Station, Michigan State University, 3700 E. Gull Lake Drive, Hickory Corners, MI 49060, USA

<sup>3</sup>Department of Integrative Biology, Michigan State University, 288 Farm Lane, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

DBVdW, 0000-0001-8803-1247

Predicting the effects of multiple global change stressors on microbial communities remains a challenge because of the complex interactions among those factors. Here, we explore the combined effects of major global change stressors on nutrient acquisition traits in marine phytoplankton. Nutrient limitation constrains phytoplankton production in large parts of the present-day oceans, and is expected to increase owing to climate change, potentially favouring small phytoplankton that are better adapted to oligotrophic conditions. However, other stressors, such as elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$ , rising temperatures and higher light levels, may reduce general metabolic and photosynthetic costs, allowing the reallocation of energy to the acquisition of increasingly limiting nutrients. We propose that this energy reallocation in response to major global change stressors may be more effective in large-celled phytoplankton species and, thus, could indirectly benefit large-more than small-celled phytoplankton, offsetting, at least partially, competitive disadvantages of large cells in a future ocean. Thus, considering the size-dependent responses to multiple stressors may provide a more nuanced understanding of how different microbial groups would fare in the future climate and what effects that would have on ecosystem functioning.

This article is part of the theme issue 'Conceptual challenges in microbial community ecology'.

## 1. Primary production in a future ocean

Marine phytoplankton play a pivotal role in the oceanic carbon cycle and fuel the marine food web. Consequently, climate-driven shifts in oceanic primary production will have major consequences not only for carbon export, but also for the structure and functioning of the entire marine biome. Understanding how multiple global change stressors act simultaneously affecting phytoplankton productivity and community structure is difficult because of the complex interactions among those factors [1]. Looking at traits that are involved in potential phytoplankton responses to different global change stressors and determining how these traits are affected by those stressors, together with assessing potential trade-offs that may be involved, could help us improve the conceptual understanding of multiple stressor effects on different phytoplankton groups.

Both elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$  and warming are major global change stressors impacting marine phytoplankton, and their effects can be direct as well as indirect. For instance, elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$  may directly facilitate oceanic primary production through enhanced photosynthesis [2–4]. Yet, the effects are species- and even strain-specific, depending on distinct inorganic carbon acquisition strategies, including the operation and regulation of carbon concentrating mechanisms

(CCMs) [5–8]. Various studies, however, have shown that elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$  does not necessarily enhance primary production, or may even have negative effects, e.g. caused by concomitant changes in carbonate chemistry such as reduced pH (i.e. ocean acidification; [9,10]). Warming directly affects organisms by enhancing their metabolic rates [11,12]. Specifically, warming may enhance respiration rates more than photosynthesis, and thus possibly lead to declines in net oceanic carbon fixation [13,14].


Besides the direct effects on primary production, warming is also expected to enhance thermal stratification at low and mid latitudes, preventing nutrients from deep waters entering the well-lit surface mixed layer, thus exacerbating phytoplankton nutrient limitation and reducing primary production [15–17]. Moreover, enhanced nutrient trapping in the Southern Ocean due to climatic changes was shown to increase nutrient export to the deep ocean, further strengthening nutrient limitation [18]. Thus, present-day oceanic phytoplankton primary production is already constrained by the availability of key nutrients such as nitrogen, phosphorus and iron [19], and this limitation is expected to increase in a future ocean. Phytoplankton have developed a range of traits to deal with prevailing low-nutrient conditions. These nutrient utilization traits may change in response not only to increased nutrient limitation but to major global change stressors as well, such as higher  $p\text{CO}_2$  and temperatures.

How do increased  $p\text{CO}_2$ , warming and nutrient limitation interact to modify phytoplankton physiology, ecology and ecosystem impacts? No doubt, the effects are complex and varied. To illustrate this complexity, we focus on how phytoplankton nutrient acquisition may be modified by elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$ , warming and higher light availabilities, and what consequences this may have on oceanic ecosystems. Inspired by trait-based approaches in ecology [20–22], we propose using traits to understand the combined effects of climate change factors and nutrient limitation on marine phytoplankton. Specifically, we highlight the impacts of climate change on nutrient acquisition at the individual level through phenotypic plasticity, at the population level through genotype-specific responses with potential consequences for evolutionary adaptation, and at the community level through climate-driven species sorting, revealing unexpected scenarios for shifts in community size structure.

## 2. Plasticity of nutrient acquisition traits

### (a) Elevated $p\text{CO}_2$ and warming

Nutrient acquisition in phytoplankton approximates a hyperbolic function, with uptake rates and growth rates steeply increasing at low nutrient concentrations toward saturation when nutrient is in excess [23–26]. Key nutrient acquisition traits include the maximum uptake rate ( $V_{\text{max}}$ ) or maximum growth rate ( $\mu_{\text{max}}$ ), and the half-saturation constant ( $K_{1/2}$ ), which describes the concentration of a nutrient where nutrient uptake or growth equals half of the maximum rate. Nutrient uptake or growth affinity ( $\alpha$ ) combines both traits, representing the initial slope following  $V_{\text{max}}/K_{1/2}$  and  $\mu_{\text{max}}/K_{1/2}$ , respectively (figure 1a) [24,27]. Climate-driven increases in nutrient limitation may thus likely benefit phytoplankton with high nutrient uptake or growth affinities, attained either through plastic responses or through evolutionary selection. In addition to the uptake traits, the minimum nutrient




**Figure 1.** Conceptual overview of nutrient acquisition traits (a) and putative impacts of climate change (warming and elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$ ) on these traits in marine phytoplankton (b). Nutrient acquisition traits include maximum growth ( $\mu_{\text{max}}$ ) or uptake ( $V_{\text{max}}$ ) rate, half-saturation concentration ( $K_{1/2}$ ) and the nutrient or growth uptake affinity ( $\alpha$ ). Brown arrows in (b) indicate potential effects of climatic change (darker shades) on nutrient acquisition traits.

requirement, minimum nutrient quota  $Q_{\text{min}}$ , is important in determining nutrient competitive abilities, which can be expressed as scaled uptake affinity  $V_{\text{max}}/K_{1/2}Q_{\text{min}}$  [28]. In general, smaller-celled species tend to have better competitive abilities [28], so that they would have a competitive advantage in the future more oligotrophic ocean.

Phytoplankton possess high phenotypic plasticity and can strongly modulate their physiology in response to elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$  and temperature. Warming may reduce the energetic and elemental costs for overall metabolism, and with elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$  the energetic costs of carbon acquisition could be reduced, notably by down-regulation of energy-demanding CCMs [4,5,29]. Consequently, cells may reallocate energy and/or elements to enhance the uptake of a limiting resource, leading to higher nutrient uptake or growth affinities (figure 1b). Indeed, at higher temperatures phytoplankton seem to have higher nitrogen uptake rates (for ammonium and urea, but not nitrate) [30], and higher nutrient growth affinities (figure 2a) [27]. Similarly, elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$  also led to higher net nitrogen assimilation rates (i.e. nitrogen quota multiplied by growth rate) in two dinoflagellate species. This was accompanied, however, by a disproportional increase in their  $K_{1/2}$  for nitrogen, highlighting a potential trade-off between the rate at which nitrogen is assimilated and the relative affinity for nitrogen [31]. Consequently, nitrogen growth affinities (i.e.  $\mu_{\text{max}}/K_{1/2}$ ) were at an optimum or decreased with elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$  (figure 2b). These findings were mainly explained by a shift toward higher investments in nitrogen-rich functional compounds, such as alkaloid toxins and chlorophyll *a*. Alternatively, the  $\text{CO}_2$ -driven down-regulation of CCMs may enhance photo-oxidative stress, leading to increased energetic and elemental costs (e.g. nitrogen) associated to photo-inhibition [36–38], which may, in turn, lead to reduced nitrogen growth affinities.

A major source of (bioavailable) nitrogen in the open ocean is the  $\text{N}_2$  fixed by diazotrophic cyanobacteria [39] and released into the water column. Thus, changes in  $\text{N}_2$  fixation could significantly alter N budgets in oligotrophic oceans. Nitrogen fixation has been shown to be strongly temperature-dependent, with optimum rates in warm, low latitude tropical and subtropical regions (figure 2c) [32,33]. Although warming generally enhances  $\text{N}_2$  fixation rates, it may also cause oxygen inhibition of the responsible enzyme nitrogenase, thereby possibly leading to a decline in  $\text{N}_2$  fixation rates at high temperatures [33,40]. Nitrogen fixation rates were shown to generally increase at higher  $p\text{CO}_2$ ,



**Figure 2.** Impacts of climate change factors on nitrogen acquisition. Temperature and  $\text{CO}_2$  effects on (a,b) nitrogen growth affinity, and (c,d) nitrogen fixation in marine phytoplankton. (a,b) Nitrogen growth affinity is defined as the initial slope of the Monod relationship, expressed as  $\text{l } \mu\text{mol}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$ . Nitrogen fixation is expressed as (c)  $\text{fmol C}_2\text{H}_4 \text{ cell}^{-1} (12 \text{ h})^{-1}$  for *Cyanosphaera* (left y-axis), and as  $\text{mmol N}_2 (\text{mol C})^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$  for *Trichodesmium* (right y-axis), and as (d)  $\mu\text{mol N} (\text{mg Chl a})^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$  for different species or strains (indicated by different colour shades) of *Crocosphaera* and *Trichodesmium*. Figures were redrawn from Reay *et al.* [27] with permission from the American Society for Microbiology (a), from Eberlein *et al.* [31] and Breitbarth *et al.* [32] under the Creative Commons Attribution License (b,c), and from Brauer *et al.* [33] and Hutchins *et al.* [34] (c,d). If unavailable, data were extracted using Engauge Digitizer [35].

from present-day levels of around 400 ppm to approximately 750 ppm [41–43], beyond which  $\text{N}_2$  fixation rates levelled off (figure 2d). These patterns show that  $\text{N}_2$  fixation can be limited by  $\text{CO}_2$ , but also that there is a maximum rate at  $\text{CO}_2$  levels above 1000 ppm [34]. Although elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$  was shown to be beneficial for  $\text{N}_2$  fixation, a decrease in pH may possibly inhibit it owing to a decrease in nitrogenase efficiency, resulting in declined growth and  $\text{N}_2$  fixation rates [44,45, but see 46].

Besides nitrogen and phosphorus, iron is a major limiting resource for oceanic primary production as well, particularly in the Southern Ocean [19]. Similar to nitrogen and phosphorus, the uptake and assimilation of iron were also shown to be affected by temperature. Specifically, along with enhancing  $\text{N}_2$  fixation, warming increased iron use efficiency in a marine diazotroph (*Trichodesmium*), and this could even offset the effect of iron limitation [47]. At the same time, however, the inhibitory effect of decreasing pH was most apparent under Fe-limiting conditions [44,45]. Whether elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$  would promote  $\text{N}_2$  fixation may, thus, depend on the availability of Fe, and further work is needed to elucidate the interactive effects of Fe and  $\text{CO}_2$  on  $\text{N}_2$  fixation in marine diazotrophic cyanobacteria.


### (b) Increased light availabilities

Enhanced thermal stratification of the oceanic waters may lead to shallowing of the upper mixed layer, which may,

together with sea ice retreat, enhance the relative light availability in the ocean surface layers and thereby stimulate primary production [48,49]. With higher relative light availabilities, the costs of light capture may be reduced and, thus, could allow reallocation of energy and/or elements towards nutrient acquisition. Indeed, higher light levels were shown to enhance  $\text{N}_2$  fixation rates in diazotrophic cyanobacteria [33,50]. Moreover, cellular chlorophyll *a* content in various phytoplankton species decreased with higher light intensities [51], which may reduce nitrogen demand for synthesizing these pigments [52]. Increasing light availability can also directly decrease nutrient demands of phytoplankton by reducing their elemental quota [53], though these responses may vary among species [54]. Higher light availabilities combined with elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$ , however, may cause photo-oxidative stress, thereby leading to reduced primary production [37,55, but see 56]. Despite being beneficial to photosynthesis, the impact of enhanced light levels will thus depend on the availability of other resources, and may possibly become detrimental.

### 3. Favouring the small...

Climate-driven depletion of nutrients may shift phytoplankton communities towards dominance by species with low nutrient requirements, high nutrient uptake efficiencies, and a high flexibility to shunt excess energy towards



**Figure 3.** Relationships between cell size and temperature in the past, present and future. Size of diatom frustules from sediment cores as a function of reconstructed past temperatures (a), cell volumes of contemporary phytoplankton from culture experiments of brackish water and marine phytoplankton (b), and cell sizes of a Baltic Sea phytoplankton community in response to experimental warming combined with nutrient limitation from a high (darker shade) to a low (lighter shade) level of nutrient limitation (c). The y-axis in (b) indicates the difference between cell volume at any temperature and the estimated volume at 15°C, normalized to this mean volume, and the x-axis indicates difference between the tested temperature and 15°C (for further details, see Atkinson *et al.* [63]). Figures were redrawn from Finkel *et al.* [64] (copyright © (2005) National Academy of Sciences) (a), from Atkinson *et al.* [63] with permission from Royal Society Publishing (b), and from Peter & Sommer [65] under the Creative Commons Attribution License (c). If unavailable, data were extracted using Engauge Digitizer [35].

nutrient acquisition. Being small seems a particularly good strategy to deal with nutrient depletion, as (absolute) nutrient requirements are proportional to size [25,57]. Moreover, because of their high surface-to-volume ratio, small cells have higher growth and nutrient uptake affinities, and are less likely to become diffusion-limited [25,58–60]. Consequently, smaller-sized phytoplankton generally dominate phytoplankton biomass in the open ocean where nutrients are depleted and primary production is low, while larger-celled phytoplankton are generally more dominant in more productive coastal waters [61,62].

With climate-driven declines in nutrient availabilities, phytoplankton communities may thus possibly shift towards small-celled species. Indeed, the size of diatom frustules, indicative of diatom cell size, was shown to be inversely correlated with temperature variations over the past approximately 65 Myr (figure 3a). In other words, warmer periods had smaller diatoms dominant, which could have resulted from the reductions in nutrient availability due to enhanced thermal stratification [64]. Also in contemporary marine phytoplankton, cell size usually decreases with temperature (figure 3b) [63]. Similarly, experimental warming led to a shift in the phytoplankton community toward smaller phytoplankton species, which was most prominent under high-nutrient stress (figure 3c) [65]. This is in line with climate change scenarios tested with a global Earth system model, which projected a shift toward smaller phytoplankton species, particularly at higher latitudes [66].


#### 4. ...and the large?

Although nutrient depletion generally favours small phytoplankton, climate-driven reallocation of energy and/or elements may be particularly beneficial for large species. First, large species are more diffusion-limited compared with small species and may thus benefit relatively more from enhanced CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion rates. For example, elevated *p*CO<sub>2</sub> was shown to favour growth of larger diatoms [67], and to shift phytoplankton communities to larger species [67,68]. Second, large species have relatively high elemental investments in light capturing, because of the lower absorption

efficiencies compared with small-celled phytoplankton [69]. Consequently, large species may benefit relatively more from increased light availability caused by shallower mixing layer depths in a warmer ocean, as they can reallocate more resources and energy from light harvesting to nutrient acquisition. Third, large species also tend to be more flexible in size, with a proportionately greater possible reduction compared with smaller species, because smaller-celled species are closer to their minimum structural demands and, therefore, have limited cell size flexibility [70]. Large species may, thus, have a greater ability to reduce cell size and benefit from the associated increases in surface-to-volume ratio. Fourth, some larger phytoplankton taxa possess vacuoles that increase their surface-to-volume ratio, thereby enhancing the effective surface area for nutrient transport [71,72]. Fifth, these vacuoles serve as storage compartments for nutrients, particularly advantageous in fluctuating nutrient conditions [73]. With climate change, storm intensities are predicted to increase [74], which may temporarily enhance nutrient concentrations in the surface waters by mixing with nutrient-rich deeper waters, and was shown, as consequence, to promote primary production and favour large diatoms [75,76]. Lastly, cell size is generally correlated with genome size [77,78], and processes such as adaptive gene loss and genomic streamlining may optimize nutrient acquisition traits in small phytoplankton species, particularly in more stable environments [79]. Conversely, it is conceivable that larger cells may have a greater gene redundancy, leading to more resilient traits [8], which may provide a competitive advantage in dynamic environments. In summary, the higher flexibility of larger phytoplankton species in response to direct and indirect effects of warming and elevated *p*CO<sub>2</sub> may, at least partially, offset their competitive disadvantage in nutrient acquisition.

#### 5. Evolution of nutrient acquisition traits

Impacts of climate change on marine phytoplankton will depend not only on their plastic responses, but also on their potential to adapt evolutionarily through selection on standing genetic variation or novel mutations [80,81]. Adaptation to elevated *p*CO<sub>2</sub> and warming was observed in



**Figure 4.** Intraspecific variation in nitrogen uptake kinetics. (a) Nitrogen uptake rates as a function of nitrogen concentrations, and (b) uptake affinities of various dinoflagellate *Alexandrium ostenfeldii* clones (indicated by different colour shades). Data were modified from Brandenburg *et al.* [95] and are available through Brandenburg *et al.* [96].

various phytoplankton species across major marine phytoplankton groups [82–88]. Yet, evolutionary responses to elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$  seem to be diverse, and may, furthermore, differ in direction compared with the observed plastic responses of phenotypes [89]. However, evolutionary changes observed in coccolithophores that adapted to elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$  were consistent with their plastic responses and, at least partially, offset fitness losses [82,89,90].

Evolutionary adaptation toward elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$  was particularly evident under environmental conditions that decreased fitness [89]. It is therefore conceivable that a decline in fitness due to increased nutrient limitation might be compensated by adaptation through increased nutrient uptake affinities. Existing intraspecific genetic and phenotypic diversity of marine phytoplankton populations is substantial and thus provides the basis for adaptation through the selection of best-fit genotypes [91–94]. With regard to nutrient acquisition, populations of the dinoflagellate *Alexandrium ostenfeldii* were shown to exhibit a large intraspecific variation in nutrient uptake kinetics, demonstrating a wide range of nitrogen uptake affinities (figure 4) [95]. This suggests a large potential for selection of clones with higher nutrient uptake affinities when nutrients become (more) limiting.

## 6. Concluding remarks and future directions

We have described how a trait-based ecological approach may help understand the interactive impacts of climate change factors and nutrient limitation on marine phytoplankton, highlighting possible shifts in nutrient acquisition

through elevated  $p\text{CO}_2$ , warming or changes in light availabilities. We hypothesize that climate-driven exacerbation of nutrient limitation may be partially counteracted by the concomitant increases in  $p\text{CO}_2$ , temperature and relative light availabilities, which may benefit large phytoplankton species capable of reallocating greater resources to nutrient acquisition more than small species and thus, at least partially, offset their competitive disadvantages. This could lead to different outcomes for phytoplankton size distributions, which, in turn, would have different effects on ecosystem processes and food-web dynamics. The next step would be to incorporate energy or resource reallocation in mechanistic models, investigating the magnitude of possible direct and indirect effects of simultaneously acting stressors, and link these to food-web and ecosystem models, thereby generating process-based predictions for oceanic ecosystems.

Obviously, global environmental changes involve a multitude of factors that may affect phytoplankton in diverse ways, maybe differently from what we propose here. By highlighting the complex interplay of several global change stressors on phytoplankton nutrient acquisition, we argue that investigating how multiple stressors may interact to modify phytoplankton traits should be an urgent research priority, requiring collaborations of phytoplankton physiologists, ecologists and modellers. Also, we note that taking into account interacting stressors may yield different predictions compared with when stressors are considered in isolation. For example, recent work showed that nutrient limitation may make phytoplankton more vulnerable to rising temperatures by decreasing their temperature optima and impeding evolutionary adaptation to warming [97,98]. Using a trait-based framework for a better mechanistic understanding of trait flexibility in different phytoplankton size classes under the combined changes in  $p\text{CO}_2$ , temperature and resource availabilities, as well as other anticipated environmental change stressors, should further improve our predictions of the future oceanic primary production and ecosystem dynamics.

**Data accessibility.** This article has no additional data.

**Authors' contributions.** Both authors contributed to the ideas presented in the manuscript. D.B.V.d.W. prepared a first version of the manuscript and figures, and both authors contributed to newer versions.

**Competing interests.** We declare we have no competing interests.

**Funding.** This work was supported by the NSF grant no. OCE-1638958 (to E.L.) and the German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv; to E.L.).

**Acknowledgements.** The authors thank David Hutchins, David Atkinson and Ulrich Sommer for providing data used for figures 2d, 3b and 3c, respectively.

## References

- Boyd PW, Lennartz ST, Glover DM, Doney SC. 2014 Biological ramifications of climate-change-mediated oceanic multi-stressors. *Nat. Clim. Change* **5**, 71–79. (doi:10.1038/nclimate2441)
- Hein M, Sand-Jensen K. 1997  $\text{CO}_2$  increases oceanic primary production. *Nature* **388**, 526–527. (doi:10.1038/41457)
- Riebesell U *et al.* 2007 Enhanced biological carbon consumption in a high  $\text{CO}_2$  ocean. *Nature* **450**, 545–548. (doi:10.1038/nature06267)
- Van de Waal DB, Brandenburg KM, Keuskamp J, Trimbom S, Rokitta S, Kranz SA, Rost B. 2019 Highest plasticity of carbon-concentrating mechanisms in earliest evolved phytoplankton. *Limnol. Oceanogr. Lett.* **4**, 37–43. (doi:10.1002/lol2.10102)
- Raven JA, Giordano M, Beardall J, Maberly SC. 2011 Algal and aquatic plant carbon concentrating mechanisms in relation to environmental change. *Photosynthesis Res.* **109**, 281–296. (doi:10.1007/s11210-011-9632-6)
- Beardall J, Stojkovic S, Larsen S. 2009 Living in a high  $\text{CO}_2$  world: impacts of global climate change on marine phytoplankton. *Plant Ecol. Divers.* **2**, 191–205. (doi:10.1080/17550870903271363)
- Dutkiewicz S, Morris JJ, Follows MJ, Scott J, Levitan O, Dyrhrman ST, Berman-Frank I. 2015 Impact of ocean acidification on the structure of future phytoplankton communities. *Nat. Clim. Change* **5**, 1002. (doi:10.1038/nclimate2722)
- Hennon GMM, Hernández Limón MD, Haley ST, Juhl AR, Dyrhrman ST. 2017 Diverse  $\text{CO}_2$ -induced

- responses in physiology and gene expression among eukaryotic phytoplankton. *Front. Microbiol.* **8**, 2547. (doi:10.3389/fmicb.2017.02547)
9. Beaufort L *et al.* 2011 Sensitivity of coccolithophores to carbonate chemistry and ocean acidification. *Nature* **476**, 80–83. (doi:10.1038/nature10295)
  10. Nagelkerken I, Connell SD. 2015 Global alteration of ocean ecosystem functioning due to increasing human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 13 272–13 277. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1510856112)
  11. Gillooly JF, Brown JH, West GB, Savage VM, Charnov EL. 2001 Effects of size and temperature on metabolic rate. *Science* **293**, 2248–2251. (doi:10.1126/science.1061967)
  12. Brown JH, Gillooly JF, Allen AP, Savage VM, West GB. 2004 Toward a metabolic theory of ecology. *Ecology* **85**, 1771–1789. (doi:10.1890/03-9000)
  13. López-Urrutia Á, San Martín E, Harris RP, Irigoien X. 2006 Scaling the metabolic balance of the oceans. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **103**, 8739–8744. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0601137103)
  14. Regaudie-de-Gioux A, Duarte CM. 2012 Temperature dependence of planktonic metabolism in the ocean. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **26**, GB1015. (doi:10.1029/2010GB003907)
  15. Boyce DG, Lewis MR, Worm B. 2010 Global phytoplankton decline over the past century. *Nature* **466**, 591–596. (doi:10.1038/nature09268)
  16. Behrenfeld MJ *et al.* 2006 Climate-driven trends in contemporary ocean productivity. *Nature* **444**, 752–755. (doi:10.1038/nature05317)
  17. Polovina JJ, Howell EA, Abecassis M. 2008 Ocean's least productive waters are expanding. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **35**, L03618. (doi:10.1029/2007gl031745)
  18. Moore JK *et al.* 2018 Sustained climate warming drives declining marine biological productivity. *Science* **359**, 1139–1143. (doi:10.1126/science.aao6379)
  19. Moore CM *et al.* 2013 Processes and patterns of oceanic nutrient limitation. *Nat. Geosci.* **6**, 701–710. (doi:10.1038/ngeo1765)
  20. Kjørboe T, Visser A, Andersen KH. 2018 A trait-based approach to ocean ecology. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **75**, 1849–1863. (doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsy090)
  21. McGill BJ, Enquist BJ, Weiher E, Westoby M. 2006 Rebuilding community ecology from functional traits. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **21**, 178–185. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2006.02.002)
  22. Litchman E, Klausmeier CA. 2008 Trait-based community ecology of phytoplankton. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **39**, 615–639. (doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.39.110707.173549)
  23. Droop MR. 1973 Some thoughts on nutrient limitation in algae. *J. Phycol.* **9**, 264–272. (doi:10.1111/j.1529-8817.1973.tb04092.x)
  24. Healey FP, Hendzel LL. 1980 Physiological indicators of nutrient deficiency in lake phytoplankton. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **37**, 442–453. (doi:10.1139/f80-058)
  25. Litchman E, Klausmeier CA, Schofield OM, Falkowski PG. 2007 The role of functional traits and trade-offs in structuring phytoplankton communities: scaling from cellular to ecosystem level. *Ecol. Lett.* **10**, 1170–1181. (doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01117.x)
  26. Flynn KJ, Skibinski DOF, Lindemann C. 2018 Effects of growth rate, cell size, motion, and elemental stoichiometry on nutrient transport kinetics. *PLoS Comp. Biol.* **14**, e1006118. (doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006118)
  27. Reay DS, Nedwell DB, Priddle J, Ellis-Evans JC. 1999 Temperature dependence of inorganic nitrogen uptake: reduced affinity for nitrate at suboptimal temperatures in both algae and bacteria. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **65**, 2577–2584. (doi:10.1128/aem.65.6.2577-2584.1999)
  28. Edwards KF, Klausmeier CA, Litchman E. 2011 Evidence for a three-way trade-off between nitrogen and phosphorus competitive abilities and cell size in phytoplankton. *Ecology* **92**, 2085–2095. (doi:10.1890/11-0395.1)
  29. Hennon GMM, Ashworth J, Groussman RD, Berthiaume C, Morales RL, Baliga NS, Orellana MV, Armbrust EV. 2015 Diatom acclimation to elevated CO<sub>2</sub> via cAMP signalling and coordinated gene expression. *Nat. Clim. Change* **5**, 761–765. (doi:10.1038/nclimate2683)
  30. Lomas MW, Glibert PM. 1999 Temperature regulation of nitrate uptake: a novel hypothesis about nitrate uptake and reduction in cool-water diatoms. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **44**, 556–572. (doi:10.4319/lo.1999.44.3.0556)
  31. Eberlein T, Van de Waal DB, Brandenburg KM, John U, Voss M, Achterberg EP, Rost B. 2016 Interactive effects of ocean acidification and nitrogen limitation on two bloom-forming dinoflagellate species. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **543**, 127–140. (doi:10.3354/meps1568)
  32. Breitbarth E, Oschlies A, LaRoche J. 2007 Physiological constraints on the global distribution of *Trichodesmium*: effect of temperature on diazotrophy. *Biogeosciences* **4**, 53–61. (doi:10.5194/bg-4-53-2007)
  33. Brauer VS, Stomp M, Rosso C, van Beusekom SAM, Emmerich B, Stal LJ, Huisman J. 2013 Low temperature delays timing and enhances the cost of nitrogen fixation in the unicellular cyanobacterium *Cyanothece*. *ISME J.* **7**, 2105–2115. (doi:10.1038/ismej.2013.103)
  34. Hutchins DA, Fu F-X, Webb EA, Walworth N, Tagliabue A. 2013 Taxon-specific response of marine nitrogen fixers to elevated carbon dioxide concentrations. *Nat. Geosci.* **6**, 790–795. (doi:10.1038/ngeo1858)
  35. Mitchell M, Muftakhidinov B, Winchen T. 1991 *Engauge Digitizer*. See <http://markummitchell.github.io/engauge-digitizer>.
  36. Raven JA. 2011 The cost of photoinhibition. *Physiol. Plant.* **142**, 87–104. (doi:10.1111/j.1399-3054.2011.01465.x)
  37. Rokitta SD, Rost B. 2012 Effects of CO<sub>2</sub> and their modulation by light in the life-cycle stages of the coccolithophore *Emiliania huxleyi*. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **57**, 607–618. (doi:10.4319/lo.2012.57.2.0607)
  38. Li G, Brown CM, Jeans JA, Donaher NA, McCarthy A, Campbell DA. 2015 The nitrogen costs of photosynthesis in a diatom under current and future pCO<sub>2</sub>. *New Phytol.* **205**, 533–543. (doi:10.1111/nph.13037)
  39. Gruber N. 2016 Elusive marine nitrogen fixation. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 4246–4248. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1603646113)
  40. Gallon JR, Pederson DM, Smith GD. 1993 The effect of temperature on the sensitivity of nitrogenase to oxygen in the cyanobacteria *Anabaena cylindrica* (Lemmermann) and *Gloeotheca* (Nägeli). *New Phytol.* **124**, 251–257. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.1993.tb03814.x)
  41. Hutchins DA, Fu FX, Zhang Y, Warner ME, Feng Y, Portune K, Bernhardt PW, Mulholland MR. 2007 CO<sub>2</sub> control of *Trichodesmium* N<sub>2</sub> fixation, photosynthesis, growth rates, and elemental ratios: implications for past, present, and future ocean biogeochemistry. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **52**, 1293–1304. (doi:10.4319/lo.2007.52.4.1293)
  42. Kranz SA, Sültemeyer D, Richter KU, Rost B. 2009 Carbon acquisition by *Trichodesmium*: the effect of pCO<sub>2</sub> and diurnal changes. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **54**, 548–559. (doi:10.4319/lo.2009.54.2.0548)
  43. Barcelos e Ramos J, Biswas H, Schulz KG, LaRoche J, Riebesell U. 2007 Effect of rising atmospheric carbon dioxide on the marine nitrogen fixer *Trichodesmium*. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **21**, GB2028. (doi:10.1029/2006gb002898)
  44. Hong H *et al.* 2017 The complex effects of ocean acidification on the prominent N<sub>2</sub>-fixing cyanobacterium *Trichodesmium*. *Science* **356**, 527–531. (doi:10.1126/science.aal2981)
  45. Shi D, Shen R, Kranz SA, Morel FMM, Hong H. 2017 Response to Comment on 'The complex effects of ocean acidification on the prominent N<sub>2</sub>-fixing cyanobacterium *Trichodesmium*'. *Science* **357**, eaao0428. (doi:10.1126/science.aao0428)
  46. Hutchins DA, Fu F, Walworth NG, Lee MD, Saito MA, Webb EA. 2017 Comment on 'The complex effects of ocean acidification on the prominent N<sub>2</sub>-fixing cyanobacterium *Trichodesmium*'. *Science* **357**, eaao0067. (doi:10.1126/science.aao0067)
  47. Jiang H-B *et al.* 2018 Ocean warming alleviates iron limitation of marine nitrogen fixation. *Nat. Clim. Change* **8**, 709–712. (doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0216-8)
  48. Grebmeier JM, Moore SE, Overland JE, Frey KE, Gradinger R. 2010 Biological response to recent Pacific Arctic sea ice retreats. *EOS Trans. Am. Geophys. Union* **91**, 161–168. (doi:10.1029/2010EO180001)
  49. Doney SC *et al.* 2012 Climate change impacts on marine ecosystems. *Annu. Rev. Mar. Sci.* **4**, 11–37. (doi:10.1146/annurev-marine-041911-111611)
  50. Fu FX, Bell PRF. 2003 Factors affecting N<sub>2</sub> fixation by the cyanobacterium *Trichodesmium* sp. GBRTRLI101. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* **45**, 203–209. (doi:10.1016/s0168-6496(03)00157-0)
  51. Laviale M, Neveux J. 2011 Relationships between pigment ratios and growth irradiance in 11 marine phytoplankton species. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **425**, 63–77. (doi:10.3354/meps09013)
  52. Edwards KF, Thomas MK, Klausmeier CA, Litchman E. 2015 Light and growth in marine phytoplankton:

- allometric, taxonomic, and environmental variation. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **60**, 540–552. (doi:10.1002/lno.10033)
53. Rhee GY, Gotham IJ. 1981 The effect of environmental factors on phytoplankton growth, light and the interactions of light with nutrient limitation. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **26**, 649–659. (doi:10.4319/lno.1981.26.4.0649)
54. Finkel ZV, Quigg A, Raven JA, Reinfelder JR, Schofield OE, Falkowski PG. 2006 Irradiance and the elemental stoichiometry of marine phytoplankton. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **51**, 2690–2701. (doi:10.4319/lno.2006.51.6.2690)
55. Gao K *et al.* 2012 Rising CO<sub>2</sub> and increased light exposure synergistically reduce marine primary productivity. *Nat. Clim. Change* **2**, 519–523. (doi:10.1038/nclimate1507)
56. Valenzuela JJ, de Lomana LG, Lee A, Armbrust EV, Orellana MV, Baliga SN. 2018 Ocean acidification conditions increase resilience of marine diatoms. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 2328. (doi:10.1038/s41467-018-04742-3)
57. Shuter BJ. 1978 Size dependence of phosphorus and nitrogen subsistence quotas in unicellular microorganisms. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **23**, 1248–1255. (doi:10.4319/lno.1978.23.6.1248)
58. Aksnes DL, Egge JK. 1991 A theoretical model for nutrient uptake in phytoplankton. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **70**, 65–72. (doi:10.3354/meps070065)
59. Edwards KF, Thomas MK, Klausmeier CA, Litchman E. 2012 Allometric scaling and taxonomic variation in nutrient utilization traits and maximum growth rate of phytoplankton. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **57**, 554–566. (doi:10.4319/lno.2012.57.2.0554)
60. Hein M, Pedersen MF, Sand-Jensen K. 1995 Size-dependent nitrogen uptake in micro- and macroalgae. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **118**, 247–253. (doi:10.3354/meps118247)
61. Marañón E, Cermeño P, Rodríguez J, Zubkov MV, Harris RP. 2007 Scaling of phytoplankton photosynthesis and cell size in the ocean. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **52**, 2190–2198. (doi:10.4319/lno.2007.52.5.2190)
62. Cabré A, Shields D, Marinov I, Kostadinov TS. 2016 Phenology of size-partitioned phytoplankton carbon-biomass from ocean color remote sensing and CMIP5 models. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **3**, 39. (doi:10.3389/fmars.2016.00039)
63. Atkinson D, Ciotti BJ, Montagnes DJS. 2003 Protists decrease in size linearly with temperature: ca. 2.5% °C<sup>-1</sup>. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **270**, 2605–2611. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2003.2538)
64. Finkel ZV, Katz ME, Wright JD, Schofield OME, Falkowski PG. 2005 Climatically driven macroevolutionary patterns in the size of marine diatoms over the Cenozoic. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **102**, 8927–8932. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0409907102)
65. Peter KH, Sommer U. 2013 Phytoplankton cell size reduction in response to warming mediated by nutrient limitation. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e71528. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071528)
66. Marinov I, Doney SC, Lima ID. 2010 Response of ocean phytoplankton community structure to climate change over the 21st century: partitioning the effects of nutrients, temperature and light. *Biogeosciences* **7**, 3941–3959. (doi:10.5194/bg-7-3941-2010)
67. Wu Y, Campbell DA, Irwin AJ, Suggett DJ, Finkel ZV. 2014 Ocean acidification enhances the growth rate of larger diatoms. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **59**, 1027–1034. (doi:10.4319/lno.2014.59.3.1027)
68. Sommer U, Paul C, Moustaka-Gouni M. 2015 Warming and ocean acidification effects on phytoplankton: from species shifts to size shifts within species in a mesocosm experiment. *PLoS ONE* **10**, e0125239. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0125239)
69. Beardall J, Allen D, Bragg J, Finkel ZV, Flynn KJ, Quigg A, Rees TAV, Richardson A, Raven JA. 2009 Allometry and stoichiometry of unicellular, colonial and multicellular phytoplankton. *New Phytol.* **181**, 295–309. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2008.02660.x)
70. Raven JA. 1998 The twelfth Tansley Lecture. Small is beautiful: the picophytoplankton. *Funct. Ecol.* **12**, 503–513. (doi:10.1046/j.1365-2435.1998.00233.x)
71. Stolte W, Riegman R. 1995 Effect of phytoplankton cell size on transient-state nitrate and ammonium uptake kinetics. *Microbiology* **141**, 1221–1229. (doi:10.1099/13500872-141-5-1221)
72. Marañón E. 2015 Cell size as a key determinant of phytoplankton metabolism and community structure. *Annu. Rev. Mar. Sci.* **7**, 241–264. (doi:10.1146/annurev-marine-010814-015955)
73. Litchman E, Klausmeier CA, Yoshiyama K. 2009 Contrasting size evolution in marine and freshwater diatoms. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **106**, 2665–2670. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0810891106)
74. Knutson TR *et al.* 2010 Tropical cyclones and climate change. *Nat. Geosci.* **3**, 157–163. (doi:10.1038/ngeo779)
75. Landry MR, Brown SL, Rii YM, Selph KE, Bidigare RR, Yang EJ, Simmons MP. 2008 Depth-stratified phytoplankton dynamics in Cyclone Opal, a subtropical mesoscale eddy. *Deep Sea Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr.* **55**, 1348–1359. (doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.02.001)
76. Chen YLL, Chen HY, Jan S, Tuo SH. 2009 Phytoplankton productivity enhancement and assemblage change in the upstream Kuroshio after typhoons. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **385**, 111–126. (doi:10.3354/meps08053)
77. Von Dassow P, Petersen TW, Chepurinov VA, Virginia Armbrust EV. 2008 Inter- and intraspecific relationships between nuclear DNA content and cell size in selected members of the centric diatom genus *Thalassiosira* (Bacillariophyceae). *J. Phycol.* **44**, 335–349. (doi:10.1111/j.1529-8817.2008.00476.x)
78. Shuter BJ, Thomas JE, Taylor WD, Zimmerman AM. 1983 Phenotypic correlates of genomic DNA content in unicellular eukaryotes and other cells. *Am. Nat.* **122**, 26–44. (doi:10.1086/284116)
79. García-Fernández JM, de Marsac NT, Diez J. 2004 Streamlined regulation and gene loss as adaptive mechanisms in *Prochlorococcus* for optimized nitrogen utilization in oligotrophic environments. *Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev.* **68**, 630–638. (doi:10.1128/mmb.68.4.630-638.2004)
80. Litchman E, Edwards KF, Klausmeier CA, Thomas MK. 2012 Phytoplankton niches, traits and evolutionary responses to global environmental change. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **470**, 235–248. (doi:10.3354/meps09912)
81. Reusch TBH, Boyd PW. 2013 Experimental evolution meets marine phytoplankton. *Evolution* **67**, 1849–1859. (doi:10.1111/evo.12035)
82. Lohbeck KT, Riebesell U, Reusch TBH. 2012 Adaptive evolution of a key phytoplankton species to ocean acidification. *Nat. Geosci.* **5**, 346–351. (doi:10.1038/ngeo1441)
83. Schaum CE, Collins S. 2014 Plasticity predicts evolution in a marine alga. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **281**, 20141486. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.1486)
84. Tatters AO, Schnetzer A, Fu F, Lie AYA, Caron DA, Hutchins DA. 2013 Short- versus long-term responses to changing CO<sub>2</sub> in a coastal dinoflagellate bloom: implications for interspecific competitive interactions and community structure. *Evolution* **67**, 1879–1891. (doi:10.1111/evo.12029)
85. Crawford KJ, Raven JA, Wheeler GL, Baxter EJ, Joint I. 2011 The response of *Thalassiosira pseudonana* to long-term exposure to increased CO<sub>2</sub> and decreased pH. *PLoS ONE* **6**, e26695. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0026695)
86. Huertas IE, Rouco M, López-Rodas V, Costas E. 2011 Warming will affect phytoplankton differently: evidence through a mechanistic approach. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **278**, 3534–3543. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.0160)
87. Listmann L, LeRoch M, Schlüter L, Thomas MK, Reusch TBH. 2016 Swift thermal reaction norm evolution in a key marine phytoplankton species. *Evol. Appl.* **9**, 1156–1164. (doi:10.1111/eva.12362)
88. O'Donnell DR, Hamman CR, Johnson EC, Kremer CT, Klausmeier CA, Litchman E. 2018 Rapid thermal adaptation in a marine diatom reveals constraints and trade-offs. *Global Change Biol.* **24**, 4554–4565. (doi:10.1111/gcb.14360)
89. Collins S, Rost B, Rynearson TA. 2014 Evolutionary potential of marine phytoplankton under ocean acidification. *Evol. Appl.* **7**, 140–155. (doi:10.1111/eva.12120)
90. Jin P, Gao K, Beardall J. 2013 Evolutionary responses of a coccolithophorid *Gephyrocapsa oceanica* to ocean acidification. *Evolution* **67**, 1869–1878. (doi:10.1111/evo.12112)
91. Rynearson TA, Armbrust EV. 2004 Genetic differentiation among populations of the planktonic marine diatom *Ditylum brightwellii* (Bacillariophyceae). *J. Phycol.* **40**, 34–43. (doi:10.1046/j.1529-8817.2004.03089.x)
92. Alpermann TJ, Tillmann U, Beszteri B, Cembella AD, John U. 2010 Phenotypic variation and genotypic diversity in a planktonic population of the toxigenic marine dinoflagellate *Alexandrium tamarense* (Dinophyceae). *J. Phycol.* **46**, 18–32. (doi:10.1111/j.1529-8817.2009.00767.x)
93. Iglesias-Rodríguez MD, Schofield OM, Batley J, Medlin LK, Hayes PK. 2006 Intraspecific genetic diversity in the marine coccolithophore *Emiliania huxleyi* (Prymnesiophyceae): the use of microsatellite analysis in marine phytoplankton population studies. *J. Phycol.* **42**, 526–536. (doi:10.1111/j.1529-8817.2006.00231.x)

94. Nagai S, McCauley L, Yasuda N, Erdner DL, Kulis DM, Matsuyama Y, Itakura S, Anderson DM. 2006 Development of microsatellite markers in the toxic dinoflagellate *Alexandrium minutum* (Dinophyceae). *Mol. Ecol. Notes* **6**, 756–758. (doi:10.1111/j.1471-8286.2006.01331.x)
95. Brandenburg KM, Wohlrab S, John U, Kremp A, Jerney J, Krock B, Van de Waal DB. 2018 Intraspecific trait variation and trade-offs within and across populations of a toxic dinoflagellate. *Ecol. Lett.* **21**, 1561–1571. (doi:10.1111/ele.13138)
96. Brandenburg KM, Wohlrab S, John U, Kremp A, Jerney J, Krock B, Van de Waal DB. 2018 Data from: Intraspecific trait variation and trade-offs within and across populations of a toxic dinoflagellate. Dryad Digital Repository. (doi:10.5061/dryad.6502mg2).
97. Thomas MK, Aranguren-Gassis M, Kremer CT, Gould MR, Anderson K, Klausmeier CA, Litchman E. 2017 Temperature–nutrient interactions exacerbate sensitivity to warming in phytoplankton. *Global Change Biol.* **23**, 3269–3280. (doi:10.1111/gcb.13641)
98. Aranguren-Gassis M, Kremer CT, Klausmeier CA, Litchman E. 2019 Nitrogen limitation inhibits marine diatom adaptation to high temperatures. *Ecol. Lett.* **22**, 1860–1869. (doi:10.1111/ele.13378)