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Abstract

Spatial increases and temporal shifts in outbreaks of gelatinous plankton have been observed over the past several decades in many estuarine and coastal ecosystems. The effects of these blooms on marine ecosystem functioning, and particularly on the dynamics of the heterotrophic bacteria are still unclear. The response of the bacterial community from a Mediterranean coastal lagoon to the addition of dissolved organic matter (DOM) from the jellyfish *Aurelia aurita*, corresponding to an enrichment of dissolved organic carbon (DOC) by 1.4, was assessed during 22 days in microcosms (8 liters). The high bioavailability of this material led to (i) a rapid mineralization of the DOC and dissolved organic nitrogen from the jellyfish and (ii) the accumulation of high concentrations of ammonium and orthophosphate in the water column. DOM from jellyfish greatly stimulated heterotrophic prokaryotic production and respiration rates during the two first days, then these activities showed a continuous decay until reaching those measured in the control microcosms (lagoon water only) at the end of the experiment. Bacterial growth efficiency remained below 20%,
indicating that most of the DOM was respired and a minor part was channeled to biomass production. Changes in bacterial diversity were assessed by tag pyrosequencing of partial bacterial 16S rRNA genes, DNA fingerprints and a cultivation approach. While bacterial diversity in control microcosms showed little changes during the experiment, the addition of DOM from the jellyfish induced a rapid growth of *Pseudoalteromonas* and *Vibrio* species that were isolated. After 9 days, the bacterial community was dominated by *Bacteroidetes*, which appeared more adapted to metabolize high-molecular-weight DOM. At the end of the experiment, the bacterial community shifted towards a higher proportion of *Alphaproteobacteria*. Resilience of the bacterial community after the addition of DOM from the jellyfish was higher for metabolic functions than diversity, suggesting that jellyfish blooms can induce durable changes in the bacterial community structure in coastal lagoons.
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1. **Introduction**

Bacteria are key organisms in carbon cycling in aquatic ecosystems, acting as a sink (mineralization of dissolved organic carbon to CO$_2$) or as a link (production of biomass that can be transferred through the microbial food web) (Cotner and Biddanda 2002). The quality and the quantity of organic matter greatly influence bacterial metabolism and community structure (Azam and Malfatti 2007). The major autochthonous source of organic matter in the marine ecosystem comes from the phytoplankton, and a substantial part (10 to 50%) of primary production is channeled through bacteria (Cole et al. 1988). A number of field and experimental studies have indicated that DOM released during phytoplanktonic blooms was associated to important changes in the microbial community diversity and metabolic properties (e.g. McCarren 2010; Sarmento and Gasol 2012). Besides phytoplankton, DOM can be provided by jellyfish (used here to refer to medusa of the phylum Cnidarian and to members of the phylum Ctenophora) that can attain enormous biomasses in marine waters when the conditions are favorable (e.g. high nutrient concentrations) (Pitt et al. 2009, Purcell 2012).

The sudden appearance and disappearance of massive jellyfish blooms is one of the distinct features of this group (Condon et al. 2012). Top-down trophic control of jellyfish populations is low and jellyfish have been suggested as being a trophic “dead end” (Arai 2005).
Nonetheless, bacteria can recycle jellyfish biomass rapidly by different ways. Firstly, jellyfish release dissolved organic matter (DOM) by excretion and mucus production (Pitt et al. 2009). Secondly, during massive die-out events, jellyfish biomass sinks to the seafloor because dead animals have greater density than live animals (Yamamoto et al. 2008). The release rates of total organic carbon by dead jellyfish is significantly higher than that of living jellyfish (Pitt et al. 2009). Depending of the water depth, decomposition of dead jellyfish can occur in the water column or at the sediment surface. Rates of decomposition of both excretion and dead jellyfish biomass result in a large input of nutrients in the marine environment (Pitt et al. 2009; West et al. 2009; Tinta et al. 2010). Recent studies also reported a change in the bacterial structure in response to the use of organic matter from jellyfish for different coastal waters (Tinta et al. 2010; Condon et al. 2011; Tinta et al. 2012; Dinasquet et al. 2013).

Coastal lagoons are semi-enclosed systems occupying approximately 13% of the world's coastline with both marine and fluvial components (De Wit, 2011). The Mediterranean coast is bordered by a series of coastal lagoons with varying sizes, and some of them are associated with important economic activities (fisheries, aquaculture, tourism, recreation activities) (De Wit, 2011). Jellyfish blooms have been reported in these coastal lagoons and in particular were attributed to the scyphomedusa Aurelia aurita (Lo and Chen 2008; Lo et al. 2008; Bonnet et al. 2013). A. aurita is widespread in coastal and shelf sea environments around the world, predominantly inhabiting highly eutrophic waters where maximum abundance can reach 300 individuals m⁻³ (Lo and Chen 2008). Due to the shallow depth of coastal lagoons, dead jellyfish can accumulate rapidly down to the sediment leading to hypoxic and anoxic conditions in these environments (West et al. 2009).

In the present study, we investigated the response of a Mediterranean coastal lagoon bacterial community to the addition of fresh jellyfish biomass (as DOM) of A. aurita using a microcosm approach. Our objective was to follow the changes in nutrients, bacterial activities and bacterial community structure during the total degradation of DOM from A. aurita in order to determine the resilience of the bacterial community exposed to the disturbance caused by a jellyfish bloom. For our purposes, we measured simultaneously bacterial production and respiration to determine the bacterial growth efficiency. We also combined the use of 454-tag pyrosequencing and DNA fingerprinting based on 16S rRNA genes and culture approach to characterize the bacterial diversity in response to the DOM addition from the jellyfish. To complete previous studies on this topic, we employed longer incubation period (22 days) with four sampling points allowing relevant analyses on the succession of taxa concurrent to the degradation of jellyfish DOM. Moreover, by using an incubation, long
enough to reach the complete mineralization of DOC from the jellyfish, it was possible to
determine and then compare the resilience of bacterial functions and diversity after jellyfish
DOM addition.

2. Material and methods

Preparation of dissolved organic matter from A. aurita

*A. aurita* jellyfish used in this study were produced in aquarium using *Artemia salina* nauplii
as food (Lautan Production, Mèze, France). The jellyfish were less than 4 months old with a
diameter around 8 cm. Twelve organisms were crushed with a blender. The homogenate was
prefiltered onto 10-µm mesh (Nytex) and then filtered with a peristaltic pump onto 0.2-µm
capsule filter (Polycap TC, Whatman) (previously rinsed with 10% HCl and washed
thoroughly with Milli-Q water). The filtrate was recovered in a pre-combusted (450°C, 6 h)
glassware bottle before being dispensed in the microcosms (see below).

Preparation of the microcosms and sampling

Water samples were collected in October 2010 from the shoreline of a Mediterranean coastal
lagoon (Bages-Sigean, France, [42°36’21” N, 2°53’49” E]). The Bages-Sigean Lagoon covers
38 km² with a mean depth of 1.3 m and a maximal depth of 3 m. The catchment area covers
greater than 456 km² and is drained by three rivers flowing into the lagoon. Water samples
(salinity 33‰) were filtered sequentially by gravity onto 250, 100, 50 and 25 µm mesh
(Nytex) and then onto 1-µm filter capsule (Polycap TC, Whatman) to remove fine particles.

Six 10-L polycarbonate carboys (Nalgene) were filled with 8-L of the filtrated lagoon water.
Three carboys received the DOM from *A. aurita* (300 ml) and the three other were used as
controls. All the carboys were incubated in the dark at *in situ* temperature (18°C) under
magnetic agitation. The caps of the carboys were maintained open to avoid any oxygen
limitation. The microcosms were sampled 30 min after DOM addition (T0) and over 22 days
(T22). At the last sampling, more than 60% of the initial volume was present in the
microcosms.

Nutrients, dissolved organic carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus

Samples (60 ml) for nitrate (NO₃⁻), nitrite (NO₂⁻) and phosphate (PO₄³⁻) were stored at -20°C
and analyzed within 1 month of collection by colorimetry using a nutrient autoanalyzer
(SEAL Analytical AA3HR) (Aminot and Kérouel 2007). Samples (100 ml in duplicate) for
ammonium (NH₄⁺) were analyzed immediately according to Holmes (1999) with a fluorometer (Jasco). Samples (20 ml in duplicate) for dissolved organic carbon (DOC) were filtered through two pre-combusted (450°C, 6 h) 25-mm GF/F filters; the filtrate was transferred into precombusted glass tubes, poisoned with 85% H₃PO₄ (final pH=2), closed with Teflon lined screw caps and stored in the dark at room temperature until analysis. DOC was analyzed using the high temperature catalytic oxidation (HTCO) technique (Cauwet 1994) using a Shimadzu TOC-V analyzer. Prior to analyses and between each set of samples, an international certified reference sample for DOC concentration was analyzed to check the calibration of the analyzer and its stability over time.

Samples for dissolved organic nitrogen (DON) and phosphorus (DOP) were filtered through 2 pre-combusted (450°C, 6 h) 25-mm GF/F filters (Whatman). Samples were collected directly in Teflon bottles and immediately frozen (-20°C) until analysis. DON and DOP were simultaneously determined by the wet oxidation procedure (Pujo-Pay and Raimbault 1994). DON (±0.1 μM) and DOP (±0.02 μM) concentrations were determined by sample oxidation (30 min, 120°C) corrected for NH₄⁺, NO₃⁻+NO₂⁻ and PO₄³⁻ concentrations, respectively.

**CDOM fluorescence**

The fluorescence properties of colored dissolved organic matter (CDOM) were determined on samples filtered through 2 pre-combusted (450°C, 6 h) 25-mm GF/F filters (Whatman). Fluorescence was measured on a Perkin Elmer LS55 spectrofluorometer using a 1-cm quartz cuvette. Different excitation/emission couples were used to determine protein-like (275/340 nm) and humic-like (320/420 nm) compounds. Fluorescence intensity values were calibrated using the Raman scatter peak of Milli-Q water (Lawaetz and Stedmon 2009).

**Virus count**

Samples (2 ml) were fixed with 0.02 μm filtered formaldehyde (0.5% final concentration) and stored at -80°C after flash freezing in liquid nitrogen. Samples were filtered onto 0.02-μm filters (Anodisc, 25 mm diameter; Whatman) and virus-like particles (VLP) were stained on the filters using SYBR-Green I and enumerated under a Zeiss Axiophot microscope equipped for epifluorescence microscopy as previously described (Noble and Fuhrman 1998). At least 400 VLP were counted per filter in several randomly selected microscopic fields.

**Heterotrophic prokaryotes abundance, production and respiration**

Heterotrophic prokaryotic (including Bacteria and Archaea) abundance (HPA) was determined by flow cytometry. Duplicate 3 ml samples in cryovials were preserved with 0.2
µm filtered formalin (2% final concentration). The samples were gently mixed and left in the dark at room temperature for 10 min before quick-freezing in liquid nitrogen and storing at -80°C. The samples were later thawed at room temperature, stained with SYBR Green I (final concentration 0.025% (v/v) of the commercial solution; Molecular Probes Inc., OR) for at least 15 min at 20°C in the dark and analyzed on a flow cytometer (FACScan, Becton Dickinson, San Jose, CA) equipped with a 488 nm, 15 mW argon laser. HP cells were detected on a plot of green fluorescence (515-545 nm) versus right angle light scatter (SSC), using the green fluorescence as threshold parameter. Fluorescent beads (1.0 µm; Polysciences Inc., Warrington, PA) were added to each sample analyzed to normalize SSC and green fluorescence. HP growth rate (µ, d⁻¹) was calculated from the following equation 

\[ \mu = \frac{(\ln HPT_2 - \ln HPT_1)}{(T_2 - T_1)} \].

Generation time (g, h⁻¹) was determined as 

\[ g = \frac{(\ln(2) \times 24)}{\mu} \].

Heterotrophic prokaryotic production (HPP) was measured by ³H-thymidine incorporation applying the centrifugation method (Smith and Azam 1992). Samples (1 ml in triplicate) were incubated in the dark at 18°C for 1 h with 20 nM [³H]-thymidine (specific activity 83.2 Ci mmole⁻¹, Perkin Elmer) in 2 ml microtubes. Incorporations were terminated by the addition of trichloroacetic acid (TCA) to a final concentration of 5%. One killed control was prepared for each assay by the addition of TCA 15 min before the addition of ³H-thymidine. Samples were stored for at least 1 h at 4°C and then centrifuged for 15 min at 12,000 g. The precipitate was rinsed twice with 5% TCA. The precipitates were resuspended in 1.0 ml of liquid scintillation cocktail (FilterCount, Perkin Elmer) and radioactivity determined by liquid scintillation counter (LS 5000CE Beckman). Thymidine incorporation rates were converted into carbon production using the conversion factors of 2.10¹⁸ cells produced by mole of thymidine incorporated and 20 fg C by cell (Ducklow and Carlson 1992).

Heterotrophic prokaryotic respiration (HPR) was measured at each time point using an oxygen microelectrode (Briand et al. 2004). The microprobes (Unisense, Denmark) are designed with an exterior guard cathode, which results in extremely low oxygen consumption by the electrodes (4.7–47 × 10⁻⁷ µmol O₂ h⁻¹). Probes have a response time shorter than 1 s and a precision of 0.05%. The HPR was measured over 4 h to 24 h in duplicate samples for each microcosm, placed in microchambers (2 ml) and immerged in a water bath with controlled temperature (18°C). A specific measurement of the dissolved O₂ concentration was carried out with a minimum of 4 times during incubation in microchambers. HPR was deduced from the linear regression established on these points of measurement. HPR were expressed in mgC m⁻³ d⁻¹ using a respiratory quotient of 1 (del Giorgio and Cole 1998). We assume here that most of the respiration measured came from heterotrophic prokaryotes.
because the water was filtered on 1-µm at the start of the experiment. However, we cannot exclude the growth of protozoa then after, leading to an overestimation of HPR. Bacterial growth efficiency (BGE, %) was calculated from the following equation $\text{BGE} = \frac{\text{HPP}}{\text{HPP} + \text{HPR}}$.

**Bacterial DNA extraction**

Samples (500 ml) at T0, T2, T9 and T22 were filtered onto a 0.2 µm Sterivex filter (Durapore, Millipore) and stored at -80°C. For analysis, 840 ml of alkaline lysis buffer (50 mM Tris hydrochloride pH 8.3, 40 mM EDTA and 0.75 M sucrose) was added in the Sterivex. Cell lysis was accomplished by an initial incubation for 45 min at 37°C after adding 50 ml of freshly prepared lysozyme solution (20 mg ml$^{-1}$), and a second incubation at 55°C for 1 h after adding 100 ml of 10% sodium dodecyl sulfate and 10 ml of proteinase K (20 mg ml$^{-1}$). Six hundred ml of lysate was treated with 10 µl of a 100 mg ml$^{-1}$ RNase A solution (Qiagen) before DNA extraction with the All Prep DNA/RNA mini (Qiagen) according to the manufacturer’s instructions.

**Analysis of bacterial community structure by capillary electrophoresis SSCP-based single strand conformational polymorphism (CE-SSCP) analysis**

CE-SSCP fingerprinting was performed (i) to follow the changes in total bacterial community structure and (ii) to check the reproducibility between replicate microcosms. DNA was used as a template for PCR amplification of the variable V3 region of the 16S rDNA (*Escherichia coli* positions 329-533), as previously described (Ghiglione et al. 2005). CE-SSCP was performed using the ABI 310 Genetic Analyzer (Applied Biosystems), equipped with a capillary tube (47 cm × 50 mm) filled with a polymer mix composed of 5.6% GeneScan polymer (Applied Biosystems), 10% glycerol and 1× buffer with EDTA (Applied Biosystems). The similarity of the CE-SSCP profiles was assessed using the software SAFUM (Zemb et al. 2007), which normalized the total area of the profiles and mobilities between different runs using an internal standard. SAFUM renders a profile of fluorescence intensity as a function of retention time per sample, thus taking into account the presence and intensity of each individual signal. Ordination of Bray-Curtis similarities among normalized sample profiles was calculated using PRIMER 5 software (PRIMER-E, Ltd., UK).

**Analysis of bacterial diversity and community structure by pyrosequencing**

Bacterial tag-encoded FLX amplicon pyrosequencing (bTEFAP) was performed using the universal bacterial primers guidelines targeting the V1 to V3 hypervariable regions of the
bacterial 16S rRNA gene: 27Fmod (5′-AGRGGTTTGATCMTGGCTCAG-3′) and 519r (5′-GWATTACCGCGGCKGCTG-3) as described previously (Dowd and al. 2008). Initial generation of the sequencing library was accomplished by a one-step PCR with a total of 30 cycles using the HotStarTaq Plus Master Mix Kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA) and amplicons originating and extending from the 27Fmod primer. Tag-encoded FLX amplicon pyrosequencing analyses were completed using the Roche 454 FLX instrument with Titanium reagents, and procedures were performed at MR DNA (Shallowater, TX, USA) following manufacturer’s guidelines.

Sequences were processed and analyzed using the Mothur software version 1.33 (Schloss et al. 2009) with default settings excluding sequences <200bp. Sequences were denoised using the Mothur implementation of PyroNoise and SeqNoise. Chimeras were removed using Chimera Slayer (Haas et al. 2011). The resulting clean sequences were clustered using operational taxonomic units (OTUs) at a 97% sequence identity level using the UCLUST algorithm (Edgar 2010) and a representative sequence from each OTU was classified using the Ribosomal Database Project (RDP) classifier (Wang et al. 2007) using the SILVA training set. Taxonomic identification of the sequence reads (tags) followed the approach by Sogin et al. (2006) and Huse et al. (2010). All samples were clustered into operational taxonomic unit (OTU) at a distance of 0.03 (Ghiglione and Murray 2012). All OTU and diversity analyses were performed on the randomly re-sampled datasets using Mothur.

**Culturable bacterial counts, isolation and 16S rRNA gene sequencing**

Culturable heterotrophic aerobic marine bacteria were enumerated during the experiment at T0, T2, T9 and T22 by plating 100 µl of diluted (in sterile seawater) or undiluted samples on marine agar 2216 (MA, Difco, Detroit, Mich.). Cycloheximide (100 mg/L) was added to the media to inhibit fungal growth. All culture were incubated at 25°C in the dark during two weeks before counting the colony forming units (CFU).

The identification of the most representative culturable strains was performed for one of the replicate for each condition after two days of incubation. The colonies were categorized using morphologic characteristics. All the different morphotypes (colony morphology) were picked for two successive sub-culturing steps on MA to ensure purification. One colony of each isolate was then grown in marine broth media (MB, Difco, Detroit, Mich.) during 48h at 25°C under agitation (100 rpm). Each culture was cryopreserved in 5% dimethylsulfoxide or 35% glycerol at -80°C. For genomic DNA extraction, 2 ml of each liquid culture were spun down (10,000 x g, 3 min). DNA extraction, PCR and sequencing were done as previously described.
Partial 16S rRNA gene sequences were trimmed manually, double checked and dereplicated using the package Staden-GAP4 (Staden et al. 2003). For bacterial strain identification, each FASTA file was uploaded in Ez Taxon-e (Kim et al. 2012) and compared with the cultured bacterial strain database using BLAST (Basic Local Alignment Search Tool). Sequences were deposited in Genbank (NCBI) under the following numbers: MOLA851-858 and MOLA865-880 from enriched microcosms and MOLA859-864 and MOLA881-887 from control microcosms.

**Statistical analyses**

Statistical analysis of the effects of treatment on chemical and biological parameters was performed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and post-hoc Tukey tests with repeated measures (i.e. microcosms) and assuming homoscedasticity and normality of the data. Statistical significance was set at $p = 0.05$ and analysis was computed using XLSTAT 2014.2 software (Addinsoft).

Bacterial community structures, either as number and area of the peaks in the CE-SSCP profiles or presence and abundance of OTU in the pyrosequencing data, were compared using ordination of Bray–Curtis similarities and used to build dendrograms by the unweighted-pair group method with arithmetic averages (UPGMA). A similarity profile test (SIMPROF, PRIMER 6) was performed on a null hypothesis that a specific sub-cluster can be recreated by permuting the entry species and samples. The significant branch (SIMPROF, $p < 0.05$) was used as a prerequisite for defining bacterial clusters.

The extent of the correlation of bacterial diversity analyzed by pyrosequencing for both conditions with the chemical parameters and the viral abundance was assessed by canonical correspondence analysis (CCA). CCA was performed with MVSP v3.12d software (Kovach Computing Service, Anglesey Wales). Relative abundances of OTUs were transformed with arcsin ($\sqrt[0.5]{x}$) to normalize the distribution of the data as suggested by Legendre and Legendre (1998).

### 3. Results

**Degradation kinetics of jellyfish dissolved organic matter**

The water in the control microcosms (i.e. lagoon water without any addition) was characterized by a high concentration of dissolved organic carbon (DOC, 573 µM), nitrogen (DON, 50 µM) and phosphorus (DOP, 0.7 µM), underlying the eutrophic status of this
ecosystem (Fig. 1a,b,c). Addition of dissolved organic matter (DOM) from *A. aurita* provided 252 µM DOC, 85 µM DON and 3 µM DOP, increasing significantly (ANOVA, p<0.05) their initial concentrations by 1.4, 2.5 and 5.8 times, respectively, compared to the control microcosms. The C:N ratio of the DOM was significantly (ANOVA, p<0.05) lower in the enriched microcosms (6:1) compared to the control microcosms (12:1) due to the high protein content of the jellyfish.

The DOC from the jellyfish was consumed at a high rate during the first four days of incubation (57 µM d⁻¹) and then at a lower rate (5.6 µM d⁻¹) (Fig. 1a). In contrast, the DOC in the control microcosms was consumed at a constant and low rate (4 µM d⁻¹) during the entire incubation. At the end of experiment, the same concentration of DOC (500 µM) was noted in the control and the enriched microcosms (ANOVA, p>0.05). The DON and the DOP concentrations were measured less frequently in the microcosms (Fig. 1b,c). The DON concentration decreased by 67 µM during the nine first days and then remained almost constant in the enriched microcosms. In contrast the DOP concentration increased during the first two days and then decreased during the rest of the incubation. For both DON and DOP, we did not observe significant changes in the control microcosms (ANOVA, p>0.05). At the end of the experiment, 86% of the jellyfish-derived DON and 57% of the jellyfish-derived DOP were degraded. The C:N ratio of the DOM in the control was close to the enriched microcosms by the end of the experiment (10:1 and 9:1, respectively).

The initial concentrations of NO₃⁺NO₂⁻ (5.5 µM), NH₄⁺ (6 µM) and PO₄ (0.5 µM) in the control microcosms were low and remained stable during the experiment time (Fig. 1d,e,f). The addition of jellyfish biomass led to an enrichment factor by 1.7, 1.0, and 11 for NO₃⁺NO₂⁻, NH₄⁺ and PO₄, respectively. NO₃⁺NO₂⁻ concentrations remained stable in enriched microcosms, with the exception of an increase (+ 4 µM) at the end of the experiment (Fig. 1d). This increase was only due to changes in NO₂⁻ concentration (data not shown). We observed a continuous increase of NH₄ up to 100 µM at T9, followed by a plateau (Fig. 1e). PO₄ concentrations (Fig. 1f) evolved in an opposite way to the DOP concentrations in the enriched microcosms: after a decrease during the first two days, the concentration increased during the rest of the incubation mainly between the days 2 and 9.

Protein-like and humic-like components of DOM were characterized by their fluorescence properties (Fig. 2). Protein-like components measured in the control microcosms remained constant during the experiment (Fig. 2a). In contrast, the protein-like components in the enriched microcosms showed a rapid decrease during the first nine days until reaching the value measured in the control microcosms at the end of the experiment. The concentration of
humic-like components (Fig. 2b) was identical in both conditions, remaining almost constant during the experiment. However, we noticed a slight but significantly (ANOVA, p<0.05) higher concentration of humic-like components in enriched conditions compared to the controls after 15 and 22 days.

**Effect of jellyfish DOM addition on viral abundance, bacterial abundance and metabolism**

Virus abundance remained almost constant during the entire period of the experiment in both controls and enriched microcosms (Fig. S1). A small but significant difference was observed between the two conditions at T2 and T4, with higher virus abundance in microcosms enriched with DOM from *A. aurita* (ANOVA, p<0.05).

During the three first days, we measured a rapid bacterial growth without lag time after the DOM addition from *A. aurita* (Fig. 3a). The bacterial growth rates calculated on the basis of bacterial abundance between T0 and T3 were 1.44 d\(^{-1}\) and 0.48 d\(^{-1}\) in the enriched and the control conditions, respectively. A sharp decrease in bacterial abundance occurred at T4 in the enriched microcosms, leading to a value identical to the control condition. Then, the bacterial abundance remained almost constant for the rest of the experiment. A rapid increase in bacterial production (BP) and bacterial respiration (BR) was also observed in the enriched condition during the first days (Fig. 3b,c). After 3 days, both activities slowly decreased at a constant and similar rate during the rest of the experiment. After 22 days, the BP and BR were not significantly different between the control and the enriched microcosms (ANOVA, p>0.05).

Bacterial growth efficiency (BGE) calculated on the basis of bacterial production and respiration was quite low at the start of the experiment (<1%) (Fig. 3d). During the first 9 days, the BGE increased up to 17% in the microcosms enriched with DOM from *A. aurita*. The BGE measured in the control microcosms remained lower than the enriched microcosms until day 15, when both conditions presented the same mean value (13%).

**Changes in culturable heterotrophic bacteria counts and diversity**

At the start of the experiment, culturable bacteria represented only a small part of the total bacteria (0.25%) (Fig. 4). After two days of incubation, culturable bacteria accounted for 65% of total bacteria in enriched microcosms, compared to 3% in the control microcosms. The bacterial growth rate calculated on the basis of culturable bacteria counts during this period was 4.8 d\(^{-1}\) in the enriched condition compared to 1.92 d\(^{-1}\) in the controls. After 9 days, there was a significant difference in the culturable bacteria fraction between the two conditions (2%
and 12%, for control and enriched microcosms, respectively) (ANOVA, p<0.05). At the end of the experiment, the culturable bacteria fraction accounted for the same percentage (~10%) in both control and enriched microcosms.

Most of the culturable strains isolated after 2 days from an enriched microcosm, belonged to the Pseudoalteromonas and Vibrio genera (class of Gammaproteobacteria) (Table 1). After 22 days, a clear shift in culturable diversity was observed in this microcosm, with the dominance of Flavobacteriaceae (phylum of Bacteroidetes) and Rhodobacteraceae (class of Alphaproteobacteria). Even if the number of bacterial strains isolated from the control microcosm was less important than for enriched microcosm (6 versus 18), the diversity seemed to be more stable during the experiment with a majority of Rhodobacteraceae.

Changes in bacterial community structure induced by Aurelia-derived DOM

A similarity dendrogram based on CE-SSCP data showed a clear separation of the bacterial community diversity into four distinct clusters (Fig. 5a). With the exception of the microcosm C2 which presented outliers at T0 and T2, cluster I included the community profiles from control and enriched microcosms at T0, and cluster II grouped together the control microcosms at T2, T9 and T22. The later time points for the enriched microcosm clustered apart from the two clusters into two subclusters comprised of time point T2 (III) and T9, T22 respectively (IV). The bacterial community structure observed in the control microcosms remained closer to the initial bacterial structure than to the enriched microcosms. With the exception of microcosm C2, the replicate microcosms grouped together for a specific condition and time, indicating that the diversity changes observed between conditions or over the time are robust.

To analyze in more detail the composition of the bacterial community, pyrosequencing was performed on one replicate microcosm for each condition at different sampling times (Fig. 5a in bold). A total of 76,027 partial 16S rRNA gene sequences remained after quality controls, yielding on average 9,503 reads per sample (5,080 - 11,600). The number of sequences was normalized to 5,080 per sample (i.e., the lowest number of sequences obtained for a sample). The total of unique OTUs was 2,800 in the whole dataset (at 97% similarity). The rarefaction curves for all samples did not reach a plateau (Fig. S1). Hence, our sequencing effort did not cover completely the bacterial diversity. However, the shape of the rarefaction curves was similar for all samples allowing the comparison of these samples. The taxonomic richness based on the Chao1 index was slightly lower in the enriched microcosm at T0 and T2 compared to the control microcosm, and higher at T9 and T22 (Table 2). The diversity based
on the inverse Simpson index \((1/ \lambda)\) ranged from 3.6 to 35.2. The diversity was higher in the enriched condition at T0 compared to the control condition then lower at T2 and T9, and similar at T22. Both conditions showed a transient decrease in diversity at T9 (Table 2).

A dendrogram based on Bray-Curtis similarities using the total number of OTUs was similar to that observed with the DNA fingerprint approach (Fig. 5b). The samples at T0 (with or without the addition of DOM from \(A. \, au\text{r}i\)ta) grouped more closely with the samples from the control microcosms at T2, T9 and T22. No significant difference (SIMPROF test, \(p >0.05\)) was observed between the samples in the control microcosms at T0 and T9. In contrast, a rapid shift in diversity was observed in the enriched microcosm at T2 (85% dissimilarity). After T9, the diversity tended to stabilize in this microcosm and no significant difference was observed in the bacterial structure at T22 (SIMPROF test, \(p >0.05\)).

The community composition at the phylum level and proteobacterial subclasses varied between treatments and with time (Fig. 6). The changes in abundances described below refer to relative abundances of the sequences and do not refer to absolute abundances of the different bacterial groups. At T0, the enriched microcosm was characterized by a higher proportion of \(\text{Actinobacteria}\) (49% versus 19% in the control microcosm) and by a lower proportion of \(\text{Alphaproteobacteria}\) (16% versus 49% in the control microcosm). The control microcosm showed continuous changes over the experiment. At the end of the experiment, \(\text{Alphaproteobacteria}\) remained the most abundant taxon (67%), whereas the \(\text{Actinobacteria}\) and \(\text{Bacteroidetes}\) tended to decrease (1.4% and 12%, respectively). \(\text{Gammaproteobacteria}\) showed a transient increase at T9 (24%) to reach the initial percentage at the end of the experiment (8%). The bacterial community in the enriched microcosm was characterized by a high proportion of \(\text{Gammaproteobacteria}\) (65%) at T2, followed by a dominance of \(\text{Bacteroidetes}\) (77%) at T9. Finally, at T22, the \(\text{Bacteroidetes}\) decreased (46%) in favor of \(\text{Alphaproteobacteria}\) (36%) and \(\text{Plantomycetes}\) (5%).

Figure 7 shows the taxonomy information for the most abundant OTUs (i.e., present at a percentage higher than 1% in a specific sample). These 71 OTUs represented only 2.5% of the total number of OTUs, however their cumulative abundances represented between 52% and 88% of all the OTUs present in a specific sample. The majority of the \(\text{Alphaproteobacteria}\) sequences in the control microcosm were assigned to SAR11 throughout the experiment. \(\text{Actinobacteria}\) present in both the control and the enriched microcosms at T0 belonged to \(\text{Microbacteriaceae}\). The bloom of \(\text{Gammaproteobacteria}\) at T2 was affiliated to \(\text{Pseudoalteromonas}\) and \(\text{Vibrio}\) species, and the \(\text{Bacteroidetes}\) at T9 were mainly composed of
Flavobacteriaceae. At the end of the experiment, the Alphaproteobacteria were dominated by Roseobacter clade bacteria (RCB) in the enriched microcosms.

In order to determine what factors were potentially controlling bacterial community composition, we applied a canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) to the data for both conditions (Fig. 8) using the distribution of the dominant OTUs (relative abundance >1%) determined by pyrosequencing. The variance explained by the two first axes represented almost 50 % (26.6% and 21.9% for axis 1 and 2, respectively). The first group comprising all the samples from the control condition and the sample at T0 from the enriched condition was related to none of chemical parameters or viral abundance. The sample at T2 from the enriched condition was isolated from the other clusters and dominated by the OTUs 0008 and 0014 (Pseudoalteromonas) and by the OTUs 0017 and 0027 (Vibrio). This group was positively structured by DOM and CDOM protein-like components. The third group including the samples at T9 and T22 from the enriched condition was dominated by the OTUs 0002, 0011 and 0021 belonging to the Flavobacteriaceae family and OTU0010 belonging to the Roseobacter genus. This cluster was positively related to inorganic nutrients, CDOM humic-like components and viral abundance.

4. Discussion

Processing of organic matter from the jellyfish and consequences for the system

If we estimate an average wet weight of 13 g per jellyfish (Lo and Chen, 2008) and apply the relationship between the wet weight and the organic carbon content determined by Schneider (1988) for A. aurita, the enrichment in DOM corresponded to the addition of the total biomass from one jellyfish in 11 L (i.e., 91 individuals m\(^{-3}\)). This value can be considered as high but not unrealistic (Lo and Chen 2008). After 22 days of incubation, the same DOC concentration was observed in the enriched and control microcosms suggesting that the bacterial community has degraded the entire DOC from A. aurita. This result highlights the high bioavailability of the DOM from A. aurita jellyfish as already reported by Tinta et al. (2012) and Purcell (2012). The excess of organic and inorganic nitrogen and phosphorus in the enriched microcosms at the end of the experiment suggests that the decrease of bacterial activities were mainly due to limitation by bioavailable carbon. In these conditions, the excess of DON and DOP after degradation of jellyfish DOM can persist in the system until a new pulse of labile organic carbon. The release of nutrients during the decomposition of organic matter from the
jellyfish observed in this study and others (e.g., West et al. 2009; Tinta et al. 2010; 2012) might stimulate primary production. However, high concentrations of ammonium, associated to unionized ammonia (NH$_3$), can be also inhibitory or toxic for some phytoplankton, amphipods, crustacean and fish species (Ferreti and Calesso 2011; Collos and Harrison 2012). The fact that only 14% DOC was degraded over 22 days in the control microcosm indicates that the bulk of DOC in coastal lagoons is refractory. The priming effect is a process well demonstrated in the case of soils that enhances the microbial decomposition of preexisting refractory organic matter upon addition of labile organic matter (Kuzyakov et al. 2000). During the decline of the bloom, jellyfish biomass can constitute a large reservoir of labile organic matter at the disposal of bacteria that can enhance the priming effect. Nevertheless, there was no evidence that DOM from the jellyfish helped for biodegradation of refractory DOM from the coastal lagoon (i.e., the final DOC and humic-like components concentrations in the enriched treatment were similar and higher, respectively, compared to the control treatment), suggesting that the priming effect did not occur under these experimental conditions. Recent studies on the priming effect in aquatic ecosystems gave contrasting results underlying the need for further studies on this process (Fonte et al. 2013; Bengtsson et al. 2014; Guenet et al. 2014).

In our study, DOM from A. aurita increased the BGE relative to the control condition after 4 days of incubation. In contrast, Condon et al. (2011) observed that the rapid increase of bacterial metabolism in response to the addition of DOM released by a jellyfish was accompanied by a significant decline of BGE by 10% to 15% compared to the control treatment. Dinasquet et al. (2013) observed a similar BGE (30-40%) for bacterial communities exposed or not to DOM from the ctenophore Mnemiopsis leidyi. These contrasting observations may result from differences in experimental setup and bacterial communities composition in these studies. Even if the BGE was stimulated with the presence of DOM from Aurelia in our study, its value remained relatively low (<20%) indicating that organic carbon was mainly shunted toward bacterial respiration rather than creation of new biomass. According to Condon et al. (2011), the low value of BGE induced by labile DOM from jellyfish could be explained by an inadequate organic C:N and C:P stoichiometry resulting in nongrowth energy dissipation (i.e., overflow metabolism). It must be underlined that for all these studies, the true value of the BGE remains questionable due to uncertainties in the different conversion factors used for its calculation, including the conversion factor for converting $^3$H-thymidine uptake into bacterial carbon production (Kirschner et al. 2004) and the respiratory quotient that may change with substrate quality (Berggren et al. 2012).
Proteins which were identified as the major constituent of jellyfish are characterized by a RQ of 0.8. By lowering the value of RQ for jellyfish condition to 0.8, BGE was increased by 21% in average (range: 19.5%-24.4%). However, this modification did not change the general shape of the curve and the comparison with the control condition (data not shown). Moreover, the calculation of BGE is complicated because HPP and HPR were measured at different time scales: while the time of incubation of HPP was short (i.e., 1h), HPR required sometimes 24h of incubation. According to del Giorgio et al. (2011), this methodological aspect in activities measurements can introduce a bias for the BGE determination.

**Dynamics of bacterial community structure during the degradation of DOM from A. aurita**

Interpretation of diversity changes during incubation in microcosms is always questionable due to a potential bottle effect (Massana et al. 2001). The bottle effect may have occurred in our experiment, as observed by the changes in the culturable bacteria fraction in the control microcosms (0.2% at T0 and 10% at T22). However, diversity as measured by pyrosequencing and DNA fingerprinting indicated that the bacterial community structure in the control microcosms did not change as drastically as in the enriched microcosms. In addition, HPP and HPR did not show significant changes over time (ANOVA test, p>0.05) in the control incubation. Both observations suggest that even if bottle effect cannot be ruled out, consequences on diversity and functions were minor compared to the changes caused by the increase of DOM. The differences in the bacterial community structure at T0 revealed by pyrosequencing between the control and enriched microcosms may be explained by the introduction of bacteria in the microcosms with the DOM from *Aurelia*, even if the DOM was previously filtered on 0.2 µm. The high percentage of *Actinobacteria* found in these microcosms might be facilitated by the very small size of these bacteria allowing them to escape the filtration (Ghai et al., 2013).

The pyrosequencing and the DNA fingerprint data demonstrate the rapid and profound effect of DOM addition from *Aurelia* on the bacterial diversity changes that persisted until the end of the experiment. Our results confirm the major role played by *Gammaproteobacteria* during the first steps of DOM degradation from jellyfish as observed in other studies (Condon et al. 2011, Tinta et al. 2012, Dinasquet et al. 2013). Surprisingly, the *Pseudoalteromonas* and *Vibrio* species blooming in the enriched microcosms in the first days were not found in the ~5,000 sequences identified for each sample at the start of the experiment, suggesting that they belong to the rare biosphere (i.e., less than 0.1%) (Pedrós-Alió 2012). If we hypothesize that these species represent less than 0.02% (1 sequence on 5,000) of the $2.10^6$ bacteria/ml
present at the start of the experiment, the theoretical bacterial growth rate for these bacteria during the three first days would be 4.32 d\(^{-1}\) (generation time = 3.8 h) to reach the concentration of 9.10\(^7\) bacteria/ml measured in the enriched microcosms after 3 days. This bacterial growth rate is not unrealistic and is comparable to the value calculated on the basis of the culturable count. Tinta et al. (2012) also observed that culturable bacteria isolated during the degradation of organic matter coming from different jellyfish in Adriatic Sea belonged to *Gammaproteobacteria* with a dominance of strains affiliated to *Vibrionaceae* and *Pseudoalteromonadaceae*. *Vibrio* and *Pseudoalteromonas* species can rapidly outcompete other bacterial species in a context of high concentration of organic matter due to greater metabolic versatility and the presence of multiple copies of rRNA genes (Williams et al. 2011). Changes in bacterial composition may not result only from competition for organic matter, but also from sensitivity of bacterial species for antagonistic compounds. For instance, Titelman et al. (2006) reported that extracts from the scyphomedusa *Periphylla periphylla* can inhibit some bacterial species, including *Actinobacteria*. An antimicrobial peptide, aurelin, exhibiting activity against Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria has been also isolated from *A. aurita* (Ovchinnikova et al. 2006). Overall, the diversity index as revealed by pyrosequencing (Table 2) remained unchanged in enriched microcosms at T2. In contrast, Tinta et al. (2012) observed a reduction in the diversity of the bacterial community during the biodegradation of *A. aurita*. This difference could be explained by the lower number of 16S rRNA clone library sequences analysed in the study of Tinta et al. (2012).

Different reasons can be evoked to explain the sudden decrease in bacterial concentration in the enriched microcosms between T3 and T4 (94% less bacteria in one day). Viral infection can induce rapid changes in bacterial abundance in aquatic environments (Berdjeb et al. 2011). However, lytic infection is associated with the release of viruses in the environment. We did not observe significant changes in viral abundance during this period, suggesting that viruses were certainly not the main factor to explain the loss of bacteria observed. Protozoan grazing can be also a cause of bacterial abundance regulation. Most of the heterotrophic nanoflagellates (HNFs) were excluded at the start of the experiment by filtering the water on 1 \(\mu\)m but we cannot exclude the possibility that some smaller HNFs passed through the filter and then proliferated during the experiment. Unfortunately, we did not measure HNF abundance in our experiment to confirm this hypothesis. Even if the role of HNFs cannot be excluded, the bacterial loss rate measured during this period (3.4 \(10^6\) bacteria/ml.h) seems particularly high (i.e., two orders of magnitude higher than grazing rates values reported in the sea [Jürgens and Massana 2008]); thus grazing by HNF was certainly not the only
explanation for the decreasing of bacterial cell numbers. An additional and not exclusive hypothesis, concerns the autolysis of bacteria after cessation of growth.

After the use of the most bioavailable DOM by *Gammaproteobacteria*, the bacterial community shifted towards a dominance of *Bacteroidetes* at T9. These bacteria are specialized in degrading polymeric organic matter compounds, including proteins (Fernández-Gómez et al. 2012). Interestingly, high proportion of *Bacteroidetes* have been reported in a Norwegian fjord where persistent high jellyfish biomass is observed (Riemann et al. 2006) and in association with the ctenophore *Mnemiopsis leidy* (water, tissue and gut) (Dinasquet et al. 2012). In our experiment, structural components of bacterial cells including membranes and peptidoglycan were certainly released in the microcosms during the bacterial decay of *Gammaproteobacteria* whatever the reason (protozoan grazing, viral infection or autolysis) (Nagata et al. 2003). *Bacteroidetes* have the capacities to recycle efficiently this material (Pinhassi et al. 1999; Cottrell and Kirchman 2000). Finally, we cannot exclude also the possibility that *Bacteroidetes* were favoured due to a negative selection by bacterivorous protists or viruses (Berdjeb et al. 2011). At the end of the experiment, there was an emergence of *Planctomycetes* (5% at T22). In aerobic environments, members of *Planctomycetes*, including the genera *Planctomyces* and *Rhodopirellula* identified in our study, have been reported to degrade complex organic matter into simpler compounds (Pizzetti et al. 2011).

**Resilience of bacterial communities**

Massive jellyfish blooms can be considered as a disturbance for the aquatic ecosystem. Stability is the general capacity of a community to return to equilibrium after perturbation, and includes components of resistance, recovery and resilience (Pimm 1984). Resistance is a community’s ability to remain unchanged when challenged with disturbance. Recovery is a community’s ability to return to its pre-disturbance composition or function, and resilience is the rate at which this return occurs (Shade et al. 2011). These different ecological concepts can be applied for a bacterial community exposed suddenly to the organic matter from jellyfish. Our results and others (Condon et al. 2011; Tinta et al. 2012; Dinasquet et al. 2013) showed that the resistance of bacteria is low, with rapid changes occurring in functions and structure when organic matter from a jellyfish is added (exudate or dead biomass). The determination of the recovery and the resilience needs experimental approaches sufficiently long to analyze these concepts. Most of the different studies previously performed on jellyfish biodegradation have used short-term incubations (<9 days) and ended before the complete degradation of organic carbon (dissolved or particulate) from the jellyfish (e.g., Condon et al.
2011; Tinta et al. 2012). In our study, it was possible to follow the complete degradation of DOC during the 22 days of incubation. Over this incubation we observed the recovery of the bacterial activities (production, respiration) but not for the bacterial structure (as measured by the Bray-Curtis distance), suggesting that resilience was higher for functions than for diversity. Consequently, jellyfish blooms can induce durable changes in chemistry (release of NH₄, DON and DOP) but also in the bacterial community structure of coastal lagoons. Future investigations on jellyfish blooms might be conducted in larger experimental systems (i.e., mesocosms) to measure at longer time scale these effects on different trophic levels by including both pelagic and benthic systems. This more realistic approach will also permit to explore the role of particle-attached bacteria in the jellyfish degradation, which was not considered in this study.
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Table 1. List of 16S rRNA sequences of bacterial colonies isolated in the control and enriched microcosms after 2 and 22 days of incubation with high similarity (>97%) to sequences previously reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment, time incubation</th>
<th>Isolate</th>
<th>Closest relative strain in EZ biocloud</th>
<th>%similarity</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Isolation source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control, 2 days</td>
<td>MOLA864</td>
<td>Muricauda lutimaris</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Flavobacteriaceae</td>
<td>Tidal flat of the Yellow Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA860</td>
<td>Lentibacter algarum</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Rhodobacteraceae</td>
<td>Coastal water during a massive green algae bloom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control, 22 days</td>
<td>MOLA922</td>
<td>Celeribacter neptunius</td>
<td>99.75</td>
<td>Rhodobacteraceae</td>
<td>Tidal flat sediment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA888</td>
<td>Phaeobacter arcticus</td>
<td>98.31</td>
<td>Rhodobacteraceae</td>
<td>Arctic Ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA890</td>
<td>Alteromonas tagae</td>
<td>97.78</td>
<td>Alteromonadaceae</td>
<td>Estuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA881</td>
<td>Lentibacter algarum</td>
<td>97.40</td>
<td>Rhodobacteraceae</td>
<td>Coastal water during a massive green algae bloom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM Aurelia, 2 days</td>
<td>MOLA855</td>
<td>Pseudoalteromonas undina</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Pseudoalteromonadace</td>
<td>Seawater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA917</td>
<td>Pseudoalteromonas issacharivorans</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Pseudoalteromonadace</td>
<td>Thiolus of the brown alga Fucus evanescens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA857</td>
<td>Pseudoalteromonas frederiksenii</td>
<td>99.53</td>
<td>Pseudoalteromonadace</td>
<td>Pufferfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA853</td>
<td>Vibrio gigantis</td>
<td>99.77</td>
<td>Vibriionaceae</td>
<td>Cultured oysters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA852</td>
<td>Vibrio hentzilii</td>
<td>99.76</td>
<td>Vibriionaceae</td>
<td>Gut microbiota of sea urchin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA850</td>
<td>Vibrio lentus</td>
<td>99.75</td>
<td>Vibriionaceae</td>
<td>Mediterranean oysters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA858</td>
<td>Oleyla marilimo sa</td>
<td>99.28</td>
<td>Flavobacteriaceae</td>
<td>Southern Ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM Aurelia, 22 days</td>
<td>MOLA874</td>
<td>Pseudoalteromonas undina</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Pseudoalteromonadace</td>
<td>Seawater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA892</td>
<td>Alteromonas tagae</td>
<td>98.35</td>
<td>Alteromonadaceae</td>
<td>Estuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA899</td>
<td>Arenibacter pavadas</td>
<td>99.53</td>
<td>Flavobacteriaceae</td>
<td>Green macroalgae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA870</td>
<td>Arenibacter echinorum</td>
<td>98.48</td>
<td>Flavobacteriaceae</td>
<td>Sea urchin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA880</td>
<td>Celeribacter baeckonomii</td>
<td>99.75</td>
<td>Rhodobacteraceae</td>
<td>Tidal flat sediment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA889</td>
<td>Phaeobacter galaeacensis</td>
<td>99.27</td>
<td>Rhodobacteraceae</td>
<td>Larval cultures of scallop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA879</td>
<td>Sulfitobacter dubius</td>
<td>98.50</td>
<td>Rhodobacteraceae</td>
<td>Star fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA877</td>
<td>Ruegeria scotomolitae</td>
<td>97.88</td>
<td>Rhodobacteraceae</td>
<td>Marine electroactive biofilm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA878</td>
<td>Phaeobacter azuritius</td>
<td>97.57</td>
<td>Rhodobacteraceae</td>
<td>Marine electroactive biofilm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA871</td>
<td>Shimia bifurcata</td>
<td>97.12</td>
<td>Rhodobacteraceae</td>
<td>Sea water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA867</td>
<td>Novosphingobium pentaromativum</td>
<td>97.38</td>
<td>Sphingomonadaceae</td>
<td>Estuarine sediment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLA867</td>
<td>Shimia bifurcata</td>
<td>97.38</td>
<td>Sphingomonadaceae</td>
<td>Estuarine sediment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Number of OTUs, microbial richness and diversity estimates based on randomly picked OTUs normalized to 5080 sequences per sample to accommodate for the sample with the lowest number of sequences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>+ DOM Aurelia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTU number</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richness (Chao1)</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity (Inverse Simpson)</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure legends

Fig. 1. Dissolved organic carbon (DOC, a), dissolved organic nitrogen (DON, b), dissolved organic phosphorus (DOP, c), nitrates plus nitrites (NO$_3$+NO$_2$, d), ammonium (NH$_4$, e) and phosphate (PO$_4$, f) concentrations during the incubations. Each point represents three replicates (mean ± standard deviation). The initial enrichment factor (EF) between enriched and control microcosms is indicated for each parameter.

Fig. 2. CDOM fluorescence of protein-like (a) and humic-like substances (b) concentrations during the incubations (ru= Raman Units). Each point represents three replicates (mean ± standard deviation).

Fig. 3. Bacterial abundance (a), production (b), respiration (c) and growth efficiency (d) during the incubations. Each point represents three replicates (mean ± standard deviation).

Fig. 4. Percentages of Colony Forming Units (CFU) to total direct counts (flow cytometry) during the incubations. Each point represents three replicates (mean ± standard deviation).

Fig. 5. Dendrograms of similarity based on (a) DNA CE-SSCP fingerprints and (b) OTUs table from the 16S rDNA 454-tag sequences for control microcosms (C1, C2, C3) and enriched microcosms with DOM from *A. aurita* (A1, A2, A3) after 0, 2, 9 and 22 days of incubation (T0, T2, T9, T22). Clustering is on the basis of a distance matrix computed using the Bray–Curtis index of similarity. The dendrogram was inferred with the unweighted pair-group average algorithm (UPGMA). a: The clusters were numbered from I to IV. Samples selected for 454 pyrosequencing are indicated in bold. b: Red branches do not differ significantly (SIMPROF test, p >0.05).

Fig. 6. Cumulative bar charts comparing the main relative phyla and Proteobacteria class abundances for control microcosms (A) and microcosms with DOM from *A. aurita* (B).

Fig. 7. Heatmap displaying the relative abundances of specific OTUs across the samples. Only OTUs with a contribution higher than 1% in the sample were used. Multiple OTUs with the same taxonomic assignment were numbered sequentially. The contribution of these OTUs to the total OTUs present in each sample is indicated at the bottom.

Fig. 8. Canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) of bacterial community structure (OTUs presented on Fig. 7) and chemical factors and viral abundance. The percent of explained variation is shown in brackets. The inflation factors for the analysis are given in Table S1.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>T0</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T9</th>
<th>T22</th>
<th>T0</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T9</th>
<th>T22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otu0009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu0952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otu1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Microbacteriaceae (1)**
**Microbacteriaceae (2)**
**Microbacteriaceae (3)**
**Microbacteriaceae (4)**
**Microbacteriaceae, Candidatus Aquifaba**
**Bacteroidetes (2)**
**Bacteroidetes (2)**
**Flavobacteriaceae (1)**
**Flavobacteriaceae (2)**
**Flavobacteriaceae (3)**
**Flavobacteriaceae (4)**
**Flavobacteriaceae (5)**
**Flavobacteriaceae (6)**
**Flavobacteriaceae (7)**
**Flavobacteriaceae (8)**
**Flavobacteriaceae (9)**
**Flavobacteriaceae (10)**
**Flavobacteriaceae, Annibacter (1)**
**Flavobacteriaceae, Annibacter (2)**
**Flavobacteriaceae, Annibacter (3)**
**Flavobacteriaceae, NJS (1)**
**Flavobacteriaceae, NJS (2)**
**Flavobacteriaceae, Kordia**
**Proteobacteria**
**Alphaproteobacteria**
**Rhodobacteraceae (1)**
**Rhodobacteraceae (2)**
**Rhodobacteraceae (3)**
**Rhodobacteraceae (4)**
**Roseobacter (1)**
**Roseobacter (2)**
**Roseobacter, Planobacterium (1)**
**Roseobacter, Planobacterium (2)**
**Roseobacter, Planobacterium (3)**
**Roseobacter, AS-21**
**Roseobacter, DCS-80-3**
**Roseobacter, Sulfitobacter**
**Neratia**
**SAR11 (1)**
**SAR11 (2)**
**SAR116**
**Seathiella (1)**
**Seathiella (2)**
**Physiobacteriaceae**
**OCS166**
**Gammaproteobacteria (1)**
**Gammaproteobacteria (2)**
**Gammaproteobacteria (3)**
**Gammaproteobacteria (4)**
**Gammaproteobacteria (5)**
**Pseudoniphomiru, OGM162**
**SAR6**
**Alteromonadaceae (1)**
**Alteromonadaceae (2)**
**Alteromonadaceae (3)**
**Alteromonadaceae, Marineinbacter**
**Pseudochloromonas (1)**
**Pseudochloromonas (2)**
**Vibrio (1)**
**Vibrio (2)**
**Vibrio (3)**
**Vibrio (4)**
**Vibrio (5)**
**OM43**
**Burkholderiales (1)**
**Burkholderiales (2)**
**Burkholderiaceae, Linnobacter**
**Cyanobacteria**
**Cyanobacteria, Merismopedia**
**Planctomyctaceae, Planctomyces**
**Planctomyctaceae, Rhodopirellula**

---

**Figure 7**
Figure 8
**Supplementary information**

Table S1. Inflation factor of CCA analysis. A value close to 1 indicates no redundancy with other variables. mc: multicollinearity between variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Inflation factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO3 + NO2</td>
<td>mc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH4</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO4</td>
<td>mc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>28.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON</td>
<td>85.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOP</td>
<td>30.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOM Fluo - Protein like</td>
<td>245.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOM Fluo - Humic like</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virus</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. S1. Virus concentration during the incubations. Each point represents 3 replicates (mean ± standard deviation).
Fig. S2. Rarefaction curves of observed operational taxonomic units (OTU) based on 16S rRNA sequences retrieved from the different samples.