1	Biofilm growth and nitrogen uptake responses to increases in nitrate					
2	and ammonium availability					
3						
4	Miquel Ribot <sup>1</sup> , Daniel von Schiller <sup>2</sup> , Francesc Sabater <sup>3</sup> and Eugènia Martí <sup>1</sup>					
5						
6	<sup>1</sup> Integrative Freshwater Ecology Group, Centre d'Estudis Avançats de Blanes, (CEAB-					
7	CSIC), Accés a la Cala St. Francesc 14, 17300, Blanes, Spain. E-mail:					
8	mribot@ceab.csic.es, and eugenia@ceab.csic.es. Tel:+34972336101,					
9	Fax:+34972337806					
10	<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Science and Technology, University of the Basque Country. PO Box 644,					
11	48080, Bilbao, Spain. E-mail: d.vonschiller@ehu.es. Tel: +34946015939					
12	<sup>3</sup> Department of Ecology, Faculty of Biology, University of Barcelona, Avinguda					
13	Diagonal 645, 08028 Barcelona, Spain. E-mail: fsabater@ub.edu. Tel: +34934021516,					
14	Fax: +34934111438					
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24	Keywords: nitrogen, biofilm, uptake, ammonium, nitrate, stream					

# 25 Abstract

26	Nitrate $(NO_3^-)$ and ammonium $(NH_4^+)$ are the two major dissolved inorganic nitrogen
27	(DIN) species available in streams. Human activities increase stream DIN
28	concentrations and modify the $NO_3^-:NH_4^+$ ratio. However, few studies have examined
29	biofilm responses to enrichment of both DIN species. We examined biofilm responses
30	to variation in ambient concentrations and enrichments in either $NO_3^-$ or $NH_4^+$ . We
31	incubated nutrient diffusing substrata (NDS) bioassays with three treatments (DIN-free,
32	$+NO_3^-$ and $+NH_4^+$ ) in five streams. Biomass-specific uptake rates (U <sub>spec</sub> ) of NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> and
33	$NH_4^+$ were then measured using in situ additions of <sup>15</sup> N-labeled $NO_3^-$ and $NH_4^+$ .
34	Biomass (estimated from changes in carbon content) and algal accrual rates, as well as
35	$U_{spec}$ - $NO_3^-$ of biofilms in DIN-free treatments varied among the streams in which the
36	NDS had been incubated. Higher ambient DIN concentrations were only correlated with
37	enhanced biofilm growth rates. $U_{spec}$ -NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> was one order of magnitude greater and
38	more variable than $U_{spec}$ -NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> , however similar relative preference index (RPI)
39	suggested that biofilms did not show a clear preference for either DIN species. Biofilm
40	growth and DIN uptake in DIN-amended NDS (i.e., $+NO_3^-$ and $+NH_4^+$ ) were
41	consistently lower than in DIN-free NDS (i.e., control). Lower values in controls with
42	respect to amended NDS were consistently more pronounced for algal accrual rates and
43	$U_{spec}$ - $NO_3^-$ and for the + $NH_4^+$ than for the + $NO_3^-$ treatments. In particular, enrichment
44	with $NH_4^+$ reduced biofilm $U_{spec}$ - $NO_3^-$ uptake, which has important implications for N
45	cycling in high NH4 <sup>+</sup> streams.
46	

#### 50 Introduction

Nitrogen (N) is a key element for organisms and its availability can either limit 51 production or favor eutrophication in aquatic ecosystems (Dodds and Welch 2000; 52 Francoeur 2001). Nitrate  $(NO_3^{-})$  and ammonium  $(NH_4^{+})$  are the two major dissolved 53 inorganic nitrogen (DIN) species available in running waters. These two DIN species 54 55 undergo different biogeochemical pathways and their relative availability may affect 56 DIN fate. In streams, DIN cycling is mostly mediated by the benthic microbial 57 assemblages (bacteria, fungi and algae) that develop on submersed substrata (i.e., biofilms; Pusch et al. 1998; Battin et al. 2003). 58 Microorganisms in biofilms can directly assimilate the two DIN species from the 59 60 water column. The rates at which they assimilate NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> not only depend on the availability of each single DIN species (Dodds et al. 2002; O'Brien et al. 2007; 61 Ribot et al. 2013), but they are also dependent on the relative availability of the two 62 63 species (Geisseler et al. 2010; Ribot et al. 2013). In addition,  $NH_4^+$  can be directly incorporated into biomass via anabolic pathways while incorporation of  $NO_3^-$  into the 64 cells requires an active pumping and a further reduction to  $NH_4^+$ ; consequently, 65 assimilation of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> is an energy-consuming process (McCarty 1995). Therefore, 66 microbial assimilation of  $NO_3^-$  may be induced by the presence of  $NO_3^-$ , and it may be 67 suppressed by the presence of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (Gonzalez et al. 2006). Furthermore, this effect at 68 69 the biofilm level may have consequences at the ecosystem level as suggested in 70 previous studies (Dugdale et al. 2007; Domingues et al. 2011). 71 Understanding how biofilms respond to increases in NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> or NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> is important 72 because human activity increases total DIN availability and changes the relative 73 abundance of the two DIN species (Stanley and Maxted 2008; von Schiller et al. 2008;

74 Lassaletta et al. 2009; Martí et al. 2010). From previous studies we have learned that

75	streams draining catchments dominated by agricultural practices have higher					
76	$NO_3^-$ : $NH_4^+$ ratios than streams dominated by urban activity. Conversely, urban streams					
77	tend to be $NH_4^+$ enriched at sites where effluent from wastewater treatment plants are					
78	subjected to a partial nitrification of the N loads received. Studies addressing the effect					
79	of increases in DIN availability on the growth of stream biofilms with explicit					
80	consideration of the two DIN species (i.e., $NO_3^-$ and $NH_4^+$ ) are scarce (but see von					
81	Schiller et al. 2007 and Hoellein et al. 2010). In addition, results from these studies are					
82	contradictory, showing either a preference for $NH_4^+$ as an N source for DIN assimilatory					
83	uptake (von Schiller et al. 2007) or no differential effect between the two DIN species					
84	on biofilm growth (Hoellein et al. 2010). Furthermore, studies designed to compare					
85	biofilm uptake responses to increases in $\mathrm{NO_3}^-$ and $\mathrm{NH_4}^+$ concentration have mostly been					
86	conducted in the laboratory (Kemp and Dodds 2002; O'Brien and Dodds 2008;					
87	Domingues et al. 2011; Bunch and Bernot 2012), with few field experiments (but see					
88	Bernot et al. 2006 and Ribot et al. 2013). $NH_4^+$ has been usually considered the					
89	preferred DIN source for DIN uptake (Dortch 1990; Naldi and Wheeler 2002); however,					
90	instances when $NO_3^-$ is the main N source for microorganisms are common due to the					
91	generally greater $NO_3^-$ availability (Domingues et al. 2011; Bunch and Bernot 2012;					
92	Ribot et al. 2013).					
93	The goal of this study was to examine biofilm responses in terms of growth and					

DIN uptake to variation in ambient concentrations and enrichments of either NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> or
NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>. We conducted nutrient diffusing substrata (NDS) bioassays with three treatments
(DIN-free, +NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and +NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) in five streams spanning a range in ambient DIN
availability. The NDS allowed us to measure biomass and algal growth under the
different treatments in the different streams. In addition, at the end of NDS incubations,
we exposed the different biofilms developed on the NDS to <sup>15</sup>N additions of either NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>

100 or NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> in a single location to measure their capacity for DIN assimilation of the two 101 species as well as their relative preference for the uptake of the two DIN species. 102 Comparison of assimilation rates between biofilms under control and DIN amended 103 conditions allowed us to estimate the effect of DIN species enrichments on N assimilation rates of biofilms. We expected that biofilms in streams with higher ambient 104 105 DIN concentration would have higher growth rates and higher N demand (i.e., higher 106 DIN uptake rates) than those developed in low DIN concentrations if biofilms were not 107 limited by any other environmental factor. In addition, we expected that responses of biofilms to NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> enrichments would be higher than those to NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> enrichments because 108 109 of greater energetic cost of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> assimilation.

110

## 111 Methods

#### 112 Study sites

La Tordera catchment (Catalonia, NE Spain) has an area of 868.5 km<sup>2</sup> dominated by 113 114 siliceous geology, and covers a 1700-m altitudinal gradient from the headwaters to the 115 sea level within a 35 km distance. Climate in this region is typically Mediterranean, with warm, dry summers, and mild, humid winters. Although most of the catchment is 116 117 forested, agricultural, urban and industrial areas tend to concentrate in the river valley, resulting in a heterogeneous land use template along the lowlands of the river network, 118 which affects stream N concentrations (von Schiller et al. 2008). Within this catchment, 119 120 we selected five streams draining sub-catchments with different land uses. Three sites have forested land-use 99 % of the watersheds, and the other two sites have human 121 land-use (i.e., agriculture + urban) of 2.7 and 7.1 % (Table 1) mostly adjacent to the 122 stream. These streams were selected to cover a wide range of DIN concentration based 123 on data from 15 streams in la Tordera catchment collected biweekly from September 124

125 2004–July 2007 (M. Ribot, unpublished data). Santa Fe del Montseny (MON), Font del

126 Regàs (FR) and Castanyet (CAS) are low DIN concentration streams located at

127 headwater-forested catchments. In contrast, Gualba (GUA) and Santa Coloma (COL)

128 are higher DIN concentration streams located at the river valley and influenced by urban

129 (GUA) and agricultural (COL) activities (Table 1).

130

## 131 Experimental approach

We conducted two separate sets of nutrient diffusing substrata (NDS) bioassays, each 132 one including enrichments of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (see description below), in each of the 133 134 five study streams. After incubation in the stream, all NDS were brought together for measurement of N assimilation (<sup>15</sup>N uptake) at a common location. The first set of NDS 135 bioassays started on June 21st 2006 and lasted for 16 days. After the incubation, we 136 137 replaced the agar solution of all treatments by fresh DIN-free agar solution to ensure 138 biofilm DIN uptake from the water column. These DIN-free NDS were transferred to 139 COL stream in containers filled with stream water. NDS were left in the stream for 140 5 days prior to the  ${}^{15}NO_3^-$  addition (see description below) to estimate rates of  $NO_3^$ assimilation by all the biofilms. We repeated the procedure for the second set of NDS 141 bioassays, which started on July 7th and lasted for 21 days, with an acclimation period 142 of 4 days before conducting the <sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> addition (see description below) to estimate 143 144 rates of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> assimilation by all the biofilms. Due to economic and logistic constraints, we could not conduct separate <sup>15</sup>N tracer additions in each study stream to quantify in 145 situ biofilm  $NO_3^-$  and  $NH_4^+$  uptake rates from the biofilm developed on the NDS. We 146 acknowledge that the acclimation period (4-5 days) of all biofilms in the COL stream 147 148 may have caused some changes in biofilm composition; and thus, in their uptake responses. However, since the acclimatization time was much shorter than the time 149

150	biofilms were exposed to all the DIN treatments in the different streams, we expected
151	this treatment conditions should dictate biofilm responses. In fact, significant
152	differences in biofilm structural and functional parameters were observed among
153	streams (see "Results").

#### 155 NDS bioassays

156 We constructed NDS following the method outlined in Tank and Dodds (2003). The NDS consisted of 60 mL plastic containers filled with a 2 % (by mass) agar solution, 157 158 which was not amended (i.e., DIN-free treatments) or was amended either with nitrate 159 (0.5 M KNO<sub>3</sub>; hereafter referred as +NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>) or ammonium (0.5 M NH<sub>4</sub>Cl; hereafter 160 referred as  $+NH_4^+$ ). We placed pre-combusted and pre-weighed Whatman GF/F glass 161 fiber filters on the top of the plastic containers to cover the agar completely and to serve 162 as the substrata for biofilm colonization. In each stream we placed three plastic baskets in a single pool. Each plastic basket contained two replicates of each treatment (DIN-163 164 free,  $+NO_3^-$  and  $+NH_4^+$ ) and stream cobbles to hold the baskets on place. Controls were placed upstream to avoid leaching nutrients towards the substratum immediately 165 166 downstream. We placed the baskets on the streambed of pools of similar water depth 167 and velocity. Stream substratum of all the selected stream reaches was composed of cobbles and pebbles with sand patches. During the study period, a well-developed 168 riparian canopy cover shaded all the selected reaches. 169

During the two NDS incubation periods, we collected stream water samples on 3 evenly spaced dates for ambient nutrient concentration analyses. We collected water samples with plastic syringes and filtered them immediately through ashed Whatman (Maidstone, UK) GF/F fiber glass filters into acid-washed plastic containers and stored them on ice for transportation to the laboratory until analysis. On the same dates, we

measured water conductivity and water temperature with a portable WTW conductivity

176 meter (Weilheim, Germany). In addition, we determined discharge on a single cross-

177 sectional transect by measuring mean wetted width, mean depth and mean water

178 velocity (Gordon et al. 1992).

179

## 180 <sup>15</sup>N constant rate additions

In COL stream, we selected a 250-m reach to run the two <sup>15</sup>N additions. In this reach, 181 182 and prior to the <sup>15</sup>N additions, we randomly distributed all NDS from the other four sites along a cross-section located 50 m downstream of the <sup>15</sup>N addition point. For each <sup>15</sup>N 183 addition (i.e., <sup>15</sup>NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and <sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) we prepared a solution amended with either <sup>15</sup>NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> 184 (as 99 % enriched K<sup>15</sup>NO<sub>3</sub>) or <sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (as 99 % enriched <sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub>Cl) in conjunction with 185 NaCl, as a conservative tracer. The amount of K<sup>15</sup>NO<sub>3</sub> and <sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub>Cl and the pump flow 186 rate were set to achieve a target  $\delta^{15}$ N enrichment of 10,000 ‰ for each DIN species in 187 the water column. We released the <sup>15</sup>N solutions at the top of the reach at a constant rate 188 189 using a Masterflex (Vernon Hills, Illinois, USA) L/S battery-powered peristaltic pump. The two <sup>15</sup>N additions started at midnight (00:00) and lasted for 12 h. The <sup>15</sup>NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> 190 addition was run on July 12th and the <sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> addition was run on August 1st. 191 We collected stream water samples at the NDS location for the analysis of the <sup>15</sup>N 192 193 isotopic signature of both DIN species  $({}^{15}NO_{3}^{-}$  and  ${}^{15}NH_{4}^{+})$  24 h prior to the start of the <sup>15</sup>N tracer additions and at plateau conditions. To verify plateau conditions during each 194 <sup>15</sup>N addition, we automatically recorded conductivity every 10 s at the end of the stream 195 196 reach using a portable WTW conductivity meter connected to a Campbell Scientific (Logan, Utah, USA) data logger. 24 h after the end of each <sup>15</sup>N addition, coinciding 197 198 with the water collection described above, we also collected the NDS filters, cut them in half and kept them on ice in the field until further laboratory analyses. 199

## 200 Laboratory analyses

One half of each filter was oven-dried at 60 °C until constant weight to estimate biofilm
dry mass, C and N content and <sup>15</sup>N signature. To estimate the biofilm dry mass we
weighed the oven-dried half-filters to the nearest 0.001 mg on a Mettler-Toledo
(Greifensee, Switzerland) MX5 microbalance and we subtracted 1/2 of the filter weight.
We then encapsulated the half-filters in tins.
The other half of the filter was kept frozen until the measurement of chlorophyll-

a (chla) content following McIntire et al. (1996). We submerged the frozen half-filters
in a known volume of 90 % v/v acetone and kept them in the dark at 4 °C overnight. We
then sonicated the filters for 5 min and centrifuged them for 10 min at 4000 rpm. We
measured the absorbance of the resultant supernatant at 664, 665 and 750 nm before and
after acidification using a Shimadzu (Tokyo, Japan) UV spectrometer.

212 We analyzed water samples for the concentrations of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, and soluble 213 reactive phosphorus (SRP) on a Bran + Luebbe (Norderstedt, Germany) TRAACS 2000 214 autoanalyzer following standard colorimetric methods (APHA 1995). We processed water samples for the analysis of  ${}^{15}NH_4^+$  and  ${}^{15}NO_3^-$  as described in Holmes et al. 215 (1998) and Sigman et al. (1997), respectively. Briefly, for <sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> determination, we 216 amended a known volume of sample with 3 g  $L^{-1}$  of MgO and 50 g  $L^{-1}$  of NaCl and a 217 218 Teflon filter packet containing an acidified 1-cm-diameter ashed Whatman GF/D fiber glass filter to trap the volatilized NH<sub>3</sub>, and incubated it on a shaker at 40 °C for 4 weeks. 219 For <sup>15</sup>NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> determination, we amended a known volume of the sample with 3 g of MgO 220 221 and 5 g of NaCl and boiled it to remove the NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>. We then added 0.5 mg of MgO and 0.5 mg Devarda's alloy to reduce the  $NO_3^-$  to  $NH_4^+$ , and treated the remaining sample 222 as for <sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>. We also diffused a set of standards of known volume for volume-related 223 fractionation corrections. Once the incubation was completed, we removed the filter 224

packets and placed them in a desiccator for 4 days. We then encapsulated the filters in
 tins and stored them until <sup>15</sup>N analysis.

Samples for the determination of the <sup>15</sup>N signature were analyzed at the 227 University of California Stable Isotope Facility (Davis, California, USA). The C and N 228 content (as a percentage of dry mass) and the abundance of the heavier isotope, 229 expressed as the <sup>15</sup>N:<sup>14</sup>N ratio compared to that of a standard (i.e., N<sub>2</sub> from the 230 atmosphere) using the notation of  $\delta^{15}$ N in units of %, were measured by continuous-231 232 flow isotope-ratio mass spectrometry (20–20 mass spectrometer; PDZ Europa, Northwich, UK) after sample combustion in an on-line elemental analyzer (PDZ Europa 233 234 ANCA-GSL). 235 236 **Parameter calculations** For each NDS treatment and stream, biomass accrual rates (in  $\mu$ g C cm<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>) were 237 calculated by dividing the C content (in  $\mu g C cm^{-2}$ ) at the end the of the NDS 238 239 incubation by the time period of the incubation (in days). Similarly, the algal accrual rates (in  $\mu$ g chla cm<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>) were calculated by dividing the chla content (in 240  $\mu$ g chla cm<sup>-2</sup>) at the end the of the NDS incubation by the time period of the incubation 241 (in days). We also calculated the C to N molar ratio of the biofilms at the end of the 242 243 NDS incubation based on the percentage of C and N in dry mass. To calculate biofilm DIN uptake rates of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> from the <sup>15</sup>NO<sub>3</sub> and 244 <sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub> additions, respectively, we first calculated the amount of <sup>15</sup>N tracer contained in 245 biofilm biomass ( $^{15}N_{biofilm}$ ; in µg N m<sup>-2</sup>) at the end of the addition using the following 246 equation: 247

248 
$${}^{15}Nbiofilm = Bbiofilm \times N / 100 \times (MFi - MFb)$$
 (1)

where  $B_{biofilm}$  is the biofilm as dry mass per unit of area ( $\mu g m^{-2}$ ), N is the biofilm N content expressed as percentage of dry mass, MF is the molar fraction of <sup>15</sup>N in biofilm at plateau conditions (MF<sub>i</sub>) and at background conditions (MF<sub>b</sub>).

We then estimated the DIN uptake rate (U; in  $\mu$ g N m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) for either NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> or NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> using the following equation:

254

$$U = {}^{15}Nbiofilm / Taddition \times ({}^{15}Nflux/Nflux)$$
(2)

where  ${}^{15}N_{biofilm}$  is the amount of  ${}^{15}N$  tracer in biofilm biomass from Eq. (1), T<sub>addition</sub> is 255 the duration of the <sup>15</sup>N addition (12 h), <sup>15</sup>N<sub>flux</sub> is the stream water <sup>15</sup>N flux (as either 256  $NO_3^-$  or  $NH_4^+$ ) at plateau conditions ( $\mu g^{15}N s^{-1}$ ) and  $N_{flux}$  is the total N flux (as either 257  $NO_3^-$  or  $NH_4^+$ ) based on stream water concentration and discharge (µg N s<sup>-1</sup>). For each 258 DIN species, we calculated the biomass-specific DIN uptake rate ( $U_{spec}$ ; s<sup>-1</sup>) by diving 259 260 U by the N content in biofilm biomass. We used U<sub>spec</sub> over U to compare uptake 261 responses among streams and NDS treatments because it avoids confounding effects associated with differences in N biomass accrual rates among all treatments. U<sub>spec</sub> has 262 263 been used in the literature as an indicator of N turnover time within a biotic 264 compartment (Dodds et al. 2004).

To assess the biofilm uptake preference for either  $NO_3^-$  or  $NH_4^+$ , we calculated the relative preference index (RPI) for  $NO_3^-$  as proposed by Dortch (1990) using the equation:

268

$$RPI_{NO3} = (U_{NO3} / \Sigma U_{DIN}) / (NO3 / DIN)$$
(3)

where  $U_{NO_3}$  is the biofilm NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> uptake rate (U for NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> from Eq. 2; in µg N m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) in a given NDS filter,  $\Sigma U_{DIN}$  is the sum of the mean biofilm uptake rate of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (U for NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> from Eq. 2; in µg N m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) within a NDS treatment, NO<sub>3</sub> is the mean nitrate concentration in COL during the two <sup>15</sup>N additions and DIN is the sum of the mean concentrations of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> in COL during the two <sup>15</sup>N additions. RPI is an

indicator of the relevance of  $NO_3^-$  uptake relative to total DIN uptake weighed by the relative importance of  $NO_3^-$  concentration to total DIN concentration. For example if  $NO_3^-$  uptake is 50 % of DIN uptake, but  $NO_3^-$  is only 25 % of DIN, the RPI value is 0.5/0.25 = 2, indicating preference for  $NO_3^-$  given the available DIN species. An RPI- $NO_3^-$  value <1 indicates a preference for  $NH_4^+$ .

279 To explore the biofilm response in terms of biomass accrual, algal accrual, C:N 280 ratios and uptake rates of the two DIN species to the enrichments of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> or NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, we calculated the response ratio to each DIN species as described in Tank and Dodds 281 (2003). For each variable, we calculated the logarithmic ratio of the values from 282 283 amended treatments  $(+NO_3^- \text{ or } +NH_4^+)$  relative to the control treatment (DIN-free). Response ratios (RRs) can be positive (i.e., treatment values greater than control) or 284 285 negative (i.e., treatment values lower than control). The RR allows normalizing for the 286 varying effect of NDS treatments on biofilm growth and DIN uptake rates among streams and among replicate locations within each stream, which may mask any 287 288 treatment effects on areal uptake.

289

#### 290 Statistical analyses

291 We pooled the data from control treatments (DIN-free) from the two NDS incubations 292 to explore differences in biofilm growth at ambient concentrations among streams in 293 which the NDS were incubated. We compared biomass and algal accrual rates and C:N molar ratios using a linear mixed-effects model with stream as fixed factor (n = 5) and 294 295 incubation date as random factor (n = 2). We included the random effect 'incubation date' in the model to account for the potential temporal variation in biofilm responses 296 297 between the two sets of NDS bioassays, despite initial analysis indicated that this effect was negligible. However, the inclusion of a non-significant random effect factor does 298

not influence the inference on fixed effects factors (Zuur et al. 2009). On the other hand, since  $U_{spec}$ -NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and  $U_{spec}$ -NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> for control treatments were calculated separately from the first and the second NDS incubations respectively, we compared  $U_{spec}$ -NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>,  $U_{spec}$ -NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> and RPI using one-way ANOVA with stream as fixed factor (n = 5) to explore differences in these variables at ambient concentrations among streams in which the NDS were incubated.

305 We explored biofilm growth response to enrichments of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> or NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> among streams by comparing the RRs of biomass and algal accrual rates and C:N molar ratios 306 using a linear mixed-effects model with stream (n = 5) and NDS treatment (n = 2) as 307 308 fixed factors and incubation as random factor (n = 2). Again, we included the random effect of 'incubation date' in the model, despite this random effect was shown to be 309 310 negligible. To explore biofilm DIN uptake response to enrichments of either  $NO_3^-$  or 311 NH4<sup>+</sup> among streams, we compared the RRs of U<sub>spec</sub>-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, U<sub>spec</sub>-NH4<sup>+</sup> and RPI using 312 two-way ANOVA with stream (n = 5) and NDS treatment (n = 2) as fixed factors. 313 We ran Pearson correlations to explore if biofilm growth and DIN uptake were related 314 to the ambient concentrations of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> of the study streams in which the NDS were incubated as well as to explore the relationships between biofilm growth and DIN 315 316 uptake. Correlations were only explored if the fixed factor 'stream' was significant in the linear mixed-effects or ANOVA models. 317

Computing, Vienna, Austria, http://www.R-project.org/.). Linear mixed-effects models were done with the R package 'nlme'. Post-hoc multiple comparisons for nmle models followed significant fixed factor (p < 0.05) using the R package 'multcomp'. Post-hoc Tukey HSD tests followed significant ANOVA (p < 0.05). When necessary, data were

We ran all statistical tests with R 2.15.0 (R Foundation for Statistical

318

log-transformed before analysis to meet assumptions of homogeneity of variance andnormality (Zar 1996).

325

```
326 Results
```

## **327 Physical and chemical characteristics of the study streams**

328 During the study period, mean discharge was relatively low at all streams and averaged

 $9.6 \text{ L s}^{-1}$  (Table 1). Stream water temperature and conductivity ranged from 14.2 to

330 21.4 °C and 61 to 310  $\mu$ S cm<sup>-1</sup>, respectively, across streams. Concentration of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>

331 was low and relatively similar among streams, ranging from 14 to 22  $\mu$ g N L<sup>-1</sup>. In

contrast,  $NO_3^-$  concentration ranged from 140 to 600 µg N L<sup>-1</sup>, and SRP concentrations

ranged from 4 to 46  $\mu$ g P L<sup>-1</sup> (Table 1). The lowest NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and SRP concentrations were

observed in two of the forested streams (CAS and FR), whereas the highest

concentrations were observed in COL, the stream with the highest percentage of

agricultural land use in the drainage area. As a result of the high variability in nutrient

concentrations, we observed a wide range in the  $NO_3^-:NH_4^+$  ratio (from 8 to 27) and in

the DIN:SRP molar ratio (23 to 95; Table 1).

339

#### 340 Biofilm responses to ambient DIN variability

341 Mean biomass accrual rates of biofilms in DIN-free treatments ranged from 43 to

 $126 \ \mu g \ C \ cm^{-2} \ d^{-1}$ , and differed significantly among the streams (Fig. 1a; Table 2) with

significant differences between GUA and FR (Tukey HSD tests, p < 0.020; Fig. 1a).

344 The biomass accrual rates of biofilms in DIN-free treatments were positively correlated

with ambient NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> concentration (r = 0.30, p = 0.029; Fig. 2a) and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentration

(r = 0.41, p = 0.002; Fig. 2b) among streams. Algal accrual rates of biofilms in DIN-free

treatments were similar among streams, except in CAS where rates were 5 times greater

348 (Tukey HSD tests, p < 0.001; Fig. 1b; Table 2). Algal accrual rates of biofilms in DIN-349 free treatments were positively correlated with ambient NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentration among 350 streams (r = 0.31, p = 0.023; Fig. 2d). Furthermore, algal accrual rates of biofilms in 351 DIN-free treatments were positively correlated with biomass accrual rates in the same 352 treatments (r = 0.38, p = 0.005; data not shown). The C:N molar ratios of biofilms in 353 DIN-free treatments (mean = 8.9) did not differ significantly among the streams 354 (Fig. 1c; Table 2).

U<sub>spec</sub>-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> of biofilms in DIN-free treatments was one order of magnitude 355 greater (mean =  $0.04 \text{ h}^{-1}$  vs. mean =  $0.005 \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) and more variable (CV = 71 % vs. 356 CV = 26 %) than  $U_{spec}$ -NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (Fig. 3a, b).  $U_{spec}$ -NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> of biofilms in DIN-free treatments 357 varied significantly depending on the stream in which the NDS were incubated (one-358 way ANOVA,  $F_{4,25} = 7.40$ , p < 0.001).  $U_{\text{spec}}$ -NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> was highest in biofilms developed in 359 360 MON, and FR (Tukey HSD tests, p < 0.012). Conversely, U<sub>spec</sub>-NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> of biofilms in DIN-free treatments did not differ significantly among the streams (one-way ANOVA, 361 362  $F_{4,20} = 1.66$ , p = 0.224). U<sub>spec</sub>-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> of biofilms in DIN-free treatments was negatively correlated with the ambient  $NH_4^+$  concentration of the streams (r = -0.37 and p = 0.045; 363 Fig. 2f). Furthermore, U<sub>spec</sub>-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> of biofilms in DIN-free treatments was negatively 364 correlated with algal accrual rates in the same NDS treatments (r = -0.37 and p = 0.046; 365 366 data not shown).

Mean RPI values of biofilms in DIN-free treatments were close to 1 and similar among biofilms developed in the different streams (one-way ANOVA,  $F_{4,25} = 0.54$ , p = 0.712), indicating no clear preference for any of the two DIN species (Fig. 3c).

370

371

#### **Biofilm responses to NO3<sup>-</sup> and NH4<sup>+</sup> enrichments**

374 In general, the comparison between DIN-free and DIN-enriched NDS treatments (i.e., the response ratio, RR) showed that both biofilm growth and DIN uptake had no effect 375 376 or a negative response to  $NO_3^-$  and  $NH_4^+$  enrichments (Figs. 4, 5). The RRs of biomass accrual rates differed significantly among streams (Fig. 4a; Table 3), but they did not 377 378 differ significantly between  $+NO_3^-$  and  $+NH_4^+$  treatments (Fig. 4a). Biomass accrual 379 response to DIN enrichments was null in those streams with lower DIN ambient availability and most negative in biofilms developed in COL, the stream with the 380 381 highest DIN (Tukey HSD tests, p < 0.036). In addition, the RRs of biomass accrual rates 382 in  $+NO_3^-$  treatments were negatively correlated with ambient  $NO_3^-$  (r = -0.39, p = 0.004) and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentrations among streams (r = -0.38, p = 0.004; data not 383 384 shown). The RRs of biofilm accrual rates in  $+NH_4^+$  treatments were also negatively 385 correlated with the ambient NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> concentration among streams (r = -0.34 and p = 0.022). These correlations suggest that biomass responsiveness decreased with 386 387 rising DIN concentration among streams. The RRs of algal accrual rates in biofilms differed significantly among the 388 streams and between  $+NO_3^-$  and  $+NH_4^+$  treatments (Fig. 4b; Table 3). The RRs for the 389 390 two DIN enrichment treatments were negative in the biofilms developed in the three 391 streams with intermediate ambient DIN concentrations (Tukey HSD tests, p < 0.030; Fig. 4b) and null in the two streams located in the extremes of the DIN gradient (Tukey 392 393 HSD tests, p < 0.005; Fig. 4b). On average, the RRs of algal accrual rates were 394 significantly more negative in  $+NH_4^+$  than in  $+NO_3^-$  treatments (mean = -0.42 and -0.09, respectively; Fig. 4b; Table 3). The RRs of algal accrual rates for both  $+NO_3^-$ 395 396 and  $+NH_4^+$  treatments were not correlated with either ambient NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> or NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>

397 concentration among streams.

The RRs of the biofilm C:N molar ratio were consistently negative across the streams and for both  $+NH_4^+$  and  $+NO_3^-$  treatments. Thus, biofilms exposed to DIN enrichments increased their N content relative to their C content. Differences in RRs of C:N were significant among streams, but not between  $+NO_3^-$  and  $+NH_4^+$  treatments (Fig. 4c; Table 3). The responses to DIN enrichments were more negative in biofilms developed in GUA (Tukey HSD tests, p < 0.005).

404 The RRs of U<sub>spec</sub>-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> for biofilms and DIN species enrichments differed significantly depending on the stream in which the biofilms had developed and between 405  $+NO_3^-$  and  $+NH_4^+$  treatments (Fig. 5a; Table 4). The interaction between the two factors 406 407 was also significant (Table 4). The reason for the interaction was the RR of U<sub>spec</sub>-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> was null in biofilms grown in  $+NO_3^-$  treatments and particularly negative for biofilms 408 409 grown in  $+NH_4^+$  treatments in 4 of the 5 sites (Fig. 5a). However, the pattern was 410 different in GUA. Overall patterns suggest lower biomass-specific uptake of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> when biofilms are exposed to NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> enrichment. 411

The RRs of  $U_{spec}$ -NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> for biofilms developed in different streams and DIN species enrichments were similar regardless of the stream considered and the NDS treatment at which they developed (Fig. 5b; Table 4). In general, the RRs of  $U_{spec}$ - NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> were negative, but lower than the RRs of  $U_{spec}$ -NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, indicating a lower effect of DIN enrichments on  $U_{spec}$ - NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> than on  $U_{spec}$ -NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>.

The RRs of biofilm RPI differed significantly depending on the stream in which the NDS were incubated and between  $+NO_3^-$  and  $+NH_4^+$  treatments, with no significant interaction between factors (Fig. 5c; Table 4). The exceptions were COL (both solutes) and CAS ( $NH_4^+$ ). However, despite these differences, the RRs of RPI were not different from 0 in 7 out of 10 cases (Fig. 5c), indicating no overall preference for any of the two DIN species.

#### 423 Discussion

### 424 Biofilm responses to ambient DIN variability

We expected that differences in ambient NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentrations among the 425 426 streams in which the NDS were incubated would affect biofilm development and its N demand from the water column. Specifically, we expected that biofilm growth and DIN 427 428 uptake would be greater in those biofilms that had developed in streams with higher 429 ambient DIN availability (Dodds et al. 2002; O'Brien et al. 2007; von Schiller et al. 2007; O'Brien and Dodds 2008). We observed that streams with higher ambient NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> 430 and NH4<sup>+</sup> concentrations showed greater biofilm biomass and algal accrual rates, 431 432 supporting our expectations and suggesting that biofilms development and its contribution to stream water DIN uptake is enhanced under higher availability of DIN. 433 434 In addition, DIN was below saturating levels and biofilms were likely not limited by 435 other factors. On the other hand, lack of significant variation in the biofilm C:N ratios at ambient levels suggests that the range of ambient DIN concentration was not broad 436 437 enough to cause significant stoichiometric differences in the biofilms among the studied streams (Dodds et al. 2004). 438

Biofilm U<sub>spec</sub>-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> was consistently greater than U<sub>spec</sub>-NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> regardless of the 439 440 differences in the concentrations of the two DIN species among the study streams, suggesting that biofilms have a consistently higher reliance on NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> than on NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> from 441 the water column to meet their N requirements. Our results are in line with previous 442 443 studies showing that the generally higher NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> availability as a DIN source ultimately 444 drives the use of this DIN species by biofilms to meet their N demand (Fellows et al. 445 2006; Newbold et al. 2006; Bunch and Bernot 2012). RPI values close to 1, indicating no preference for either DIN species, support this explanation. These results contrast the 446 general idea that microbial assemblages in biofilms preferentially remove NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> due to 447

the lower energetic cost (Dortch 1990; Naldi and Wheeler 2002). However, the results are in line with empirical data from a previous study which showed an unclear pattern of biofilm preference for  $NH_4^+$  relative to  $NO_3^-$  availability (Hoellein et al. 2010).

451 According to previous studies (O'Brien et al. 2007; von Schiller et al. 2007), we 452 expected that variability in U<sub>spec</sub> of the two DIN species among biofilms would be 453 positively related to differences in ambient DIN concentration of the streams in which 454 the NDS were previously incubated. However, the results did not support our expectations. Greater U<sub>spec</sub>-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> was observed in biofilms that developed in 2 of the 3 455 streams with the lowest NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> concentrations, and no differences among streams in 456 457 biofilm U<sub>spec</sub>-NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> were found. In fact, we observed lower biofilm U<sub>spec</sub>-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> in streams with higher NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentration, which supports previous studies indicating that 458 459  $NH_4^+$  availability may regulate the uptake of DIN in the form of  $NO_3^-$  (Gonzalez et al. 460 2006; Dugdale et al. 2007; Domingues et al. 2011). The low range of variation in NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentration among streams where biofilms developed (from 14 to 22  $\mu$ g N/L) may 461 462 have precluded observing differences in U<sub>spec</sub>-NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, despite previous studies have shown that a broader range in the concentration of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> can control NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> uptake rates 463 at whole-reach scale (Dodds et al. 2002; O'Brien and Dodds 2008). Alternatively, lack 464 of U<sub>spec</sub>-NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> variation among biofilms developed in the different streams also suggests 465 466 that biofilms NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> turnover was similar among streams, regardless of the differences in biomass accrual and algal growth observed, probably due to the lower range of NH4<sup>+</sup> 467 468 concentration among streams.

Variation in biomass accrual rates among streams was positively related to algal accrual rates, indicating that algae had a similar response to that of the bulk biofilm. In this context, the negative correlation between algal accrual rates and  $U_{spec}$ -NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, contrasts with other studies indicating that algae in biofilms rely mostly on NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>

(Bernhardt et al. 2002; Bechtold et al. 2012). It is worth noting that the streams where
the NDS were incubated were heavily shaded by riparian vegetation, which may have
limited N demand, especially by algae in biofilms (Hill et al. 1995; Sabater et al. 2000;
von Schiller et al. 2007). Therefore, it is possible that light-limitation may have masked
the effects of other factors such as variation in DIN concentration or relative availability
between DIN and SRP among streams, on algal uptake (von Schiller et al. 2007).

479

## 480 Biofilm responses to enrichments in NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> or NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>

We expected a positive response of biofilms to NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> enrichments if these 481 482 DIN species were below saturation under ambient conditions within each stream and if other environmental conditions were favorable. In addition, we expected that the 483 biofilm responses would be more positively pronounced for NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> than for NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> 484 485 enrichments because biofilms have a higher preference for the former DIN species. However, we found that biofilm response to either  $NO_3^-$  or  $NH_4^+$  enrichments was in 486 487 general either null or negative for most of the investigated variables, suggesting that biofilms were either above DIN saturation at the ambient conditions at which they 488 developed or that the experimental enrichments affected the structure or the species 489 490 composition of the biofilms leading to lower biomass accrual rates. Furthermore, algal 491 accrual,  $U_{spec}$ -NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and RPI response ratios were consistently more negative in those 492 biofilms that developed under NH4<sup>+</sup> enriched conditions compared to NO3<sup>-</sup> enriched conditions, suggesting a differential effect of the two DIN species on biofilm 493 494 development and biogeochemical activity.

The negative response to DIN enrichments was more pronounced for algal
accrual than for bulk biomass accrual. This may be explained by the low light
availability (i.e., closed canopy reaches) during the experiments, which had a higher

constrain on algal development in biofilms than on whole-bulk biofilm biomass. 498 499 Interestingly, we also observed that the negative responses of algal growth were more pronounced in +NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> than in +NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> treatments. Instances of lower biofilm and algal 500 501 growth in DIN-enriched substrates with respect to control treatments are relatively 502 common in the literature (Francoeur 2001; Tank and Dodds 2003; Bernhardt and Likens 2004; von Schiller et al. 2007), although these studies have mainly focussed on  $NO_3^-$ 503 504 enrichments. Several mechanisms have been proposed to explain this response: (1) preference of grazing invertebrates for biofilms developed on nutrient-rich substrates, 505 (2) nutrient enrichment up to toxic levels, or (3) changes in the species composition of 506 507 biofilms (Bernhardt and Likens 2004; Hoellein et al. 2010; Domingues et al. 2011). 508 Despite field observations during both NDS incubations confirmed low presence of 509 grazers on NDS filters, we cannot rule out invertebrates as responsible for differences in 510 biomass accrual between control and DIN-enriched substrates (Steinman 1996). Furthermore, we cannot exclude the fact that  $+NH_4^+$  treatments lead to toxic effects 511 512 (Camargo and Alonso 2006) or that either NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> or NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> enrichments lead to changes in 513 biofilm assemblage composition because the experiment was not aimed to provide these mechanistic results. Future research could explore the possible toxic effect of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> 514 515 enrichments by exploring responses using NDS across streams with a wider gradient of 516 ambient  $NH_4^+$  concentrations. The most relevant biofilm responses to enrichment of the two DIN species were 517

observed for N uptake. In absolute terms, the negative response observed was greater for  $U_{spec}$ -NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> than for  $U_{spec}$ -NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> and mostly associated with NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> enrichments. NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> enrichment caused only minor changes in either  $U_{spec}$ -NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> or  $U_{spec}$ -NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> when compared with NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> enrichment. Based on our results, we suggest that biofilm exposures to NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> enrichment may induce some functional and/or structural changes in

the biofilms resulting in a lower demand for  $NO_3^-$ . In addition,  $NH_4^+$  enrichments might 523 524 have enhanced NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> sorption and internal N cycling within the biofilms; thereby decreasing the biofilm  $NO_3^-$  dependence from the water column (von Schiller et al. 525 2007). An alternative explanation is that the enrichment of  $NH_4^+$  can favor the 526 development of nitrifiers, which is supported by results from previous studies 527 528 (Bernhardt and Likens 2004; Merbt et al. 2014). Nitrifying microorganisms have lower 529 growth efficiencies compared to other microbial components of the biofilms (Risgaard-Petersen et al. 2004) and they also have a preferential demand for NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>. This potential 530 shift in the microbial composition of biofilms could at least partially explain the more 531 532 negative effects on U<sub>spec</sub>-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> in NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> enrichments consistently observed for biofilms developed in all streams studied. Future studies following NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> enrichment in NDS 533 534 would benefit from measurements of nitrification activity or community composition to 535 elucidate the underlying mechanism driving the observed biofilm response.

536

## 537 Conclusions

NDS bioassays have been commonly used to assess nutrient limitation of P and N in a 538 large variety of freshwater environments (Francoeur 2001; Johnson et al. 2009; Keck 539 540 and Lepori 2012; King et al. 2014). However, NDS have rarely been employed to 541 address other ecologically relevant questions, such as to contrast biofilm responses to 542 different DIN species (but see von Schiller et al. 2007 and Hoellein et al. 2010). In 543 addition, studies using NDS have mostly focused on the biofilm response in terms of 544 biomass accrual, and less attention has been paid on how the nutrient enrichments affect biofilm function, such as the demand of nutrients from the water column. In this regard, 545 546 we found that the most relevant biofilm responses to enrichment of the two DIN species were observed for N uptake, and more specifically, that NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> enrichments caused a 547

548	clear decrease in $U_{spec}$ -NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> . Knowledge on these responses provides a better					
549	understanding of the effects of elevated DIN availability on biofilm development and					
550	contribution to in-stream N uptake. We suggest that biofilms developing in streams with					
551	high $NO_3^-$ concentration, such as those draining agricultural catchments (Stanley and					
552	Maxted 2008; Lassaletta et al. 2009) may have a limited capacity to retain excess $NO_3^-$ .					
553	On the other hand, biofilms developing in streams with low $NO_3^-$ : $NH_4^+$ ratios due to					
554	inputs of NH4 <sup>+</sup> -rich sources, such as streams receiving wastewater treatment plant					
555	effluents (Marti et al. 2004; Martí et al. 2010), may show decreases in the capacity for					
556	$NO_3^-$ uptake. Biofilm responses to increases in the concentration of the DIN species,					
557	which can be driven by land use changes, may have relevant implications for the export					
558	of DIN to downstream ecosystems.					

## 560 Acknowledgments

- 561 We thank M. Martí and S. Pla for their field and laboratory assistance. We are also
- 562 grateful to the to the Font del Regàs landowners, Massaneda Garden and the Direcció
- del Parc Natural del Montseny (Diputació de Barcelona) for allowing access to the
- study sites during the experiments. This study was funded by the Spanish Ministry of
- 565 Education and Science through NICON project (ref: CGL2005-7362). MR was
- supported by a contract with the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation through
- the MED\_FORSTREAM project (CGL2011-30590-C02-02). DvS's work was also
- funded by a Juan de la Cierva postdoctoral contract (JCI-2010-06397) from the Spanish
- 569 Ministry of Science and Innovation.

# **References**

572	APHA (1995) Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater. 19thedn.
573	American Public Health Association, Washington.
574	Battin TJ, Kaplan LA, Newbold JD, Hansen CME (2003) Contributions of microbial
575	biofilms to ecosystem processes in stream mesocosms. Nature 426:439-442
576	doi:10.1038/nature02152
577	Bechtold HA, Marcarelli AM, Baxter CV, Inouye RS (2012) Effects of N, P, and
578	organic carbon on stream biofilm nutrient limitation and uptake in a semi-arid
579	watershed. Limnol Oceanogr 57:1544-1554 doi:10.4319/lo.2012.57.5.1544
580	Bernhardt ES, Hall RO, Likens GE (2002) Whole-system estimates of nitrification and
581	nitrate uptake in streams of the Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest.
582	Ecosystems 5:419-430 doi:10.1007/s10021-002-0179-4
583	Bernhardt ES, Likens GE (2004) Controls on periphyton biomass in heterotrophic
584	streams. Freshw Biol 49:14-27 doi:10.1046/j.1365-2426.2003.01161.x
585	Bernot MJ, Tank JL, Royer TV, David MB (2006) Nutrient uptake in streams draining
586	agricultural catchments of the midwestern United States. Freshw Biol 51:499-
587	509 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2427.2006.01508.x
588	Bunch ND, Bernot MJ (2012) Nitrate and ammonium uptake by natural stream
589	sediment microbial communities in response to nutrient enrichment. Res
590	Microbiol 163:137-141 doi:10.1016/j.resmic.2011.11.004
591	Camargo JA, Alonso A (2006) Ecological and toxicological effects of inorganic
592	nitrogen pollution in aquatic ecosystems: A global assessment. Environ Int
593	32:831-849 doi:10.1016/j.envint.2006.05.002
594	Dodds WK, Lopez AJ, Bowden WB, Gregory S, Grimm NB, Hamilton SK, Hershey
595	AE, Marti E, Mcdowell WH, Meyer JL, Morrall D, Mulholland PJ, Peterson BJ.,
596	Tank JL, Valett HM, Webster JR. & Wollheim W (2002) N uptake as a function
597	of concentration in streams. J N Am Benthol Soc 21:206-220

598	Dodds WK, Marti E, Tank JL, Pontius J, Hamilton SK, Grimm NB, Bowden WB,					
599	Mcdowell WH, Peterson BJ, Valett HM, Webster JR, Gregory S (2004) Carbon					
600	and nitrogen stoichiometry and nitrogen cycling rates in streams. Oecologia					
601	140:458-467 doi:10.1007/s00442-004-1599-y					
602	Dodds WK, Welch EB (2000) Establishing nutrient criteria in streams. J N Am Benthol					
603	Soc 19:186-196					
604	Domingues RB, Barbosa AB, Sommer U, Galvao HM (2011) Ammonium, nitrate and					
605	phytoplankton interactions in a freshwater tidal estuarine zone: potential effects					
606	of cultural eutrophication. Aquat Sci 73:331-343 doi:10.1007/s00027-011-0180-					
607	0					
608	Dortch Q (1990) The interaction between ammonium and nitrate uptake in					
609	phytoplankton. mar ecol-prog ser 61:183-201 doi:10.3354/meps061183					
610	Dugdale RC, Wilkerson FP, Hogue VE, Marchi A (2007) The role of ammonium and					
611	nitrate in spring bloom development in San Francisco Bay Estuar. Coast Shelf					
612	Sci 73:17-29 doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2006.12.008					
613	Fellows CS, Valett HM, Dahm CN, Mulholland PJ, Thomas SA (2006) Coupling					
614	nutrient uptake and energy flow in headwater streams. Ecosystems 9:788-804					
615	doi:10.1007/s10021-006-0005-5					
616	Francoeur SN (2001) Meta-analysis of lotic nutrient amendment experiments: detecting					
617	and quantifying subtle responses. J N Am Benthol Soc 20:358-368					
618	doi:10.2307/1468034					
619	Geisseler D, Horwath WR, Joergensen RG, Ludwig B (2010) Pathways of nitrogen					
620	utilization by soil microorganisms - A review. Soil Biol Biochem 42:2058-2067					
621	doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2010.08.021					
622	Gonzalez PJ, Correia C, Moura I, Brondino CD, Moura JJG (2006) Bacterial nitrate					
623	reductases: Molecular and biological aspects of nitrate reduction. J Inorg					
624	Biochem 100:1015-1023 doi:10.1016/j.jinorgbio.2005.11.024					

625	Gordon ND, McMahon TA, Finlayson BL (1992) Stream hydrology: an introduction for							
626	ecologists. Stream hydrology: an introduction for ecologists. John Wiley &							
627	Sons,							
628	Hill WR, Ryon MG, Schilling EM (1995) Light limitation in a stream ecosystem -							
629	responses by primary producers and consumers. Ecology 76:1297-1309							
630	doi:10.2307/1940936							
631	Hoellein TJ, Tank JL, Kelly JJ, Rosi-Marshall EJ (2010) Seasonal variation in nutrient							
632	limitation of microbial biofilms colonizing organic and inorganic substrata in							
633	streams. Hydrobiologia 649:331-345 doi:10.1007/s10750-010-0276-x							
634	Holmes RM, McClelland JW, Sigman DM, Fry B, Peterson BJ (1998) Measuring N-15-							
635	NH4+ in marine, estuarine and fresh waters: An adaptation of the ammonia							
636	diffusion method for samples with low ammonium concentrations. Marine							
637	Chemistry 60:235-243							
638	Johnson LT, Tank JL, Dodds WK (2009) The influence of land use on stream biofilm							
639	nutrient limitation across eight North American ecoregions Can J Fish Aquat Sci							
640	66:1081-1094 doi:10.1139/f09-065							
641	Keck F, Lepori F (2012) Can we predict nutrient limitation in streams and rivers?							
642	Freshw Biol 57:1410-1421 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2427.2012.02802.x							
643	Kemp MJ, Dodds WK (2002) The influence of ammonium, nitrate, and dissolved							
644	oxygen concentrations on uptake, nitrification, and denitrification rates							
645	associated with prairie stream substrata. Limnol Oceanogr 47:1380-1393							
646	King SA, Heffernan JB, Cohen MJ (2014) Nutrient flux, uptake, and autotrophic							
647	limitation in streams and rivers. Freshw Sci 33:85-98 doi:10.1086/674383							
648	Lassaletta L, Garcia-Gomez H, Gimeno BS, Rovira JV (2009) Agriculture-induced							
649	increase in nitrate concentrations in stream waters of a large Mediterranean							
650	catchment over 25 years (1981-2005). Sci Total Environ 407:6034-6043							
651	doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2009.08.002							

652	Marti E, Aumatell J, Gode L, Poch M, Sabater F (2004) Nutrient retention efficiency in					
653	streams receiving inputs from wastewater treatment plants. Journal of					
654	Environmental Quality 33:285-293					
655	Martí E, Riera J, Sabater F (2010) Effects of Wastewater Treatment Plants on Stream					
656	Nutrient Dynamics Under Water Scarcity Conditions. In: Sabater S, Barceló D					
657	(eds) Water Scarcity in the Mediterranean, vol 8. The Handbook of					
658	Environmental Chemistry. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, pp 173-195.					
659	doi:10.1007/698_2009_33					
660	McCarty GW (1995) the role of glutamine-synthetase in regulation of nitrogen-					
661	metabolism within the soil microbial community plant and soil 170:141-147					
662	doi:10.1007/bf02183062					
663	McIntire CD, Gregory SV, Steinman AD, Lamberti GA (1996) Modeling benthic algal					
664	communities: an example from stream ecology. Algal ecology: freshwater					
665	benthic ecosystems. Academic Press. doi:10.1016/b978-012668450-6/50050-3					
666	Merbt S, Auguet J-C, Blesa A, Martí E, Casamayor E (2015) Wastewater Treatment					
667	Plant Effluents Change Abundance and Composition of Ammonia-Oxidizing					
668	Microorganisms in Mediterranean Urban Stream Biofilms Microb Ecol 69:66-74					
669	doi:10.1007/s00248-014-0464-8					
670	Naldi M, Wheeler PA (2002) N-15 measurements of ammonium and nitrate uptake by					
671	Ulva fenestrata (chlorophyta) and Gracilaria pacifica (rhodophyta): Comparison					
672	of net nutrient disappearance, release of ammonium and nitrate, and N-15					
673	accumulation in algal tissue. J Phycol 38:135-144 doi:10.1046/j.1529-					
674	8817.2002.01070.x					
675	Newbold JD, Bott TL, Kaplan LA, Dow CL, Jackson JK, Aufdenkampe AK, Martin					
676	LA, Van Horn DJ, De Long AA (2006) Uptake of nutrients and organic C in					
677	streams in New York City drinking-water-supply watersheds. J N Am Benthol					
678	Soc 25:998-1017					
679	O'Brien JM, Dodds WK (2008) Ammonium uptake and mineralization in prairie					
680	streams: chamber incubation and short-term nutrient addition experiments.					
681	Freshw Biol 53:102-112 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2427.2007.01870.x					

682	O'Brien JM, Dodds WK, Wilson KC, Murdock JN, Eichmiller J (2007) The saturation						
683	of N cycling in Central Plains streams: N-15 experiments across a broad						
684	gradient of nitrate concentrations. Biogeochemistry 84:31-49						
685	doi:10.1007/s10533-007-9073-7						
686	Pusch M et al. (1998) The role of micro-organisms in the ecological connectivity of						
687	running waters. Freshw Biol 40:453-495 doi:10.1046/j.1365-2427.1998.00372.x						
688	Ribot M, von Schiller D, Peipoch M, Sabater F, Grimm NB, Marti E (2013) Influence						
689	of nitrate and ammonium availability on uptake kinetics of stream biofilms.						
690	Freshw Sci 32:1155-1167 doi:10.1899/12-209.1						
691	Risgaard-Petersen N, Nicolaisen MH, Revsbech NP, Lomstein BA (2004) Competition						
692	between ammonia-oxidizing bacteria and benthic microalgae. Appl Environ						
693	Microbiol 70:5528-5537 doi:10.1128/aem.70.9.5528-5537.2004						
694	Sabater F, Butturini A, Marti E, Munoz I, Romani A, Wray J, Sabater S (2000) Effects						
695	of riparian vegetation removal on nutrient retention in a Mediterranean stream. J						
696	N Am Benthol Soc 19:609-620 doi:10.2307/1468120						
697	Sigman DM, Altabet MA, Michener R, McCorkle DC, Fry B, Holmes RM (1997)						
698	Natural abundance-level measurement of the nitrogen isotopic composition of						
699	oceanic nitrate: an adaptation of the ammonia diffusion method. Marine						
700	Chemistry 57:227-242						
701	Stanley EH, Maxted JT (2008) Changes in the dissolved nitrogen pool across land cover						
702	gradients in Wisconsin streams. Ecol Appl 18:1579-1590 doi:10.1890/07-1379.1						
703	Steinman AD (1996) Effects of grazers on freshwater benthic algae. Algal ecology:						
704	freshwater benthic ecosystems. doi:10.1016/b978-012668450-6/50041-2						
705	Tank JL, Dodds WK (2003) Nutrient limitation of epilithic and epixylic biofilms in ten						
706	North American streams. Freshw Biol 48:1031-1049 doi:10.1046/j.1365-						
707	2427.2003.01067.x						
708	von Schiller D, Marti E, Riera JL, Ribot M, Marks JC, Sabater F (2008) Influence of						
709	land use on stream ecosystem function in a Mediterranean catchment. Freshw						
710	Biol 53:2600-2612 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2427.2008.02059.x						

711	von Schiller D, Marti E, Riera JL, Sabater F (2007) Effects of nutrients and light on
712	periphyton biomass and nitrogen uptake in Mediterranean streams with
713	contrasting land uses. Freshw Biol 52:891-906 doi:10.1111/j.1365-
714	2427.2007.01742.x
715 716	Zar JH (1996) Biostatistical analysis. 3 <sup>rd</sup> edition. Prentice–Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
717	Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Walker NJ, Saveliev AA, Smith GM (2009) Mixed effects models
718	and extensions in ecology with R (Statistics for biology and health). Springer
719	Science+Business Media, LLC2009.

# 721 Tables

- **Table 1.** Physical and chemical characteristics of the streams in which the nutrient
- 723 diffusing substrata (NDS) were incubated.

	Font del Regàs	Castanyet	Santa Fe del Montseny	Gualba	Santa Coloma
Stream code	FR	CAS	MON	GUA	COL
Forested area (%)	99.7	99.6	99.4	96.0	92.6
Urban area (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	3.7
Agricultural area (%)	0.2	0.4	0.0	2.1	3.4
Longitude 2º E	27'00''	37'25''	27'42''	30'17''	39'32''
Latitude 41° N	49'32''	53'28''	46'37''	44'02''	51'48''
Mean altitude (m)	429	572	1419	940	554
Discharge (L s <sup>-1</sup> )	21.7 ± 4.4	2.5 ± 1.4	$9.3 \pm 0.5$	11.2 ± 3.1	11.5 ± 4.5
Water temperature (°C)	$16.6 \pm 0.4$	19.8 ± 0.9	$14.2 \pm 0.8$	19.8 ± 0.9	21.4 ± 1.0
Conductivity (µS cm <sup>-1</sup> )	198.0 ± 3.2	214.0 ±10	$60.6 \pm 0.4$	123.9 ± 7.7	309.7 ± 8.8
NH4+ (µg N L <sup>-1</sup> )	14 ± 3	19 ± 2	16 ± 3	17 ± 3	22 ± 1
NO3 <sup>-</sup> + NO2 <sup>-</sup> (µg N L <sup>-1</sup> )	144 ± 33	140 ± 85	189 ± 23	270 ± 9	600 ± 263
SRP (µg P L <sup>-1</sup> )	4 ± 1	8 ± 5	20 ± 2	20 ± 1	46 ± 39
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> :NH <sub>4</sub> +	11.8 ± 3.9	8.0 ± 5.5	12.9 ± 3.4	16.5 ± 2.6	27.7 ± 11.8
DIN:SRP (molar)	95.3 ± 27.7	$50.3 \pm 6.4$	22.9 ± 2.9	32.3 ± 1.8	84.4 ± 33.3

724 Data reported are the mean  $\pm$  SE of samples collected on three different dates during

Note that streams are listed in order of increasing DIN availability (sum of  $NH_4^+$  and

- 727  $NO_3^-$  concentrations).
- 728
- 729

each of the two NDS incubation periods (n = 6).

- **Table 2.** Results from the linear mixed-effects model with stream as fixed factor and
- 732 incubation as random factor on the biomass accrual rate, algal accrual rate and C:N
- 733 molar ratio of biofilms in DIN-free treatments.

Variable	df	F	р
Biomass accrual rate			
Stream	4	5.80	<0.001
Incubation			0.922
Algal accrual rate			
Stream	4	14.64	<0.001
Incubation			0.173
C:N molar ratio			
Stream	4	0.20	0.940
Incubation			0.664
Values highlighted in bol	d indicate	significant ef	fects ( $p < 0$ .

- 746
- 747
- 748

- **Table 3.** Results from the linear mixed-effects model with stream and NDS treatment as
- 750 fixed factors and incubation as random factor on biofilm growth response ratio (RR) to
- 751 DIN enrichments in the form of  $NO_3^-$  and  $NH_4^+$  among streams in terms of biomass
- accrual rate, algal accrual rate and C:N molar ratio.

Variable	df	F	р		
Biomass accrual rate					
Stream	4	3.99	0.005		
Treatment	1	0.06	0.813		
Stream x treatment	4	0.75	0.558		
Incubation			0.150		
Algal accrual rate					
Stream	4	10.17	<0.001		
Treatment	1	13.85	<0.001		
Stream x treatment	4	2.00	0.101		
Incubation			0.221		
C:N molar ratio					
Stream	4	5.09	<0.001		
Treatment	1	0.50	0.483		
Stream x treatment	4	0.88	0.480		
Incubation			0.734		

753 Significance of the random factor incubation was obtained with the Likelihood Ratio

756

757

<sup>754</sup> Test.

<sup>755</sup> Values highlighted in bold indicate significant effects (p < 0.05).

- **Table 4.** Results from two-way ANOVA with stream and NDS treatment as fixed
- factors on biofilm uptake response ratio (RR) to DIN enrichments in the form of  $NO_3^-$
- and  $NH_4^+$  among streams in terms of biomass-specific uptake rate of  $NO_3^-$  ( $U_{spec}$ - $NO_3^-$ ),
- 762  $\text{NH}_4^+$  ( $U_{spec}$ - $\text{NH}_4^+$ ) and relative preference index (RPI).

	Variable	df	F	р
U <sub>spec</sub> -NO <sub>3</sub> -				
	Stream	4	9.57	<0.001
	Treatment	1	58.13	<0.001
	Stream x treatment	4	6.12	<0.001
U <sub>spec</sub> -NH <sub>4</sub> +				
	Stream	4	1.99	0.118
	Treatment	1	1.06	0.311
	Stream x treatment	4	1.92	0.129
RPI				
	Stream	4	5.38	0.001
	Treatment	1	4.81	0.034
	Stream x treatment	4	2.30	0.075

763 Values highlighted in bold indicate significant effects (p < 0.05).

## **Figure legends**

**Figure 1.** Biomass accrual rate (**a**), algal accrual rate (**b**) and C:N molar ratio (**c**) of biofilms developed on nutrient diffusing substrata (NDS) for the different streams and nutrient treatments in which the NDS were incubated. Data reported are the mean  $\pm$  SE.

**Figure 2.** Relationships between biofilm variables and ambient concentrations of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> in the streams in which the NDS were incubated. Biomass accrual rates and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> (**a**) or NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (**b**), algal accrual rates and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> (**c**) or NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (**d**), and biomass-specific uptake for NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> ( $U_{spec}$ -NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>) and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> (**e**) or NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (**f**). Results are for Pearson correlations. Values highlighted in *bold* indicate significant correlations (p < 0.05).

**Figure 3.** Biomass-specific uptake for NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> ( $U_{spec}$ -NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>; **a**), for NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> ( $U_{spec}$ -NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>; **b**) and relative preference index (RPI; **c**) of biofilms developed on nutrient diffusing substrata (NDS) in the different streams and nutrient treatments. Note that the y-axis from panel **b** is one order of magnitude lower than that from panel **a**. In panel **c**, the *horizontal dashed line* at *1* denotes the shift from NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> to NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> preference. Values <1 indicate preference for NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, whereas values >1 indicate preference for NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>. Data reported are the mean ± SE.

**Figure 4.** Biofilm growth response ratio (RR) to enrichments of  $NO_3^-$  and  $NH_4^+$  in terms of biomass accrual rate (**a**), algal accrual rate (**b**) and C:N molar ratio (**c**) for the different streams in which the nutrient diffusing substrata (NDS) were incubated. Data reported are the mean  $\pm$  SE.

**Figure 5.** Biofilm DIN uptake response ratio (RR) to enrichments of  $NO_3^-$  and  $NH_4^+$  in terms of biomass-specific uptake for  $NO_3^-$  ( $U_{spec}$ - $NO_3^-$ ; **a**) and for  $NH_4^+$  ( $U_{spec}$ - $NH_4^+$ ; **b**), and relative preference index (RPI; **c**) for the different streams in which the nutrient diffusing substrata (NDS) were incubated. Data reported are the mean  $\pm$  SE.



Figure 1



Figure 2

Figure 3









