Top-down and bottom-up control of epilithic periphyton in a tropical stream
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Abstract: Tropical forests are characterized by high tree biomass that forms a dense canopy, thereby reducing the amount of light that reaches forest streams. Forest streams are likely to receive large amounts of organic matter in the form of leaf litter and also have low primary production relative to more open forested systems. Forest clearing can, therefore, affect the in-stream carbon cycle by increasing carbon immobilization and decreasing mineralization. We addressed the question of whether heavily shaded streams are bottom-up limited by light and nutrients or top-down limited by grazers. To answer these questions, we experimentally manipulated nutrients and grazers in enclosures established in either a shaded or a partially open stretch of an Atlantic Forest stream in Brazil. Algal biomass in this stream was low (51.5 to 367.2 mg Chl a/m²). Prior tree removal resulted in a 58% increase in light in the semi-open stream area, and enclosures in this area had a 2.7× increase in algal biomass and a 4× increase in primary production (from 10–40 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹) relative to enclosures in shaded areas. Nutrient (P) addition had no effect on algal standing crop. Grazing by the caddisfly Helicopsyche caused a ~50% reduction in algal biomass. The addition of the most abundant predator, the stonefly Anacroneuria, to the enclosures did not reduce feeding by Helicopsyche. Substrates in the shaded and semi-open stretches differed in the dominance of some algal taxa, and grazing appeared to favor the cyanobacteria Dolichospermum sp. over diatoms. We conclude that algae in forested, low-order streams in the Atlantic Forest are limited by both top-down (herbivory) and bottom-up (light) factors. These findings suggest that tree removal in riparian areas can cause small changes to light availability in streams, but that even small changes can have profound effects on primary producers and, therefore, energy supply for stream consumers.
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Low-order forested streams are heterotrophic systems fueled by litter input from the riparian zone (Abelho 2001). However, benthic algae can also have an important role in the energy balance of these streams, even at low biomass levels (Moultom et al. 2015, Neres-Lima et al. 2016, Crenier et al. 2017). Benthic algae may be particularly important in tropical systems where allochthonous organic matter is a low-quality resource for consumers because of its high tannin content and toughness and may contribute to low shredder abundance in some streams (Boyero et al. 2011, 2017, Bruder et al. 2014, Graça et al. 2015a, b). Moreover, benthic algae synthesize compounds, particularly fatty acids, which are essential for stream invertebrate growth and secondary production (Guo et al. 2016a, Crenier et al. 2017).

Primary production and periphyton biomass in low-order forested streams can be bottom-up limited by light because of dense canopy cover (Mallory and Richardson 2005) and by nutrient availability in oligotrophic systems (Hart and Robinson 1990, Hill et al. 1992, Rosemond et al. 1993, Artigas et al. 2013). Primary production in low-order
forested streams can also be top-down limited by invertebrate and fish grazers (e.g., Feminella et al. 1989, Álvarez and Peckarsky 2005, Mallory and Richardson 2005, Taylor et al. 2006). Selective feeding by grazers can cause changes in algal assemblage structure and dominance by reducing the abundance of more-palatable algal taxa (Feminella and Resh 1991, Pan and Lowe 1994, Cibils-Martina et al. 2014). Frequently, periphyton is jointly affected by interactions among these bottom-up (nutrients and light) and top-down (consumer) effects (e.g., Hill et al. 1992, Rosemond et al. 1993, Larned and Santos 2000). Finally, predators of algal grazers may cause cascading trophic effects if they control the densities or foraging activities of grazers (Moulton et al. 2010, Álvarez and Peckarsky 2014).

Tropical forests have the highest plant and animal biodiversity and the highest plant biomass on the planet. Tropical forests also contribute disproportionately to the global carbon cycle because of their high productivity and litter decomposition rates (Huston 1979). This high tree biomass results in low streambed insolation, but tropical forests are often cleared for cattle grazing and farming (Laurnace et al. 2000). In temperate systems, forest clearing results in increased light and nutrient runoff (Likens et al. 1970). However, the effect of clearing tropical forests on the global carbon cycle is poorly understood (Neill et al. 2001). Nutrient enrichment in the tropics can also be caused by agriculture and urbanization with poor sewage treatment (Mitchell et al. 2009, Ramírez et al. 2009). These environmental changes are likely to affect stream functional and structural parameters, which can contribute to the ongoing decrease in biodiversity and changes to carbon cycles.

The Brazilian Atlantic Forest is one of 25 global biodiversity hotspots and is, therefore, a conservation priority (Myers et al. 2000). It is also the most-threatened Brazilian biome. The small fraction of the original forest that remains (11–16%) is highly fragmented (Ribeiro et al. 2009). Some studies in the Rio de Janeiro Atlantic Forest have found that both nutrients and grazing limit biofilm biomass in low-order streams (Moulton et al. 2010, Lourenço-Amorim et al. 2014). These studies also found that primary production is a major energy source for stream macroinvertebrates (Neres-Lima et al. 2016). These findings are consistent with other study results in shaded tropical streams. For example, in Hong Kong forest streams, primary production was an important energy and nutrient source for aquatic food webs even when there was low algal biomass (Lau et al. 2009). The Uaimii State Forest (S. Bartolomeu, Minas Gerais, Brazil) in the Serra do Espinhaço Biosphere Reserve is one fragment of the Atlantic Forest that is part of a regional ecological corridor. Macroinvertebrate density is low in the Uaimii Forest streams (Graça et al. 2015b). Additionally, the proportion of predators is high compared with temperate systems, and these predators are often large-bodied (Graça et al. 2015b), which could limit grazers and, thus, grazer influence on algae.

To our knowledge, the importance of light for primary producers and its interaction with other factors like nutrients and grazing has rarely been addressed in the Brazilian Atlantic Forest streams, despite the uniqueness of the system. We hypothesized that primary production and periphyton biomass would be bottom-up limited by both light and nutrients in these streams because of the high proportion of predators, low dissolved nutrients, and dense shade. To address this hypothesis, we deployed 100 enclosures in a stream to manipulate herbivory pressure, light, and nutrients in different combinations, and measured how primary production responded to these manipulations. We also measured algal assemblage structure in these enclosures, to test whether these factors act as environmental filters on the local and regional species pool of algae.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study area

We conducted a field experiment in a ~100-m stream reach in the Mata-Pau, a 2nd-order stream that flows through the Uaimii Atlantic Forest (lat 20°17’35.56” S, long 043°34’14.48” W) in April–May 2016, just before the dry season. The stream bed was 1.5 to 4.0 m wide and had a maximum depth of 25 cm in the experimental stretch. The substrate consisted of coarse gravel and small cobbles (4–140 cm), and we observed no differences in substrate across the experimental reach. The forest had a closed canopy, but in a ~30-m section large trees were lacking on the north bank, which allowed sunlight to reach the stream bed directly for 3 h/d. We refer to this part of the reach as the ‘semi-open’ area (~70% coverage) to differentiate it from the shaded area (100% coverage).

General experimental design

We conducted field work in 3 phases. In phase 1, we sampled invertebrates to determine the identity and density of grazers and predators in the experimental stretches. We also deployed standardized tile substrates for algal colonization. In phase 2, we moved some of the colonized tiles into enclosures to conduct 2 experiments. The 1st experiment focused on interactions between light availability and trophic complexity, whereas the 2nd experiment focused on interactions between light availability and nutrients. In phase 3, we measured algal biomass and identity from tiles subjected to the different treatments in the laboratory.

During phases 1 and 2 we measured pH, conductivity (Digimed field probe; Digimed Instrumentação Analítica, São Paulo, Brazil), and current velocity (FP111 Flow Probe; Global Water; College Station, Texas) at 12 random locations in each of the shaded and semi-open areas), and discharge (velocity-area method; Hauer and Lamberti 2006) in a ~30-m downstream section with uniform width and depth. We collected water samples in a 1-L bottle for total alkalinity (titration with H2SO4, 0.01 N to pH 4.5; Car-
mouse 1994), total nitrogen (Kjeldahl method; APHA 2005), phosphorus (ascorbic acid method; APHA 2005) and phospho-
ate (colorimetric method; Mackereth et al. 1989) analysis.
We conducted these analyses 4× during the experimental period (5, 9, 12, and 16 May). We measured photosynthet-
ically active radiation (PAR) and temperature with Hobo®
data loggers (model Pendant UA-002-64; Onset, Bourne, Mas-
sachusetts) that took measurements every 10 min in both
the shaded and semi-open areas throughout the experimen-
tal period.

Algal colonization and invertebrate sampling
On 18 April 2016 we deployed 120 unglazed slate tiles
(8 × 8 × 1.9 cm) on the stream bed in the semi-open area
at ~6 cm depth and allowed algae to colonize and grow on
the tiles for 21 days. In another Atlantic Forest stream in
Rio de Janeiro, algal biomass stabilized after 15 days (Moul-
ton et al. 2015), so 21 days should have allowed sufficient
time for colonization. We ensured similar initial algal con-
ditions for all enclosure experiments described below by in-
cubating all tiles in the same stream stretch.

We estimated in-stream Helicopsyche densities from
stones randomly picked up from the stream bed in the shaded
(n = 10) and semi-open (n = 10) stretches (stones mea-
sured 8–12 cm along the largest axis, and individual areas
were recorded). We also measured the density of inverte-
brates in the shaded and semi-open areas from samples
(Surber sampler with 30 × 30 cm area and 0.5 mm mesh)
collected at 10 locations in each area. Samples were taken
by disturbing the substrate for ~45 seconds at each site
within the sampling frame. We sorted the invertebrates
alive in situ, preserved them in 70% ethanol, and then iden-
tified, measured, counted, and classified them by functional
feeding groups based on information for both the neotrop-
ics (Bello and Cabrera 2001, Polegatto and Froehlich 2001,
Baptista et al. 2006, Tomanova et al. 2006) and North Amer-
ica (Merritt and Cummins 1996, Cummins et al. 2005). We
identified and counted taxa under a stereomicroscope (Leica
M80) equipped with a digital camera (Leica IC 80 HD), and
measured all specimen lengths with the software Motic Im-
age Plus 2.0 (Hong Kong, China). Finally, we estimated spec-
imen biomass from length-mass equations (Smock 1980,
Benke et al. 1999, Johnson et al. 1999, Miserrandino 2001,
Stoffels and Karbe 2003).

Experimental manipulations

**Experiment 1: consumers and light manipulations**

On 9 May (after 21 d), we created 4 replicated experimental treat-
ments (n = 10 for each treatment in light condition): 1) no consumers, 2) ambient density of consumers (2 Hel-
copsyche), 3) high density consumer (4 Helicopsyche), and
4) consumers + predators (2 Helicopsyche and 1 Anacro-
neuria). The stonelike Anacronoeuria was the most abundant
predator in the stream. Fish were virtually absent through-
out the experiment, and during the entire study we only ob-
served one 1-cm *Loricariidae*, a grazer. To set up treat-
ments, we first transferred 80 periphyton-colonized tiles
from the stream bed to the enclosures (40 enclosures each in
the semi-open and shaded areas). Each enclosure was a
19 cm high, 18-cm-diameter plastic bucket with two 6-cm
 diameter windows on opposite sides. Each window was cov-
ered by 1-mm mesh that allowed water flow but kept out in-
vertebrates (Fig. S1). We placed the enclosures at <20-cm
depth and attached them to the stream bed with iron rods.
We then placed 1 tile in each enclosure. During this exper-
iment we checked the enclosures every 3 to 5 days and
cleared the clays that passed through the enclosure nets
and settled on the bottom of the buckets. Survivorship of in-
vertebrates was 100% during the experimental period. After
15 days we retrieved the tiles from the enclosures to deter-
ine algal biomass and identity (see below).

**Experiment 2: nutrient and light manipulation**

We placed a 2nd set of enclosures (n = 10) in each area with nutrient
diffusing substrates (but no invertebrates) in both the
semi-open and shaded areas, downstream of the 1st set.
We used commercial fertilizer pellets (Pastilhas Nutritivas
para Samambaias and Pastilhas Nutritivas para Flores, 2
pellets of each; West Garden, São Paulo, Brazil) as nutrients
and placed them in plastic vials with 4 pinholes that allowed
nutrients to diffuse into the water. The pellets (1.12–1.36 g
each) contained 9% N as (NH4)2SO4 and NH4H2PO4, 9%
P as P2O5, and 6% K2O. We replaced the pellets 3× (~every
4 d) over the course of the experiment. Nutrient leaching
occurred exponentially (based on 5 readings over a 4-d pe-
riod measured in 3 replicate enclosures), with P increasing
from 5.5 to 164.1 µg/L and total N from 46.5 to 97.6 µg/L.
However, these values fluctuated based on the time since
the pellets had been replaced. We used the same control tiles
from enclosures with no invertebrates in this experiment as
we did in experiment 1. As in experiment 1, we retrieved
all tiles after 15 d and used them to determine algal biomass
and identity (see below).

We also estimated gross primary production from tiles
incubated in the light (shade and semi-open) and nutrient
(with and without) treatments. We estimated primary pro-
duction by measuring changes in dissolved oxygen concen-
trations (Hauer and Lamberti 2006). We placed individual
tiles colonized with algae in glass flasks (1.5 L, 9-cm mouth
opening) and measured changes in oxygen in the dark (alu-
minum foil-covered) and light. We filled all flasks with
stream water and incubated them within 2 m of their enclo-
sures (to allow flasks to be submersed) for ~4:30 h (the ex-
act time was recorded for each bottle) in 4 runs on consec-
utive days, for a total of 68 measurements. We conducted
each set of measurements between 09:30 and 16:30 h. We
measured oxygen by inserting a YSI probe (Clark electrode;
Yellow Springs Instruments, Yellow Springs, Ohio) into the
flask through a hole in the lid. We made holes in the flask lids prior to the experiment and covered them with transparent tape to stop oxygen exchange. Changes in oxygen were expressed per unit area and time (mg O₂ cm⁻² h⁻¹), and we calculated gross primary production (GPP) as the sum of the estimated net primary production (NPP, changes in the oxygen content in the transparent flasks) and respiration (R, changes in the oxygen content in the dark flasks). We transformed oxygen values to carbon units by assuming 6 molecules of C were fixed for every 6 molecules of oxygen produced. Given that the atomic masses of oxygen and carbon are respectively 16 and 12, the release of 32 g of oxygen results in the fixation of 12 g of carbon, i.e., 0.375 g C/O₂. However, the photosynthetic coefficient is not 1.0, but 1.2 because glucose is quickly converted into other compounds (Brower et al. 1998). We, therefore, used the following equation to convert oxygen production (OP) to carbon fixation (CF):

\[ CF = \frac{0.375 \times OP}{1.2} \]  

[Eq. 1]

**Determination of algal biomass and identity**

After removing tiles from the enclosures, we used a toothbrush to scrape the accumulated biofilm from the tile surface into a tray, transferred it to a 50-mL Falcon™ centrifuge tube, and adjusted it to a final volume of 45 mL. We transferred a 3-mL portion of the suspended biofilm to Eppendorf™ tubes and preserved it with 3 mL of Lugol’s and 5 mL formalin (4%) for algal identification (see below). We filtered the remaining 42 mL in situ (glass fiber prefilters, AP4004700; Millipore®, Burlington, Massachusetts). We used algal assemblage structure data (square-root transformed) from both experiments (grazer and nutrient manipulations) to conduct both a nondimensional multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA; PRIMER-E®) (Anderson et al. 2008). We compared temperature (every 15 min along the 24 h cycle) and light intensity (every 15 min along 12 h cycle) in the shaded and semi-open areas throughout the entire 15 days of the experiment with non-parametric pairwise comparisons (Signed Rank Test). We compared the other environmental conditions with Student’s t-test. We compared invertebrate densities, total biomass, and biomass of functional feeding groups between the shaded and semi-open stretches with either t-tests when the data were normally distributed or Mann–Whitney U-tests when data were not normally distributed. We compared Chl a concentration on tiles in the stream bed (freely accessible to Helicopsyche) and tiles in the enclosures with 2 Helicopsyche (stream density) with a Student’s t-test.

In experiment 1, we assessed the simultaneous effects of consumers (4 levels: 0, 2, and 4 Helicopsyche, and 2 Helicopsyche with 1 predator [Anacronera]) and light (2 levels: shade and semi-open) on Chl a concentration with a 2-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), after ensuring the data was normally distributed (Shapiro–Wilk test; rank transformation was applied when the normality test failed). In experiment 2, we assessed the effect of light (2 levels: shade vs. semi-open) and nutrients (2 levels, with and without) on tile Chl a concentration and on primary production with 2-way ANOVA. We used the same control tiles here as we did in experiment 1 (no invertebrates).

We used algal assemblage structure data (square-root transformed) from both experiments (grazer and nutrient manipulations) to conduct both a nondimensional multivariate scaling (NMDS) based on Bray–Curtis similarities and a 2 factorial permutational analysis of variance (PERMANOVA; PRIMER-E®) (Anderson et al. 2008). We also compared the number of taxa and cell density in the treatments with and without consumers (4 levels) and light (2 levels) with a 2-way ANOVA and a post-hoc Holm–Sidak test when the differences were significant.

**RESULTS**

**Physical and chemical environment**

The median daily light intensity in the semi-open area (3700 lux) was 58% higher than the shaded area during the day (2300 lux; Z = 2.67, df = 22, p = 0.005). However,
during the 3 h direct sunlight reached the stream bed, light intensity was $10 \times$ higher than in the shaded area (Fig. 1). The temperature was identical in both reaches (mean = 16.7°C in both areas; shaded area range = 15.0–18.3°C; semi-open area range = 14.9–19.5°C). During the experiment, the pH (7.4 ± 0.1; mean ± SE), conductivity (31.6 ± 2.6 µS/cm), turbidity (3.1 ± 0.1 NTU), total alkalinity (283 ± 16 µEq/L), oxygen (9.4 ± 0.3 mg/L), N-total (46.5 ± 3.0 µg/L), P-PO4 (3.1 ± 0.4 µg/L), and P-total (5.5 ± 0.2 µg/L) remained relatively stable. The mean current velocity in the stream was 0.27 m/s and was significantly higher in the semi-open (median = 0.16; $U = 414.5$, df = 46, $p = 0.009$) than in the shaded stretch (median = 0.16; $U = 414.5$, df = 46, $p = 0.009$). Within the enclosures the current velocity was near zero. Finally, the discharge ranged from 0.09 to 0.17 m³/s, with a decrease toward the end of the experiment.

Invertebrate densities and biomass

The mean densities of *Helicopsyche* on natural stones were similar between shaded (1.6 ± 0.4 SE /stone) and semi-open (1.7 ± 0.2 SE /stone) stretches ($U \geq 42.5$, df = 18, $p \geq 0.570$). These estimates extrapolate to approximately 310 *Helicopsyche* m⁻², but under the assumption that the entire stream bed was covered with stones. The densities of *Helicopsyche* on tiles left in the stream bed during the experiment were 3.0 tile⁻¹, or 240 m⁻².

The overall density of the 31 observed taxa was 175 (±27 SE) individuals m⁻², and the total biomass was 348 (±149 SE) mg (DM) m⁻². We found no differences in density or total biomass between the semi-open and shaded areas ($t = 0.797$, df = 18, $p = 0.44$; and $U = 64$, df = 18, $p = 0.31$; Table 1). Predators made up 61% of the invertebrate biomass (26% in number of individuals), followed by filtering-collectors (31%), grazers and shredders (3% each), and gathering-collectors (2%; Fig. 2). A large proportion of predator biomass in the shaded area was contributed by just 5 specimens of *Corydalus* (Megaloptera, Corydalidae). If these 5 specimens are excluded from analyses, the biomass totals change to 68% filtering-collectors, 16% predators, 6% each grazers and shredders, and 4% gathering-collectors. The total biomass in shaded and semi-open areas did not differ significantly among any of the functional feeding groups ($U = 41–89$, df = 18, $p = 0.054–0.970$).

Experiment 1: consumer and light manipulations

Both light and consumer density affected algal biomass ($F > 12.99$, $p < 0.001$; Table S1; Fig. 3). Algal biomass on tiles with no consumers was significantly higher in the semi-open area (343.5 ± 48.7 mg Chl a m⁻²) than in the shaded area (128.4 ± 13.3 mg Chl a m⁻²). The presence of *Helicopsyche* at densities of 2 and 4 tile⁻¹ caused a 50 to 60% reduction in algal biomass in the semi-open and shaded areas, respectively. The presence of predators did not cause decreased algae on the tiles (Fig. 4).

![Figure 1. Average hourly temperature (°C) and light (lux) in the shaded (black squares) and semi-open (gray diamonds) areas in the Mata Pau Atlantic Forest stream ($n = 72$ d × 24 h = 1728 observations).](image)

Experiment 2: nutrient and light manipulation

Algal biomass differed among treatments ($F > 4.66$, $p < 0.04$), but algal biomass was significantly reduced in the presence of nutrients in the shaded, but not in the semi-open area (Fig. 5; Table S1). Gross primary production expressed as fixed C ranged from 0.009 to 0.417 µg C cm⁻² h⁻¹ (Fig. 6) and was significantly higher in the semi-open than the shaded area ($F = 31.38$, $p < 0.01$; Table S2). Gross primary production was not affected by nutrients alone but nutrients did interact with light such that gross primary production was lower in the shade when nutrients were present.

Algal assemblages

Twenty-seven algal taxa colonized the tiles (Table 2). All algae were in the Bacillariophyceae except for *Dolichospermum* sp. (Cyanobacteria) and *Ulothrix* sp. (Chlorophyceae). We found no difference in number of taxa across treatments ($F_{i.e} < 2.415$, $p > 0.127$), but the number of algal cells...
cm$^{-2}$ was significantly higher in the semi-open (155 ± 26) than the shaded area (53 ± 12; $F_{1,43} = 6.683, p = 0.013$). Assemblage structure was significantly different between the semi-open and shaded areas regardless of grazer presence (pseudo $F_{1,5} = 2.018, p = 0.036$). The algal taxa *Dolichospermum* sp. and *Eutoniopsis bilunaris* both had higher relative abundances in the semi-open than the shaded areas (12 vs 2% and 20 vs 13%, respectively). Conversely, *Fragilaria* sp. was less abundant in the semi-open than in the shaded areas (17 vs 32%; Table 2). However, when grazers were present *Dolichospermum* relative abundance increased from 3.5 to 38.9% in the semi-open area, and from <0.1 to 10.5% in the shaded area (Table S2). In contrast, we found no interaction in the effect of light and nutrients on assemblage structure (pseudo $F_{1,5} = 4.6$, $p = 0.1$). In the nutrient only treatment *Gomphonema aciulatum* was more abundant (7.7 vs 31.2 %, Table S1). As-
our findings have important implications for forecasting the ecosystem impacts of ongoing anthropogenic changes in these Neotropical Atlantic Forest streams.

**Nutrients**

Nutrients can limit primary production in streams (Hart and Robinson 1990, Artigas et al. 2013, Lourenço-Amorim et al. 2014). The Mata Pau stream total nitrogen was 46.46 ± 2.71 μg/L, which is at the extreme low end of the range reported for other tropical rivers and streams with low or no nutrient input (35–230 μg/L range; Brito et al. 2006, Moretti et al. 2009, Agra 2014, Guo et al. 2016b). The P-PO₄ concentration of ~3.1 μg/L is also at the low end of the range reported for other tropical streams with low anthropogenic impacts (2.7–470 μg/L range; e.g., Rosemond 1993, Flecker et al. 2002, Encalada et al. 2010, Ferreira et al. 2012, Moulton et al. 2015). Consistent with our expectations based on the low nutrient levels, algal biomass was low in these streams. However, it was within the range of values reported for other low-order streams (e.g. Rosemond 1993, Álvarez and Peckarsky 2005, Lourenço-Amorim et al. 2014, Garcia et al. 2015, Moulton et al. 2015, Guo et al. 2016b).

Here, we found that nutrient addition did not result in increased algal biomass. This finding is contrary to the results of some previous studies (Hart and Robinson 1990, Artigas et al. 2013, Lourenço-Amorim et al. 2014), but it is consistent with some other systems that have low ambient N and P concentrations (e.g., Mallory and Richardson 2005). In nutrient-limited systems where algal biomass is not affected by nutrient additions, algal growth limitations are generally attributed to other limiting factors, particularly light (Larned and Santos 2000, Lourenço-Amorim et al. 2014, Guo et al. 2016b). Streams in this area of the Atlantic Forest, though generally nutrient poor, are probably N- rather than P-limited, as reported for other Atlantic Forest streams in Rio de Janeiro state (Lourenço-Amorim et al. 2014, Moulton et al. 2015).

Nutrient addition to the shade treatment had an unexpected inhibitory effect on both primary production and algal biomass. This could be a result of nutrient toxicity, as has been reported in other studies (e.g. Burrows et al. 2017). This is unlikely, however, because we did not use extremely high nutrient concentrations in our experiment. Biomass accrual inhibition in our experiment could be a consequence of the replacement of some taxa or changes in the activity of key remaining taxa (see below). The interactive effects of light and nutrients on primary production warrant further investigation.

**Light**

Light can often limit primary production in streams and rivers (e.g. Hill et al. 1995, Mallory and Richardson 2005). We found that the removal of only a few trees in 1 area of 1 stream bank caused an overall 58% increase in light in that area, and resulted a 2.7× increase in periphyton biomass relative to fully shaded sections of the stream. We also found that primary production increased in the semi-open area compared with the shaded area. Our estimates for gross primary production under shade conditions (10 mg C m⁻² day⁻¹) are at the low end of the range reported for other shaded tropical streams (5–113 mg C m⁻² day⁻¹) (Davies et al. 2008). The 58% light increase in the semi-open area resulted in a 4× increase in primary production (to ~40 mg C m⁻² day⁻¹). However, it is unlikely that the 58% increase in light fully eliminated light limitation, because the increased rate of primary production was still lower than the ~90 mg C m⁻² day⁻¹ value reported by Moulton et al. (2015) in another low-order Atlantic Forest stream receiv—

![Figure 2. Mean (±SE) biomass of invertebrate functional feeding groups in shaded (black) and semi-open (gray) areas of the Mata Pau stream. In the column that represents biomass of predators in the shade, the area above the white line indicates the contribution of 5 specimens of Corydalidae.](image)

![Figure 3. Mean (±SE) Chl a on tiles incubated in enclosures with 0, 2 and 4 Hydropsyche tile⁻¹ placed in the shaded (black) and semi-open (gray) areas of the stream.](image)
even though grazers were not numerically abundant they constituted 12.7% of the algal biomass fixed by primary producers under nutrient enrichment in these closely shaded streams.

Other studies have found evidence for light or nutrient limitation (e.g., Mallory and Richardson 2005) or co-limitation (e.g., Larned and Santos 2000; light and P co-limitation). We also found an interaction of light and nutrients, with unexpectedly lower algal biomass under nutrient enrichment in the shade relative to algal biomass in semi-open conditions. Under shade conditions, 3 algal taxa differed between the control (no nutrients) and nutrient enriched conditions. *Eunotia bilunaris* constituted 12.7% of the cells in control treatments, but only 4.5% in enriched conditions. *Fragilaria capucina* also decreased between the control and enriched treatments, from 53.4 to 43.1%. In contrast, *Eunotia minor* increased from 5.0 to 21.6% in the control and in the nutrient enrichment treatment, respectively. Regardless of the mechanism behind the changes in the abundance of a few algal taxa, the decrease in C fixed by primary producers under nutrient enrichment in the shade may reinforce the heterotrophy of these systems.

**Herbivory**

*Helicopsyche* is the main grazer in the Mata Pau stream, and reached densities of ~310 individuals m$^{-2}$ on colonizable stone surfaces during this experiment. These densities are within the lower range reported for other systems (e.g., from 200 to ~2000; Pan and Lowe 1994, Guo et al. 2016b). We did not expect these grazers to reduce algal biomass, because their densities were so low compared to previously reported densities for the same streams, and because of the high proportion of predators. We found, however, that even though grazers were not numerically abundant they substantially lowered algal biomass. This finding refuted our hypothesis that top-down control of algal biomass by herbivores is unimportant in our system.

Grazer pressure was more intense in the semi-open than in the shaded stream area. In the shaded area grazers removed 33% of the algal biomass, whereas in the semi-open area grazers removed 53%. It is plausible that consumers grazed more efficiently in semi-open than in shaded areas because of high resource concentrations in semi-open areas. Thus, grazers in shaded areas would need to move more to find algal cells, and *Helicopsyche* growth rates might be faster in the semi-open areas than in the shaded ones. The results of our grazer experiment contrast with previous studies in which the grazing snail *Juga silicula* consumed 90% of the primary production under low-irradiance conditions, and <15% under high irradiance conditions (Lamberti et al. 1989). However, a meta-analysis that examined the controls on benthic algae found that while both light and herbivory are important, herbivory has a greater effect under high light conditions (Hillebrand 2005). This pattern can occur if high light favors algal types that grazers can easily digest (Hillebrand 2005).

Our results also contradict reports from other Atlantic Forest streams (Rio de Janeiro; Lourenço-Amorim et al. 2014) in which algae responded more to nutrient enrichment than to herbivore exclusion. The authors suggested the weak top-down effect may be associated with seasonal changes in the density of consumers and the small size of the dominant grazers (mainly Baetidae).

**Predation**

During our experiments, predators made up 26% of all invertebrates in terms of biomass in the Mata Pau stream, which is typical for nearby streams (33%; Graça et al. 2015b) and for streams elsewhere in the Atlantic Forest (31%; dos Santos and Rodrigues 2015). Predators were expected to exert a strong influence on herbivores and, thus, herbivory. However in the enclosures, the presence of the *Anacro-
neuria predator did not reduce herbivory. Most likely, the sand-covered *Helicopsyche* case is an effective protection against predation by *Anacroneuria*. In this study area, therefore, the most abundant predator does not appear to control grazing by the most abundant grazer by either direct consumption or reducing grazer activity (e.g. McIntosh et al. 2006, Álvarez and Peckarsky 2014). The abundance of other, more vulnerable, herbivores such as Baetidae (low in the study system) might be controlled by predators. However, this hypothesis remains to be tested. Finally, fish, which may be abundant in other low-order Atlantic Forest streams, may consume *Helicopsyche* and trigger trophic cascades down to the periphyton (Moulton et al. 2010).

**Periphyton community structure**

Diatoms are the dominant periphytic taxa in shaded Atlantic Forest streams (Felisberto and Rodrigues 2010, Lobo

Table 2. Mean (±SE) numbers (cells) of algal taxa and their relative abundances (%) on tiles incubated in semi-open and shaded areas in the Mata Pau stream.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxa</th>
<th>cells / cm²</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>semi-open</td>
<td>shaded</td>
<td>semi-open</td>
<td>shaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aulacoseira granulata</em> (Ehrenberg) Simonsen</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.33</td>
<td>0.37 ± 0.84</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cyclotella meneghiniana</em> Kützing</td>
<td>0.02 ± 0.10</td>
<td>0.05 ± 0.15</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Diatoma mesodon</em> (Ehrenberg) Kützing</td>
<td>0.71 ± 1.22</td>
<td>0.67 ± 1.17</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dolichospermum</em> sp.</td>
<td>18.96 ± 31.84</td>
<td>2.02 ± 3.45</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eucyonema</em> sp.</td>
<td>0.06 ± 0.17</td>
<td>0.12 ± 0.39</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eunotia bilunaris</em> (Ehrenberg) Schaarschmidt</td>
<td>30.40 ± 28.30</td>
<td>11.35 ± 9.90</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eunotia minor</em> (Kützing) Grunow</td>
<td>17.80 ± 16.40</td>
<td>10.68 ± 11.94</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eunotia flexuosa</em> (Brébisson ex Kützing) Kützing</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.22</td>
<td>0.35 ± 1.33</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fragilaria intermedia</em> (Grunow) Grunow</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.77</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.78</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fragilaria capucina</em> Desmazières</td>
<td>26.47 ± 40.81</td>
<td>26.67 ± 36.54</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fragilaria ulna</em> (Nitzsch) Lange-Bertalot</td>
<td>6.28 ± 7.03</td>
<td>1.69 ± 11.49</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gomphonema acuminatum</em> Ehrenberg</td>
<td>3.16 ± 5.04</td>
<td>0.46 ± 0.88</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gomphonema apiculatum</em> Ehrenberg</td>
<td>4.28 ± 5.87</td>
<td>3.06 ± 4.66</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gomphonema gracile</em> Ehrenberg</td>
<td>8.54 ± 17.06</td>
<td>2.69 ± 4.34</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gomphonema intricatum</em> Kützing</td>
<td>10.32 ± 14.66</td>
<td>5.84 ± 5.59</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gyrosigma</em> sp.</td>
<td>1.35 ± 2.57</td>
<td>0.97 ± 2.56</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Navicula accomoda</em> Hustedt</td>
<td>20.25 ± 15.91</td>
<td>8.02 ± 9.06</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Navicula lanceolata</em> Ehrenberg</td>
<td>3.41 ± 6.17</td>
<td>1.99 ± 3.09</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Navicula tridentula</em> Krasske</td>
<td>0.90 ± 1.81</td>
<td>1.90 ± 3.35</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Navicula</em> sp4.</td>
<td>0.14 ± 0.45</td>
<td>0.19 ± 10.43</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nitzschia</em> sp.</td>
<td>0.02 ± 0.10</td>
<td>0.09 ± 0.35</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pinnularia lanceolata</em> Heiden</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.83</td>
<td>0.21 ± 0.78</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pinnularia</em> sp2.</td>
<td>0.06 ± 0.20</td>
<td>2.87 ± 7.55</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pinnularia viridis</em> (Nitzsch) Ehrenberg</td>
<td>0.75 ± 2.57</td>
<td>1.65 ± 2.08</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Placoneis clementis</em> (Grunow) E.J.Cox</td>
<td>0.12 ± 0.52</td>
<td>0.46 ± 1.56</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Surirella</em> sp.</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.36</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ulothrix</em> sp.</td>
<td>0.31 ± 1.18</td>
<td>0.09 ± 0.44</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Mean (±SE) gross primary production in terms of carbon fixation on tiles incubated with (+) and without (−) nutrients in the shaded (black) and semi-open (gray) areas of the stream.
et al. 2010). As in other stream studies, in our study grazing resulted in fewer diatoms and more cyanobacteria (e.g. Rosemond 1993, Rosemond et al. 1993), likely because cyanobacteria are less palatable or have fewer nutrients for grazers compared with diatoms (Martin-Creuzburg et al. 2008). Cyanobacteria lack highly unsaturated fatty acids like 20:5\(\omega\)3, which are fundamental for grazer development (Müller-Navarra et al. 2000, Crenier et al. 2017). Regardless of the mechanism, we found that grazing was an important factor that structured algal communities.

Conclusion

Our findings from the Uaimii subsection of the Atlantic Forest indicate that light also may be a major factor limiting primary producers in other remains of the Brazilian Atlantic Forests. In particular, we showed that small changes in canopy cover may have a profound influence on in-stream energy sources and algal assemblages. The Brazilian Atlantic Forests have been so highly fragmented that \(\frac{1}{2}\) of the remaining Atlantic forest is <100 m from an edge (Ribeiro et al. 2009). This fragmentation results in increased light penetration to streams and in higher periphyton levels now than in the past. Our estimates were that a 58% increase in light resulted in a \(-4\times\) increase in gross primary production and \(-2.7\times\) increase in algal biomass. If our estimates can be extrapolated to other areas of the Atlantic Forest, fragmentation may thus be enriching streams with higher-quality resources (algae vs leaf litter), leading to changes in stream structure (invertebrate and algal assemblages) and function including decreased heterotrophy and increased autotrophy.
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