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Abstract

Feeding by the heterotrophic nanoflagellate *Katablepharis japonica* on red-tide organisms and interactions between the phototrophic dinoflagellate *Heterocapsa minima* and heterotrophic protists

Ji Eun Kwon

School of Earth and Environmental Sciences
College of Natural Sciences
Seoul National University

Heterotrophic nanoflagellates are ubiquitous and known to be major predators of bacteria. However, the feeding of free-living heterotrophic nanoflagellates on phytoplankton is poorly understood, although these two components usually co-exist. To investigate the feeding and ecological roles of major heterotrophic nanoflagellates *Katablepharis* spp., the feeding ability of *Katablepharis japonica* on bacteria and
phytoplankton species and the type of the prey that *K. japonica* can feed on were explored. Furthermore, the growth of *K. japonica* and its ingestion rates of the dinoflagellate *Akashiwo sanguinea*—a suitable algal prey item—heterotrophic bacteria, and the cyanobacteria *Synechococcus* sp., as a function of prey concentration were determined. Among the prey tested, *K. japonica* ingested heterotrophic bacteria, *Synechococcus* sp., the prasinophyte *Pyramimonas* sp., the cryptophytes *Rhodomonas salina* and *Teleaulax* sp., the raphidophytes *Heterosigma akashiwo* and *Chattonella ovata*, and the dinoflagellates *Heterocapsa rotundata, Amphidinium carterae, Prorocentrum donghaiense, Alexandrium minutum, Cochlodinium polykrikoides, Gymnodinium catenatum, A. sanguinea, Coolia malayensis,* and the ciliate *Mesodinium rubrum*, however, it did not feed on the dinoflagellates *Alexandrium catenella, Gambierdiscus caribaeus, Heterocapsa triquetra, Lingulodinium polyedrum, Prorocentrum cordatum, P. micans, and Scrippsiella acuminata* and the diatom *Skeletonema costatum*. Many *K. japonica* cells attacked and ingested a prey cell together after pecking and rupturing the surface of the prey cell and then uptaking the materials that emerged from the ruptured cell surface. Cell of *A. sanguinea* supported positive growth of *K. japonica*, but neither heterotrophic bacteria nor *Synechococcus* sp. supported growth. The maximum specific growth rate of *K. japonica* on *A. sanguinea* was 1.01 d\(^{-1}\). In addition, the maximum ingestion rate of *K. japonica* for *A. sanguinea* was 0.13 ng C predator\(^{-1}\)d\(^{-1}\)
(0.06 cells predator$^{-1}$d$^{-1}$). The maximum ingestion rate of *K. japonica* for heterotrophic bacteria was 0.019 ng C predator$^{-1}$d$^{-1}$ (266 bacteria predator$^{-1}$d$^{-1}$), and the highest ingestion rate of *K. japonica* for *Synechococcus* sp. at the given prey concentrations of up to ca. $10^7$ cells ml$^{-1}$ was 0.01 ng C predator$^{-1}$d$^{-1}$ (48 *Synechococcus* predator$^{-1}$d$^{-1}$). The maximum daily carbon acquisition from *A. sanguinea*, heterotrophic bacteria, and *Synechococcus* sp. were 307, 43, and 22%, respectively, of the body carbon of the predator. Thus, low ingestion rates of *K. japonica* on heterotrophic bacteria and *Synechococcus* sp. may be responsible for the lack of growth. The results of the present study clearly show that *K. japonica* is a predator of diverse phytoplankton, including toxic or harmful algae, and may also affect the dynamics of red tides caused by these prey species.

Prior to the present study, the phototrophic dinoflagellate *Heterocapsa minima* was not reported from Korean waters. I isolated this species from waters of Mijo Port, southern Korea in 2016. The genus *Heterocapsa* has been well documented as one of the major red-tide or harmful dinoflagellates. To investigate effective protist predators on *H. minima*, feeding by the engulfment-feeding heterotrophic dinoflagellates (HTDs) *Oxyrrhis marina*, *Gyrodinium dominans*, and *Polykrikos kofoidii*, the peduncle-feeding HTD *Pfiesteria piscicida*, the pallium-feeding HTD *Oblea rotunda*, and the naked ciliates *Pelagostrobilidium* sp. on *H. minima* was explored. I found that *O. marina*, *G. dominans*, *P. piscicida*, and
*Pelagostrobilidium* sp. were able to feed on *H. minima*. However, *H. minima* may not affect growth of predators. These findings suggest that the effect of predation by heterotrophic protists on *H. minima* might be negligible.
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Chapter 1. General introduction

Marine heterotrophic nanoflagellates (HNFs) and dinoflagellates are major components in marine ecosystems (Patterson and Larsen, 1991; Sanders et al., 1992; Hansen, 2011; Berge et al., 2012; Stoecker et al., 2017; Lim et al., 2018). HNFs are known to be major predators of marine bacteria and occasionally control their populations (Fenchel, 1982; Azam et al., 1983; Sieburth, 1984; Tanaka et al., 1997; Seong et al., 2006) and in turn, they are prey for heterotrophic dinoflagellates, ciliates, and copepods (Verity, 1991; Nakamura and Turner, 1997; Jeong et al., 2007). Therefore, they play an important role in the transfer of bacterial materials to heterotrophic protists and metazoans in marine planktonic food webs, and thus are a key component in marine microbial loops (Azam et al., 1983).

The phototrophic dinoflagellates are important prey items for other mixotrophic dinoflagellates, heterotrophic dinoflagellates (Hansen, 1992), and several varieties of metazooplankton. Owing to their diverse and important roles in marine ecosystems, studies have suggested that they form one of the major functional groups (e.g., Mitra et al., 2016). Therefore, to understand the roles of phototrophic dinoflagellates in marine ecosystems, it is important to understand their predators among co-occurring plankton, and their growth rates caused by predation of the species implied in the predator-prey relationships of the targeted dinoflagellates (e.g., Jeong et al., 2015).
This thesis consists of 5 chapters including this introduction (Fig. 1). Overall, newly discovered role of the heterotrophic nanoflagellate *Katablepharis japonica* as an effective predator on red-tide organisms and the first report of the phototrophic dinoflagellate *Heterocapsa minima* in Korean waters and its interactions with heterotrophic protists.

In chapter 2, the distributions of the heterotrophic nanoflagellate *Katablepharis japonica* in Korean waters were analyzed using quantitative real-time PCR. The specific primers and probe for *K. japonica* were developed. Also, 24 samples in Jinhae Bay in May 2014 to July 2017 were analyzed. The results of this chapter provides on understanding relationships between the distribution of *K. japonica* and environmental factors.

In chapter 3, to investigate the feeding and ecological roles of major heterotrophic nanoflagellates *Katablepharis* spp., the feeding ability of *Katablepharis japonica* on bacteria and diverse algal prey species including red-tide species were explored. Furthermore, the growth of *K. japonica* and its ingestion rates of the dinoflagellate *Akashiwo sanguinea*, heterotrophic bacteria, and the cyanobacteria *Synechococcus* sp., as a function of prey concentration were determined. This characteristic, studied in this chapter, provided a basis for understanding the interactions between *Katablepharis* spp. and bacteria and phytoplankton and their ecological roles in marine ecosystems, specifically, in red-tide dynamics.
In chapter 4, prior to the present study, the phototrophic dinoflagellate *Heterocapsa minima* was not found in the Korean waters. I successfully isolated *H. minima* cells from Mijo port, southern Korea in 2016 and established a clonal culture of this species. Using this culture, I determined the molecular sequences of the D1-D2 LSU rDNA, and the ITS region (ITS1, 5.8S, and ITS2) and performed phylogenetic analyses. Furthermore, to investigate its protistan predators, interactions between *H. minima* and common heterotrophic protists were explored. This chapter provides a basis for understanding the interactions between *H. minima* and common heterotrophic protist species, and their ecological roles in the marine planktonic community.

**Fig. 1.** Thesis Outline
Chapter 2. Distribution of the heterotrophic nanoflagellate *Katablepharis japonica* in Jinhae Bay, Korea in 2014-2017 using quantitative real-time PCR

2.1. Introduction

The genus *Katablepharis* is one of the major genera of HNFs and has a worldwide distribution (Kahn et al., 2014; Péquin et al., 2017). This genus was first established by Skuja in 1939 and placed in the family Katablepharidaceae in the class Cryptophyceae (Lee and Kugrens, 1991), however, it was moved to Katablepharidea, an independent class (Vørs, 1992; Clay and Kugrens, 1999; Okamoto and Inouye, 2005).

Recently, a free-living HNF was isolated from Masan Bay, Korea and a clonal culture was established. Based on morphological and genetic analyses, it was revealed to be *Katablepharis japonica*. The small subunit ribosomal DNA of this Korean strain was identical to that of a Japanese strain (GenBank accession number AB231617). Data on the distribution and population dynamics of *K. japonica* are lacking.

In this study, the distribution of *K. japonica* in Korean waters was analyzed using qRT-PCR assay utilizing TaqMan probes. Twenty four samples were collected in Jinhae Bay, Korea in May 2014 to July 2017. To detect specifically species, primers and probes were originally developed to fit the target *Katablepharis japonica* using sequences of its small subunit
ribosomal DNA regions. All these primers and probes passed the species-specificity test.

This study provides the comprehensive data on distribution of *Katablepharis japonica* in Jinhae Bay, Korea. The results of this study provide a basis on better understanding the ecology of the *K. japonica*, and relationships between the abundances of *K. japonica* and environmental factors.

### 2.2. Materials and Methods

#### 2.2.1. The quantitative real-time PCR assay

To develop a probe and primer set for the detection and quantification of *Katablepharis japonica*, DNA of cells from a dense culture of *K. japonica* KJMS1610 was extracted using the AccuPrep® Genomic DNA Extraction Kit (Bioneer Cooperation, Daejeon, Korea). Then, the small subunit ribosomal DNA (SSU rDNA) region was amplified using EukA (Medlin et al., 1988) as the forward primer and G23R (Litaker et al., 2003) as the reverse primer (Table 1). PCR amplification and sequencing were conducted as in Lee et al. (2017). In addition to the obtained sequences of my *K. japonica*, the sequences of the other strains of *K. japonica* and related dinoflagellate SSU rDNA region available from GenBank were aligned using MEGA v.4 (Tamura et al., 2007). Manual curation of the alignments was conducted to identify unique sequences and develop a *K.*
japonica specific qPCR assay. The sequences for the primer-probe set were selected from the region that were conserved K. japonica strains, but allowed for discrimination from other dinoflagellates. The primer and probe sequences of the target species were analyzed using a method of Lee et al. (2017). The probe was dual-labeled with the fluorescent dyes FAM and BHQplus (Biosearch Technologies Inc., Novato, CA) at the 5' and 3' ends, respectively.

**Table 1**

Information on the primers used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sequence (5'-3')</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer</td>
<td>EukA</td>
<td>AACCTGGTTGATCCTGCCAGT</td>
<td>Medlin et al. 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer</td>
<td>G23R</td>
<td>TTCAGCCTTGCGACCATA</td>
<td>Litaker et al. 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A dense culture of *K. japonica* KJMS1610 was also used to conduct standard curve. The DNA was extracted from the dense culture of *K. japonica* and then diluting the extracted DNA in serial. To conduct standard curve, 2-l PC bottles that contain the dense culture (containing approximately > 1000 cells ml⁻¹) were well mixed and 10-ml aliquots were taken and fixed with 5% Lugol's iodine solution from bottle to enumerate cell concentrations. The determination of cell concentrations was examined under a compound microscope and enumerated in 1-ml SRC chamber.
The standard curve was conducted by serially diluting extracted DNA originated from a dense culture of *K. japonica* (concentration = 6,930 cells ml\(^{-1}\)) by adding diverse aliquots of extracted DNA to elution buffer so that each sample may target approximately 50000, 25000, 10000, 1000, 100, 10, and 1 cells ml\(^{-1}\) of *K. japonica* (Table 2). The whole procedure including DNA extraction and DNA dilution was conducted in triplicate. Then samples were stored at -20 °C in the freezer and qPCR amplification was conducted within a day. The qPCR assays for determination of the standard curve obtained by preparation were performed as in Lee et al. (2017). The DNA of each sample was amplified 7–12 times to ensure accuracy of results and natural seawater samples without *K. japonica* cells were used as the negative control. The fluorescence of each reaction tube was quantified per cycle and the threshold for a positive reaction was automatically selected by using the default settings on the accompanying qPCR instrument using Rotor-Gene Q Series Software (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). Then, based on the result obtained, the threshold of standard curves was fixed at 0.0138, which was first automatically selected by the software, and showed most optimal florescence results. From the threshold, the threshold cycle (Ct) values, which were the intersection between the amplification curve and threshold line, were obtained.
Table 2

Preparation methods used to determine standard curves used in this study to determine the efficiency of real-time PCR in respect to the quantification of the heterotrophic nanoflagellate *Katablepharis japonica*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Collection date</th>
<th>Collection area</th>
<th>Temp. (℃)</th>
<th>Salinity</th>
<th>Actual cell concentration approximate (cells ml⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Katablepharis japonica</em></td>
<td>2016 10</td>
<td>Masan, Korea</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>50000, 25000, 10000, 1000, 100, 10, and 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Cell concentration of the culture (6930 cells ml⁻¹).

2.2.2. Relationships between the abundance of *K. japonica* and environmental factors

Data were analyzed statistically using the IBM SPSS, Statistics v25 program. Pearson’s correlation analysis was conducted for the correlation between the abundances of *K. japonica* and environmental factors. (Garson, 2013; Heck et al., 2013; West, 2009; West et al., 2014).

2.3. Results

2.3.1. Assay development

Primers and probe for *Katablepharis japonica* were established (Table 3). Specific primers and probe passed specificity test. Only reagents
containing target species were detected. Also, standard curve of *K. japonica* was developed and r2 value of curve is higher than 0.98.

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sequence (5'-3')</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forward primer</strong></td>
<td>JAPOF</td>
<td>TGCTTGTCGGCTTTCTTTTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reverse primer</strong></td>
<td>JAPOR</td>
<td>GGCCTGCTTTGAACACTCTAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probe</strong></td>
<td>JAPOP</td>
<td>GGGGACCACATTTGCTTTTACTGAGGA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2. Distribution of *K. japonica* in Korean waters assessed using qPCR

Among the 24 samples investigated in the present study, the abundance of *K. japonica* was $\geq 0.2$ cells ml$^{-1}$ in 12 samples in Jinhae Bay from May 2014 to July 2017 (Table 4). Cells of *K. japonica* were not detected in samples off of May, July 2014, May, September 2015, January, March, July, September, and October 2016. The highest abundance of *K. japonica* in Jinhae Bay, 13.6 cells ml$^{-1}$, was obtained in September 2014, while the second-highest abundance, 4.9 cells ml$^{-1}$, was measured in May 2017 (Table 4).
Table 4

The abundance of *Katablepharis japonica* (Kj), temperature (T), salinity (S), and chlorophyll-a concentration in Jinhae Bay, Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>date</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Chl-a (mg/m³)</th>
<th>Kj (cells/ml)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 0509</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 0522</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 0711</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 0904</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 0919</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 1111</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 0119</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 0409</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 0528</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 0716</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 0904</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 1014</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 0115</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 0330</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 0511</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 0706</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 0710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 0907</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 1008</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 1216</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 0326</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 0518</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 0708</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.3. Relationships between the abundance of *K. japonica*, temperature, salinity, and chlorophyll-a concentration in Jinhae Bay, Korea.

The abundance of the heterotrophic nanoflagellate *Katablepharis japonica* in Jinhae Bay, Korea, together with environmental factors, were studied. Through the IBM SPSS program, the correlation between the abundances of *K. japonica* and chlorophyll-a appears to be significant at a significance level of $P < 0.05$. Also, it has a slightly higher correlation of around 0.634 (Table 5). Temperature and salinity concentrations correlated poorly with the abundances of *K. japonica*. 
Table 5
Correlation between the abundance of *K. japonica* (kj), temperature (T), salinity (S), and chlorophyll-a (Chl-a) concentration in Jinhae Bay, Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Chl-a</th>
<th>Abundance of Kj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.507*</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>40.565</td>
<td>-7.865</td>
<td>6.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.507*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>-7.865</td>
<td>5.925</td>
<td>-6.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chl-a</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>6.090</td>
<td>-6.291</td>
<td>80.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundance of Kj</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>-.318</td>
<td>.634*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>4.455</td>
<td>-2.401</td>
<td>21.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
2.4. Discussion

2.4.1. Detection of Katablepharis japonica using quantitative real-time PCR assay

In this study, species-specific primers and probe for the qRT-PCR assay on *K. japonica* were developed. Sequences of SSU rDNA regions were used in this study to easily find unique sequences which only one species have. Also, the TaqMan method was chosen in this study to minimize the chance to detect false-positive signals. TaqMan probe method is more stable than SyBR Green method, because additional specific probe is needed in TaqMan method (Antonella and Luca, 2013).

2.4.2. Relationships between the abundance of *K. japonica*, temperature, salinity, and chlorophyll-a concentration in Jinhae Bay, Korea.

The abundance of *K. japonica* in this study was significantly affected by chlorophyll-a concentration, but not water temperature or salinity. The phototrophic dinoflagellates generally have chloroplasts (Dodge, 1971; Dodge, 1975; Gibbs, 1981). So this study suggests a significant relationship between the abundances of *K. japonica* and other phytoplankton. *K. japonica* may feed on co-occurring phytoplankton. Thus, it is worthwhile to investigate feeding by *K. japonica* on diverse algal prey items.
Chapter 3. Feeding by the heterotrophic nanoflagellate *Katablepharis japonica* on red-tide organisms

3.1. Introduction

In Chapter 2, the distribution of the HNF *Katablepharis japonica* was significantly affected by chlorophyll-a, indicating feeding by this HNF on phytoplankton. Compared with numerous studies on predation by HNFs on bacteria, there have been considerably fewer studies that have investigated HNF feeding on algal prey (e.g., Suttle et al., 1986; Kühn et al., 1996; Schnepf and Schweikert, 1997; Clay and Kugrens, 1999).

Marine phytoplankton is a major component of marine ecosystems and major primary producers in the sea, and in turn, it is an important prey item for diverse mixotrophic and heterotrophic organisms (Sanders, 1991; Stoecker, 1998; Tillmann, 2004; Jeong et al., 2010b, 2015; Lim et al., 2017). Some phytoplankton species are toxic or harmful to other marine organisms and humans (Smayda, 1997; Basti et al., 2016; Jeong et al., 2017). Furthermore, some species are primarily responsible for harmful algal blooms (HAB) or red tides, which cause large-scale mortality of fish or human illnesses (Hallegraeff, 1993; Anderson, 1989; Park et al., 2013; Lim et al., 2015; Reich et al., 2015; Lee et al., 2016; Grattan et al., 2016). Therefore, understanding population dynamics of a red tide or HAB species, and predicting the outbreaks, persistence, and declines of the red tide or
HAB species are critical concerns in scientists, officials, and people in the aquaculture industry. In population dynamics of a red tide or HAB species, growth and mortality caused by predation are two critical parameters (e.g., Jeong et al., 2015). Compared to the number of studies exploring the growth of a red tide species, those on mortality caused by predation are relatively rare (e.g., Turner, 2006; Jeong et al., 2010b, 2015). Furthermore, most reported predators of red tide organisms are heterotrophic dinoflagellates, ciliates, and metazoans (Hansen, 1991; Jeong et al., 2003, 2015; Tillmann, 2004; Kamiyama et al., 2006; Turner, 2006, 2014; Harvey and Menden-Duer, 2011; Kim et al., 2013; Yoo et al., 2013a, 2013b). Predation by free-living HNFs on red tide species is still poorly understood, although free-living HNFs and red tide species usually co-occur in most marine environments and the abundance of free-living HNFs is often greater than that of heterotrophic dinoflagellates, ciliates, and metazoans (Jeong et al., 2013; Yoo et al., 2013a). Therefore, it is worthwhile to explore feeding by HNFs on red tide species.

In marine environments, *Katablepharis* spp. sometimes dominate the assemblages of free-living HNFs (e.g., Kahn et al., 2014), however, there have been only a few studies on feeding by marine *Katablepharis* species (e.g., Clay and Kugrens, 1999). These studies briefly reported that *Katablepharis* spp. fed on the haptophyte *Chrysochromulina parva* and the cryptophytes *Chroomonas* sp. and *Rhodomonas* sp., however, many
common phytoplankton species, including harmful dinoflagellates and raphidophytes, have not yet been tested as prey for *Katablepharis* spp. Thus, it is worthwhile to explore the interactions between *Katablepharis* spp. and co-occurring phytoplankton and their ecological roles in marine planktonic communities.

In the present study, using this culture, the type of the prey that *K. japonica* can feed upon was investigated by providing them with heterotrophic bacteria, cyanobacteria, and diverse phytoplankton. Additionally, the growth of *K. japonica* and the ingestion rates of *K. japonica* on the harmful dinoflagellate *Akashiwo sanguinea*, the suitable prey, heterotrophic bacteria, and the cyanobacteria *Synechococcus* sp., as a function of prey concentration were determined. The results of the present study provided a basis for understanding the interactions between *Katablepharis* spp. and bacteria and phytoplankton and their ecological roles in marine ecosystems, specifically, in red tide dynamics.

### 3.2. Materials and Methods

#### 3.2.1. Preparation of experimental organisms

Many algal species belonging to diverse taxa and having diverse sizes and shapes were provided as potential prey items (Table 6). Some species were thecate and others were non-thecate and single cells to chain forms. A
culture of *Alexandrium catenella* CCMP 1493 (previously *A. tamarense* CCMP 1493) that is a toxic strain was obtained from National Center for Marine Algae and Microbiota, USA (Orr et al., 2013). All algal prey species, except *Cochlodinium polykrikoides* and *Lingulodinium polyedra*, were grown at 20°C in enriched f/2-Si seawater media (Guillard and Ryther, 1962) under 20 µE m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ illumination on a 14:10 h light/dark cycle. Cells of *C. polykrikoides* and *L. polyedra* were grown under continuous illumination of 50 µE m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, provided by a cool white fluorescent light, because they do not grow well under lower illumination on a light/dark cycle (Lee et al., 2014). The mean equivalent spherical diameter (ESD) ± standard deviation was measured using an electronic particle counter (Coulter Multisizer II; Coulter Corporation, Miami, Florida, USA). The ESD of the phytoplankton species were obtained from previous studies (Jeong et al., 2010a, 2011, 2012b, 2016; Yoo et al., 2010; Kang et al., 2011).
Table 6
Taxa, size, and concentration of bacterial and algal prey species offered to *Katablepharis japonica*. Mean equivalent spherical diameter (ESD, µm) for algae. The initial concentrations of *K. japonica* were 500–2000 cells ml⁻¹. T: Thecate, NT: Non-thecate, Y: Attack or feeding by *K. japonica*, N: Not attacked or fed on by *K. japonica*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>ESD (± SD)</th>
<th>Initial prey concentration (cells/ml)</th>
<th>Attack</th>
<th>Feeding by <em>K. japonica</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bacteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Heterotrophic bacteria</em></td>
<td>1.0 (0.04)</td>
<td>1x10⁷</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Synechococcus sp.</em></td>
<td>1.0 (0.2)</td>
<td>1x10⁷</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bacillariophytes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Skeletonema costatum</em></td>
<td>5.9 (1.1)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prymnesiophytes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Isochrysis galbana</em></td>
<td>4.8 (0.2)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prasinophytes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pyramimonas sp.</em></td>
<td>5.6 (0.1)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cryptophytes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Teleaulax sp.</em></td>
<td>5.6 (1.5)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rhodomonas salina</em></td>
<td>8.8 (1.5)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhaphidophytes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Heterosigma akashiwo</em></td>
<td>11.5 (1.9)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chattonella ovata</em></td>
<td>40.0 (1.6)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dinoflagellates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>ESD (µm) ± SD</th>
<th>Abundance (cells ml⁻¹)</th>
<th>Predation (Y = yes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterocapsa rotundata (T)</td>
<td>5.8 (0.4)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphidinium carterae (NT)</td>
<td>9.7 (1.6)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prorocentrum minimum (T)</td>
<td>12.1 (2.5)</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prorocentrum donghaiense (T)</td>
<td>13.3 (2.0)</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterocapsa triquetra (T)</td>
<td>15.0 (4.3)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandrium lusitanicum (T)</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrippsiella trochoidea (T)</td>
<td>22.8 (2.7)</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochlodinium polykrikoides (NT)</td>
<td>25.9 (2.9)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prorocentrum micans (T)</td>
<td>26.6 (2.8)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akashiwo sanguinea (NT)</td>
<td>30.8 (3.5)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandrium tamarense (T)</td>
<td>32.6 (2.7)</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolia maleyensis (T)</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambierdiscus caribaeus (T)</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnodinium catenatum (NT)</td>
<td>33.9 (1.6)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingulodinium polyedrum (T)</td>
<td>38.2 (3.6)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Naked ciliate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>ESD (µm) ± SD</th>
<th>Abundance (cells ml⁻¹)</th>
<th>Predation (Y = yes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesodinium rubrum</td>
<td>22 (0.04)</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The abundances of the predator for each target prey were 2000–5000 cells ml⁻¹. ?, questionable; ESD, mean equivalent spherical diameter (µm) ± SD of the mean was measured by an electronic particle counter (Coulter Multisizer II, Coulter Corporation, Miami, FL).
The heterotrophic bacterial cells that originated from a clonal culture of *Katablepharis japonica* were used after being fluorescently labeled, following Sherr et al. (1987). In this study, the fluorescently labeled bacteria (FLB) were mostly seen as rods (a cylinder) and rarely spherical. The longest (length) and the shortest axes (width) of 30 FLB cells were measured under an epifluorescence microscope as in Lee and Fuhrman (1987) and then the volume was calculated according to the following equation: $\text{volume} = \left[ \pi \left( \frac{3L - W}{3} \times \left( \frac{W}{2} \right)^2 \right) \right]$ for a rod (cylinder) and $\frac{4}{3} \times \left[ \pi R^3 \right]$ for a sphere, where $L =$ length, $W =$ width, and $R =$ radius as in Lee (1993). The mean (+ standard error, n) volumes of FLB were $0.45 \, \mu m^3 \pm 0.05, n=30$.

The cyanobacterium *Synechococcus* sp. (SYN, GenBank accession number = DQ023295, ESD = ca. 1 µm) were grown at 20°C in enriched f/2 seawater media (Guillard and Ryther 1962) without silicate, under a 14:10 h light-dark cycle of 20 µE m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ provided by a cool white fluorescent light (Table 6).

Cells of *K. japonica* were isolated from plankton samples collected in Masan Bay, Korea in October 2016, when the water temperature and salinity were 21.8°C and 19.3, respectively. The samples were screened gently through a 154-µm Nitex mesh and placed in 6-well tissue culture plates. A clonal culture of *K. japonica* KJMS1610 was established using two serial single-cell isolations. The raphidophyte *Chattonella ovata* was
originally provided as prey. As the concentration of *K. japonica* increased, the culture was sequentially transferred to 50-, 250-, and 800-ml flasks containing fresh prey (ca. 10,000 cells ml\(^{-1}\)), however, *Pyramimonas* sp. cells were not completely eliminated by the predator. Thus, *Akashiwo sanguinea* was provided as an alternative prey item because this prey was completely eliminated. The flasks were filled to capacity with freshly filtered seawater, capped, and placed on a shelf at 20°C under illumination of 20 \(\mu\)E m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) provided by cool white fluorescent lights, under a 14:10 h light/dark cycle. The mean ESD of *K. japonica* was 8.1 \(\mu\)m and its carbon content was estimated from cell volume (Menden-Deuer and Lessard 2000) as 0.043 ng C per cell.

### 3.2.2. Feeding occurrence

Experiment 1 was designed to investigate the ability of *K. japonica* to feed on individual target species when unialgal diets of diverse algal species, *Synechococcus* sp., and heterotrophic bacteria were provided (Table 6). The initial concentrations of each algal species had a similar carbon biomass.

**Algal prey**

A culture of approximately 8000 cells ml\(^{-1}\) of *K. japonica* growing on *A. sanguinea* was transferred to a single 250-ml culture flask containing freshly filtered seawater after *A. sanguinea* became undetectable. This culture was maintained for 1 day. Three 1-ml aliquots were then removed
from the flask and examined with a light microscope to determine the concentration of *K. japonica*.

The initial concentrations of *K. japonica* (ca. 2000–5000 cells ml\(^{-1}\)) and each of the target algal species were established using an autopipette to deliver a predetermined volume of culture with a known cell density into wells of 6-well plate chambers. For each algal species, triplicate wells containing mixtures of *K. japonica* and prey (total of 5 ml in each well), and triplicate predator control wells containing a culture of *K. japonica* only (total of 5 ml in each well) were established. The plate chambers were placed on a shelf and incubated under a 14:10 h light-dark cycle of 20 µE m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) of cool white fluorescent light.

After 2, 24, and 48 h, >30 *K. japonica* cells in the well were monitored under a dissecting microscope with a magnification of ×40–63 to determine whether *K. japonica* is able to feed on the target prey species.

**Heterotrophic bacteria**

For the epifluorescence microscopy, the heterotrophic bacterial cells that originated from a clonal culture of *K. japonica* were used after being fluorescently labeled as described above. To remove any aggregated FLB, the FLB were dispersed throughout the medium using a sonicator (Bransonic cleaner 5510E-DTH, Danbury, CT, USA) for 10–30 s and then filtered through 3-µm pore sized filter (Whatman, Polycarbonate, Maidstone, UK).
In this experiment, the initial concentrations of *K. japonica* (1000 cells ml\(^{-1}\)) and FLBs (1 \(\times\) 10\(^7\) cells ml\(^{-1}\)) were established using an autopipette to deliver a predetermined volume of culture with a known cell density to the experimental bottles. Triplicate 42-ml polycarbonate (PC) bottles (mixtures of predators and FLBs) and triplicate predator control bottles (containing predator only) were established at a single prey concentration. The bottles were placed on a shelf and incubated at 20°C under a continuous illumination of 20 \(\mu\)E m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) provided by cool white fluorescent light. At the beginning, and after 5- and 10-min incubation periods, 5-ml aliquots were removed from each bottle, transferred into 20-ml vials, and then fixed with borate-buffered formalin [final conc. = 4% (v/v)] for FLB observation. The fixed samples were stained using 4′6′-diamidino-2-phenylindole (DAPI; final conc. = 1 \(\mu\)M) and then filtered onto 3 \(\mu\)m-pore-sized PC white membrane filters. Cells of *K. japonica* on the membranes were observed under an epifluorescence microscope (Ziess-Axiovert 200M, Carl Zeiss Ltd., Göttingen, Germany) at a magnification of 1000\(\times\) and pictures were taken.

**Cyanobacterial prey**

A dense culture of *K. japonica* was transferred to a 1-l PC bottle containing freshly filtered seawater. Three 1-ml aliquots were then removed from the bottle and examined using a compound microscope to determine the *K. japonica* concentration.
In this experiment, the initial concentrations of *K. japonica* (1000 cells ml$^{-1}$) and *Synechococcus* ($1 \times 10^7$ cells ml$^{-1}$) were established using an autopipette to deliver a predetermined volume of culture with a known cell density to the experimental bottles. Triplicate 42-ml PC bottles (mixtures of predator and *Synechococcus*) and triplicate predator control bottles (containing predator only) were established at a single prey concentration. The bottles were filled to capacity with freshly filtered seawater, capped, and placed on a shelf at 20°C under continuous illumination of 20 µE m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$. After 5- and 10-min incubation, a 5-ml aliquot was removed from each bottle, transferred into a 20-ml vial, and fixed with formalin (final conc. = 4%). The fixed aliquots were filtered onto 3 µm-pore sized, 25-mm PC black membrane filters and then the concentrated cells on the membranes were observed under an epifluorescence microscope (Zeiss-Axiovert 200M, Carl Zeiss Ltd., Göttingen, Germany) with red light excitation at a magnification of 1000× to determine whether *K. japonica* predator could feed on *Synechococcus*. Pictures showing ingested *Synechococcus* cells inside the protoplasm of each *K. japonica* cell were taken using a digital camera at a magnification of 1000×.

3.2.3. Feeding behaviors

Experiment 2 was designed to investigate the feeding behavior of *K. japonica* when provided with unialgal diet of the algal prey. The initial
concentrations of predator and prey used in Experiment 2 were the same as those described above for Experiment 1 (Table 6, 7).
Table 7
Design of experiments. The numbers in prey and predator columns are the actual initial densities (cells ml\(^{-1}\)) of prey and predators in Experiments 1–7 (see text). Values in parentheses in the predator column are the predator densities in the predator control bottles (prey density = 0 cells ml\(^{-1}\)). BI: Bottle incubation method. IC: Inclusion method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expt No.</th>
<th>Prey</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Predator</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diverse prey</td>
<td>See Table 1</td>
<td>Katablepharis japonica</td>
<td>See Table 1</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Diverse prey</td>
<td>See Table 1</td>
<td>K. japonica</td>
<td>See Table 1</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Akashiwo snaguinea</td>
<td>16, 55, 79, 112, 664, 1089, 1928, 3305, 0</td>
<td>K. japonica</td>
<td>20, 35, 79, 74, 354, 836, 2356, 3253, (87)</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Heterotrophic bacteria</td>
<td>1.1x10(^5), 1.3 x10(^5), 5.0 x10(^5), 1.0 x10(^6), 5.0 x10(^6), 7.1 x10(^6), 1.0 x10(^7)</td>
<td>K. japonica</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Synechococcus sp.</td>
<td>4.1x10(^5), 9.5 x10(^5), 1.4 x10(^6), 1.9 x10(^6), 5.5 x10(^6), 6.7 x10(^6), 9.8 x10(^6)</td>
<td>K. japonica</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Heterotrophic bacteria</td>
<td>6.9 x10(^6), 1.1 x10(^7)</td>
<td>K. japonica</td>
<td>2950, 3700</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Synechococcus sp.</td>
<td>7.3 x10(^6), 9.7 x10(^6)</td>
<td>K. japonica</td>
<td>2290, 2340</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each target species, a well containing a mixture of *K. japonica* and the prey (total of 5-ml) was established. As soon as the mixture was added to the well, many *K. japonica* cells attacked a prey cell together. Thus, the feeding processes, from the time a prey cell was attacked to the time the prey was completely ingested by the predators, were observed by monitoring the behavior of many unfed *K. japonica* cells for each prey species under a light microscope at a magnification of ×100–630. The feeding process for a *K. japonica* cell was documented using a video analyzing system (Sony DXC-C33; Sony Co., Tokyo, Japan) mounted on a compound microscope at a magnification of ×100–630.

To determine whether *K. japonica* can feed on actively swimming *Akashiwo sanguinea* cells, *K. japonica* cells were monitored after ca. 200 *K. japonica* cells and ca. 3000 *A. sanguinea* cells were mixed in two wells of a 12-well plate chamber. The feeding process of *K. japonica* cells feeding on 3 actively swimming *A. sanguinea* cells was documented using a video analyzing system. Furthermore, to determine whether *K. japonica* can feed on *A. sanguinea* cells when the concentration of the predator is low, *K. japonica* cells were monitored after establishing mixtures of *K. japonica* and *A. sanguinea* cells with predator:prey ratios of 10:100 (cells ml\(^{-1}\):cells ml\(^{-1}\)), 20:500, 50:800, 100:1000, 200:2000, 500:3000, and 1000:4000 in wells of 12-well plate chambers. Duplicate wells for each ratio were established. The
feeding process for *K. japonica* cells feeding on actively swimming *A. sanguinea* cells was documented. Moreover, to examine whether *K. japonica* can feed on *A. sanguinea* cells under turbulent conditions, feeding by *K. japonica* cells on *A. sanguinea* was examined under a dissecting microscope after mixtures of *K. japonica* and *A. sanguinea* cells at predator:prey ratios of 100:1000 (cells ml\(^{-1}\):cells ml\(^{-1}\)) and 1000:4000 had been established in one 42-ml flask for each ratio and subsequently placed on a rotating wheel for 3 h at 0.9 rpm.

3.2.4. Growth and ingestion rates as a function of prey concentration

Experiments 3, 4, and 5 were designed to measure the growth and ingestion rates of *K. japonica* on *A. sanguinea*, heterotrophic bacteria, and *Synechococcus* sp., as a function of prey concentration (Table 7). In the preliminary test, *K. japonica* grew well on *A. sanguinea*, but did not grow on the other algal prey species.

For the experiment on *A. sanguinea* prey (i.e., experiment 3), cultures of ca. 11,000 cells ml\(^{-1}\) of *K. japonica* growing on *A. sanguinea* were transferred to a single 250-ml culture flask containing freshly filtered seawater after *A. sanguinea* became undetectable. This culture was maintained for 1 day. Three 1-ml aliquots were then collected from the flask
and examined using a light microscope to determine the concentration of *K. japonica*.

The initial concentrations of *K. japonica* and *A. sanguinea* were established using an autopipette to deliver predetermined volumes of known cell concentrations to the flasks. For each predator-prey combination, triplicate experimental 50-ml culture flasks (containing a mixture of predator and prey) and triplicate control flasks (containing a culture of prey only) were established. Triplicate control flasks containing only *K. japonica* were also established at a single predator concentration. To ensure similar water conditions, the water of the predator culture was filtered through a 0.7-µm GF/F filter, and this was added to the prey control flasks at the same volume that the predator culture was added into the experimental flasks for each predator-prey combination. The flasks were filled to 10 ml with freshly filtered seawater, capped, and then placed on a shelf at 20 °C under a 14:10 h light-dark cycle of 20 µE m⁻² s⁻¹ of cool white fluorescent light. To determine the actual initial predator and prey densities (cells ml⁻¹) at the beginning of the experiment (Table 7) and after a 2-day incubation period, 5-ml aliquots were removed from each flask and fixed with 5% Lugol’s solution. Then, all *K. japonica* cells and all or >300 prey cells in three 1-ml Sedgwick-Rafter chambers (SRC) were enumerated. Only 5 ml water in each 50-ml flask after subsampling at the beginning of the experiment was
incubated to increase encounter rates between predators and prey because *K. japonica* swam near the bottom of the flask (i.e., to create a shallow depth in the flasks).

The specific growth rate of *K. japonica* was calculated as follows:

\[
\mu = \frac{\ln \left( \frac{C_t}{C_0} \right)}{t}
\]

where \(C_0\) is the initial concentration of *K. japonica* and \(C_t\) is the final concentration after time \(t\). The period was 2 days. The mean prey concentration was calculated using the equation of Frost (1972). The ingestion and clearance rates were calculated using the equations of Frost (1972) and Heinbokel (1978).

Data for *K. japonica* growth rate were fitted to the following equation:

\[
\mu = \frac{\mu_{\text{max}} (x - x')}{K_{GR} + (x - x')}
\]

where \(\mu_{\text{max}}\) is the maximum growth rate (day\(^{-1}\)), \(x\) is the prey concentration (cells ml\(^{-1}\) or ng C ml\(^{-1}\)), \(x'\) is the threshold prey concentration (i.e., the prey concentration where \(\mu = 0\)), and \(K_{GR}\) is the prey concentration sustaining 1/2 \(\mu_{\text{max}}\). Data were iteratively fitted to the model using DeltaGraph (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

Ingestion rate data were fitted to a Michaelis-Menten equation:
\[
IR = \frac{I_{\text{max}}(x)}{K_{\text{IR}} + (x)}
\]

where \(I_{\text{max}}\) is the maximum ingestion rate (cells predator\(^{-1}\) d\(^{-1}\) or ng C predator\(^{-1}\) d\(^{-1}\)), \(x\) is the prey concentration (cells ml\(^{-1}\) or ng C ml\(^{-1}\)), and \(K_{\text{IR}}\) is the prey concentration sustaining 1/2 \(I_{\text{max}}\).

For the experiment on heterotrophic bacteria prey (i.e., experiment 4), one or two days prior to this experiment, the bacterial cells, which originated from a clonal culture of \(K. japonica\), had been fluorescently labeled, as described above. To remove any aggregated FLB, the FLB were sonicated and then filtered through a 3-\(\mu\)m pore sized filter, as described above. The volumes of FLBs were measured as described above and the ratio of the actual initial abundances of FLBs to the abundances of non-FLB bacteria was also measured.

A dense culture of \(K. japonica\) growing on algal prey and then starved for 1 day (until ingested prey cells were undetected inside the protoplasm of the predator cells) was transferred into a 1-l PC bottle. Three 1-ml aliquots from the bottle were counted using a compound microscope to determine the cell concentrations of \(K. japonica\), as described above. The mean actual initial predator and prey concentrations are shown in Table 6. Triplicate 42-ml PC experimental bottles (containing mixtures of predator and prey) and triplicate predator control bottles (containing predator only) were also
established. All the bottles were filled to capacity with freshly filtered seawater, capped, placed on a shelf, and incubated at 20°C under continuous illumination of 20 µE m² s⁻¹ provided by cool white fluorescent lights. After 1-, 5-, 10-, and 20-min incubation periods, 5-ml aliquots were removed from each bottle, transferred into 20-ml vials, and fixed with borate buffered formalin [final conc. = 4% (v/v)]. The fixed samples were stained using DAPI (final conc. = 1 µM) and then filtered onto 3 µm-pore-sized PC white membrane filters. The FLB inside a *K. japonica* cell were enumerated under an epifluorescence microscope with blue light excitation. Additionally, at the beginning of the experiment, a 1-ml fixed aliquot was stained with DAPI and then filtered onto 0.2 µm-pore-sized PC black membrane filters. Bacteria (both FLB and non-FLB) outside *K. japonica* cells were also enumerated under an epifluorescence microscope with UV light excitation for non-FLB, and blue light excitation for FLB. After subsampling, the bottles were capped, placed on a shelf, and incubated again, as described above.

The ingestion rate of *K. japonica* on FLBs (FLBs predator⁻¹ h⁻¹) was calculated by linear regression of the number of FLBs per *K. japonica* cell as a function of incubation time as described by Sherr et al. (1987). Furthermore, the ingestion rate of *K. japonica* on heterotrophic bacteria (bacterial cells predator⁻¹ h⁻¹) was calculated by multiplying the ingestion
rate of *K. japonica* on FLBs by the ratio of the abundance of total heterotrophic bacteria (i.e., FLB plus non-FLB) relative to that of FLBs. All ingestion rate data were fitted to a Michaelis-Menten equation. In this plotting, the prey concentration is the sum of living heterotrophic bacteria (i.e., non-FLB) and FLBs.

For the experiment on *Synechococcus* prey (i.e., experiment 5), the initial concentrations of the *K. japonica* predator and live *Synechococcus* were established using an autopipette to deliver predetermined volumes of known cell concentrations to the bottles (Table 7). Triplicate 42-ml PC experimental bottles (containing mixtures of predator and prey) and triplicate predator control bottles (containing predator only) were also established. All the bottles were then filled to capacity with freshly filtered seawater, capped, and placed on the shelf. After 1-, 10-, and 20-min incubation, 5-ml aliquots were removed from each bottle, transferred into 20-ml vials, and then fixed with formalin (final conc. = 4%). One 2-ml fixed aliquot was filtered onto 3 µm-pore sized, 25 mm PC black membrane filters. Red-colored inclusions (*Synechococcus* cells) inside the protoplasm of >40 *K. japonica* predator cells on the PC black membrane filters were enumerated under an epifluorescence microscope with blue light excitation. No red-colored inclusions were observed inside the protoplasm of the *K. japonica* predators in the control bottles. The bottles were capped, placed on
a shelf, and incubated as described above. A linear regression curve for the number of prey cells inside a *K. japonica* predator cell against incubation time was obtained and then an ingestion rate (prey cells predator$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) was calculated by extrapolation, as in Sherr et al. (1987).

Experiment 6 was designed to investigate whether heterotrophic bacteria alone support positive growth of *K. japonica*. The growth rates of *K. japonica* on living heterotrophic bacteria at two high bacterial concentrations were measured (Table 7).

One day before this experiment was conducted, a dense culture of *K. japonica* growing on algal prey, was transferred into a 1-l PC bottle containing filtered autoclaved seawater. Three 1-ml aliquots were then collected from the bottle and cells were enumerated to determine the concentration of *K. japonica*.

Initial concentrations of *K. japonica* and bacteria were established using an autopipette to deliver predetermined volumes of known cell concentrations to the flasks. Triplicate 50-ml experimental flasks (mixtures of predator and prey) and triplicate control flasks (prey only) were established for each predator-prey combination. All the flasks were then filled to capacity with autoclaved seawater, filtered by a 0.2-µm PC membrane filter (Chisso filter Co. LTD., Tokyo, Japan), and capped. To determine the actual initial predator and prey densities at the beginning of
the experiment and after 48-h incubation, a 5-ml aliquot was removed from each flask and fixed with 5% Lugol’s solution. All or >300 \textit{K. japonica} cells, fixed in Lugol’s solution, in three 1-ml Sedgwick-Rafter counting chambers were enumerated. Another 5-ml aliquot was removed from each flask, fixed with formalin (final conc. = 4%), and filtered onto 0.2 µm-pore sized PC black membrane filters. The bacteria were enumerated, as described above. The specific growth rate \( \mu \) (d\(^{-1}\)) of \textit{K. japonica} was calculated as described above.

Experiment 7 was designed to investigate whether \textit{Synechococcus} sp. supported positive growth of \textit{K. japonica}. The growth rates of \textit{K. japonica} on living \textit{Synechococcus} sp. at two high bacterial concentrations were measured (Table 7).

The initial concentrations of the \textit{K. japonica} predator and live \textit{Synechococcus} sp. were established using an autopipette to deliver predetermined volumes of known cell concentrations to the flasks. Triplicate 50-ml PC experimental flasks (containing mixtures of predator and prey), triplicate prey control flasks (containing prey only), and triplicate predator control flasks (containing predator only) were also established. All the flasks were then filled to capacity with freshly filtered seawater, capped, placed on the shelf, and incubated at 20°C under an illumination of 20 \( \mu \text{E m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \). To determine the actual initial predator and prey densities at the
beginning of the experiment and after 48-h incubation, a 5-ml aliquot was removed from each bottle and fixed with 5% Lugol’s solution. All or >300 *K. japonica* cells, fixed in Lugol’s solution, in three 1-ml Sedgwick-Rafter counting chambers were enumerated. Another 5-ml aliquot was removed from each bottle, fixed with formalin (final conc. = 4%), and filtered onto 0.2 µm-pore sized PC black membrane filters. Red-colored prey cells on the PC filter were enumerated under an epifluorescence microscope. Growth rates were calculated as described above.

### 3.3. Results

#### 3.3.1. Feeding occurrences

Among the bacterial and algal prey tested, *Katablepharis japonica* ingested heterotrophic bacteria, *Synechococcus* sp., the prasinophyte *Pyramimonas* sp., the cryptophytes *Rhodomonas salina* and *Teleaulax* sp., the raphidophytes *Heterosigma akashiwo* and *Chattonella ovata*, and the phototrophic dinoflagellates *Heterocapsa rotundata*, *Amphidinium carterae*, *Prorocentrum donghaiense*, *Alexandrium minutum* (previously *A. lusitanicum*), *Cochlodinium polykrikoides*, *Gymnodinium catenatum*, *Coolia malayensis*, and *A. sanguinea*, and the mixotrophic ciliate *Mesodinium rubrum* (Table 6; Figs. 2–4).
Under epifluorescence microscopy, an unfed *K. japonica* cell appeared to have a bright blue color in the center of the cell, but a thin blue color in the remaining parts (Fig. 2A). Furthermore, un-ingested FLBs appeared as bright blue colored rods (Fig. 2B). Many FLBs (seen as bright blue colored rods) were observed inside the protoplasm of a *K. japonica* cell (Fig. 2C).
Fig. 2. Images of *Katablepharis japonica* cells feeding on bacteria and the dinoflagellate *Akashiwo sanguinea*. (A-C) Fluorescent labeled bacteria (FLB) prey. *K. japonica* cell without added prey observed under a light microscope (A), unfed FLBs (B), and many FLBs (arrows) inside the protoplasm of a *K. japonica* cell observed under an epifluorescence microscope (C). (D-I) Feeding process of *Katablepharis japonica* on *Akashiwo sanguinea* recorded by video-microscopy. (D-E) Several *K. japonica* (Kj) cells attacking an *A. sanguinea* cell (As). (F-H) Size of *A. sanguinea* cell reduced because of predation by Kj cells. (I) The *A. sanguinea* cell was undetectable. The numbers are min:s. Scale bar = 5 µm for (A, D-I), 1 µm for (B, C).
Fig. 3. Images of *Katablepharis japonica* cells feeding on the dinoflagellate *Akashiwo sanguinea* taken using a transmission electron microscope (A–E). (A) Unfed Kj cell containing the nucleus (Nu) in the center of the cell. (B) Intact As cell having chloroplast (PC). (C) Enlarged from (B). (D) A Kj cell contained ingested parts of As cells. The Nu descended to the posterior of the cell. (E) Enlarged from (D). Chloroplasts of As cells were observed. Scale bar = 0.5 µm for (C, E) and 1 µm for (A, B, D).
Fig. 4. Feeding process of *Katablepharis japonica* on the dinoflagellates *Cochlodinium polykrikoides* cells in a chain (A-F) and *Gymnodinium catenatum* cells in a chain (G-L) and the raphidophyte a *Chattonella ovata* cell (M-R) recorded by video-microscopy. (A) Several *K. japonica* (Kj) cells attacked a *C. polykrikoides* chain (Cp). (B-F) The chain of *C. polykrikoides* cells was broken and the cells decomposed because of predation by Kj cells. (G-J) Many Kj cells attacked *G. catenatum* (Gc) cells in a chain. (K, L) A Gc cell disappeared. (M-R) Many Kj cells attacking a *C. ovata* (Co) cell. The numbers are min:s. Scale bar = 5 µm.
Using transmission electron microscopy (TEM), unfed *K. japonica* cells were observed to have the nucleus in the center of their cells, and did not have chloroplasts (Fig. 3A). Intact *A. sanguinea* cells were observed to possess chloroplasts (Fig. 3B, C). *K. japonica* cells were observed to have a food vacuole containing parts of an *A. sanguinea* cell, such as chloroplasts (Fig. 3D, E). Inside the food vacuole, thylakoids, which are major components of a chloroplast, were clearly observed.

A few *K. japonica* cells attacked an algal prey cell or a ciliate cell, although many *K. japonica* cells approached and attacked together (Figs. 2, 4). After a few *K. japonica* cells attacked an algal prey cell, the attacked algal prey cells almost disappeared within ca. 40-70 s for *Akashiwo sanguinea*, *Mesodinium rubrum*, and *Rhodomonas salina* (Fig. 2D-I). Furthermore, *Gymnodinium catenatum* and *Chattonella ovata* cells disappeared within 1200-1600 s after a few *K. japonica* cells attacked the algal prey cell (Fig. 4G-R). Moreover, the time from which an algal prey cell was attacked by several *K. japonica* cells to that which the algal prey cell disappeared were 120-470 s for *C. polykrikoides*, *H. rotundata*, *P. donghaiense*, *A. carterae*, and *H. akashiwo*, (Fig. 4A-F).
Fig. 5. The dinoflagellate and diatom species that *Katablepharis japonica* did not feed on, and lysis of Kj cells with addition of cells and culture filtrate of *Gambierdiscus caribaeus* (Gc). (A-C) *K. japonica* (Kj) cells attaching an *Alexandrium tamarense* (At) cell for ca. 70 min, but the At cell was not fed. (D–F) Kj cells attaching a *Prorocentrum minimum* (P.min) cell for ca. 90 min, but the P.min cell was not fed. (G–I) *K. japonica* (Kj) cells attaching a *Skeletonema costatum* (Sc) cell for ca. 85 min, but the Sc cell remained unchanged. (J-L) Kj cells attaching a Gc cell for ca. 80 min, but the Gc cell survived. (M–O) Lysis of Kj cells after addition of Gc cells. Almost all Kj cells were lysed at ca. 37 min. (P-R) Lysis of Kj cells after addition of Gc culture filtrate. Almost all Kj cells were lysed at ca. 40 min. The numbers are min:s. Scale bar = 5 µm.
Cells of *K. japonica* did not feed on the dinoflagellates *Gambierdiscus caribaeus*, *Heterocapsa triquetra*, *Lingulodinium polyedra*, *Prorocentrum cordatum* (previously *P. minimum*), *P. micans*, *Alexandrium catenella* CCMP 1493, and *Scrippsiella acuminata* (*S. trochoidea*), and the diatom *Skeletonema costatum* (Table 6; Fig. 5A-R). *K. japonica* cells were observed to attack (i.e., peck) these prey cells for >1 h, but the surface of these prey cells did not rupture. *K. japonica* cells were immobilized within 1 h after *G. caribaeus* cells or culture filtrates were added (Fig. 5M-R).

Cells of *K. japonica* were observed to feed on actively swimming *Akashiwo sanguinea* cells (Fig. 2G-L). Furthermore, *K. japonica* cells fed on actively swimming *A. sanguinea* cells at predator concentrations ≥100 cells ml$^{-1}$, but it did not feed on actively swimming *A. sanguinea* cells at predator concentrations of 10–50 cells ml$^{-1}$. Moreover, *K. japonica* fed on *A. sanguinea* cells under turbulent conditions.
Fig. 6. Specific growth (A) and ingestion (B) rates of *Katoblepharis japonica* on *Akashiwo sanguinea* as a function of mean prey concentration (x, ng C ml⁻¹). Symbols represent treatment means ± standard error. The curve in (A) is fitted by a Michaelis-Menten equation [Eq. (2)] using all treatments in the experiment. Growth rate (GR, d⁻¹) = 1.01 [(x - 425) / (1510 + (x - 425))], $r^2 = 0.924$. The curve in (B) is fitted by a Michaelis-Menten equation [Eq. (3)] using all treatments in the experiment. Ingestion rate (IR, ng C predator⁻¹ d⁻¹) = 0.132 [(x / (4090 + x)], $r^2 = 0.417$. 
3.3.2. Growth and ingestion of *K. japonica* on algal prey

With increasing mean prey concentration, the specific growth rate of *K. japonica* on *Akashiwo sanguinea* increased rapidly at the prey concentrations <2540 ng C ml$^{-1}$ (ca. 1140 cells ml$^{-1}$), but became saturated at higher prey concentrations (Fig. 6A). When the data were fitted to Eq. (2), the maximum specific growth rate of *K. japonica* feeding on *A. sanguinea* was 1.01 d$^{-1}$, whereas the growth rate without added prey was -0.57 d$^{-1}$. The threshold prey concentration (i.e., the prey concentration where $\mu = 0$) and $K_{GR}$ (i.e., the prey concentration sustaining 1/2 $\mu_{max}$) was 425 ng C ml$^{-1}$ and 1510 ng C ml$^{-1}$, respectively.

With increasing mean prey concentration, the ingestion rate of *K. japonica* on *A. sanguinea* increased rapidly at prey concentrations <1480 ng C ml$^{-1}$ (663 cells ml$^{-1}$), but increased slowly at higher prey concentrations (Fig. 6B). When the data were fitted to Eq. (3), the maximum ingestion rate of *K. japonica* on *A. sanguinea* was 0.13 ng C predator$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$ (0.06 cells predator$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$), whereas the maximum clearance rate of *K. japonica* on *A. sanguinea* was 0.002 µl predator$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$.
Ingestion rates by *Katablepharis japonica* on heterotrophic bacteria (A) and the cyanobacterium *Synechococcus* sp. (B) as a function of mean prey concentration (pc, cells ml\(^{-1}\)). Symbols represent treatment means ± standard error. The curve in (A) is fitted by a Michaelis–Menten equation [Eq. (3)] using all treatments in the experiment. Ingestion rate (IR, cells predator\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\)) = \(11.1 \times \frac{pc}{(0.13 \times 10^6 + pc)}\), \(r^2 = 0.558\). The curve in (B) is fitted by a linear regression using all treatments in the experiment. At the prey concentrations of \(<1 \times 10^7\) cells ml\(^{-1}\), Ingestion rate (IR, cells predator\(^{-1}\) d\(^{-1}\)) = 0.187 (pc \(\times 10^6\)), \(r^2 = 0.886\).
3.3.3. Growth and ingestion of *K. japonica* on bacterial prey

With increasing initial prey concentration, the ingestion rates of *K. japonica* on heterotrophic bacteria increased rapidly at prey concentrations of ca. 1.1–5.0 × 10^5 cells ml^{-1}, but slowly at the higher prey concentrations (Fig. 7A). When the data were fitted to Eq. (3), the maximum ingestion rate of *K. japonica* on heterotrophic bacteria was 266 bacteria predator\(^{-1}\)d\(^{-1}\) (0.019 ng C predator\(^{-1}\)d\(^{-1}\)).

With increasing initial prey concentration, the ingestion rates of *K. japonica* on *Synechococcus* sp. increased continuously at prey concentrations of ca. 0.4–9.8 × 10^6 cells ml^{-1} (Fig. 7B). At the given prey concentrations, the highest ingestion rate of *K. japonica* on *Synechococcus* sp. was 48 *Synechococcus* predator\(^{-1}\)d\(^{-1}\) (0.01 ng C predator\(^{-1}\)d\(^{-1}\)).

3.4. Discussion

3.4.1. Prey items and feeding behavior of *Katablepharis japonica*

This study revealed that *K. japonica* could feed on both bacterial and algal prey. Cells of *K. japonica* were revealed to feed on all tested algal prey species, except *Skeletonema costatum*, *Gambierdiscus caribaeus*, *Heterocapsa triquetra*, *Lingulodinium polyedra*, *Prorocentrum cordatum*, *P. micans*, *Alexandrium catenella*, and *Scrippsiella acuminata*. The range of the sizes of the edible prey species was wide; some prey species were
spherical, whereas others were flattened (e.g., *Prorocentrum donghaiense*); some prey species were singular, whereas others were chain-forming (*Cochlodinium polykrikoides* and *Gymnodinium catenatum*); some prey species were non-thecate, whereas others were thecate (*Heterocapsa rotundata*, *P. donghaiense*, and *Alexandrium minutum*). Thus, *K. japonica* has diverse prey items, regardless of sizes, shapes, toxicity, and presence of theca. Among phagotrophic protists, engulfment feeders usually feed on prey items that are smaller than themselves (Jeong et al., 2010b). The ability of *K. japonica* to feed on prey larger than itself is related to its feeding behavior; it engulfs small pieces of prey materials after causing the prey surface to rupture by pecking, however, the surface of *S. costatum*, *G. caribaeus*, *H. triquetra*, *L. polyedra*, *P. cordatum*, *P. micans*, *A. catenella*, and *S. acuminata* cells were not ruptured even though *K. japonica* cells pecked these algal cells many times for \( \leq 48 \) h. Thus, these algal cells may have surfaces hard enough to resist dissolution by force or chemicals driven by *K. japonica*. Ecologically, *K. japonica* may not be abundant when *A. catenella*, *G. caribaeus*, *H. triquetra*, *L. polyedra*, *P. cordatum*, *P. micans*, *S. acuminata*, and *S. costatum* are abundant in natural environments.

Cells of *K. japonica* can feed on diverse phototrophic dinoflagellates. Furthermore, *K. japonica* grows well on *A. sanguinea* (previously *Gymnodinium splendens* and *G. sanguineum*), which has often formed red
tides or HABs in the coastal waters off many countries (Kiefer and Lasker, 1975; Jeong et al., 2013). This dinoflagellate is known to feed on small ciliates (Bockstahler and Coats, 1993). In the original microbial loop, a sequence of bacteria-HNFs-ciliates was suggested (Azam et al., 1983). Now, a new pathway in microbial food webs, bacteria-HNFs-ciliates-\textit{A. sanguinea}-\textit{K. japonica}, can be suggested. Cycling of materials among these components may be helpful for many species to co-exist. If there is no cycling in the food web, a predator may starve to death when its prey is eliminated by the predator.

Diverse red-tide dinoflagellates and raphidophytes are fed on by \textit{K. japonica}. Grazing by heterotrophic dinoflagellates and/or ciliates is believed to contribute to the decline of red tides (Eppley and Harrison, 1975; Jeong, 1999; Kamiyama et al., 2000; Johnson et al., 2003; Kim and Jeong, 2004; Tillmann, 2004; Jeong et al., 2010b, 2015; Yoo et al., 2013), however, prior to the present study, the grazing effects by free-living HNFs like \textit{Katablepharis} spp. on red tide species had not been explored, although there have been some studies on killing by parasitic heterotrophic flagellates on red tide species (e.g., Norén et al., 1999; Velo-Suárez et al., 2013; Alacid et al., 2015). The results of the present study suggest that grazing by free-living HNFs on red tide species should be taken into consideration in assessing red tide dynamics. Because of the addition of free-living HNFs as
grazers on red-tide organisms, total grazing effects by heterotrophic protistan grazers on populations of the red tide organisms are likely to increase.

Cells of *K. japonica* can feed on *C. malayensis*, which is a primarily benthic dinoflagellate (Ten-Hage et al., 2000; Penna et al., 2005; Fraga et al., 2008; Leaw et al., 2010; Laza-Martinez et al., 2011; Jeong et al., 2012a, 2012b), but not *G. caribaeus*, another benthic dinoflagellate. Instead, *G. caribaeus* immobilized *K. japonica* cells. Cells of *G. caribaeus* may have chemicals for anti-predation against *K. japonica*, which *C. malayensis* does not have. The size of *G. caribaeus* (ESD = 67.4 μm) is much larger than that of *C. malayensis* (ESD = 32.8 μm). Thus, a substantial difference in the sizes of these two benthic dinoflagellates might be partially responsible for the differential feeding of *K. japonica*. In turn, the differential feeding on these two benthic species may change the dominant species in the benthic dinoflagellate community.

Actively swimming *A. sanguinea* cells are fed on by *K. japonica* cells under both non-turbulent and turbulent conditions. Thus, *K. japonica* cells are likely to feed on actively swimming *A. sanguinea* cells in natural environments if the *K. japonica* concentration exceeds 100 cells ml$^{-1}$, however, *K. japonica* cells may feed on slow-moving or dead *A. sanguinea*
cells during the decline stage of *A. sanguinea* red tides or blooms, even when the *K. japonica* concentration is low.

3.4.2. Growth and ingestion rates

Prior to the present study, there were no reports on the growth rates of marine *Katoblepharis* spp., whereas many reports on those of other HNFs exist (Table 8). Furthermore, there has been a report on a growth rate of a HNF on algal prey (Ohno et al., 2013). Therefore, this study adds useful information on growth rates of HNFs on algal prey.
Table 8
Comparison of the maximum growth and ingestion rates of *Katablepharis japonica* and other heterotrophic nanoflagellates. CV, cell volume (μm³); CC, Carbon content per cell (ng C cell⁻¹); HTB, heterotrophic bacterial prey; MGR, maximum growth rate (d⁻¹); MIR, maximum ingestion rate (ng C predator⁻¹d⁻¹); CSMIR, carbon specific maximum ingestion rate (d⁻¹); MSS, maximum swimming speed (μm s⁻¹), blank, not tested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species name</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>CC*</th>
<th>Prey</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>MGR</th>
<th>MIR</th>
<th>CSMIR</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Monosiga</em> sp.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.080</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Stephanoeca diplocostata</em></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.896</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ochromonas minima</em></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudobodo</em> sp.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.760</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Codosiga gracilis</em></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Diaphanoeca grandis</em></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.880</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ochromonas</em> sp.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.048</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Lower Limit</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Lower Limit</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleuromonas jaculans</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.840</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodo designis</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.840</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurnella sp.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.192</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pteridomonas danica</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synechococcus sp.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pteridomonas danica</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actinomonas mirabilis</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakoba libera</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanoeca diplocostata</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudobodo tremulans</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyramimonas disomata</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>C (mg C/m³)</td>
<td>N (mg N/m³)</td>
<td>Chla (mg Chla/m³)</td>
<td>Cell Number</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphysomonas vestita</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.520</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochromonas sp.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.560</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphysomonas imperforata</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.040</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciliophrys infusionum</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katablepharis japonica</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>Akashiwo sanguinea</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katablepharis japonica</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katablepharis japonica</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>Synechococcus sp.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified HNF</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>Skeletonema costatum</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum growth rate ($\mu_{\text{max}}$) of *K. japonica* feeding on *A. sanguinea* (1.01 $\text{d}^{-1}$) is comparable to or slightly greater than that of *Jakoba libera*, *Stephunoeca diplocostuta*, and *Ciliophrys infusionurn* on bacteria (0.84–1.08 $\text{d}^{-1}$) or unidentified HNF on the diatom *Skeletonema costatum* (0.79 $\text{d}^{-1}$) (Geider and Leadbeater, 1988; Eccleston-Parry and Leadbeater, 1994; Ohno et al., 2013), however, the $\mu_{\text{max}}$ of *K. japonica* on *A. sanguinea* was lower than that of other reported HNF on bacteria (1.25–6.60 $\text{d}^{-1}$) (Table 8; Fig. 7A). In general, $\mu_{\text{max}}$ of HNFs decreases with increasing cell volume (Fenchel, 1987). Most HNFs reported are smaller than *K. japonica*. Thus, the larger size of *K. japonica* may be partially responsible for the lower $\mu_{\text{max}}$. However, the $\mu_{\text{max}}$ of *K. japonica* feeding on *A. sanguinea* is much lower than that of *Paraphysomonas imperforata*, *Paraphysomonas vestita*, and *Ochromonas* sp., whose sizes are slightly smaller than *K. japonica*. The maximum ingestion rate ($I_{\text{max}}$) of *K. japonica* feeding on *A. sanguinea* is considerably lower than that of *P. imperforata*, *P. vestita*, and *Ochromonas* sp. on bacteria (Table 8; Fig. 7B). It may be more difficult for *K. japonica* to capture, ingest, and digest the dinoflagellate species (e.g., probably because of swimming speed, large-sized prey) than for *P. imperforata*, *P. vestita*, and *Ochromonas* sp. to capture, ingest, and digest bacterial prey. This lower $I_{\text{max}}$ for *K. japonica* feeding on *A. sanguinea* may be partially responsible for the lower $\mu_{\text{max}}$. Moreover, the carbon specific
maximum ingestion rate (CSI_{max}) of *K. japonica* feeding on *A. sanguinea* was lower than that of the HNFs, with exceptions of smaller *J. libera* and *Spurnella* sp. feeding on bacteria or unidentified HNF feeding on *S. costatum* (Table 8; Fig. 8C). Thus, the lower CSI_{max} of *K. japonica* feeding on *A. sanguinea* also may be partially responsible for this lower $\mu_{max}$ than that of most HNFs.
Fig. 8. Abundances of the red-tide dinoflagellate *Akashiwo sanguinea* (A) and heterotrophic nanoflagellates (HNFs, B) at a fixed station in Masan Bay from June 1, 2004 to May 31, 2005 (redrawn from Jeong et al. (2013) and Yoo et al. (2013), and (C) calculated grazing coefficients (g, d⁻¹) attributable to *Katablepharis japonica* on populations of *Akashiwo sanguinea* (see text for calculation).
Neither heterotrophic bacteria nor *Synechococcus* sp. supported positive growth of *K. japonica*. When combining maximum or highest ingestion rates and prey carbon, *K. japonica* can acquire 307% of its body carbon from *A. sanguinea*, but only 43 and 22% from heterotrophic bacteria and *Synechococcus* sp., respectively (Table 9). Therefore, low daily carbon acquisition from bacterial prey could be responsible for the lack of positive growth of *K. japonica*, whereas the high daily carbon acquisition from *A. sanguinea* prey supported substantial positive growth for *K. japonica*. To the best of my knowledge, *K. japonica* is the first reported HNF that can grow on algal prey, but not grow on bacteria prey. These results may change my conventional view on the critical role of bacteria as the optimal prey item to support growth of HNFs. An uncoupling between the abundance of *K. japonica* (or total HNFs if *K. japonica* is a dominant HNF) and bacteria in natural environments should be expected.
Table 9
Comparison of carbon acquisition of *Katablepharis japonica* (Kj) from *Akashiwo sanguinea*, heterotrophic bacteria (HTB), and the cyanobacterium *Synechococcus* sp. prey. PC, prey carbon (pg C per cell); MIR-cell, maximum ingestion rate (cells predator$^{-1}$d$^{-1}$); MIR-carbon (h), maximum ingestion rate (pg C predator$^{-1}$h$^{-1}$); MIR-carbon (d), maximum ingestion rate (pg C predator$^{-1}$d$^{-1}$); KjC, Kj carbon (pg C per cell); DAC, daily acquired carbon from prey relative to the predator carbon (%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prey</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>MIR-cell</th>
<th>MIR-carbon (h)</th>
<th>MIR-carbon (d)</th>
<th>KjC</th>
<th>DAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Akashiwo sanguinea</em></td>
<td>2230.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>132.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTB</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Synechococcus</em> sp.</td>
<td>0.20#</td>
<td>2.0*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>9.5*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


#: Jeong et al. (2005).

*: Highest value among all values obtained at a given concentration.
The results of the present study show that *K. japonica* is a predator of diverse phytoplankton, including toxic or harmful dinoflagellates and raphidophytes and may also affect dynamics of red tides caused by these prey species.
Chapter 4. The first report of the phototrophic dinoflagellate *Heterocapsa minima* in Korean waters and its interactions with common heterotrophic protists

4.1. Introduction

The dinoflagellate genus *Heterocapsa* is composed of small armored dinoflagellates, but the species in the genus are distributed worldwide in coastal waters. Some *Heterocapsa* species such as *Heterocapsa rotundata* (Lochmann) Hansen and *Heterocapsa triquetra* (Ehrenberg) F. Stein often form red tides causing shellfish mass mortalities (Matsuyama et al., 1995, Matsuyama 1999).

*H. minima* was first described by Pomroy (1989) based on samples collected in the Celtic Sea in 1982-1983. This species has been reported only from the European Ocean (Pomroy 1989; Salas et al. 2014). I isolated a small dinoflagellate from Mijo Port, Korea in 2016. Based on molecular analysis, this dinoflagellate was revealed to be *Heterocapsa minima*. *H. minima* formed dense blooms in Celtic Sea (ca. 62,400 cells l\(^{-1}\)) (Pomroy, 1989). Thus, there is a high possibility that this species causes harmful effects on marine organisms during or after dense blooms.

Heterotrophic protists are major microzooplankton and macrozooplankton, respectively, in marine ecosystems and play important
roles in marine food webs (Stoecker and Sanders, 1985; Sherr and Sherr, 1994, 2016; Jeong 1999; Calbet and Landry, 2004; Calbet et al., 2009; Yoo et al., 2013b, 2015; Lee et al., 2014; Turner, 2014; Petitpas et al., 2015; Jang et al., 2016). Heterotrophic protists such as heterotrophic dinoflagellates and ciliates have been revealed as effective grazers on many phototrophic dinoflagellates. Furthermore, the grazing impacts by heterotrophic protists on populations of phototrophic dinoflagellates are sometimes high enough to control prey populations. Therefore, mortality due to predation by heterotrophic protists should be studied to understand phototrophic dinoflagellate dynamics in marine ecosystems.

In addition, HTDs and ciliates are major components in marine ecosystems (Stoecker et al. 1984; Hansen 1991; Jeong 1999; Levinsen and Nielsen 2002; Sherr and Sherr 2007; Jeong et al. 2010b, 2015; Yoo et al. 2013a; Lim et al. 2017). They feed on diverse types of prey, such as bacteria, phytoplankton including red-tide species, mixotrophic, or heterotrophic protists, eggs and early naupliar stages of metazooplankton, and sometimes control populations of their prey (Hansen 1992; Jeong 1994; Montagnes et al. 1996; Jeong et al. 2004, 2008; Kamiyama and Matsuyama 2005; Turner 2006; Yoo et al. 2013b; Lee et al. 2014; Jang et al. 2016; Lim et al. 2017). In general, due to much higher abundances of HTDs or ciliates than those of metazooplankton, effect of grazing on prey populations by the former
grazers is usually greater than that by the latter grazers (Kim et al. 2013, Yoo et al. 2013a). Thus, to understand the roles of potential prey species in food webs, feeding by HTDs or ciliates on the prey should be explored. Therefore, I investigated whether *H. minima* attacks common heterotrophic protists or not. The results of the present study provide a basis for understanding the interactions between *H. minima* and common heterotrophic protist species, and their ecological roles in the marine planktonic community. To the best of my knowledge, no studies have been reported on the protist predators of *H. minima*. To understand the roles of *H. minima* in red tide dynamics, mortality due to predation should be determined.

For better understanding of the ecology of *H. minima* in marine ecosystems, further studies on of the interactions between *H. minima* and common predatory plankton are required. Therefore, in the present study, genetic characterization of the phototrophic dinoflagellate *H. minima* and feeding behaviors of the common heterotrophic protists on *H. minima* and vice versa were observed. The results of the present study provide a basis on understanding the interactions between *H. minima* and common heterotrophic protists, and their ecological roles in the marine planktonic community.
4.2. Materials and Methods

4.2.1. Sequencing and phylogenetic analysis

DNA sequencing

Three to five cells of *H. minima* from a clonal culture were transferred to a 0.2-ml PCR tube containing 38.75 μl of distilled water. To break the cell membranes before PCR analysis, the tube was frozen at −72°C for 1–3 min and then thawed. The final mixture (50 μl total volumes) was vortexed and PCR reaction was performed as follows: A thermal cycler (Eppendorf AG, Mastercycler® ep, model 5341, Hamburg, Germany) was used for the PCR reactions. The final concentrations of PCR products were: 5 μl of 10X F-StarTaq buffer, 1 μl of 10 mM of dNTP mix, 0.25 μl of 5 U/μl BioFACT™ F-Star Taq DNA polymerase (BioFACT Co., Ltd., Daejeon, Korea), 0.02 μM of each primer, for a final volume of 50 μl. The following primer pairs were used for amplification of ITS region, and LSU (D1-D2) rDNA sequences: ITSF2 (5′ - TAC GTC CCT GCC CTT TGT AC -3′; Litaker et al. 2003) and ITSR2 (5′ - TCC CTG TTC ATT CGC CAT TAC -3′; Litaker et al. 2003); and D1RF (5′ - ACC CGC TGA ATT TAA GCA -3′; Scholin et al. 1994), and LSUB (5′ - ACG AAC GAT TTG CAC GTC AG -3′; Litaker et al. 2003). The PCR conditions were as follows: one activation step at 95°C for 2 min; followed by 35 cycles at 95°C for 20 s, the selected annealing temperature (AT) for 40 s, and 72°C
for 1 min; a final elongation step at 72°C for 5 min. The AT was adjusted depending on the primers used according to the manufacturer's instructions.

Positive and negative controls were used for all amplification reactions. The purity of the amplicons was checked by electrophoretically separating 3-μl of PCR products mixed with 0.5-μl of goRed fluorescent reagent using a 1.0% agarose gel at 100 V and observing it under a UV lamp to ensure that a single product was formed. Products containing a single band were then purified using an AccuPrep® PCR purification kit (Bioneer Corp., Daejeon, Korea) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The purified DNA was sent to the Genome Research Facility at School of Biological Science, Seoul National University, Korea, and sequenced with an ABI PRISM® 3700 DNA Analyzer (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA, USA). Each portion of the target DNA was independently sequenced three times in both directions using primer pairs identical to those used for DNA amplification. Sequences were aligned using the ContigExpress alignment program (InforMax, Frederick, MD, USA) to edit out low-quality regions and to assemble the individual sequence reads.

**Phylogenetic analyses**

Separate phylogenetic analyses were performed based on alignments of partial 3′ end ITS and LSU (full sequence of the domain D1·D2) sequences. Analyses included sequences obtained from GenBank.
Multiple sequences were aligned automatically using MEGA4’s native implementation of ClustalW (Tamura et al. 2007), then further aligned manually by eye for refinement of the alignments. Maximum-likelihood (ML) analyses were performed using the RAxML 7.0.3 program (Stamatakis 2006) with default GTR + G model. Tree likelihoods were estimated using a heuristic search with 100 random additional sequence replicates and tree bisection and reconnection branch swapping. ML bootstrapping with 1,000 replications was also conducted. Bayesian analyses were performed using MrBayes v.3.1 (Huelsenbeck and Ronquist 2001; Ronquist and Huelsenbeck 2003) with the GTR + G model to determine the best available model for the data for each region. Phylogenetic trees were created for all sequences using four independent Markov Chain Monte Carlo runs performed simultaneously until average standard deviation of split frequencies dropped below 0.01. The trees were sampled every 1,000 generations. To ensure likelihood convergence, the first 800 trees were discarded as burn-in.

4.2.2. Preparation of experimental organisms

A clonal culture of *H. minima*, which was isolated from plankton samples collected from Mijo Port, Korea in April 2016. As the concentration of *H. minima* increased, the culture was transferred to 250-ml
flasks (approximately 200,000 cells ml\(^{-1}\)). The flasks were filled to capacity with freshly filtered seawater, capped, and placed on a shelf at 20°C under an illumination of 20 \(\mu\)E m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) provided by cool white fluorescent lights, under a 14 : 10 h light : dark cycle. The mean equivalent spherical diameter (± standard deviation) and carbon content of \(H.\) minima were 8.2 \(\mu\)m (± 0.2) and 0.04 ng C per cell, respectively.

For the isolation and culture of the HTD predators \textit{Gyrodinium dominans}, \textit{Oblea rotunda}, \textit{Oxyrrhis marina}, and \textit{Polykrikos kofoidii}, plankton samples were collected by using water samplers, from the coastal waters off Jangheung, Jinhae, or Shiwha, Korea during 2008–2016 (Table 9). A clonal culture of each species was established by using two serial single-cell isolations (Table 10). A clonal culture of \textit{Pfiesteria pisicicida} was obtained from Microbiota, United States.
Table 10

Isolation and maintenance conditions for the experimental organisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>Prey species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heterotrophic dinoflagellate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gyrodinium dominans</em></td>
<td>Shiwha Bay, Korea</td>
<td>Nov 2011</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>EG</td>
<td><em>Amphidinium carterae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oblea rotunda</em></td>
<td>Jinhae Bay, Korea</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td><em>Amphidinium carterae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oxyrrhis marina</em></td>
<td>Shiwha Bay, Korea</td>
<td>Dec 2008</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>EG</td>
<td><em>Amphidinium carterae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polykrikos kofoidii</em></td>
<td>Jangheung Bay, Korea</td>
<td>Jul 2016</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>EG</td>
<td><em>Scrippsiella trochoidea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pfiesteria piscicida</em></td>
<td>Neuse River, USA</td>
<td>Jan 1998</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td><em>Amphidinium carterae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CCMP2091)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ciliate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pelagostrobilidium sp.</em></td>
<td>Tongyoung, Korea</td>
<td>Aug 2017</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>EG</td>
<td><em>Prorocentrum minimum</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sampling location and time; water temperature (T, °C), salinity (S) for isolation; feeding mechanisms (FM), and prey species.

EG, engulfment feeder; PE, peduncle feeder; PA, pallium feeder.
For the isolation and culture of the ciliate *Pelagostrobilidium* sp. (approximate cell length = 50 μm), plankton samples were collected by using a 10-μm mesh, in coastal waters off Tongyoung, Korea in August 2017 when the water temperature and salinity were 27.2°C and 31.5, respectively (Table 10).

The carbon contents of the HTDs and the ciliate were estimated from the cell volume, according to the procedure of Menden-Deuer and Lessard (2000). The cell volumes of the predators were estimated using the methods of Kim and Jeong (2004) and Yoon et al. (2012) for *G. dominans*, that of Jeong et al. (2008) for *O. marina*, Jeong et al. (2001) for *P. kofoidii*, Jeong et al. (2007) for *P. piscicida*, and Kim et al. (2017) for *O. rotunda*, and *Pelagostrobilidium* sp. (Table 10).

4.2.3. Interactions between *Heterocapsa minima* and heterotrophic protists

Experiment (Exp.) 1 was designed to investigate interactions between *H. minima* and each of the heterotrophic protists after two components was mixed (Table 11). In this experiment, it was tested whether the target heterotrophic protist is able to feed on *H. minima* and vice versa.

A culture of approximately 200,000 cells ml⁻¹ of *H. minima* was transferred to a single 250-ml culture flask containing freshly filtered seawater. This culture was maintained for 1 day. Three 1-ml aliquots were
examined with a light microscope to determine the concentration of $H. \text{minima.}$
### Table 11

**Experimental design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp. No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Prey density</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Predator density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Heterocapsa minima</em></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td><em>Gyrodinium dominans</em></td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td><em>Oblea rotunda</em></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td><em>Oxyrrhis marina</em></td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td><em>Polykrikos kofoidii</em></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td><em>Pfiesteria piscicida</em></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td><em>Pelagostrobilidium sp.</em></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Heterocapsa minima</em></td>
<td>199, 484, 1,002, 2,075, 4,789, 9,296, 12,889, 20,863, 33,630, 51,222</td>
<td><em>Gyrodinium dominans</em></td>
<td>27, 68, 143, 250, 483 (547), 734, 967, 1,215, 1,450, 2,381 (2,406)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers in the prey and predator columns are the target initial densities (cells ml\(^{-1}\)) of prey and predator for Exp. 1, and the actual initial densities for Exp. 2. The values within parentheses in the predator column in Exp. 2 are the predator densities in the control bottles.
The initial concentrations of *H. minima* (approximately 8,000–10,000 cells ml\(^{-1}\)) and each of the target heterotrophic protist species were established using an autopipette to deliver a predetermined volume of culture with a known cell density into the wells of 6-well plate chambers. For each heterotrophic protist species, duplicate wells containing mixtures of *H. minima* and heterotrophic protist (a total of 5-ml in each well), duplicate predator control wells containing a culture of heterotrophic protists only (a total of 5 ml in each well), and duplicate prey control wells containing a culture of *H. minima* only (a total of 5 ml in each well) were established. The plate chambers were placed on a shelf and incubated under a 14 : 10 h light : dark cycle of 20 μE m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) of cool white fluorescent light.

After 2 and 24 h, >30 target predator cells in the well was monitored using an inverted epifluorescence microscope equipped with differential interference contrast at a magnification of 50–200× to determine whether the target predator species is able to feed on *H. minima* or not. The feeding process of each of these heterotrophic protists on *H. minima* was recorded using a video analyzing system (Sony DXC-C33; Sony Co., Tokyo, Japan) and also captured using a digital camera. The reciprocal feeding of *H. minima* on each of the heterotrophic protists was tested and recorded in the same manners as described above.
4.2.4. Effects of the *Heterocapsa minima* concentration on the growth rate of *Gyrodinium dominans*

In Exp. 1, *H. minima* fed on *G. dominans*. Thus, Exp. 2 was designed to measure the growth rate of *G. dominans* as a function of *H. minima* concentration (Table 11).

For the experiment *H. minima* were transferred to a single 250-ml culture flask containing freshly filtered seawater. This culture was maintained for 1 day. Three 1-ml aliquots were then collected from the flask and examined using a light microscope to determine the concentration of *H. minima*.

The initial concentrations of *H. minima* were established using an autopipette to deliver predetermined volumes of known cell concentrations to the flasks. For each predator-prey combination, triplicate 42-ml experimental flasks (containing a mixture of *H. minima* and predator) and triplicate control flasks (containing a culture of *H. minima* only) were established. Five milliliters of f/2-Si medium was added to all flasks, which were then filled to capacity with freshly-filtered seawater and capped, and then placed on a shelf at 20°C under a 14 : 10 h light : dark cycle of 20 μE m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ of cool white fluorescent light. To determine the actual initial predator and prey densities (cells ml$^{-1}$) at the beginning of the experiment (Table 11) and after a 2-day incubation period, 10-ml aliquots were removed
from each flask and fixed with 5% Lugol’s solution. Then, all _H. minima_ cells and all or >300 prey cells in three 1-ml Sedgwick-Rafter chambers were enumerated.

The specific growth rate of _G. dominans_ was calculated as follows:

\[
\mu = \frac{\ln (C_t / C_0)}{t}
\]

where \( C_0 \) is the initial concentration of predator and \( C_t \) is the final concentration after time \( t \). The period was 2 days. The mean prey concentration was calculated using the equation of Frost (1972). The ingestion and clearance rates were calculated using the equations of Frost (1972) and Heinbokel (1978).

4.2.5. Artemia test for toxicity

A bioassay using the brine shrimp _Artemia salina_, which is susceptible to saxitoxin (STX) was conducted. Encysted eggs of _A. salina_ were hatched in 500-ml of filtrated natural seawater under artificial light at 20 °C for 48 h. Six-well plate chambers were prepared with triplicate wells of 100, 1000, 5000, 10000, 30000, and 60000 cells ml\(^{-1}\) of _H. minima_, respectively, and then 10 _A. salina_ nauplii were placed in each well of the plate chambers. In addition, triplicate wells containing a mixture of 10 nauplii and _H. minima_-filtrate as well as triplicate wells containing 10
nauplii only were established. The filtrate was obtained through filtration (grade GF/C) of a dense *H. minima* culture. As a positive control, *A. minutum* was used in an identical experimental setup. The plate chambers were incubated at 20 °C under a 14:10 h light–dark cycle of cool white fluorescent lights at 20 μE m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\). At the beginning of the incubation and 1, 2, 4, 8, 12, 24, and 48 h later, the plate chambers were placed under a dissecting microscope, and living and dead nauplii were counted at a magnification of ×7–40.

### 4.3. Results

#### 4.3.1. Phylogeny

The assumed equal nucleotide frequencies of ITS rDNA comprised a substitution rate matrix with A-C substitutions = 0.0771, A-G substitutions = 0.3129, A-T substitutions = 0.1071, C-G substitutions = 0.0198, C-T substitutions = 0.4348, and G-T substitutions = 0.0483. The proportion of sites assumed to be invariable was 0.1939 and the rates for variable sites were assumed to follow a gamma distribution with a shape parameter of 0.7881. The assumed equal nucleotide frequencies of LSU rDNA comprised a substitution rate matrix with A-C substitutions = 0.0511, A-G substitutions = 0.1556, A-T substitutions = 0.0971, C-G substitutions = 0.0624, C-T substitutions = 0.5361, and G-T substitutions = 0.0977. The proportion of
sites assumed to be invariable was 0.4867 and the rates for variable sites were assumed to follow a gamma distribution with shape parameter of 0.5657.

In the phylogenetic analyses based on the ITS and LSU (D1–D2) rDNA, *H. minima* was clearly divergent from the other clades (Figs. 9, 10).
Fig. 9. Consensus Bayesian tree of the family Suessiaceae based on 767 aligned positions of ITS rDNA. *Prorocentrum* spp. were chosen as the outgroup taxon. The branch lengths are proportional to the amount of character change. The numbers above the branches indicate the Bayesian posterior probability (left) and maximum-likelihood bootstrap values (right).
Fig. 10. Consensus Bayesian tree of the family Suessiaceae based on 889 aligned positions of LSU (D1-D2) rDNA. *Prorocentrum* spp. were chosen as the outgroup taxon. The branch lengths are proportional to the amount of character change. The numbers above the branches indicate the Bayesian posterior probability (left) and maximum-likelihood bootstrap values (right).
4.3.2. Interactions between *Heterocapsa minima* and common heterotrophic protists

Among the 6 common predator species tested in this study, Cells of *Oxyrrhis marina*, *Gyrodinium dominans*, *Pfiesteria piscicida*, and *Pelagostrobilidium* sp. were able to feed on *Heterocapsa minima* cells, but cells of *Oblea rotunda*, and *Polykrikos kofoidii* were not feed on *H. minima* (Table 12). *H. minima* were attacked by *O. rotundata*, but not eaten. Cells of *O. marina* and *G. dominans* contained 1–3 ingested prey cells.
Table 12
Taxa and size of common heterotrophic dinoflagellate and naked ciliate predators offered to *Heterocapsa minima*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predators</th>
<th>ESD (µm)</th>
<th>Feeding of <em>H. minima</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Gyrodinium dominans</em></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oblea rotunda</em></td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oxyrrhis marina</em></td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polykrikos kofoidii</em></td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pfiesteria piscicida</em></td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pelagostrobilidium sp.</em></td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial concentrations of *H. minima* were 8,000–10,000 cells ml\(^{-1}\). Mean equivalent spherical diameter (ESD, µm).

Y, feeding; N, no feeding.
Feeding by cells of *O. marina* on *H. minima* was confirmed by observation using epifluorescence microscopy (Fig. 11E). The body of *H. minima*, having chloroplasts, was seen as a red sphere under an epifluorescence microscope, while the body of *O. marina* was not seen because it does not have chloroplasts. The two species (predator and prey) were mixed, red particles were transferred from the bodies of *H. minima* to those of *O. marina*.

Feeding by cells of *G. dominans* on *H. minima* was confirmed by observation using epifluorescence microscopy (Fig. 11G). One *H. minima* cell inside the protoplasm of a *G. dominans* cell observed under an epifluorescence microscope.
Fig. 11. Images of heterotrophic dinoflagellates feeding on *Heterocapsa minima* (Hm). *H. minima* cell without added predator observed under a light microscope (A), *Oxyrrhis marina* (Om) cell without added prey (B), and *Gyrodinium dominans* (Gd) cell without added prey (C), Feeding of Om cell (blue arrow) on Hm cells (red arrow) observed under an epifluorescence microscope without filters (D) or under green filter (E), Feeding of Gd cell (blue arrow) on Hm cell (red arrow) observed under an epifluorescence microscope without filters (F) or under green filter (G). Scale bar = 10 µm for (A-G).
4.3.3. Effects of the Heterocapsa minima concentration on the growth rate of Gyrodinium dominans

The growth rates of O. marina, G. dominans, P. piscicida, and Pelagostrobilidium sp. on H. minima were very low or negative at almost all prey concentrations. The specific growth rate of G. dominans on H. minima at the all prey concentration (8-2049 ng C ml$^{-1}$) (range = -0.25 d$^{-1}$ ~ -0.14 d$^{-1}$) was lower than that of G. dominans without added prey (mean ± standard error = 0.034 d$^{-1}$ ± 0.017, n = 3) (p > 0.1, two-tailed t-test). The specific growth rate of G. dominans incubated with H. minima was significantly lower than that without H. minima (Fig. 12).

Fig. 12. Growth rates of Gyrodinium dominans on Heterocapsa minima as a function of mean prey concentration.
4.3.4. Artemia test for toxicity

One to two (average = 1.7) of 10 Artemia salina nauplii in each well died after 48 h incubation with A. minutum at the concentrations of >1000 cells ml\(^{-1}\), while almost all nauplii survived after incubation with A. minutum filtrate. However, almost all nauplii of A. salina survived after 48 h of incubation with H. minima (>100 cells ml\(^{-1}\)), but two to three A. salina nauplii per well aggregated and thus could not swim normally. None of the A. salina nauplii was dead after 48 h of incubation with H. minima filtrate.

4.4. Discussion

4.4.1. Interactions between Heterocapsa minima and common heterotrophic protists

This study clearly showed that common HTDs and ciliates fed on H. minima. Of the HTDs included in the present study, O. marina, G. dominans, Pelagostrobilidium sp. and P. piscicida fed on H. minima cells, whereas O. rotunda, P. kofoidii did not feed on H. minima. The HTDs O. rotunda, and P. kofoidii attempt to feed on H. minima cells. O. rotunda uses a tow filament, and P. kofoidii uses a nematocyst-taeniocyst complex (Strom and Buskey 1993; Kiørboe and Titelman 1998; Matsuoka et al. 2000; Jeong et al. 2001). Therefore, H. minima cells may not draw deployment of a tow filament or a nematocyst-taeniocyst complex.
4.4.2. Effects of the Heterocapsa minima concentration on the growth rate of Gyrodinium dominans

When suitable prey species are provided, the specific growth rates of *G. dominans* were negative at almost all prey concentrations. The phototrophic dinoflagellate prey *Prorocentrum minimum*, *Heterocapsa triquetra*, and the raphidophyte *Chattonella antiqua* cause this positive trend (Kim et al., 2004; Nakamura et al., 1995; Nakamura et al., 1992). When *G. dominans* fed on *H. triquetra*, the maximum growth rate of *G. dominans* was 0.54 d$^{-1}$. However, in the present study, the specific growth rate of *G. dominans* was very low or negative at almost all prey concentrations. Thus, *H. minima* may neither markedly support nor inhibit the growth of *G. dominans*.

4.4.3. Ecological niche

Interestingly, the results of this study show that, while *A. minutum* cells kill *Artemia salina* nauplii, *H. minima* cells do not. *H. minima* may not have harmful ingredients for the predators and may not affect growth of predators. This study shows that *H. minima* is not a good prey for predators. When *Heterocapsa* spp. bloom occurs, predators are expected to eat other species that can grow through eating instead of the innutritious *H. minima*. Thus, *H. minima* might play diverse ecological roles in marine planktonic...
communities by having an advantage over competing phytoplankton in anti-predation against common protistan grazers.
Chapter 5. General conclusions

In this thesis, I explored the distribution of the heterotrophic nanoflagellate Katablepharis japonica in Jinhae Bay from May 2014 to July 2017. Furthermore, I discovered a newly identified role of K. japonica, an effective predator on red-tide organisms. Moreover, I first reported the presence of the phototrophic dinoflagellate Heterocapsa minima in Korean waters and investigated its interactions with common heterotrophic protists.

From the data on the abundance of Katablepharis japonica in Jinhae Bay, Korea from May 2014 to July 2017, quantified using qPCR method and newly designed specific primer-probe sets, the abundances of K. japonica was affected by chlorophyll-a concentration. This evidence suggests that this HNF may feed on phytoplankton. The subsequent feeding experiments showed that K. japonica is a predator of diverse phytoplankton, including toxic or harmful dinoflagellates and raphidophytes. Prior to this study, most protistan predators on toxic or harmful dinoflagellates and raphidophytes were mixotrophic dinoflagellates, heterotrophic dinoflagellates, and ciliates. However, this discovery extends protistan predators to HNFs. Furthermore, mortality due to predation by HNFs should be taken into consideration in establishing models of understanding or predicting process of red tides or harmful algal blooms.
Prior to this study, *Heterocapsa minima* was reported only from the European Ocean. Discovery of this species in the Korean waters extends its distribution to the Pacific Ocean. Using a clonal culture of this species, interactions between this species and common heterotrophic protistan predators were explored. The heterotrophic dinoflagellates *Oxyrrhis marina*, *Gyrodinium dominans*, and *Pfiesteria piscicida* and the naked ciliate *Pelagostrobilidium* sp. fed on *Heterocapsa minima* cells, whereas the heterotrophic dinoflagellates *Oblea rotunda* and *Polykrikos kofoidii* did not feed on *H. minima* cells. However, the specific growth rates of predators were very low or negative at almost all prey concentrations. Thus, *H. minima* did not support growth of all common heterotrophic protists tested. Furthermore, its mortality due to predation by heterotrophic protistan predators may be very low.
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국문 초록

종속영양성 미세조류는 어디에나 있고, 박테리아의 주요 포식자로 알려져 있다. 그러나, 식물성 플랑크톤을 섭식하는 종속영양성 미세조류의 섭식에 대한 이해가 부족하다. 이 두 가지 요소들은 일반적으로 공존하는데, 주요 종속영양성 미세조류인 Katablepharis 종들의 섭식과 생태학적 역할을 조사하기 위하여 박테리아와 식물성 플랑크톤을 섭식하는 Katablepharis japonica의 섭식 능력과 어떠한 먹이 유형을 먹는지에 대한 조사를 하였다.

더군다나, K. japonica의 성장률과 와편모조류인 Akashiwo sanguinea(적절한 조류 먹이), 종속영양성 박테리아, 그리고 남세균인 Synechococcus sp.를 먹이로 하였을 때 소화율을 먹이 농도에 따른 함수로 밝혀냈다. 먹이 실험 대상 중에, K. japonica는 종속영양성 박테리아, Synechococcus sp., 담녹조강인 Pyramimonas sp., 은편모조류인 Rhodomonas salina와 Teleaulax sp., 침편모조류인 Heterosigma akashiwo와 Chattonella ovate, 와편모조류인 Heterocapsa rotundata, Amphidinium carterae, Prorocentrum donghaiense, Alexandrium minutum, Cochlodinium polykrikoides, Gymnodinium catenatum, A. sanguinea, Coolia malayensis, 그리고 섬모충인 Mesodinium rubrum을 소화했지만, 와편모조류인 Alexandrium catenella, Gambierdiscus
caribaeus, Heterocapsa triquetra, Lingulodinium polyedrum, Prorocentrum cordatum, P. micans, Scrippsiella acuminata 와 규조류인 Skeletonema costatum 는 섭식하지 못하였다. 많은 K. japonica 세포들이 함께 공격하며 먹이 세포의 표면을 쪼아서 섭식한 후 파열된 세포 표면에서 나온 물질들을 흡수한다. A. sanguinea 는 K. japonica 의 양의 성장을 지지했지만, 종속영양성 박테리아와 Synechococcus sp.는 성장을 지지하지 못하였다. A. sanguinea 를 섭식한 K. japonica 의 최대 특정 성장률은 1.01 d⁻¹이고, 최대 소화율은 0.13 ng C predator⁻¹d⁻¹ (0.06 cells predator⁻¹d⁻¹) 이다. 종속영양성 박테리아를 섭식한 K. japonica 의 최대 소화율은 0.019 ng C predator⁻¹d⁻¹ (226 bacteria predator⁻¹d⁻¹) 이고, Synechococcus sp.를 섭식한 K. japonica 의 가장 높은 소화율은 (약 10⁷ cells ml⁻¹의 농도로 먹이 제공) 0.01 ng C predator⁻¹d⁻¹ (48 Synechococcus predator⁻¹d⁻¹) 이다. A. sanguinea, 종속영양성 박테리아, Synechococcus sp.로부터의 최대 일일 탄소 유입량은 포식자의 몸 탄소의 각각 307, 43, 22%였다. 따라서, 종속영양성 박테리아와 Synechococcus sp.를 섭식한 K. japonica 의 낮은 소화율은 성장 부족의 원인이 될 수 있다. 이 연구의 결과는, K. japonica 는 유독하거나 해로운 조류를 포함한 다양한 식물성 플랑크톤의 포식자이며, 먹이 종들에 의해
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야기되는 적조의 역학에도 영향을 미칠 수 있다는 것을 분명히 보여 준다.
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