The unique ecological role of pyrosomes in the Eastern Tropical Pacific
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Abstract

Pyrosomes are an important but often overlooked component of marine zooplankton communities, with limited existing information regarding their ecological and trophic roles in pelagic ecosystems. We present the first estimates of grazing and trophic interactions of the large tropical pyrosome, *Pyrostremma spinosum*, in the Eastern Tropical Pacific. While patchy in distribution, *Pyrostremma spinosum*’s grazing impact was substantial, up to 17.5% of chlorophyll *a* standing stock d−1 in certain areas. In contrast, these organisms cleared a very small percentage of the abundant picoplankton *Synechococcus* spp. compared to the bulk zooplankton community. Stable isotopes (13C and 15N) indicated that particulate organic matter (POM) from the surface mixed layer (0–20 m) constitutes the isotopic food-web baseline for most of the zooplankton community, and zooplankton trophic interactions were size structured in some areas. Pyrosomes, doliolids, and appendicularians, along with the smallest size class of net-collected zooplankton, had isotopic values closest to pure herbivory, while intermediate size classes, copepods, and salps showed substantial omnivory/carnivory. Euphausiids, chaetognaths, and > 2 mm zooplankton were the main carnivorous zooplankton in the plankton food web. Stable isotopes indicated that *Pyrostremma spinosum* is trophically distinct from the rest of the zooplankton community, grazing just below the mixed layer (20–40 m), as opposed to feeding on surface POM. Pyrosomes represent an additional, distinct pathway for material transfer up the plankton food web, by directly consuming POM sources not substantially grazed upon by the rest of the mesozooplankton community.

Pyrosomes, the largest pelagic colonial tunicates, occur in most marine ecosystems from the warm tropics to cold temperate regions, yet their roles in marine food webs remain poorly known. From studies of pelagic tunicates (mainly of salps, doliolids, and appendicularians), we know that these organisms have general capabilities and functions that differ appreciably from their crustacean zooplankton counterparts (Alldredge and Madin 1982; Michaels and Silver 1988; Bone 1998). Their characteristics include gelatinous bodies, very high rates of reproduction, and the ability to form massive blooms (Andersen 1998; Deibel 1998; Fenaux et al. 1998). While feeding mechanisms of each group differ, their filtering modes are more efficient and allow much higher per capita clearance rates than crustacean zooplankton (Bone 1998; Deibel 1998; Scheinberg et al. 2005; Hereu et al. 2010). In addition, the small pore sizes of their mucus filters allow capture of particles in the micron to submicron particle range, enabling the capture of bacteria and picophytoplankton not generally accessible to crustacean zooplankton (Madin and Kremer 1995; Zubkov and Lopez-Urrutia 2003; Scheinberg and Landry 2005; Sutherland et al. 2010). The combination of high particle consumption and growth rates of pelagic tunicates can also lead to substantial contributions to vertical export fluxes. When present in significant numbers, salps can dominate export due to high grazing and production of large fecal pellets that sink rapidly from the surface ocean with minimal microbial degradation (Madin 1982; Michaels and Silver 1988; Madin et al. 2006; Henschke et al. 2016; Stone and Steinberg 2016). The discarded mucus houses of appendicularians typically contain abundant fresh particles and can act as aggregation nuclei, attaching smaller particles as they contribute to the rain of marine snow (Alldredge 1972; Gorsky and Fenaux 1998; Lombard and Kiørboe 2010). Blooms of doliolids and salps further contribute to export by transporting carbon...
to depth in sinking carcasses (Deibel 1998; Smith et al. 2014; Takahashi et al. 2015).

As the least studied pelagic tunicates, the pyrosome knowledge gap has been highlighted by recent observations of anomalously high pyrosome densities around the world, including the first observation of Pyrosoma atlanticum in the Canary Islands (Tobena and Escanez 2013), Taiwan (Kuo et al. 2015) and record densities in the California Current (Sakuma et al. 2016; Brodeur et al. 2018). The abundant and cosmopolitan species, *P. atlanticum*, often exceeding $10^6$ cells mL$^{-1}$, is uniquely characterized by a tough, hard tunic resilient to net collections, colonies reaching sizes up to 17 cm (Van Soest 1981), and by swarms capable of removing substantial amounts of the phytoplankton standing stock (Drits et al. 1992; Perissinotto et al. 2007). To our knowledge, only one study has evaluated rates of fecal pellet sinking and degradation, suggesting sinking speeds (70 m d$^{-1}$) significantly less than those for salp pellets (Drits et al. 1992). While many studies support the idea that salps and appendicularians can tap into the microbial loop (Sutherland et al. 2010), comparable data on pyrosomes do not exist. Perissinotto et al. (2007) found higher retention efficiencies for cells greater than 10 μm in *P. atlanticum*, and fatty acids indicated a mixed phytoplankton diet of diatoms, dinoflagellates, and prymnesiophytes. *P. atlanticum* carcasses also contribute to carbon export, which can be substantial following blooms (Lebrato and Jones 2009; Liao et al. 2013).

We encountered large colonies of a pyrosome in the Eastern Tropical Pacific (ETP), later identified as *Pyrosternma spinosum*, a much lesser studied pyrosome with a more delicate consistency than *P. atlanticum*, as part of the Costa Rica Dome (CRD) FLUx and Zinc Experiments (FLUZiE) voyage (Landry et al. 2016a). The CRD is a unique open-ocean upwelling system within the ETP, characterized by very high abundances of *Synechococcus* spp., often exceeding $10^6$ cells mL$^{-1}$ (Li et al. 1983; Fiedler et al. 2002; Selph et al. 2016), large zooplankton stocks (Décima et al. 2016), and a food web that supports many charismatic megafauna (including sea turtles, which feed on gelatinous zooplankton such as salps and pyrosomes) and top predators (Ballance et al. 2006). *Pyrosternma spinosum* has not, to our knowledge, been reported previously in the area (Van Soest 1981, 1998), but is known in other regions of the tropical Pacific (Griffin and Yaldwyn 1970; Van Soest 1998) as well as in the Arabian Sea (Gauns et al. 2015). We initially hypothesized that pelagic tunicates (anticipating mainly salps and appendicularians) would be uniquely equipped to capitalize on the large concentrations of picophytoplankton in the area. The occurrence of numerous large *Pyrosternma spinosum* colonies, however, provided an unexpected opportunity to investigate their roles in the trophodynamics and biogeochemistry of the area. In this study, we compare the grazing impacts of pyrosomes and size-fractionated mesozooplankton on phytoplankton and *Synechococcus* spp. using tracer pigments. We additionally investigate the resources sustaining zooplankton, using $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta^{15}$N of particulate organic matter (POM) to identify the vertical distributions of particles consumed by size-fractionated zooplankton, appendicularians, salps, chaetognaths, ostracods, and pyrosomes, to construct a size-based assessment of material flows through the planktonic community, and to identify the likely source depth of particles sinking below the euphotic zone.

**Material and methods**

The FLUZiE voyage was conducted on the R/V *Melville*, from 22 June 2010 to 25 July 2010, in the area of 7.5–10.2°N, 87–93°W, in the ETP (Fig. 1). The sampling plan was based around semi-Lagrangian experiments, with each “cycle” of activity following a water parcel marked by satellite-tracked drogued drifters for 4–5 d (Landry et al. 2016a). We first conducted a transect across a broad area with elevated surface chlorophyll $a$ (Chl $a$), to determine the center of the dome. The first cycle of the cruise was conducted in coastal waters and is not presented here. Cycle 2 was carried out in the central core area of the CRD, and Cycle 4 was initiated at the location of a drifter left to mark the movement of the same water where Cycle 2 ended 5 d earlier. Cycles 3 and 5 were located at the periphery of the dome, to the east and west, respectively (Fig. 1).

One drift array was used as a platform for in situ rate measurements including primary production (PP), phytoplankton growth, microzooplankton grazing, and nitrate uptake (Landry et al. 2016a). A second drift array had sediment traps at 90 and 150 m (Stukel et al. 2013). Net tows for zooplankton biomass and grazing estimates were conducted twice daily in the marked water parcels (Décima et al. 2016). Full descriptions of the experimental design, and references to studies already published from this cruise, can be found elsewhere (Landry et al. 2016a,b). Below, we provide details of the measurements that relate specifically to the current analysis.

**Zooplankton sample collection**

Mesozooplankton (> 200 μm) were collected with double-oblique tows taken twice daily from ~150 m to the surface between 10:00–13:00 h (daytime) and 21:00–24:00 h (nighttime) using a 1-m ring net fitted with a 202-μm Nitex mesh net, a temperature-depth logger, and a General Oceanics flow meter. Samples for biomass and gut-fluorescence grazing analyses were size fractionated (SF) using nested sieves into five size classes: 0.2–0.5, 0.5–1, 1–2, 2–5, and > 5 mm (Décima et al. 2016). Additional tows to 150 m, typically in late afternoon and at dusk, were conducted to collect live animals for experiments with other zooplankton (not presented here). *Pyrosternma spinosum* was mostly caught at night, with no specimens collected in morning or mid-day tows, strongly suggesting that the colonies were undergoing diel vertical migration (DVM), consistent with other species in the group (Andersen et al. 1992; Andersen and Sardou 1994; Bone 1998). Because the pyrosome colonies were relatively sparse but had a much greater biovolume when captured than the combined taxa of the regular net tows, we used catches from both standard night tows and evening live tows to estimate their...
abundances and grazing impacts. These were combined by averaging the night catches (live and standard) only, not including day tows because of DVM.

*Pyrostremma spinosum* has a soft consistency and a tendency to break up in the nets. It should be noted that some literature citations refer to *Pyrosoma spinosum* (e.g., Griffin and Yaldwyn 1970; Gauns et al. 2015), but we use the cladistic classification from Van Soest (1998), which identifies this organism as *Pyrostremma spinosum*. However, the possibility of a new species cannot be discounted.

Our initial sampling plans were not optimized for capturing *Pyrostremma spinosum* (colonies were typically larger than the cod ends of our nets or the nested sieves used for size-fractionation). When it became apparent on Cycles 2 and 3 that they were quantitatively important, we modified our methods to allow quantitative grazing and biogeochemical measurements of *Pyrostremma spinosum* on Cycles 4 and 5. We estimated size by measuring displacement volume and used this metric to extract standing stock and grazing estimates from the measurements made on pooled zooids. Collected pyrosomes, their displacement volumes, and analyzed specimens are indicated in Table 1. Subsamples of *Pyrostremma spinosum* were frozen at −80°C for later laboratory analysis.

**Zooplankton grazing**

Grazing rates for *Pyrostremma spinosum* were estimated by taking 2.5 mL aliquots (4 aliquots per specimen) of thawed pyrosome (9 ± 2 zooids), extracted in 10 mL of acetone.
Table 1. Displacement volumes of Pyrostemma spinosum caught during FLUZIE zooplankton tows, estimated zooids per colony, and mean abundance per cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Colony volume (liter)</th>
<th>Abundance (mL m⁻² cycle⁻¹)</th>
<th>Zooids per colony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transect Sta. 4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>821.35*</td>
<td>7319 ± 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>1764 ± 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>106 ± 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2*</td>
<td>277.31</td>
<td>4233 ± 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0*</td>
<td>7055 ± 423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>19,400 ± 1162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7*</td>
<td>118.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2116 ± 127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that for Sta. 4 on the transect, the abundance was normalized by the one station, and is equivalent to abundance of one tow. Errors for zooid estimate per colony are SE.
†Organisms assayed for bulk isotopes.
‡Colonies assayed for gut pigments.

(90%), and sonicated with an ultrasonic tissue homogenizer. Samples were then allowed to extract for 2–4 h at −20 °C, centrifuged for 5 min at 3000 × g to remove pyrosome tissue, and poured into 7-mL borosilicate tubes for fluorometric analysis. Pigments (Chl a and phaeopigments) were analyzed using a Turner 10AU fluorometer with a Chl a filter set, before and after acidification with two drops of 10% HCl (Strickland and Parsons 1972). A similar procedure was employed to measure phycocerythrin (PE), a pigment indicative of Synechococcus spp., using the glycerol uncoupling method. Aliquots for PE were transferred to a glycerol saline solution (50%), ground with a non-ultrasonic tissue homogenizer to release gut contents, and centrifuged to remove consumer tissues. Samples were measured on a Turner Designs TD-700 fluorometer with a PE filter set (Wyman 1992; Dore et al. 2002; Stukel et al. 2013). For each pyrosome, we calculated grazing as:

\[ G = (p_{Chl} \times f \times D \times 12 \times GCR)/vol \]

where \( G \) is grazing (mg m⁻² d⁻¹), \( p_{Chl} \) is the pigment gut (Chl a and phaeopigment or PE) content (mg), \( f \) is fraction of sample analyzed (2.5 mL/pyrosome volume), \( D \) is depth of tow (m), \( vol \) is volume of water filtered (m³), and \( GCR \) is the gut clearance rate (h⁻¹). There is no GCR literature value for Pyrostemma spinosum, so we used the value of 0.699 h⁻¹, derived for P. atlanticum in the Indian Ocean at 13–15°C, which is similar to our temperatures below the thermocline (Perissinotto et al. 2007). Finally, we multiplied these estimates by 12 (h d⁻¹), consistent with the DVM observations noted above (Andersen and Sardou 1994; Bone 1998).

Detailed methods for estimates of size-fractionated mesozooplankton community grazing rates have been published elsewhere (Stukel et al. 2013; Décima et al. 2016). Briefly, we used a method similar to that detailed above on the size-fractioned mixed community, using phaeopigment concentrations as the gut fluorescence estimate of herbivorous feeding to ensure that chlorophyll-containing phytoplankton aggregates caught by the net did not bias the grazing estimate. PE estimates of grazing rates on Synechococcus by the full zooplankton community were done similarly to those for Pyrostemma spinosum. The GCR for zooplankton was 2.1 h⁻¹, based on experimentally determined gut turnover rates in the Equatorial Pacific at similar mixed-layer (ML) temperatures (~25–27°C) (Zhang et al. 1995). For mesozooplankton, we multiplied day and nighttime rate estimates by 12 h each, and added the two for a daily grazing total.

Grazing impacts on the entire phytoplankton and Synechococcus (PE) communities were calculated by taking the daily averages of pigments consumed by each zooplankton group, normalized by the integrated pigment standing stock and multiplied by 100. Carbon egestion by zooplankton was estimated by multiplying the pigment-based rates times the C : Chl ratios from Taylor et al. (2016) at the appropriate feeding depths (see Data Analysis section below), and assuming an absorption efficiency of 0.7 (Conover 1966). We calculated mean regional grazing estimates for Pyrostemma spinosum by applying our rate determinations (e.g., mg Chl a eq. zooid⁻¹ d⁻¹) from specific stations to the pyrosome abundances calculated for each cycle/station during the cruise, normalized by the sampling time (transect + Cycles 2–5), which was 23 d.

δ¹³C and δ¹⁵N determination

Eight depths from two casts with the conductivity-temperature-depth (CTD) rosette per cycle were sampled for water-column particulate organic carbon and nitrogen (POC, PON) and stable isotopes (¹³C, ¹⁵N). Samples were filtered onto pre-combusted glass fiber filters (GF/F) filters and frozen in liquid N₂, subsequently acidified, and analyzed by mass spectrometry. Samples from the shallow (90 m) sediment traps were prepared and analyzed in a similar manner (Stukel et al. 2016). Stable isotopes of size-fractionated zooplankton samples were measured on one day and one night tow, per cycle. Frozen samples were dried at 60°C for 24 h, and subsequently homogenized with a motorized tissue grinder in a glass test tube. Representative aliquots of each size (0.2, 0.5, 1, and 2 mm) were packed into individual tin cups for analysis. Stable isotopes of individual taxa were measured in two ways. Individuals from four groups (appendicularians, ostracods, calanoid copepods, and chaetognaths) were sorted from frozen samples, pooled and placed in tin cups, dried at 60°C for 24 h, packed, and analyzed for ¹³C and ¹⁵N. Individuals from fixed (formalin) samples were used for abundance estimates (published in Décima et al. 2016) and ¹⁵N measurements but not C as the δ¹³C increases in formalin preserved samples over time (Rau et al. 2003). Formalin preserved samples were subsampled to obtain specimens for: appendicularians, ostracods, doliolids, and euphausiids. Subsampling was done with a
Folsom splitter to obtain at least 100 individuals. Samples were sorted under a stereomicroscope, rinsed, imaged, and measured using Image J. Only euphausiids were identified to species (Euphausia distinguenda, Euphausia lamelligera, and Euphausia eyjafjordensis). Average sizes were calculated for each group from the mean sizes in each cycle. Mean sizes for the size-fractioned community were taken as the midpoint of the size interval (i.e., 0.375, 0.75, 1.5, and 3.5 mm).

Bulk isotopes for salps were obtained for both the main body and the gut separately from frozen samples. Using a thin blade scalpel, the guts of individual salps were excised, put into tin cups and dried for later analysis. The remaining body was processed in the same manner. For Pyrostrema spinosum, portions of approximately 40–60 zooids per colony were excised, dried at 60°C for 24 h, packed in tin cups and analyzed.

All isotope determinations were conducted at the Isotope Biogeochemistry lab at Scripps Institution of Oceanography. Isotope samples were neither acidified or lipid extracted prior to analyses. Acidification was not done because there were relatively few carbonate-containing organisms in our zooplankton tows (Décima et al. 2016), and acidification has been shown to artificially decrease both δ13C and δ15N values (Ute et al. 2005). 13C values of thinly calcified ostracods could be slightly enhanced due to this decision (which we address in the discussion), but those values were within the measured range for the rest of the community (Supporting Information Fig. S1). Additionally, ostracods, while never dominant, were most abundant for Cycle 3 (Décima et al. 2016), but size-fractionated 13C values for that cycle were within the same range as the others (Supporting Information Fig. S1). Lipids are typically significantly depleted in 13C, and large amounts, as occurs in fish, mammals, and many polar zooplankton, can significantly bias their carbon isotopic values (Logan et al. 2008). However, the zooplankton of tropical regions like the CRD generally do not accumulate lipid stores (Lee et al. 2006), and pelagic tunicates and gelatinous organisms, in particular, have negligible lipid accumulation (Madin et al. 1981; Deibel et al. 1992; Nelson et al. 2000). Ricca et al. (2007) advise against lipid extraction for lower pelagic food-web members, especially if nitrogen is of particular interest, and high precision of 13C is not required. Mintenbeck et al. (2008) have also shown that lipid extraction can alter δ15N values significantly, up to 1.65‰.

Data analysis

The feeding depths of individual zooplankton groups were evaluated relative to POM isotope profiles. These were separated into four depth strata: 0–20, 21–40, 41–60, and 61–100 m, the deeper depths of each strata roughly corresponding to: the ML, 20°C isotherm, euphotic zone, and sub-euphotic zone, although these were quite variable among cycles (Taylor et al. 2016). Trophic discrimination factors (TDF; Δ) were added to water-column POM values for both δ13C and δ15N. Because fractionation can vary among species, we drew consumer polygons that included the POM measurement (Δ13C = Δ15N = 0), and the POM measurement plus Δ13C = 0.5‰ and Δ15N = 2.5‰. These numbers are consistent with TDF literature values (Vander Zanden and Rasmussen 2001; Post 2002; Williams et al. 2014), although slightly lower than the typical 3.4‰, as we chose the Δ15N to ensure no animal had a trophic position (TP) < 2 (see below). These consumer polygons delimit the isotope area in which particle feeders should fall, encompassing all the possible isotopic values that a particle grazer could have if consuming locally available POM nonselectively.

Zooplankton TPs were calculated using POM values as a baseline, as follows:

\[
TP = (\delta^{15}N_{\text{consumer}} - \delta^{15}N_{\text{POM}})/\Delta^{15}N + 1
\]

where \(\delta^{15}N_{\text{consumer}}\) corresponds to the zooplankton value, and \(\delta^{15}N_{\text{POM}}\) is the POM value at the baseline depth, based on feeding depths determined using POM consumer polygons. We used 2.5 as a TDF to ensure that size-fractionated zooplankton had TP ≥ 2. This value is consistent with other studies of marine zooplankton trophic enrichment (e.g., Rau et al. 2003). We consider the problem of baseline variability on TP estimates in the discussion. TDFs for salps were assessed by comparing δ15N tissue to δ15N gut. Consumer polygons and other data analyses were made using Matlab 2013a.

Results

Oceanographic conditions

The ML depth at ~ 20–30 m was clearly identified by the abrupt decrease in temperature and dissolved oxygen concentrations, and increase in salinity values (Fig. 1), with particle and plankton concentrations closely tied to these water-column physical properties. Chl a peaked in the ML (Fig. 2a), suspended phaeopigment maxima were just below the ML (Fig. 2b), Synechococcus spp. concentrations peaked typically at the surface (Fig. 2c), with highest concentrations of \(2 \times 10^5\) cells mL\(^{-1}\) in the dome center, and larger phytoplankton (> 2-μm cells) decreased from surface to depth (Fig. 2d). Particle concentrations were highest at the surface, decreasing somewhat monotonically from surface to roughly 60 m (Fig. 3a,b), yet PO13C and PO15N showed differing vertical profiles. Δ13C values were highest in particles in the upper 20 m (~21‰) and decreased rapidly to ~26‰ at 40 m, changing little at deeper depths (Fig. 3a). Vertical profiles of PO15N were enriched in 15N in the upper 20 m and at depth (60–80 m), with local minima at intermediate depths (30–40 m), depleted by up to 4‰ compared to surface values (Fig. 3d). Surface Δ15N values ranged from 4‰ to 7‰, while deep PO15N (70–80 m) was consistently ~ 7‰.

Pyrostemma spinosum abundance and grazing

Individual pyrosome colonies varied in biovolume from 25 ml to 5.5 l, resulting in total tow densities of
Due to possible break up during net capture, the lower estimates may not represent full colonies. From visual observations, intact *Pyrostemma spinosum* floating near the sea surface at night were 0.5–2 m in length, consistent with net-collected animals during this part of the cruise (Table 1). Pyrosome grazing rates were very high due to large colony size, with up to 20,000 zooids colony$^{-1}$ (Table 1), and high pigment content per zooid (Table 2). Regional grazing impacts of pyrosomes were variable, with a single colony capable of removing up to 36% of Chl $a$ standing stock (Table 3).

However, due to low abundance and patchy distribution, the integrated value over a single water patch varied between 0.7% and 17.5%, with an overall cruise mean of 4.2% (Table 3). Compared to ingested Chl $a$ + phaeo, PE concentrations (1–1.9 μg per zooid) were low in all analyses (Table 2), resulting in insignificant percentage removal of *Synechococcus* standing stock d$^{-1}$ by pyrosome colonies (Table 3).

### Trophic niches within the water column

The vertical distributions of PO$^{13}$C and PO$^{15}$N are useful for determining the sources of material for particle-feeders, as different strata were found to have different δ$^{13}$C and δ$^{15}$N values, with δ$^{13}$C of −24‰ to −23‰ found only in the layer immediately below the ML, and lowest δ$^{15}$N values present uniquely in subsurface waters as well (Fig. 3; Table 4). Consumer polygons delineating the isotope space for animals feeding in each of these depth strata were constructed using combined data from all locations. While the individual cycles showed almost no overlap between the two shallowest depth strata (Supporting Information Fig. S1), the regional averages had greater overlap between the surface (0–20 m) and the 21–40 m strata. The deeper strata (41–60 and 61–100 m) were always clearly separated from the shallow surface ML (Fig. 4). δ$^{13}$C and δ$^{15}$N values for size-fractioned zooplankton, most of the zooplankton taxonomic groups, and pelagic tunicates.
(with the exception of pyrosomes) fell within the 0–20 m depth polygon (or outside with slightly higher values). This suggests that surface production was fueling these assemblages, although most organisms (including salps) exhibited varying degrees of omnivory/carnivory, resulting in higher $\delta^{13}C$ and $\delta^{15}N$ isotope values (Fig. 4 and Supporting Information Fig. S1; Table 4). Sediment trap values, in contrast, suggested that material sinking across the 90-m depth horizon originated from the euphotic zone below the ML, with lower values for both $\delta^{15}N$ and $\delta^{13}C$, despite high variability among replicates (Fig. 4). Most interestingly, bulk isotopes of *Pyrostromma spinosum* indicated that they were the only group consistently feeding at depths below 20 m, and had isotope values similar to sediment trap material from 90 m. On only one out of our four Lagrangian cycles, size-fractioned zooplankton displayed a range of $\delta^{13}C$ values, suggesting that larger organisms can feed on particles or organisms from deeper depths (Supporting Information Fig. S1; Fig. 4). Salps and appendicularians had similar isotopic contents to small zooplankton, ostracods, and copepods, all feeding on the POM baseline originating at the surface. Chaetognaths and > 1-mm zooplankton had the highest $^{15}N$ values, suggesting enhanced levels of carnivory (Fig. 4).
**Table 3.** Grazing impact of mesozooplankton (> 200 μm) and pyrosomes on Chl a and *Synechococcus* (Syn), expressed as percent removed per day. Mean ± Std of each cycle. Sta. 4 during the line transecting the dome represents one station where a large *Pyrostremma spinosum* was collected, and does not correspond to any of the cycles. Nd indicates no data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Chl a standing stock</th>
<th>Impact on Chl a</th>
<th>Pyrosomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mg Chl a m⁻²</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sta. 4</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>36.2 ± 26.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17 ± 4.2</td>
<td>9.8 ± 3.4</td>
<td>3.2 ± 2.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.2 ± 3.5</td>
<td>23.1 ± 9.84</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.9 ± 2.9</td>
<td>21.8 ± 10.4</td>
<td>17.5 ± 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.8 ± 4.8</td>
<td>44.6 ± 18.8</td>
<td>6.6 ± 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLUZIE average</td>
<td>19.2 ± 5.0</td>
<td>14.2 ± 10.6</td>
<td>4.2 ± 2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.** Percent carbon, C:N (g:g), stable isotope composition of mesozooplankton, salps, and *Pyrostremma spinosum*. Mesozooplankton values are a biomass-weighted average of all size-classes. Nd indicates no data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>C : N</th>
<th>δ¹³C</th>
<th>δ¹⁵N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 2</td>
<td>Mesozooplankton</td>
<td>37.6 ± 2.1</td>
<td>3.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>−19.9 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salps</td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pyrostremma spinosum</em></td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment trap</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9.6 ± 0.7</td>
<td>−24.1 ± 1.6</td>
<td>14.3 ± 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 3</td>
<td>Mesozooplankton</td>
<td>33.4 ± 6.2</td>
<td>3.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>−20.4 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salps</td>
<td>16.5 ± 9.4</td>
<td>5.0 ± 0.4</td>
<td>−20.8 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pyrostremma spinosum</em></td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment trap</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11.7 ± 2.2</td>
<td>−24.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>4.6 ± 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 4</td>
<td>Mesozooplankton</td>
<td>36.4 ± 1.0</td>
<td>3.6 ± 0.3</td>
<td>−20.4 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salps</td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>Nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pyrostremma spinosum</em></td>
<td>10.2 ± 4.2</td>
<td>6.3 ± 1.0</td>
<td>−23.8 ± 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment trap</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10.9 ± 0.7</td>
<td>−24.0 ± 0.0</td>
<td>5.3 ± 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 5</td>
<td>Mesozooplankton</td>
<td>39.11 ± 0.04</td>
<td>4.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>−22.3 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salps</td>
<td>13.3 ± 5.9</td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.8</td>
<td>−19.0 ± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pyrostremma spinosum</em></td>
<td>8.1 ± 0.9</td>
<td>6.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>−23.4 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment trap</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11 ± 1.76</td>
<td>−24.1 ± 0.2</td>
<td>6.9 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indirect grazing estimates, based on gut pigment measurements normalized by pyrosome biovolume conducted in Cycles 4 and 5, and applied to the measured pyrosome abundances.

Omnivory of salps was supported by visual investigations of fecal pellets produced during incubations of freshly collected organisms. These showed a mixed diet including copepods, ostracods, radiolarians and phytodetritus (Fig. 5). We attempted to estimate TDFs from the isotopic differences between gut contents and bulk tissues of salps, but the results were quite variable, with salp tissues typically enriched by 0.1‰ to 2.1‰, relative to guts, for both ¹³C and ¹⁵N (Table 5).

**Discussion**

The pyrosome *Pyrostremma spinosum* appears to occupy a distinct vertical niche in the pelagic habitat of the ETP. Their isotopic values differ significantly from all the other groups in the zooplankton assemblage, matching the profile below the surface ML, and resembling the material exported to sediment traps. While they contribute little to the grazing impact on *Synechococcus* (the dominant phytoplankter, constituting 20–30% of autotrophic carbon), they have a high grazing impact on deeper dwelling phytoplankton, and likely the sinking aggregate pool, impacting export through the base of the euphotic zone. In the following discussion, we consider these ecological roles in comparison to other zooplankton taxa and the lower food-web dynamics and biogeochemistry of the region.

**Trophic flows through zooplankton**

Consumer polygons, TP estimates, and pigment-based grazing depict a zooplankton community largely fueled by surface...
production, with significant levels of carnivory and omnivory, and a separate pyrosome assemblage sustained by phytoplankton residing just below the ML. While inferences based on bulk isotopes can be complicated by isotopic variability of the POM baseline (Post 2002; Chouvelon et al. 2012; Décima et al. 2013), significant amounts of inorganic carbon (Ute et al. 2005), or substantial lipids in zooplankton samples (Ricca et al. 2007; Mintenbeck et al. 2008), these factors likely do not significantly affect our conclusions. POM-based polygons were constructed using eight measurements at each depth, over a large area (Fig. 1), carried out over a 20-d period, which likely decreased the effect of high-frequency variability on the baseline of each cycle (Fig. 4; Supporting Information Fig. S1). Zooplankton isotope values are consistent with low amounts of inorganic carbon and lipids, as ostracods did not have substantially higher δ13C values than the rest of the zooplankton community, and bulk zooplankton were not significantly depleted in δ13C (a consequence of high lipid concentrations; Fig. 4). If we were to apply a general mathematical correction (Post et al. 2007), our sample values would shift to the right, resulting in zooplankton with highly enriched δ13C values well outside any of the consumer polygons. In addition, our results agree with other stable isotope determinations from the area (Williams et al. 2014), and our own visual observation of salp fecal pellets (Fig. 5) containing large copepods, ostracods, and radiolarians, along with phytodetritus.

The TP estimates for salps, reflecting substantial omnivory (mean = 2.24, range = 1.9–2.8, Fig. 6), are conservative if the TDF value that we used (2.5‰ for 15N) is too high, as suggested by the body-gut difference from Table 5, from which we can calculate a mean TDF of 1‰ (range 0.1–1.9). If we use this empirically derived TDF for thaliaceans in general, our isotope measurements would give a mean TP = 2 (range 0.5–3.2) for doliolids, as opposed to the unrealistic estimates in Fig. 6. While we can also generally attribute the low TP estimates for Pyrostremma spinosum to uncertainties in the applicable TDF values for such consumers, one specimen had15N values less than the PO15N of the intermediate depth stratum (less than any PO15N sampled), indicating that it had grown under food conditions that differed in 15N content from the water column where it was collected. This decoupling is not surprising given that Pyrostremma spinosum migrate to deeper depths with different currents during daytime.

We generally interpret the isotope enrichment of mesozooplankton as not accounting for the transfers through protistan microzooplankton, because prior studies have shown that phagotrophic protists increase only minimally in δ15N, up to 0.5‰, with trophic transfers (Gutiérrez-Rodríguez et al. 2014; Décima et al. 2017; Landry and Décima 2017). Other lines of evidence from experimental studies, however, have demonstrated the importance of microzooplankton as prey for open-ocean mesozooplankton generally (Stoecker and Capuzzo 1990; Fessenden and Cowles 1994; Roman and Gauzens 1997;
Calbet and Landry 1999; Liu et al. 2005; Landry et al. 2016b; Décima et al. 2017), and as a major trophic pathway to mesozooplankton in the ETP (Stukel et al. 2013; Stukel et al. 2016; Landry et al. 2016b). In fact, it would be possible for some of the deeper (20–40 m) material to support zooplankton production, but this would require an average TP ≥ 3 for phagotrophic protists (assuming a 0.5‰ isotopic enrichment), as intermediate prey, to be consumed by the mesozooplankton.
Microzooplankton grazing in the upper 40 m was equivalent to 601 ± 61 mg C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ (Landry et al. 2016b), supporting 180 ± 18 mg C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ of protistan grazers (TP = 2) assuming a growth efficiency of 0.3 (Straile 1997), and 54 ± 5 C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ secondary consumers (TP = 3). This would be equivalent to 15% of the mesozooplankton phytoplankton consumption, which is an upper-bound as most of the grazing in the upper 40 m occurred in the shallow ML. However, this does not preclude greater contributions of protistan production in shallower waters, as this process would result in similar isotopic values as the herbivorous pathways, and the small size of phytoplankton requires an intermediate grazer of a size large enough to be consumed by mesozooplankton. Our pigment-derived estimates suggest substantial consumption of phytoplankton by both microzooplankton and mesozooplankton (Décima et al. 2016; Landry et al. 2016b), as well as pelagic tunicates, which together add up to ~50% of Chl $a$ standing stock removed per day (Table 3, Landry et al. 2016b). The related pathway of zooplankton feeding on aggregates (Goldthwait et al. 2005; Stukel et al. 2014) containing Chl $a$-degradation products (phaeopigments; Fig. 2b) could also account for some of the measured grazing. Marine snow is hypothesized to be an important source of food for zooplankton (Goldthwait et al. 2004), and the high water-column concentrations of phaeopigments at the base of the euphotic zone suggest that this is an important process in this area (Fig. 2b).

Our combined stable isotope and grazing results suggest different trophic pathways in the water column, with most of the integrated primary production (~77%) occurring in the upper 20 m and roughly half of this surface production (47% ± 34%, mean ± SE) consumed directly by mesozooplankton (excluding pyrosomes), supporting a multistep food web within the zooplankton (Fig. 7). Waters directly beneath the ML (20–40 m) supported ~20% of total PP, and 31% ± 16% (mean ± SE) of this subsurface production was consumed by Pyrostremona sp. Despite a pyrosome standing stock 30 times less than that of mesozooplankton on a dry weight (DW) basis (0.2 ± 0.1 and 6.2 ± 0.5 g DW m$^{-2}$, respectively), their large biovolume and grazing potential, along with reduced PP below the ML, lead to a large impact of pyrosomes on the deeper phytoplankton assemblage not exploited by other mesozooplankton consumers (Fig. 7).

The ecological role of Pyrostremona sp. in the ETP

Our results support the possibility of a unique role for these pyrosomes in the ETP, consuming large quantities of phytoplankton below the ML and potentially altering the export of particles to depth. For grazing rate estimates, the gut clearance rate used (0.699 h$^{-1}$) has considerable uncertainty. We used this value because it was experimentally determined under similar water temperatures (12–15°C; Perissinotto et al. 2007) to our sub-ML thermocline. The rate would presumably be higher for the ML temperature of ~27°C (closer to 0.75 h$^{-1}$; Drits et al. 1992). However, these GCR estimates come from experiments with P. atlanticum, a species of much smaller size and firmer consistency than Pyrostremona sp. (Van Soest 1998), and therefore could be different. Regardless of the uncertainty, the high concentrations of ingested pigment in
Unfortunately, we do not have zoid size estimates for either of these species to evaluate this scaling effect. However, if we scale these rates with colony length, using the zoid/length relationships above, we estimate that a 1 m-long *P. atlanticum* would filter ~ 1.6 m$^{-3}$ colony$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$, which is in the range of the estimates for pyrosomes in this study.

Our identification was based on the characteristics described by Van Soest (1998), and in that study, *Pyrostremma spinosum* is not indicated to inhabit the ETP, and we have found no additional references of this species in the area. However, in the same study, Van Soest (1998) summarizes the bioregions in which each species of pyrosoma has been observed. While no records of *Pyrostremma spinosum* were listed for the ETP, observations were listed for the two contiguous bioregions (not separated by land or major oceanographic features), the equatorial and southwest Pacific, and a congeneric species (*Pyrostremonia agassizi*) have been observed within the ETP. It is likely that the lack of studies in this area have contributed to our sparse understanding of its distribution and ecology. The only other study to document the habitat for *Pyrosoma spinosum* was done in the Arabian Sea (Gauns et al. 2015). In this area, *Pyrosoma spinosum* was found under conditions of high macronutrient concentrations, modest Chl $a$, dominance of *Synechococcus* in the upper 40 m, and overlying a well-developed shallow oxygen minimum zone, all of which are very similar to the characteristics of our study area (Buchwald et al. 2015; Selph et al. 2016), and suggest these as typical habitat characteristics for *Pyrosoma spinosum*.

It is unclear if *P. spinosum* functions mainly as a “flux-feeder,” a suspension-feeding grazer of phytoplankton and protists (Table 2), or some combination of the two. The higher ratio of phaeo : Chl $a$ in the depth range where it feeds (Fig. 2a,b) suggests that these pyrosomes may consume some fecal material produced by other mesozooplankton. The δ$^{13}$C and δ$^{15}$N of *Pyrostremma spinosum* (1–3.5‰ and ~ 5‰ lower than for other mesozooplankton), however, would suggest this process is minor, as larger isotope depletion of feces with respect to body tissues would be required (Checkley and Enteroth 1985) yet imply higher TPs that would lead to unrealistically low TPs. It is more likely, from the stable isotope perspective, that the bulk zooplankton is consuming high levels of fecal material. While the relative contributions of fresh phytoplankton, fecal pellets, and other detritus in the diet of *Pyrostremma spinosum* cannot be determined with certainty, the isotopic composition of exported material (at a depth of 90 m) more closely resembles *Pyrostremma spinosum* than either POM or zooplankton from the ML. The mismatch between the isotopic compositions of both ML POM (where most primary productivity occurs) and suspended deep POM from sinking material suggests a transformation mediated by zooplankton (Stukel et al. 2011; Turner 2015) or microbial reprocessing (Legrand and Lefevre 1995). Calculations of the total particulate carbon egested by pyrosomes, 18.9 ± 18.3 (Table 6), are equivalent to about 30% of the regional mean.

**Fig. 7.** Schematic of the partitioning of grazing on phytoplankton primary production through the water column, the food-chain within the integrated zooplankton community, and the standing stocks of both *Pyrostremonia spinosum* ($0.2 \pm 0.1$ g DW m$^{-2}$) and mesozooplankton ($6.2 \pm 0.5$ g DW m$^{-2}$). PP was integrated for three depth strata (0–20, 21–40, or 41–100 m). Percentages (± SE) denote consumption from each depth strata, where the mesozooplankton community is assumed to graze ML production, while pyrosomes graze on production in the underlying (21–40 m) layer. Dashed-dotted profile denotes salinity, and black profile indicates mean oxygen concentration. Dashed line denotes the average depth of the euphotic zone.

*Pyrostremonia spinosum* zoids still indicate an important grazing role for this pyrosome (Table 2).

The high ratio of (Chl $a$ + phaeo) : PE (median = 240 : 1 g : g) in *pyrosoma* zoids indicates that they do not efficiently capture *Synechococcus*. For comparison, where pyrosomes were collected, the ratio of Chl $a$ + phaeo : PE in the water column at 20–40 m depth was ~ 5 : 1. The average ratio of PE in > 20-μm aggregates to total water-column PE was closer to 1 : 7, suggesting that aggregate-associated *Synechococcus* ingestion would be sufficient to explain zoid PE concentrations. Individual colonies consumed an average of 0.8 mg Chl $a$ h$^{-1}$ (range 0.2–2.1 mg Chl $a$ h$^{-1}$). We can estimate the volume filtered by a colony using average Chl $a$ concentrations in the 20–40 m depth range (0.27 ± 0.08 mg Chl $a$ m$^{-3}$) and measured pigment ingestion. Colonies of 1.2–3.7 liters in volume had clearance rates of 3 ± 1 m$^3$ colony$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ (mean ± SE). For comparison, the average clearance rates of ~ 55-mm colonies of *P. atlanticum* was determined to be 5.5 L colony$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ (Drits et al. 1992), which results in very different clearance rates per zoid. The 55-mm *P. atlanticum* had ~ 1412 zoids per colony (Andersen and Sardou 1994) and *Pyrostremonia spinosum* in our study had 2000–20,000 zoids per colony while reaching much larger sizes (Table 1), which translates to a ~ 2 order of magnitude increase in zoid clearance rate, from 3.5 mL zoid$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ (*P. atlanticum*) to 450 mL zoid$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ (*Pyrostremonia spinosum*).
Table 6. Potential contribution of Pyrostemma spinosum and the mesozooplankton size-fractionated community to export flux, assuming egestion = 0.3 consumption, and using C : Chl from the assumed feeding depths of each group, from Taylor et al. (2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>POC flux (90 m) (mg C m⁻² d⁻¹)</th>
<th>P. spinosum colony fecal production (mg C m⁻² d⁻¹)</th>
<th>Zooplankton size-fractionated community fecal production (mg C m⁻² d⁻¹)</th>
<th>% POC export P. spinosum fecal production</th>
<th>% POC export zooplankton fecal production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.9 ± 18.0</td>
<td>8.0 ± 5.8*</td>
<td>54.6 ± 8.1</td>
<td>12.5 ± 9.1*</td>
<td>85.5 ± 12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67.3 ± 4.8</td>
<td>1.6 ± 1.2*</td>
<td>225.9 ± 93.3</td>
<td>2.4 ± 1.8*</td>
<td>335.6 ± 138.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.3 ± 6.0</td>
<td>42.6 ± 16.3*</td>
<td>91.4 ± 35.0</td>
<td>84.6 ± 32.4</td>
<td>181.7 ± 69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>72.4 ± 6.0</td>
<td>23.5 ± 8.8</td>
<td>315.5 ± 55.0</td>
<td>32.4 ± 12.1</td>
<td>435.5 ± 75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>63.5 ± 9.5</td>
<td>18.9 ± 18.3</td>
<td>171.9 ± 120.8</td>
<td>29.8 ± 28.8</td>
<td>259.6 ± 156.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These estimates were based on recorded volumes of collected pyrosomes (Table 1) and estimated mean grazing rate per milliliter of colony, assuming 4.5 d (cycle duration).

†Mean cruise estimates were made using measured grazing of pyrosomes when possible, and including the estimates for Cycle 2 and Cycle 3, normalized to 18 sampling days—the length of the four cycles considered here (there is no sediment trap data for the transect stations, hence that estimate was not included here).

POC collected in sediment traps at 90 m, while the mesozooplankton community produce feces calculated to be ~260% of sinking POC (Stukel et al. 2016). The excess of grazing over export by the combined mesozooplankton/Pyrostemma spinosum community indicates that most egested material is substantially reworked before sinking (Stukel et al. 2016) and is supported by the change in phaeo : Chl a ratio with depth.

The distinct isotopic values of Pyrostemma spinosum, signaling a specific depth of feeding (20–40 m, Figs. 4, 7), begs the question of why these organisms feed at a different depth than the rest of the community. Perhaps their nutritional requirements are different, as trace metal ratios were depth specific, with higher Fe : S (but lower Zn : S and Ni : S) in the subsurface chlorophyll maximum compared to the surface (Baines et al. 2016). Particle aggregation at the bottom of the ML may also lead to higher concentrations of large particles, satisfying the nutritional requirements of Pyrostemma spinosum, while limiting other zooplankton due to low Zn and Ni (Baines et al. 2016). This could also explain why the isotopic values of exported POC and Pyrostemma spinosum are so similar, as both would be fueled by larger particles forming or concentrating below the ML. Finally, these organisms may prefer the cooler temperatures, reduced turbulence levels beneath the ML, or be potentially better equipped to survive the low oxygen concentrations. Regardless, by directly consuming larger particles in a portion of the euphotic zone not heavily exploited by the rest of the mesozooplankton community, Pyrostemma spinosum represents a distinct pathway of material and energy transfer to higher trophic levels in the ETP.
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